



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Lords of land and labour: a comparison of Antebellum Mississippi's John A. Quitman and Nineteenth-Century Ireland's Lord Clonbrock
Author(s)	Smith, Cathal
Publication Date	2015-12-17
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/5438

Downloaded 2024-04-26T04:55:12Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.





Lords of Land and Labour:
A Comparison of Antebellum Mississippi's John A.
Quitman and Nineteenth-Century Ireland's Lord
Clonbrock

Cathal Smith

A Dissertation Submitted for the Award of the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Head of Department: Dr. Alison Forrestal
Supervisor: Dr. Enrico Dal Lago

Department of History
School of Humanities
National University of Ireland, Galway

September 2015

CONTENTS

<i>Abstract</i>		iii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>		iv
<i>Abbreviations</i>		v
Introduction		1
Chapter One	Ireland, the American South, and ‘Rural Subjection,’ c. 1550-1800	24
Chapter Two	Second Slavery and Second Lordship: John A. Quitman’s and Lord Clonbrock’s Economic Attitudes and Behaviours	68
Chapter Three	Planter and Landlord Ideologies: John A. Quitman, Lord Clonbrock, and Paternalism	109
Chapter Four	Varieties of Paternalism in Practice: Labour Relations on the Quitman Plantations and Clonbrock Estates	152
Chapter Five	“We Have Become a Second Ireland”: Elites, Unionism, and Nationalism in the Antebellum U.S. South and Nineteenth-Century Ireland	196
Conclusion		240
<i>Bibliography</i>		254

ABSTRACT

This study investigates similarities, differences, and connections between antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders and nineteenth-century Irish landowners. In particular, it focuses on the comparison of Mississippi's John A. Quitman (1799-1858) and Galway's Robert Dillon, third baron Clonbrock (1807-1893). Quitman was a New York-born, first generation slaveholder who migrated to Natchez in 1821 and subsequently became a planter. He was also a prominent politician who advocated Mississippi's secession from the United States during the 1850s. Clonbrock was a member of the long-established Dillon family and inherited numerous landed estates throughout Ireland, mostly in east County Galway, when he turned twenty-one in 1828. Like Quitman, Clonbrock was active in local and national politics, although he remained a committed supporter of Ireland's place in the United Kingdom throughout his life.

Taking these two individuals as case studies representative of their respective classes, this dissertation compares American planters' and Irish landlords' economic behaviours, ideologies, relationships with their labourers, and political histories. It suggests that Quitman and Clonbrock were representative of a particular type of economically progressive but socially and politically conservative landed proprietor that became increasingly common in the American South and Ireland during the nineteenth century. At the same time, Quitman's and Clonbrock's actions were also conditioned by the crucial differences between their contexts. By contrasting these contexts, we arrive at a better understanding of the reasons why American slaveholders and Irish landlords had such different relationships with their respective national governments—why Quitman became a proponent of Southern secession, whereas Clonbrock was always a British unionist.

This dissertation also examines some of the direct and indirect transnational connections between antebellum American slaveholders and their Irish landed contemporaries. It shows that Quitman and Clonbrock were mutually influenced by many of the same international economic, intellectual, and political developments, while the mass migration from Ireland to the United States that occurred during the nineteenth century also had a dramatic effect on the Southern and Irish landed elites.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My first thanks must go to my doctoral supervisor, Dr. Enrico Dal Lago, who inspired my original idea to write this dissertation, who shepherded it to completion with unceasing advice and encouragement, and whose own work provided a high standard to aspire to. My second thanks to my external and internal examiners—Professor Peter Kolchin and Dr. Róisín Healy—whose questions and comments during my viva were both helpful and stimulating.

I would also like to acknowledge all of the lecturers in the National University of Ireland, Galway's history department, especially the members of my Graduate Research Committee: Dr. John Cunningham, Dr. Dáibhí Ó'Cróinín, and Dr. Alison Forrestal. Dr. Gearoid Barry deserves special mention for his help and encouragement at various stages.

Special thanks must also go to Drs. Kevin McKenna and Brian Casey, two scholars who generously shared their research with me in the early stages of my PhD; and to David Gleeson for providing me with his copies of the Gregory Papers, which saved a trip to Atlanta.

This dissertation would not have been possible without the monetary support of a number of institutions. The Irish Research Council provided me with a postgraduate scholarship between 2010 and 2013. NUI Galway contributed funds toward my first research trip to the U.S. in 2012, and also provided a write-up bursary that facilitated the completion of my dissertation. Finally, the Royal Irish Academy funded a second American research trip that I took in May 2014. I am grateful to all of the above institutions for their generosity.

Huge thanks to my friends, brothers, and sister—Declan, Richard, Brían, Gerard, and Caitriona—for all of our trips to Galway, Longford, Clare, London, Kentucky, and the cinema. Their main contributions to this dissertation have been the provision of welcome breaks from study, and the preservation of my sanity. Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Anne and Brian.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CP** Clonbrock Papers, National Library of Ireland, Dublin.
- FHQP** F. Henry Quitman Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- JAQPL** John Anthony Quitman Papers, Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.
- JAQPM** John A. Quitman Papers, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson.
- QFP** Quitman Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Manuscripts Department, Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation compares antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholding and nineteenth-century Irish landlordism. More specifically, it focuses on the investigation of similarities and differences between two case studies: John A. Quitman, a planter from Natchez, Mississippi, and Robert Dillon, Lord Clonbrock, a landowner from east County Galway in Ireland. The son of an immigrant Lutheran Reverend, Quitman was born in Rhinebeck, New York in 1799. At the age of twenty-two, he moved to Mississippi, where he passed the bar and established a legal practice. Quitman became a planter in 1828, after he purchased land in southern Louisiana, which he subsequently developed into a sugar plantation. By the time he died in 1858, Quitman also owned three Mississippi cotton plantations and had become one of the U.S. South's largest slaveholders. He was also a prominent politician who earned national notoriety for his proslavery and states' rights views, his role as a general during the Mexican-American War (1846-48), and his advocacy of Mississippi's secession from the United States during the 1850s.¹

Eight years younger than Quitman, Robert Dillon, third baron Clonbrock, was born into one of Ireland's wealthiest landed families in 1807. The Dillons of Clonbrock owned numerous estates, but most of their land was located in County Galway, in the west of Ireland. In common with the majority of his fellow landlords, Clonbrock was Protestant, which distinguished him from Ireland's mostly Catholic population. Unlike most Irish landed families, however, the Dillons did not arrive in Ireland as part of England's sixteenth and seventeenth-century colonisation of the country, but rather had roots that went back as far as

¹ On the life of Quitman, see Robert May, *John A. Quitman: Old South Crusader* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985).

the late twelfth century. In 1790, Robert Dillon's grandfather was granted the hereditary title baron Clonbrock by the Irish parliament; he inherited his estates in 1828, was elected to Westminster's House of Lords in 1838, and earned himself a generally positive reputation as a 'good' landlord before his death in 1893.²

This study argues that we can attain a better understanding of American planters and Irish landlords by comparing Quitman and Clonbrock. As a number of scholars have suggested, comparative history offers the possibility to gain new insights into a range of historical individuals, events, or processes by viewing them in a wider context; according to Peter Kolchin, for example, comparative history can be used to reduce parochialism and enable historians to form or disprove generalisations.³ Before embarking upon a comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock, however, it is necessary to first justify the comparability between the landed classes to which they belonged. To do so, one may begin with Marc Bloch's remark that, in any successful comparative study, "there must be a certain similarity between the facts observed ... and a certain dissimilarity between the situation in which they have arisen."⁴ In other words, there should be both parallels and contrasts between American slaveholding and Irish landlordism in order to render the case studies of Quitman and Clonbrock worthy of sustained and rigorous comparison.

Even a cursory glance at the histories of U.S. Southern planters and Irish landlords reveals a number of striking similarities. The labour systems that supported the two landed classes—slavery and tenancy—were established in the 1500s and 1600s, following England's colonisation of Ireland and North America; American slaveholding and Irish landlordism can

2 See Kevin McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual: Paternalism on the Clonbrock Estates, 1826-1908," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011).

3 Peter Kolchin, "The American South in Comparative Perspective," in Enrico Dal Lago and Rick Halpern (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 37. Also see Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (1980), 174-197; Raymond Grew, "The Case for Comparing Histories," *American Historical Review* 58 (1980), 763-778; Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, "Comparative History: Methods, Aims, Problems," in Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor (eds.), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 23-39.

4 Marc Bloch, "A Contribution Towards a Comparative History of European Societies," in Marc Bloch, *Land and Work in Medieval Europe: Selected Papers* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967 [1928]), 45.

therefore be traced to a common origin. Thereafter, the American South and Ireland were both dominated by agrarian elites who owned and profited from landed estates that produced agricultural commodities for export. Also, from the late eighteenth century on, American slaveholders and Irish landlords were increasingly critiqued as economically backward and morally corrupt, and those comparable attacks prompted comparable ideological defences. Furthermore, the antebellum American South and nineteenth-century Ireland were both parts of larger political entities: the United States and the United Kingdom. Therefore, American planters and Irish landlords were distinctively *regional* agrarian elites.

Yet, notwithstanding these analogies, the antebellum U.S. South's slaveholders and nineteenth-century Ireland's landowners unquestionably inhabited very different contexts. The most obvious contrast between the two elites is the fact that slavery was the predominant mode of labour deployed on American plantations, whereas Irish landed estates were worked by legally free tenants and labourers. Related to this fundamental difference between the types of agrarian labour extant in the U.S. South and Ireland is the fact that American slaves were exclusively of African descent, whereas Irish peasants were mostly of indigenous origin. Hence, the antebellum South included a racial dichotomy between whites and blacks that was not present in nineteenth-century Ireland. However, I shall argue later on that the religious divide between mostly Protestant landowners and mostly Catholic peasants in Ireland constituted a subtle form of racism. Other notable contrasts between the American slaveholders' and Irish landlords' nineteenth-century contexts include the fact that the U.S. South had an expanding frontier and was part of a federal republic, whereas Ireland had no such frontier and was part of a constitutional monarchy. Therefore, while U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords shared certain characteristics that stemmed from the fact that both groups were regionally distinctive agrarian elites, differing historical conditions in the American South and Ireland produced two landed classes that were unlike each other in many

respects. For this reason, American planters and Irish landlords fulfil Bloch's criteria for comparison.

To be sure, the existence of similarities and differences between the American South and Ireland has not escaped the attention of historians. Nicholas Canny, Jack Greene, and Audrey Horning have published monographs that compare various aspects of Irish and British American history in the early modern period.⁵ Theodore Allen has examined the origins and development of Ireland's Protestant ascendancy and the American South's white supremacy in comparative perspective.⁶ In their respective treatments of the role that Irish migrants played in shaping the history of the U.S. South, David Gleeson and Kieran Quinlan have both discussed parallels and contrasts between the immigrants' home and host countries.⁷ Finally, a recent historiographic trend—exemplified by the work of Nini Rodgers, Angela Murphy, and Caleb McDaniel—has focused on the investigation of Irish involvement in American slavery and transnational links between American and Irish abolitionisms during the nineteenth century.⁸ Yet, notwithstanding this scholarship on the similarities, differences, and connections between the American South and Ireland, no sustained and systematic comparison of American slaveholders and Irish landlords has been published to date. Building on the above scholarship, and using Quitman and Clonbrock as case studies, with my dissertation I intend

5 Nicholas Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988); Jack Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Audrey Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

6 Theodore Allen, *The Invention of the White Race, Volume One: Racial Oppression and Social Control* (London: Verso, 1994).

7 David Gleeson, *The Irish in the South, 1815-1877* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Kieran Quinlan, *Strange Kin: Ireland and the American South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005). For a recent treatment of Irish-American planters and overseers, see Joe Regan, "Irish Immigrants in the Rural U.S. Slave South," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Galway, 2015).

8 Nini Rodgers, *Ireland, Slavery and Anti-Slavery, 1612-1865* (London: Palgrave, 2007); Angela Murphy, *American Slavery, Irish Freedom: Abolition, Immigrant Citizenship, and the Transatlantic Movement for Irish Repeal* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2010); W. Caleb McDaniel, "Repealing Unions: American Abolitionists, Irish Repeal, and the Origins of Garrisonian Disunionism," *Journal of the Early Republic* 28 (2008), 243-269. Also see Tom Chaffin, *Giant's Causeway: Frederick Douglass's Irish Odyssey and the Making of an American Visionary* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014); Fionnghuala Sweeney, *Frederick Douglass and the Atlantic World* (Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 2007).

to fill this historiographical lacuna.

Although no historian has hitherto written a comparative study of U.S. Southern slaveholding and Irish landlordism, comparative historical studies of American slavery are hardly novel.⁹ In comparing Quitman and Clonbrock, I am following particularly in the footsteps of three other historians who have systematically compared the antebellum U.S. South with nineteenth-century European societies. In *Unfree Labor* (1987), Peter Kolchin has examined similarities and differences between American slavery and Russian serfdom; in *Masters and Lords* (1993), Shearer Davis Bowman has juxtaposed U.S. Southern planters with Prussian Junkers; and, most recently, in *Agrarian Elites* (2005), Enrico Dal Lago has compared American slaveholders and southern Italian landowners. Although the specific similarities and differences that emerge from the comparison of an American planter and an Irish landlord naturally diverge in certain respects from Kolchin's, Bowman's, and Dal Lago's findings, their monographs provide valuable models for my own study.¹⁰

Significantly, Kolchin has also provided a theoretical framework for the understanding of comparisons of the American South. In *A Sphinx on the American Land* (2003), he has argued that there are three distinct ways to examine the South in comparative perspective: comparisons with the American North, or 'un-South'; comparisons between the internal geographic, temporal, social, and political variations of the 'many Souths' that formed the South; and comparisons with 'other Souths,' which involves "examining the South in the context of societies outside the United States that have shared some of the same attributes."¹¹

Nineteenth-century Ireland can be seen as one of several 'other Souths,' since it arguably

9 For a historiographical overview, see Enrico Dal Lago, "Comparative Slavery," in Robert Paquette and Mark Smith (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 664-684.

10 Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987); Shearer Davis Bowman, *Masters and Lords: Mid-Nineteenth-Century U.S. Planters and Prussian Junkers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Enrico Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites: American Slaveholders and Southern Italian Landowners, 1815-1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005). Also see George Fredrickson, *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study of American and South African History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981).

11 Peter Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 4-5.

shared enough analogies with the antebellum U.S. South to render the two regions, their labour systems, and their respective agrarian elites—including individuals such as Quitman and Clonbrock—worthy of sustained comparison. Some of the most important parallels and contrasts between American slaveholders and Irish landlords have already been noted above. Yet, we can make better sense of those similarities and differences by placing the U.S. South and Ireland within established methodological frameworks whose usefulness in facilitating rigorous comparison has been proven by Kolchin's, Bowman's, and Dal Lago's studies.

One feature to emphasise when arguing for nineteenth-century Ireland's status as an 'other South' is the fact that it played a fundamentally comparable role of 'periphery' within the methodological framework of Immanuel Wallerstein's world-system to that of the antebellum U.S. South. In Wallerstein's formulation, a capitalist world-economy emerged in western Europe and the Atlantic during the sixteenth century and expanded thereafter. This international capitalist system was characterised by a single division of labour between core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral regions. The core of the world-system was the region that was economically strongest and tended to concentrate on manufacturing. Peripheries, instead, were locations that focused on the cultivation of agricultural raw materials and foodstuffs for export and provided markets for goods manufactured in core regions. Between the mid-eighteenth and late-nineteenth centuries, England functioned as the core of the capitalist world-economy.¹² In both Ireland and the American South, on the other hand, although different items were farmed using different types of labour, the underlying fact remains that agrarian enterprises whose primary function was the production and export of agricultural commodities were ubiquitous during the nineteenth century. In this sense, the two regions

12 Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Capitalist World-Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 1-36; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, 4 vols. (New York: Academic Press, 1974-2011); Immanuel Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004). For more on Wallerstein's world-system concept and its critics, see Enrico Dal Lago, "World-Systems Theory," in Joseph Miller (ed.), *The Princeton Companion to Atlantic History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 498-501; Marcel Van Der Linden, *Workers of the World: Essays Toward a Global Labor History* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 287-318.

functioned as peripheries.¹³

Wallerstein has explicitly argued that the world-system provides a platform for the systematic comparison of different peripheral societies, by viewing them as constituent parts of a larger whole. Significantly, both *Masters and Lords* and *Agrarian Elites*, and also, in lesser measure and implicitly, *Unfree Labor*, have built on this premise in their respective comparisons of the American South with Prussia, southern Italy, and Russia.¹⁴ Therefore, the fact that nineteenth-century Ireland, similarly to the three aforementioned European regions, also functioned as a periphery within the capitalist world-system provides an important support to the theoretical justification of its comparability with the U.S. South, and, by extension, to the comparability of American slaveholders with Irish landlords. Even though the crops farmed on Quitman's and Clonbrock's estates and their means of producing and profiting from those crops differed, the fact that the two elites depended for their wealth on the sale of agricultural commodities in the world market provides a strong link between the foundations of their labour systems. Indeed, Ireland's peripheral status has already been at the heart of Marta Petrusiewicz's comparison of nineteenth-century Irish landowners with their Polish and southern Italian counterparts. Arguably, the fact that Ireland was, in Petrusiewicz's words, "representative of the objective peripheral condition," can also be used to compare Irish landlords with other peripheral agrarian elites, including American slaveholders.¹⁵

At the same time, the fact that both the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland functioned as peripheries within the capitalist world-economy does not mean that they were equivalent, as some critics of Wallerstein's world-system concept have suggested

13 On the American South as a peripheral region, see Wallerstein, *Capitalist World-Economy*, 202-221. On Ireland, see Kevin Whelan, "Ireland in the World-System, 1600-1800," in Hanz-Jürgen Nitz (ed.), *The Early-Modern World-System in Geographical Perspective* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993), 204-216.

14 Wallerstein, *Capitalist World-Economy*, 36; Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16 (1974), 387-415; Bowman, *Masters and Lords*, 97-101; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 17-19, 35-54; Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 1-2, 385n.

15 Marta Petrusiewicz, "The Modernity of the European Periphery; Ireland, Poland and the Two Sicilies, 1820-1870: Parallel and Connected, Distinct and Comparable," in Cohen and O'Connor (eds.), *Comparison and History*, 146.

peripheral categorisations may imply.¹⁶ Although Wallerstein has associated the periphery with systems of legal bondage and coerced labour—such as American slavery and eastern European serfdom—there were some peripheral regions that utilised sharecropping or tenancy arrangements, which were arguably no less coercive, even if the workers were legally ‘free.’ In fact, the type of labour system established in a given peripheral region depended upon the specific historical circumstances that existed at the time of its incorporation into the world-system and the symbiotic interaction of global and local processes that affected its development thereafter. Periphery, therefore, is a category that may include a variety of comparable agrarian labour systems, both unfree and legally free.¹⁷

This recognition of differentiation between the labour systems that played a peripheral role in the development of global capitalism owes a great deal to the scholarship that has refined Wallerstein’s ideas by suggesting ways to avoid the potentially reductive consequences of fixed categorisations of peripheries. Foremost among the scholars who have argued for the use of updated models of world historical analysis for the comparative investigation of a wide range of agrarian labour systems are Dale Tomich and Enrico Dal Lago. In *Through the Prism of Slavery* (2004), Tomich has argued that Wallerstein did not adequately distinguish between different types of labour within the periphery, and the latter’s world-system theory is therefore “unable to comprehend either the differences between the various relations of production or the historically changing relations among them within the processes constituting world economy.”¹⁸ This is not an insurmountable flaw, however, since Tomich and a few other scholars have outlined how the world-system can be re-imagined in a

16 See Robert Brenner, “The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism,” *New Left Review* 104 (1977), 25-92; Dale Tomich, *Through the Prism of Slavery: Labor, Capital, and World Economy* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), 15-17.

17 Wallerstein, *Capitalist World-Economy*, 119-131; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 18-19; Dal Lago, “Comparative Slavery,” 673, 679-680; Stanley Engerman, “Introduction,” in Stanley Engerman (ed.), *Terms of Labor: Slavery, Serfdom, and Free Labor* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 1-23.

18 Tomich, *Through the Prism of Slavery*, 17. For other criticisms of Wallerstein’s world-system theory, see Brenner, “Origins of Capitalist Development,” 25-92; Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times* (London: Verso, 1994); William Robinson, “Globalization and the Sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A Critical Appraisal,” *International Sociology* 26 (2011), 1-23; Daniel Garst, “Wallerstein and His Critics,” *Theory and Society* 14 (1985), 469-495.

way that respects equally the importance of global processes and historical materialism by recognising variations between peripheral agrarian labour systems in specific local contexts.¹⁹

While Tomich has applied his sophisticated interpretation of the world-economy chiefly to the analysis of a number of New World slave societies, his ideas undoubtedly have a broader significance.²⁰ Following Tomich's suggestions, agrarian regions where the labourers were legally free can be classified as peripheries alongside regions that utilised unfree labour without ignoring the fundamental differences between them. This is a point that has been developed by Enrico Dal Lago, who has argued that European regions where tenancy and sharecropping were the favoured modes of labour control—such as southern Italy and Spain—can be effectively compared with American slave and eastern European serf societies. As Dal Lago has argued, even while tenants and sharecroppers in different parts of modern Europe were legally free, they were often still exploited and discriminated against to the extent that they were subject to a degree of practical 'unfreedom' caused by economic dependence and social subordination to the landowning classes.²¹

These ideas are directly relevant to the comparison of Lord Clonbrock and John Quitman at the heart of my study, since the comparability between their classes is justifiable, in part, by taking into account nineteenth-century Ireland's and the antebellum U.S. South's common status as economic peripheries. Although Ireland's peasants were never legally enslaved, they were nonetheless part of a system of agrarian labour that was incorporated into the world-economy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when British settlers

19 Tomich, *Through the Prism of Slavery*, 32-55. Also see Philip McMichael, "Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method," *American Sociological Review* 55 (1990), 385-397; Sidney Mintz, "The So-Called World System: Local Initiative and Local Response," *Dialectical Anthropology* 2 (1977), 253-270.

20 See Tomich, *Through the Prism of Slavery*, 120-136; Dale Tomich, *Slavery in the Circuit of Sugar: Martinique in the World Economy, 1830-1848* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990); Dale Tomich and Michael Zeuske, "Introduction, The Second Slavery: Mass Slavery, World Economy, and Comparative Microhistories," *Review* 31 (2008), 91-100.

21 Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 18-19; Enrico Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond: The U.S. "Peculiar Institution" in International Perspective* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2013), 95-121. Also see Piero Bevilacqua, "Peter Kolchin's 'American South' and the Italian *Mezzogiorno*: Some Questions About Comparative History," in Dal Lago and Halpern (eds.), *American South and Italian Mezzogiorno*, 65-67.

established tenancy on landed estates throughout the country. Within this socioeconomic system, since they possessed no permanent property rights to the land they farmed and could be evicted at short notice, Irish peasants were vulnerable to economic and social exploitation by the landed class—an exploitation comparable, though not equivalent, to that experienced by different groups of unfree labourers, among whom were the slaves who worked on American plantations. In other words, Ireland’s landless tenants and labourers constituted a dependent workforce that was subject to a degree of *de facto* unfreedom. Thus, it is possible to compare Irish tenancy with American slavery, since, from this perspective, both were variations of a range of different labour arrangements employed in peripheral regions of the world-economy.²²

My dissertation builds upon the above scholarship to make a further suggestion. Edgar Melton has recently used the term ‘rural subjection’ in order to describe the variety of forms of serfdom that existed in different parts of Europe between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries. I believe that the definition of ‘rural subjection’ could include both the unfree and nominally free peripheral agrarian labour systems that existed in different times and places. This hypothesis expands on the ideas of Michael Bush, who has argued that modern systems of legally unfree labour, or *servitude*, “came in a number of different forms, some of them far more exploitative than others.” Viewed in a broader context, these different types of servitude are potentially comparable with free labour, especially with agrarian labour systems where the workers were legally ‘free,’ but subject to different degrees of exploitation. In fact, Bush has described post-feudal English tenancy as a form of “subjection” in which “the tenant farmers’ subservience was a fact,” implying that it had features in common with systems of servitude.

22 See Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 100; Stanley Engerman, “Slavery, Serfdom, and Other Forms of Coerced Labour: Similarities and Differences,” in Michael Bush (ed.), *Serfdom and Slavery: Studies in Legal Bondage* (London: Longman, 1996), 18-41; Robert Steinfeld and Stanley Engerman, “Labor—Free or Coerced? A Historical Reassessment of Differences and Similarities,” in Tom Brass and Marcel Van Der Linden (eds.), *Free and Unfree Labor: The Debate Continues* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 107-126; Robert Steinfeld, *Coercion, Contract, and Free Labor in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Conceivably, then, we could redefine Melton's concept of 'rural subjection' by using it to encompass the full range of agrarian labour systems employed in peripheral regions of the capitalist world-economy, including slavery, serfdom, sharecropping, and tenancy. Thus, while Kolchin has compared American slavery and Russian serfdom as types of 'unfree labour' and Bush has classified slavery and serfdom as comparable forms of 'servitude,' I argue that we can also compare U.S. Southern slavery and Irish tenancy—viewed holistically as labour systems that participated in global capitalism—as varieties of 'rural subjection.'²³

Since American slavery and Irish tenancy were both forms of peripheral agrarian labour—or 'rural subjection'—integrated into the world-economy, planters in the American South and landlords in Ireland were mutually influenced by developments within global capitalism; as such, the two elites were equally affected by the consequences of the Industrial Revolution. When England became the 'workshop of the world' during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, international demand for agricultural raw materials and foodstuffs produced in peripheral regions increased exponentially. Discussing the impact of these developments in the Americas, Dale Tomich, Michael Zeuske, and Anthony Kaye have argued that British industrialisation was the driving force behind the emergence of a phenomenon that they have called the 'second slavery.' This concept describes how, in response to rising international demand for cotton, sugar, and coffee, a capitalist form of slavery expanded in the U.S. South, Cuba, and Brazil during the nineteenth century, even while the institution simultaneously declined and was abolished in other parts of the Americas. The 'second slavery' concept can help us to contextualise the histories of antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders, including Mississippi's John Quitman, by revealing the complex ways in which

23 Edgar Melton, "Manorialism and Rural Subjection in East Central Europe, 1500-1800," in David Eltis and Stanley Engerman (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Vol. 3: AD 1420-AD 1804* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 297-322; Michael Bush, *Servitude in Modern Times* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000), ix; Michael Bush, *The English Aristocracy: A Comparative Synthesis* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 127-128; Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*. Also see Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 100.

they were part of global trends and historical processes.²⁴

Significantly, since the effects of the Industrial Revolution upon the world-economy were global, they affected not only New World planters, but also European landed proprietors. As industrialising England's urban workforce and middle classes grew in number over the course of the nineteenth century, its demand for grain, dairy, livestock, fruit, and wine increased, and this affected the peripheral regions of Europe where serfs, sharecroppers, or tenants farmed those commodities as commercial crops. Indeed, Bowman and Dal Lago have shown how these developments affected Prussian Junkers and southern Italian landowners in comparable ways to U.S. Southern slaveholders during the nineteenth century, prompting similar moves toward economic reform among the agrarian elites in both cases.²⁵ Building on this scholarship, I argue that, as a 'second slavery' emerged in the U.S. South in connection with the Industrial Revolution, a parallel 'second landlordism,' characterised by a drive toward modernisation on the part of economically progressive landowners, developed in Ireland as a result of the same global processes. Therefore, not only did comparable types of 'rural subjection' exist in the American South and Ireland in the early modern and modern eras, but also, during Quitman's and Clonbrock's lifetimes, those labour systems can be understood within the comparable paradigms of the 'second slavery' and the 'second landlordism.'²⁶

The antebellum U.S. South's and nineteenth-century Ireland's historical functions as peripheral regions where different types of 'rural subjection' were established is a particularly important reason for considering Ireland as one of Peter Kolchin's 'other Souths,' but it is not the only one. We can also identify striking similarities and differences between U.S. Southern

24 Tomich and Zeuske, "Introduction," 91-100; Tomich, *Through the Prism of Slavery*, 56-71; Dale Tomich, "The 'Second Slavery': Bonded Labor and the Transformation of the Nineteenth-Century World Economy," in Francisco Raimrez (ed.), *Rethinking the Nineteenth Century: Contradictions and Movements* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), 103-117; Anthony Kaye, "The Second Slavery: Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century South and the Atlantic World," *Journal of Southern History* 75 (2009), 627-650.

25 Bowman, *Masters and Lords*, 42-78; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 28-97.

26 See Cathal Smith, "Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity: A Comparison of Antebellum Mississippi and Nineteenth-Century Ireland," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 5 (2015), 204-230.

planters and Irish landlords in their national and local contexts. Significantly, during the nineteenth century, both the American South and Ireland were distinctive regions of larger political Unions—namely, the United States and the United Kingdom. Of course, these Unions were different in many respects, as were American slaveholders’ and Irish landlords’ relationships with their national governments: the United States were a federal republic, whereas the United Kingdom was a constitutional monarchy. Also, most Southern slaveholders famously chose to secede from the U.S. in 1860-61, while the majority of Irish landowners were staunch unionists throughout the 1800s. Still, since American planters and Irish landlords were both peripheral landed classes who controlled politics within their localities and held varying degrees of power in their national governments during the nineteenth century, a comparison of the interplay between regionalism and nationalism among the two elites can provide new insights into their national identities and the reasoning behind their seemingly opposite political behaviour.²⁷

Even as nineteenth-century American planters and Irish landlords both shared distinctive regional identities, the U.S. South and Ireland also contained their own internal sub-regional variations that caused heterogeneity within Southern slaveholding and Irish landlordism in specific local contexts. As Peter Kolchin has pointed out, there were many significant geographic and socioeconomic differences between the ‘many Souths’ that formed the American South in the antebellum era. In fact, the area known today as ‘the antebellum South’ is a teleological conception—one that usually denotes either the fifteen U.S. states in which slavery was legal on the eve of the American Civil War (1861-65), or the eleven slave states that formed the Confederacy in 1861. In reality, however, the geographic boundaries of ‘the South’ were in constant flux during the first half of the nineteenth century, as slavery

27 Both Shearer Davis Bowman and Enrico Dal Lago have emphasised the importance of regional distinctiveness in their respective comparisons of American planters with Prussian East Elbian and southern Italian landed elites. See Bowman, *Masters and Lords*, 13-14, 34; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 19, 180-270. For a comparison of the Irish and Scottish unions with England, see Alvin Jackson, *The Two Unions: Ireland, Scotland, and the Survival of the United Kingdom, 1707-2007* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

rapidly expanded westwards across the North American continent, largely as a result of the cotton boom associated with the ‘second slavery.’ Consequently, the antebellum U.S. South included considerable internal differences between and within individual slave states, as well as between older and newer sections of the slaveholding elite, who concentrated on the production of either tobacco, rice, cotton, or sugar, depending upon the climate and geography of a particular location.²⁸

Although Ireland was far smaller than the U.S. South, it too was characterised by subregional diversity, albeit to a lesser degree. Ireland is comprised of four provinces—Ulster to the north, Leinster to the east, Munster to the south, and Connacht to the west—all of which differed from each other slightly in their geographic, demographic, and socioeconomic compositions during the nineteenth century. In this period, while commercial tillage and livestock farming were practised throughout Ireland, the best land and most prosperous tenants were to be found in Leinster, whereas Connacht, Munster, and Ulster were generally more densely populated and the average peasant was poorer. Yet, even taking these regional differences into account, as a result of centuries of intermarriage and consolidation, Ireland’s landed class was far smaller and more homogeneous than the American slaveholding elite during the 1800s. In other words, if the antebellum U.S. South encompassed ‘many Souths’ and many different types of slaveholders, then, adapting Kolchin’s terminology, nineteenth-century Ireland consisted of ‘many Irelands,’ but fewer types of landlord.²⁹ By situating

28 Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land*, 15-17, 39-73; William Freehling, *The Road to Disunion, Vol. 1: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), vii, 13-36; Brian Schoen, “The Burdens and Opportunities of Interdependence: The Political Economies of the Planter Class,” in L. Diane Barnes, Brian Schoen, and Frank Towers (eds.), *The Old South’s Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 66-84.

29 Cormac Ó’Gráda, *Ireland: A New Economic History, 1780-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 32-42; T.W. Freeman, “Land and People, c. 1841,” in W.E. Vaughan (eds.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 5: Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford university Press, 1989), 242-271. As one prominent Irish historian has argued, “regardless of religion, social standing or estate size, all landlords shared the same social, political and economic powers that were conferred by land ownership in their respective localities.” Terrence Dooley, *The Decline of the Big House in Ireland: A Study of Irish Landed Families, 1860-1960* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 2001), 11. For an example of a study that examines variations among Irish landlords, see Cathal Smith, “A Tale of Two Estates: A Comparison of Thomas Redington’s and Major Denis Mahon’s Elite Ideologies and their Estate Management Practices in the Mid-Nineteenth Century,” (M.A. thesis, National University of Ireland, Galway, 2009).

Mississippi's John A. Quitman and Connacht's Lord Clonbrock firmly within their wider local, regional, and national contexts while comparing them, I intend to reveal the different degrees of diversity that existed among antebellum American slaveholders and their Irish landed contemporaries.

Remarkably, there are similarities not only between the histories of Quitman's and Clonbrock's social classes, but also between their historiographies. In the American case, twentieth-century scholars have generally fallen into two broad categories: those who interpreted slaveholders as pre-capitalists and those who portrayed them as capitalists. Preeminent among the historians who have argued in favour of the former proposition is Eugene Genovese. In the *Political Economy of Slavery* (1965), Genovese suggested that Southern planters "were precapitalist, quasi-aristocratic landowners who had to adjust their economy and ways of thinking to a capitalist world market." In his view, slave labour was inefficient, while slaveholders were more concerned with social status than with plantation management. Subsequently, Genovese refined this thesis, popularising the idea that antebellum planters' widespread commitment to the ideology of paternalism—which caused them to take an interest in their slaves' welfare—limited their focus on profit and engendered among them a pre-modern mentality. In turn, largely as a result of the slaveholders' dominance of the economy, the South developed as a 'backward' region, characterised by an absence of urbanisation and industrialisation.³⁰ Various aspects of this interpretation of Southern history have been supported and advanced by a number of prominent scholars, including Raimondo Luraghi, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Drew Faust, Douglas Egerton, and Peter Kolchin.³¹ To this school of thought we could also add the 'neo-abolitionist' scholarship

30 Eugene Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York: Vintage, 1967 [1965]); Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage, 1974). Also see Eugene Genovese, *The World the Slaveholders Made: Two Essays in Interpretation* (New York: Vintage, 1969); Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *Fruits of Merchant Capital: Slavery and Bourgeois Property in the Rise and Expansion of Capitalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983).

31 Raimondo Luraghi, *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation South* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1978); Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill:

that characterised American slavery as an economically moribund labour system whose expiration was virtually inevitable in the long term as a consequence of its incompatibility with modern capitalism.³²

Yet, the idea that U.S. Southern slaveholders were backward or pre-capitalist has been subject to sustained challenge. In *Time on the Cross* (1974), neo-classical economic historians Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman argued that the antebellum South's slave system was highly profitable, while the region's planters generally acted like rational businessmen. For James Oakes, notwithstanding their reliance on slave labour, most Southern masters were capitalists who treated their plantations and farms as 'factories in the fields.' More recently, in *The Half Has Never Been Told* (2014), Edward Baptist has asserted that antebellum slaveholders were exploitative entrepreneurs who owned productive and efficient 'slave labor camps,' while Southern slavery was central to the development of American capitalism. Together, these and other historians have made a strong case for an interpretation of the antebellum U.S. South as a capitalist society, contrary to what Genovese and his supporters contended.³³

Significantly, over the past two decades, a number of scholars have discussed the possibility of reaching a consensus in the above debates. As Mark Smith has pointed out, much of the disagreement between historians of American slavery hinges on differing understandings of capitalism, with Marxist scholars often prioritising a free wage labour

University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Drew Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982); Douglas Egerton, "Markets Without a Market Revolution: Southern Planters and Capitalism," *Journal of the Early Republic* 16 (1996), 207-221; Peter Kolchin, *American Slavery, 1619-1877* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2003 [1993]).

32 The twentieth-century historians who advanced this argument were typically influenced by the Victorian Irish economist, John Elliot Cairnes. See John Elliot Cairnes, *The Slave Power: Its Character, Career, and Probably Designs* (New York: Carleton, 1862). On 'neo-abolitionism,' see James McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975).

33 Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974); James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982); Edward Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014). Also see Kenneth Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution: Negro Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South* (New York: Vintage, 1956); William Duminberre, *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014).

definition, and non-Marxist historians identifying profit-motive and market participation as its distinguishing characteristics. By recognising this source of theoretical confusion, it has been possible for recent studies to find common ground between the scholarly interpretations of the antebellum South's slave system that once seemed irreconcilable. In fact, as Smith has shown, American slaveholders often applied factory-like labour management techniques and technologies to their plantations and farms, even as paternalism characterised their relations with their workers. According to Jeffrey Young, many planters from South Carolina and Georgia combined paternalistic and capitalistic features together in an ideology that he has called 'corporate individualism.' And for Richard Follett, Louisiana's sugar masters used paternalism to mask the exploitation of their slaves and thereby aid their quest for efficiency and profitability on their plantations. Arguably, therefore, a consensus seems to be emerging on the idea that capitalist and pre-capitalist elements coexisted in the minds and behaviours of most American slaveholders in the antebellum era.³⁴

When viewed in comparative perspective, it is noteworthy that the historiography on nineteenth-century Ireland has gone through similar phases as the one on the antebellum U.S. South. The traditional scholarly picture of the country's rural economy tended to depict the landowners as absentee aristocrats who exploited their tenants through high rents and managed their estates ineffectually. This interpretation is typified by the work of J.E. Pomfret, who argued in *The Struggle for Land in Ireland* (1930) that "the landlords as a class were alien and absentee, and had little interest either in the welfare of the peasants or in the improvement of their property."³⁵ In other words, Irish landlords were rentiers whose neglect

34 Mark Smith, *Debating Slavery: Economy and Society in the Antebellum American South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Mark Smith, *Mastered By The Clock: Time, Slavery, and Freedom in the American South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Jeffrey Young, *Domesticating Slavery: The Master Class in South Carolina and Georgia, 1670-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); Richard Follett, *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in Louisiana's Cane World, 1820-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005).

35 J.E. Pomfret, *The Struggle for Land in Ireland, 1800-1923* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1930), 27. Also see Elizabeth Hooker, *Readjustments of Agricultural Tenure in Ireland* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938); Patrick O'Hegarty, *A History of Ireland Under the Union, 1801 to 1922* (London: Methuen, 1952); Cecil Woodham-Smith, *The Great Hunger, 1845-1849* (London: Penguin Books, 1962).

of their properties was the root of the perceived ‘backwardness’ of agriculture in nineteenth-century Ireland. This view has remained influential, especially among Marxist scholars. According to Terrence McDonough and Eamonn Slater, for example, Irish landlordism was a “feudal” institution as a consequence of the fact that the landowners often extracted rents from their tenants through extra-economic coercion. Mirroring the historiography on the antebellum American South, therefore, one school of scholarly thought depicts nineteenth-century Ireland as a ‘backward’ region and Irish landlords as a pre-capitalist class.³⁶

As Cormac Ó’Gráda noted in a 1989 publication, “the traditional picture of Irish landlordism ... has much in common with the recent American ‘neo-abolitionist’ literature on plantation slavery. To show how morality and economics pointed in the same direction was the aim of both.”³⁷ Yet, just as the contention that Southern slaveholders and slavery were backward was challenged by a number of American historians, so too have some Irish scholars questioned the orthodox interpretation of landlordism in Ireland. In particular, James Donnelly and W.A. Maguire have shown that, although Irish landlords generally did not farm their land themselves, but rather leased most of it to tenants, they were by no means passive rentiers. Instead, many members of the Irish landed class were resident on their properties and took an interest in promoting economic reform during the nineteenth century. In effect, these landowners showed an entrepreneurial attitude toward the management of their landed estates, akin to what Fogel, Engerman, and Oakes argued of antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders. Also, in Kevin Whelan’s opinion, Irish landlordism was thoroughly capitalist as a result of its highly commercialised and market-oriented nature.³⁸

36 Terrence McDonough and Eamonn Slater, “Colonialism, Feudalism and the Mode of Production in Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” in Terrence McDonough (ed.), *Was Ireland A Colony? Economics, Politics and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2005), 27-45; Eamonn Slater and Terrence McDonough, “Bulwark of Landlordism and Capitalism: The Dynamics of Feudalism in Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” *Research in Political Economy* 14 (1994), 63-119.

37 Cormac Ó’Gráda, “Poverty, Population and Agriculture, 1801-45,” in Vaughan (ed.), *New History of Ireland*, V, 128.

38 James Donnelly, *The Land and the People of Nineteenth-Century Cork: The Rural Economy and the Land Question*, (London: Routledge, 1975); James Donnelly, *Landlord and Tenant in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1973); W.A. Maguire, *The Downshire Estates in Ireland 1801-1845: The Management of Irish Landed Estates in the Early Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972);

To this day, similar to historians of the American South, Irish historians continue to debate questions regarding the character of Ireland's landed elites and their effect on the country's historical development.³⁹ Perhaps, in light of the clear parallels between the theoretical issues at the heart of scholarly debates about slavery in the American South and landlordism in Ireland, we could recognise that nineteenth-century Irish landowners were neither exclusively capitalist nor pre-capitalist, but rather combined features of both, as recent scholarship on American slavery has suggested was true of antebellum planters. In any event, the developments of the historiographies on U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords are certainly comparable. My comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock seeks to build upon these historiographies and contribute to debates that have long occupied American and Irish historians.⁴⁰

Given, then, that there are numerous compelling historical and historiographical reasons to consider nineteenth-century Ireland an 'other South,' in Kolchin's definition, we can learn a great deal from a systematic comparison of U.S. Southern slaveholding and Irish landlordism. My work investigates similarities and differences between Mississippi planter John Quitman and Galway landlord Lord Clonbrock in order to demonstrate this proposition. There are many reasons for using Quitman and Clonbrock as case studies in a comparison of the agrarian elites of which they were respective members. First, although they came from very different backgrounds, Quitman and Clonbrock occupied similar sections of their respective landed classes: by the early 1830s, they were among the wealthiest and most

Whelan, "Ireland in the World-System," 204-216. Also see L.M. Cullen, *The Emergence of Modern Ireland, 1600-1900* (London: Batsford Academic and Educational, 1981); Joe Cleary, *Outrageous Fortune: Capital and Culture in Modern Ireland* (Dublin: Field Day Publications, 2007), 33-36.

39 See Ó'Gráda, *Ireland*; Joel Mokyr, *Why Ireland Starved: A Quantitative and Analytical History of the Irish Economy, 1800-1850* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983); W.E. Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); Gerard Moran, *Sir Robert Gore Booth and his Landed Estate in County Sligo, 1814-1876: Famine, Emigration, Politics* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006); Patrick Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society in Galway* (Dublin: De Búrca, 2012).

40 On the significance of historiographical parallels in the construction of a case for comparability, see Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 1-15; Enrico Dal Lago and Rick Halpern, "Two Case-Studies in Comparative History: The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno," in Dal Lago and Halpern (eds.), *American South and Italian Mezzogiorno*, 3-5; Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land*, 81-83.

influential American planters and Irish landlords, and both were also politically active. Second, a large volume and variety of primary sources pertaining to Quitman and Clonbrock has survived from which we can reconstruct detailed pictures of their economic, social, and political behaviours and their ideologies.⁴¹ Finally, both case studies have already been independently examined by historians. Of the two individuals under focus here, Quitman has elicited the more scholarly interest, which is unsurprising considering his lasting reputation as one of antebellum Mississippi's most vocal proponents of states' rights and secession; of all the many discussions of Quitman's life and times, Robert May's biography stands alone as the most comprehensive treatment.⁴² Clonbrock has also received attention from a number of historians, most notably from Kevin McKenna, who has investigated landlord-tenant relations on the Clonbrock estates during the years 1826-1908.⁴³ These specific secondary sources have provided useful contexts in which to root my comparative analysis of Quitman and Clonbrock.

Examining similarities and differences between Quitman and Clonbrock offers the possibility to ask numerous questions about U.S. Southern planters and Irish landlords that can be clarified through systematic comparison. Specifically, following the examples of Kolchin, Bowman, and Dal Lago, comparative questions may focus on the economic

41 Primary sources pertaining to Quitman are housed at a number of American universities and libraries, including the University of North Carolina, Harvard University, the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Louisiana State University, the Pennsylvania Historical Society, and the University of Virginia. The Clonbrock Papers, which are among the largest archival collection for any Irish landed family, are held at the National Library of Ireland.

42 May, *John A. Quitman*; Robert May, "John A. Quitman and His Slaves: Reconciling Slave Resistance with the Proslavery Defense," *Journal of Southern History* 46 (1980), 551-570; John McCardell, "John A. Quitman and the Compromise of 1850 in Mississippi," *Journal of Mississippi History* 37 (1975), 239-66; Eric Walther, "Honorable and Useful Ambition: John A. Quitman," in Eric Walther, *The Fire-Eaters* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992), 83-111; James McLendon, "John A. Quitman," (PhD diss., University of Texas, 1949); J.F.H. Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Major-General, U.S.A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1860).

43 McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual"; Kevin McKenna, "Charity, Paternalism and Power on the Clonbrock Estates, County Galway, 1834-44," in Laurence Geary and Oonagh Walsh (eds.), *Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015), 97-114; Kevin McKenna, "Elites, Ritual, and the Legitimation of Power on an Irish Landed Estate, 1855-90," in Ciaran O'Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), 68-82; John O'Sullivan, "Landlord-Tenant Relations on the Clonbrock Estate in Galway, 1849-93," (M.A. thesis, National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 1997); Dooley, *Decline of the Big House in Ireland*, 32-36; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*.

behaviour of the two peripheral agrarian elites and their relationships to ‘modernity’; their ideologies and the particular types of paternalism that developed in both locations during the nineteenth century; labour relations on U.S. Southern plantations and Irish landed estates; and the political behaviours and national identities of the two regional elites. In the process, by assessing Quitman and Clonbrock in relative terms, I believe it will be possible to make some generalisations about the nature of U.S. Southern slaveholding and Irish landlordism during the nineteenth century. Thus, with my study of similarities and differences between Quitman and Clonbrock, I aim to shed new light not only on these two case studies, but also on their social classes, labour systems, and regional societies, as well as on the concepts of ‘second slavery’ and ‘second landlordism.’

A final important methodological point must be noted. While my dissertation is primarily a comparative historical study that investigates similarities and differences between antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders and nineteenth-century Irish landlords through the systematic comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock, it also includes a transnational dimension. Peter Kolchin has defined transnational history as the “the explanation of interconnections, linkages, and influences across different locations.” While a number of scholars, including Kolchin, have pointed to tensions between comparative and transnational history, others have argued that the two methodologies can be successfully combined.⁴⁴ Even though it is true that no contact need *necessarily* exist between comparative case studies, where interconnections, linkages, and influences did exist, they can be taken into consideration. There were certainly many transnational connections between the United States and Ireland during the nineteenth

44 Peter Kolchin, “The South and the World,” *Journal of Southern History* 75 (2009), 576-577. For discussions of the differences and potential conflict between comparative and transnational methodologies, see Ian Tyrrell, “American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History,” *American Historical Review* 96 (1991), 1031-1055; Deborah Cohen and Maura O’Connor, “Introduction: Comparative History, Cross-National History, Transnational History—Definitions,” in Cohen and O’Connor (eds.), *Comparison and History*, ix-xxiv. On their compatibility, see Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, “Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope, and Perspectives of Comparative History,” in Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka (eds.), *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 1-21.

century—perhaps most notably, the large-scale migration of people from the latter country to the former.⁴⁵ Since direct and indirect connections between their societies affected Quitman and Clonbrock in important ways, my study also includes a discussion of transnational features where appropriate. Thus, since it combines comparative history with transnational history, my dissertation applies the ‘cross-national comparative history’ approach discussed by George Fredrickson, Michael Miller, and Enrico Dal Lago to the study of U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords.⁴⁶

The chapters of this dissertation are organised as follows. Chapter One compares the origins and historical development of landlordism in Ireland and slaveholding in the American South before the nineteenth century. Chapter Two analyses Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s economic behaviours within the contexts of the second slavery and the second landlordism and argues that both individuals manifested entrepreneurial attitudes in response to a combination of global developments and specific local circumstances. Chapter Three investigates similarities and differences between the Southern slaveholders’ and Irish landlords’ world-views, focusing particularly on the paternalistic ideologies that Quitman and Clonbrock cultivated during the middle decades of the 1800s. Chapter Four compares labour relations on Quitman’s plantations and Clonbrock’s estates and highlights the fact that American slaves and Irish peasants were not passive groups, but rather resisted their exploitations in comparable ways. Chapter Five examines Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s political behaviours and investigates the reasons why, although both men were socially and politically conservative, this conservatism ultimately motivated Quitman to advocate Mississippi’s secession from the United States, whereas it led Clonbrock to consistently

45 See Kerby Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); Gleeson, *Irish in the South*; Earl Niehaus, *The Irish in New Orleans, 1800-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965).

46 George Fredrickson, “From Exceptionalism to Variability: Recent Developments in Cross-National Comparative History,” *Journal of American History* 82 (1995), 587-604; Michael Miller, “Comparative and Cross-National History: Approaches, Differences, Problems,” in Cohen and O’Connor (eds.), *Comparison and History*, 115-132; Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 10-16.

oppose Ireland's separation from the United Kingdom. Finally, the Conclusion suggests avenues for future studies in the field of cross-national comparison of American slaveholding and Irish landlordism.

CHAPTER ONE

Ireland, the American South, and ‘Rural Subjection,’ c. 1550-1800

The gentry classes that dominated Ireland and the U.S. South during the 1800s—landlords in the former case, planters in the latter—were both formed over the course of the preceding three centuries. The fact that Irish landlordism and American slaveholding were established at roughly the same time is not a coincidence, since the agrarian labour systems that supported them—tenancy and slavery—were products of the same general historical processes: the early modern expansion of European capitalism and English colonialism. To better understand these processes, it is useful to locate Ireland and the American South within an updated interpretation of Immanuel Wallerstein’s world-system mode of historical analysis. According to Wallerstein, the sixteenth century witnessed the birth of the capitalist world-economy, an international network of trade and communications characterised by core, peripheral, and semi-peripheral regions. ‘Core’ applies to the economically strongest area of the world-system, which typically produced manufactured goods; ‘peripheries’ were regions that focused on the production and export of raw materials and agricultural commodities, while ‘semi-peripheries’ were locations that included a mix of core and peripheral activities.¹ As discussed in the Introduction, since Wallerstein first proposed this theory in the 1970s, a number of scholars have offered suggestions for its refinement, particularly through the acknowledgement of differences between the world-economy’s component parts.² By taking

1 Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Capitalist World-Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 1-36; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System, Vol. 1: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).

2 See Dale Tomich, *Through the Prism of Slavery: Labor, Capital, and World Economy* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), 3-55; Philip McMichael, “Incorporating Comparison Within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method,” *American Sociological Review* 55 (1990), 385-397; Sidney Mintz, “The So-Called World System: Local Initiative and Local Response,” *Dialectical Anthropology* 2 (1977), 253-270; Enrico Dal Lago, “World-Systems Theory,” in Joseph Miller (ed.), *The*

on board these suggestions, we can recognise that, between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both Ireland and (part of) the American South were incorporated into the capitalist world-system as peripheries.³

For Wallerstein, peripheral regions have typically been characterised by a preponderance of landed estates that produced cash crops for international markets using coerced labour. This was the case in much of eastern Europe and the Americas, where the opportunity to profit from commercial agriculture in regions suited to the growth of various commodities that were in demand in western Europe led to either the emergence or reemergence of different types of unfree labour—including serfdom, slavery, and indentured servitude—in the early modern period. The seventeenth-century American South was one such region; there, plantations were established primarily for the production and export of staple crops—notably tobacco and rice—using servile labour. By the early eighteenth century, African slavery had become the main form of labour used on those plantations.⁴

However, as a number of scholars have argued, historical systems of free (or nominally free) agrarian labour have also fulfilled a fundamentally peripheral function as agricultural exporters since the sixteenth century. From the perspective of the world economy, plantation slavery was one of several different types of peripheral agrarian labour. Others include the serf-worked *pomest'ia* and *Rittergüter* of eastern Europe, Latin American *haciendas*, and the *latifondi* of southern Italy and Spain, where tenancy and sharecropping were the favoured modes of labour control.⁵ As such, peripheral regions were home to more

Princeton Companion to Atlantic History (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 498-501.

3 Immanuel Wallerstein, "American Slavery and the Capitalist World-Economy," *American Journal of Sociology* 81 (1976), 1199-1213; Kevin Whelan, "Ireland in the World-System, 1600-1800," in Hanz-Jürgen Nitz (ed.), *The Early-Modern World-System in Geographical Perspective* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993), 204-216.

4 Wallerstein, *Capitalist World-Economy*, 17-18; Wallerstein, *Modern World-System*, I, 87-95. Also see Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987), 1-46; Evsey Domar, "The Causes of Slavery or Serfdom: A Hypothesis," *Journal of Economic History* 30 (1970), 18-32; Robert Brenner, "The Rises and Declines of Serfdom in Medieval and Early Modern Europe," in Michael Bush (ed.), *Serfdom and Slavery: Studies in Legal Bondage* (London: Longman, 1996), 247-276; Michael Bush, *Servitude in Modern Times* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000).

5 See Shearer Davis Bowman, *Masters and Lords: Mid-Nineteenth-Century U.S. Planters and Prussian Junkers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 97-101; Enrico Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites: American*

than just legally unfree labour systems; instead, I propose that they were characterised by “rural subjection.” This is a term that Edgar Melton has used in order to encompass the variety of forms of serfdom that existed in different parts of early modern Europe.⁶ However, the definition of ‘rural subjection’ can conceivably be broadened to include all the agrarian labour systems employed in peripheral regions of the capitalist world-economy, whether the workers were legally free or unfree. In other words, rural subjection took many different forms, each tailored to the requirements of a particular time and place, but in all cases, the *raison d’être* was to generate wealth for landowners through the production of specific crops that were in demand on the world market. Such a definition includes the agrarian labour systems that characterised Ireland and the American South from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onward, since tenants farmed livestock and grain for export in the former case, while slaves grew tobacco, rice, sugar, or cotton for sale on international markets in the latter. Therefore, despite the many differences between them, Irish tenancy and American slavery are comparable on the basis that they can both be classified as different types of ‘rural subjection’ that were established in peripheral regions of the capitalist world-economy.⁷

Significantly, in both Ireland and the American South, incorporation into the world-economy occurred in the same way: through British colonisation. During the reign of Henry VIII (1509-47), the English state initiated a systematic policy of expansion in Ireland, an island over which it had claimed authority in the twelfth century but never fully conquered.

Slaveholders and Southern Italian Landowners, 1815-1861 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 35-54; Enrico Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond: The U.S. “Peculiar Institution” in International Perspective* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2013), 95-121; Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 310-353; Marta Petrusiewicz, *Latifundium: Moral Economy and Material Life in a Nineteenth-Century Periphery* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996 [1989]).

6 Edgar Melton, “Manorialism and Rural Subjection in East Central Europe, 1500-1800,” in David Eltis and Stanley Engerman (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Vol. 3: AD 1420-AD 1804* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 297-322.

7 Cathal Smith, “Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity: A Comparison of Antebellum Mississippi and Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” *Journal of the Civil War Era* 5 (2015), 206-208. The definition of ‘rural subjection’ forwarded here is influenced by Jason Moore’s discussion of peripheral regions as ‘commodity frontiers’ that produced different items for the world market using different types of agrarian labour. See Jason Moore, “Sugar and the Expansion of the Early Modern World-Economy: Commodity Frontiers, Ecological Transformation, and Industrialization,” *Review* 23 (2000), 409-433.

Later, in the late 1500s and throughout the 1600s, following the example of the Spanish and Portuguese, the English Crown also backed the foundation of settlements in the New World, including the eastern seaboard of what would become the American South. Starting with the work of D.B. Quinn and Nicholas Canny, numerous historians began to recognise and trace the connections between English colonialism in early modern Ireland and the Americas, connections underscored by the fact that many of the same individuals—such as Humphrey Gilbert, Walter Raleigh, and William Penn—were involved in colonisation schemes in both contexts.⁸ Many scholars now agree that British colonial activities in Ireland and America during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are comprehensible as part of a single “westward enterprise.”⁹ This, in turn, led to the transference of English culture, traditions, and institutions to both regions. Thus, as Jack Greene and J.R. Pole have written of the mainland North American colonies, and as is also true of Ireland, “they were all cultural provinces of Britain whose legal and social systems, perceptual frameworks, and social and cultural imperatives were inevitably in large measure British in origin and whose inhabitants thereby shared a common identity as British peoples.” Crucially, however, these common features evolved differently in each local instance of English colonisation.¹⁰

8 D.B. Quinn, *Raleigh and the British Empire* (London: English Universities Press, 1969 [1947]); D.B. Quinn, *Ireland and America: Their Early Associations, 1500-1600* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1991); Nicholas Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988); Nicholas Canny, “The Irish Background to Penn’s Experiment,” in Richard Dunn and Mary Dunn (eds.), *The World of William Penn* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 139-156.

9 Karl Bottigheimer, “Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Westward Enterprise, 1536-1660,” in Kenneth Andrews, Nicholas Canny, and P.E.H. Hair (eds.), *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America, 1480-1650* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1978), 45-65. Also see Audrey Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013); Jack Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Kenneth Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). It should be noted that Ireland’s colonial status has been the subject of debate among historians. See Canny, *Kingdom and Colony*, 6-14; Edward Cavanagh, “Kingdom or Colony? English or British? Early Modern Ireland and the Colonialism Question,” *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 14 (2013).

10 Jack Greene and J.R. Pole, “Reconstructing British-American Colonial History: An Introduction,” in Jack Greene and J.R. Pole (eds.), *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 14. Also see Jack Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986); Louis Hartz, *The Founding of New Societies: Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and Australia* (New York: Harcourt,

From the twin processes of colonisation and peripheralisation that occurred in Ireland and the American South in the early modern period emerged two comparable agrarian elites: Irish landlords and American planters. While this study is primarily concerned with similarities, differences, and connections between these regional gentry classes in the 1800s—and between Galway’s Lord Clonbrock and Mississippi’s John A. Quitman in particular—it is important to first examine their prior histories, since these resulted in legacies that conditioned the composition and behaviour of the two nineteenth-century elites. Thus, this chapter provides a comparative overview of the systems of ‘rural subjection’ that developed in Ireland and the American South from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the end of the eighteenth century. To begin with, I examine similarities and differences between the landed estates and agrarian labour systems established in the two regions by British settlers during the 1500s and 1600s. I then turn to a discussion of the eighteenth-century histories of the agrarian elites who rose to prominence in Ireland and the American South as a result of their ownership of landed estates and exploitation of different types of landless agricultural labourers, whether those were peasants of mostly native Irish origin in the former case, or slaves of African descent in the latter. My aim in this chapter is to come to a better understanding of the early histories of Irish landlordism and American slaveholding through their comparison. In the process, we should also gain some new insights into the relationship between English colonialism, the expansion of the capitalist world-economy, and the contingent creation of different, but comparable, systems of ‘rural subjection’ in the early modern era.

The Origins of Irish Tenancy and American Slavery

In both Ireland and the American South, following piecemeal colonisations by England during

Brace & World, 1964); Ian Tyrrell, “Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History,” in Thomas Bender (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 168-192.

the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, British settlers established landed estates and farms that were oriented toward the production of agricultural commodities for sale on international markets; as such, the two regions were incorporated into the capitalist world-economy in a peripheral role. Yet, the particular local conditions extant in the two regions in the early modern period led to the introduction and institutionalisation of different types of agricultural enterprises worked by different types of labourers in either case. In Ireland, the British settlers who colonised the country from the 1550s onward brought with them a form of tenure based on contemporary English practices. They established large landed estates that they divided among legally free leaseholding tenants, most of whom were taken from the ranks of the native Irish population. Subsequently, Ireland's peasantry farmed livestock and grain as commercial products in order to pay rent to the landowners.¹¹

In the Chesapeake and Lowcountry regions of mainland North America, by contrast, seventeenth-century British colonists encountered very different circumstances. There, with land abundant, labour scarce, and environments suited to the growth of either tobacco or rice—both of which were in high demand on international markets—many of the settlers established plantations, i.e., integrated agricultural enterprises that were geared primarily toward the production of cash crops. Unlike what happened in Ireland, the colonists who settled in different parts of the early American South ultimately displaced the native population and decided to import African slaves as the most suitable source of labour to work their estates. As a result, at different times and in different ways, the southern colonies of British North America underwent what Ira Berlin has called a “plantation revolution” and became “slave societies,” where slavery was central to economic production and planters were the ruling class.¹² Thus, English colonisation led to the creation of two different

11 Raymond Gillespie, *The Transformation of the Irish Economy, 1550-1700* (Dublin: Economic and Social History Society of Ireland, 1991), 12-29; Sean Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland, 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 278-332; John Montañó, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

12 Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge:

peripheral agrarian labour systems—here understood as comparable types of ‘rural subjection’—in Ireland and the American South during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Historical, environmental, and demographic contrasts between the two regions explain why tenancy was established on the landed estates in one case and slavery in the other.

The landed estate system that dominated rural Ireland’s landscape until the early twentieth century was largely created by British settlers during the 1500s and 1600s. Ireland was subject to the English Crown since the Anglo-Norman invasion of the late twelfth century, and the conquering lords—who later became known as the ‘Old English’—subsequently established manorial landed estates in different parts of the country.¹³ However, in practice, England only definitively secured Dublin and its hinterland, an area famously known as ‘the Pale.’ During the medieval period, Gaelic customs, law, and tenure survived throughout most of the island. In the 1530s and 1540s, for a number of reasons, not the least of which was Henry VIII’s desire to extend the Reformation throughout his kingdoms, the English state began to systematically expand and consolidate its influence in Ireland. At first, it did so by means of a policy known to historians as ‘surrender and regrant,’ whereby the country’s Gaelic chieftains were pressured to accept the Crown’s authority and ultimate ownership of their land in return for rights to that land based on English law. Yet, after finding surrender and regrant an

Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998), 8-11, 94-108; Peter Kolchin, *American Slavery, 1619-1877* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2003 [1993]), 3-27; David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 124-140; Philip Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998). For more on the concept of “slave societies,” see Keith Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 99-100; Moses Finley, *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology* (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1998 [1980]), 135-160.

13 F.X. Martin, “Diarmait Mac Murchada and the Coming of the Anglo-Normans,” and Kevin Down, “Colonial Society and Economy,” both in Art Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. II, Medieval Ireland, 1169-1534* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993 [1987]), 43-66, 439-491; B.J. Graham, “Anglo-Norman Manorial Settlement in Ireland: An Assessment,” *Irish Geography* 18 (1985), 4-15. Also see Nicholas Canny, *The Formation of the Old English Elite in Ireland* (Dublin: National University of Ireland, 1975); Robin Frame, *Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369* (Dublin: Helcion, 1981); Thomas Bartlett, *Ireland: A History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 34-78.

unsatisfactory means of ‘anglicising’ Ireland, as the English establishment had hoped to do, they decided to colonise the country with British settlers instead.¹⁴

Between the 1550s and the 1660s, England used ‘plantations’ in order to colonise Ireland. The Irish plantations—first introduced in the midlands and later in the south and north of the country—were massive tracts of land that were confiscated from Gaelic chieftains or Hiberno-Norman landowners who either rebelled against or refused to submit to English rule. Sixteenth and seventeenth-century Ireland’s plantations were then divided into landed estates of varying sizes that were allocated to new owners, most of whom came from England and Scotland. These British ‘planters’ took the risk of migrating to Ireland and settling on confiscated land, among an often hostile native population, primarily with a view toward generating wealth for themselves; they typically looked to agriculture to do so, and, accordingly, the widespread practice of commercial farming was a direct consequence of England’s colonisation of early modern Ireland.¹⁵

Ireland’s topography and climate, similar to Britain’s in most respects, meant that it was suited to the type of commercial agriculture that was practiced in post-medieval England and Scotland: a mixture of cattle, sheep, and grain farming. Both pastoral and arable agriculture had long pedigrees throughout Ireland, and some parts of the country had a pre-existing market infrastructure that had been fostered by the Old English lords who had settled there following the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman conquest. During the medieval period, however, most of Ireland remained forested and farming was generally oriented toward

14 Christopher Maginn, “‘Surrender and Regrant’ in the Historiography of Sixteenth-Century Ireland,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 38 (2007), 955-974; Steven Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998); Colm Lennon, *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1994); Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 47-78. For more on the persistence of Gaelic society after the Anglo-Norman conquest, see Kenneth Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2003 [1972]).

15 See Tadhg Ó’Hannracháin, “Plantation, 1580-1641,” in Alvin Jackson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 291-314; Nicholas Canny, *From Reformation to Restoration: Ireland, 1534-1660* (Dublin: Helicon, 1987); Canny, *Making Ireland British*; Montaña, *Roots of English Colonialism*; Michael MacCarthy-Morrogh, *The Munster Plantation: English Migration to Southern Ireland, 1583-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986); Dean Gunter White, “The Tudor Plantations in Ireland Before 1571,” (PhD diss., Trinity College Dublin, 1968).

internal consumption. This began to change in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, since the British colonists who settled in the country in this period established landed estates whose primary purpose was to generate wealth for their owners through commercial agriculture.¹⁶

Tenancy was adopted as a suitable form of labour to work the new landed estates that were established from Ireland's plantations. Since those estates were generally large—ranging from one thousand to tens of thousands of acres—and fragmented, it was impossible for their owners to organise production on a centralised or seigneurial basis on any more than a small portion of their land. Instead, following a practice that had by then become commonplace throughout much of western Europe, sixteenth and seventeenth-century Ireland's 'planters' divided most of their property among juridically free tenants who paid rent in return for its use. Thus, as Aidan Clarke has written, the typical Irish landed estate "was a unit of ownership rather than of production: as a rule it did not consist of a single block of land but an aggregation of dispersed parcels of land, some of which were reserved for the direct use of the owner, either for tillage or grazing, some of which were leased, and some of which were let in small pieces to tenants." Irish tenants paid their rents primarily in cash, which they earned by selling their livestock and grain surpluses at local markets and fairs. Additionally, in-kind payments with a portion of a crop or payment for land with duty labour became widely accepted as forms of rent throughout Ireland, especially at the lower levels of occupancy where casual labourers rented small holdings from the landowners or large tenants on a short-term basis.¹⁷

16 See Gillespie, *Transformation of the Irish Economy*, 12-30; Aidan Clarke, "The Irish Economy, 1600-60," in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 3, Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 168-186; D.M. Woodward, "The Anglo-Irish Livestock Trade in the Seventeenth Century," *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1973), 489-523; John O'Donovan, *The Economic History of Livestock in Ireland* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1940); L.M. Cullen, *The Emergence of Modern Ireland, 1600-1900* (London: Batsford Academic and Educational, 1981). For a case study, see Nicholas Canny, *The Upstart Earl: A Study of the Social and Mental World of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork, 1566-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

17 Clarke, "Irish Economy," 172; Aidan Clarke and R. Dudley Edwards, "Pacification, Plantation, and the Catholic Question, 1603-23," in Moody, Martin, and Byrne (eds.), *New History of Ireland*, III, 196-205. Also see T.W. Moody, *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609-41: The City of London and the Plantation in Ulster* (Belfast: William Mullin and Son, 1939).

In their resort to tenancy to generate wealth from their estates through rents, early modern Ireland's new landowners had post-medieval English tenure as their model. Many of these individuals came from the lower ranks of the English gentry, or were soldiers or merchants who aspired to the aristocratic status that was so highly esteemed in their homeland. Given the similarities between the Irish and British environments and climates, it was logical for them to organise their estates in emulation of those that they had been familiar with in England, where peasants were juridically free and contracted for tenancies, or else worked as wage labourers for landlords or tenants. In practice, however, Irish tenancy also developed many of its own peculiar features, and some elements of the communal tenures that had been common under Gaelic law were incorporated into the new system.¹⁸

The landowners who took possession of the estates that were formed from Ireland's plantations were sometimes called "undertakers," because they undertook certain obligations when they invested in Irish land. A central feature of those obligations was the expectation that they would populate their estates exclusively with English or Scottish tenants as part of the state's plan to 'anglicise' Ireland. To achieve this goal, the undertakers offered attractive terms to British peasants in order to entice them to move to Ireland to cultivate their land as leaseholding tenants. This led to an influx of settlers known to historians as the 'New English' (in reality English and Scottish) in the late 1500s and 1600s.¹⁹ However, British demand for Irish tenancies was soon found to have been well below their supply. Consequently, the

18 Jane Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English: The Irish Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 84-134; Clarke, "Irish Economy," 169-174; George Sigerson, *History of the Land Tenures and Land Classes of Ireland* (London: Longmans, 1871); Canny, *Kingdom and Colony*, 46. On English tenancy in the early modern era, see Joan Thirsk, *The Rural Economy of England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984). For more on the communal tenures—known as rundale—that persisted on many Irish landed estates into the nineteenth century, see Donald Jordan, *Land and Popular Politics in Ireland: County Mayo from the Plantation to the Land War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 54-59; R.H. Buchanan, "Field Systems of Ireland," in A.R.H. Baker and R.A. Butlin (eds.), *Studies of Field Systems in the British Isles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 580-618.

19 *Conditions to be Observed by British Undertakers of the Escheated Lands in Ulster* (London: Walter J. Johnson, 1610); Canny, *Kingdom and Colony*, 69-102; Raymond Gillespie, *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster, 1600-1641* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1985); M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1973); Eric Richards, *Britannia's Children: Emigration from England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland Since 1600* (London: Hambledon Press, 2004), 29-31.

undertakers looked to Ireland's native population, not only as a source of menial labour for their English and Scottish tenants—as was originally envisioned by the Irish plantations' architects—but also to contract for tenancies themselves. Although Ireland had a relatively low population density in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, there were still enough natives to provide an adequate supply of tenants and agricultural labourers. Crucially, the Irish were also proficient farmers of grain and livestock, since they had long farmed these items for subsistence purposes, and they generally proved eager to lease land from the new owners, in preference to displacement. Over time, native tenants actually became favoured by many undertakers, since they could be charged higher rents and given shorter leases than those that were typically negotiated with English and Scottish immigrants.²⁰

Unsurprisingly, early modern Ireland's colonisation by England caused considerable tension and periodic conflict between the settlers and the established population—conflict exacerbated by the religious difference between the two groups, since the newcomers were mostly Protestant, whereas the Irish had generally remained Catholic in the aftermath of the Reformation. Between the 1550s and the 1660s a pattern emerged of state-backed plantations, followed by rebellion, confiscation of land, and more plantations. When the relatively small midlands plantations of the 1550s and 1560s were succeeded by the larger Munster plantation (in the south of Ireland) in the 1580s, an alliance of Irish chieftains and landowners formed in opposition to the English Crown, which led to the outbreak of the Tyrone War (1594-1603). After losing this war, the Gaelic Earls who had rebelled fled to Europe and their land—mostly situated in the north of the country—was confiscated and used to initiate the Ulster plantation

20 Philip Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1984), 91-108; Clarke and Edwards, "Pacification, Plantation, and the Catholic Question," 204-205; T.W. Moody, "The Treatment of the Native Populations Under the Scheme for the Plantation in Ulster," *Irish Historical Studies* 1 (1938), 59-63; Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 121-242; Nicholas Canny, *The Upstart Earl: A Study of the Social and Mental World of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork, 1566-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 124-138. On Irish demographics in this era, see L.M. Cullen, "Population Trends in Seventeenth-Century Ireland," *Economic and Social Review* 6 (1975), 249-265.

in the years 1606-1609.²¹ Later, in 1641, a period of relative peace was broken by a massive rebellion, during which many New English landlords and tenants were attacked and forcibly ejected from the country by disaffected Irish Catholics. Between 1649 and 1652, after emerging victorious from the English Civil War, Oliver Cromwell presided over the reconquest of Ireland, and subsequently organised new plantations that attracted another influx of British settlers.²²

Thus, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw the piecemeal transfer of Irish land from Gaelic Irish and Old English (Catholic) to New English (Protestant) owners. This process continued into the 1700s, as most—though not all—of the remaining Catholic landholders either converted to Protestantism or were bought out. The new landowners divided their estates among legally free tenants, who were impelled to produce agricultural commodities for the market in order to pay rent. Those tenants were of mixed origin: some were English and Scottish, but the majority were taken from the ranks of the native Irish population. From the plantations, English-style tenure and commercial agriculture spread to land that belonged to the small number of surviving Catholic landowners, who struggled to keep pace with the settlers in order to retain their properties. As a result, by the late 1600s, Ireland's socioeconomic structures had been drastically altered from their composition of a century and a half before. As a consequence of English colonisation, Ireland acquired a landed estate system that, in Kevin Whelan's words, "provided a market mechanism, while simultaneously orienting agricultural production to those commodities [livestock and grain]

21 Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-76* (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1976); MacCarthy-Morrogh, *Munster Plantation*; Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1999 [1993]); John McCavitt, *The Flight of the Earls* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2005); Jonathan Bardon, *The Plantation of Ulster* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2012).

22 Canny, *Making Ireland British*, 461-550; M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994); John Cunningham, *Conquest and Land in Ireland: The Transplantation to Connacht, 1649-1680* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011); Toby Barnard, "Planters and Policies in Cromwellian Ireland," *Past and Present* 61 (1973), 31-69; Karl Bottigheimer, *English Money and Irish Land: The Adventurers in the Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971); Pádraig Lenihan, *Consolidating Conquest: Ireland, 1603-1727* (Essex: Pearson Education Limited, 2008).

dictated by the emerging world-system.”²³ Significantly, these developments in Ireland did not occur in isolation; they were paralleled (and affected) by events on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, where England was engaged in other colonial endeavours in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Indeed, the association between Ireland and British America in Stuart-era England was such that one member of the English gentry remarked in a 1617 publication that Ireland was an “island in the Virginian sea.”²⁴

Soon after the English state began to consolidate its influence in Ireland by introducing plantations, it also backed the foundation of numerous settlements in the New World, which led, in some cases, to the creation of plantations of a different sort. In the second half of the 1500s, the term ‘plantation’ was usually synonymous with ‘colony’ throughout the English-speaking world, as evinced by its use in Ireland. But a plantation was also the name for a particular type of integrated landed estate where the landowners typically used unfree labourers to produce staple crops for sale on international markets.²⁵ This kind of agrarian enterprise had originated in the Mediterranean region in the medieval era, where it was associated with sugar cultivation. During the 1500s, Spanish and Portuguese colonists established plantations in the Americas, where they proved an effective way for settlers to earn large profits from commercial agriculture, especially in regions suited to the growth of sugar, such as northeast Brazil and the Caribbean islands.²⁶ Having been thus tested in other

23 Whelan, “Ireland in the World-System,” 215.

24 Fynes Moryson, *An History of Ireland, from the Year 1599 to 1603* (Dublin: S. Powell, 1735 [1617]), II, 359.

25 Trevor Burnard, “The Planter Class,” in Gad Heuman and Trevor Burnard (eds.), *The Routledge History of Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 187; Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History*, 314-315; Edgar Thompson, *Plantation Societies, Race Relations, and the South* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1975). On the distinction between the meaning of ‘plantation’ in Ireland and British America, see Nicholas Canny, “The Origins of Empire: An Introduction,” in Nicholas Canny (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol. 1, The Origins of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 8. For contemporary usage of the term in seventeenth-century Ireland, see John Davies, *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland Was Never Entirely Subdued* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1988 [1612]), 221-222.

26 Philip Curtin, *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex: Essays in Atlantic History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 3-28; Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492-1800* (London: Verso, 1997), 33-94; Davis, *Inhuman Bondage*, 27-47; Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986 [1985]); David Eltis, *The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas* (New York: Cambridge University Press,

parts of the New World in the sixteenth century, plantations were later introduced by British colonists in the parts of mainland North America where some of the subtropical crops that were in high demand in western Europe could be suitably cultivated: first in the Chesapeake colonies, where tobacco was grown commercially from the mid-1610s onward, and then in South Carolina, where plantations were adapted to the production of rice after 1690.²⁷

In 1607, at the same time that England was engaged in establishing its largest Irish plantation to date—in Ulster—it also founded its first permanent American settlement at Jamestown, Virginia. According to William Smyth, the expectations of the individuals who planned the two colonial ventures were similar: Ulster and Virginia would theoretically generate wealth—both for settlers and investors—through the production and export of commodities that were in short supply in Britain, including fish, fur, hides, and timber. Thus, as Nicholas Canny has written of these two particular cases, “English colonisation in completely different climactic and economic environments frequently followed the same course during the early years of settlement, because the different promoters shared the same assumptions.” In practice, however, Ulster and Virginia followed substantially different paths of development, a fact largely attributable to the discovery that the latter location was suited to the growth of tobacco.²⁸

The early years of settlement at Jamestown were notoriously fraught with difficulties for the colonists—difficulties that would have been well understood by their counterparts in Ireland, including famine and intermittent conflict with the local indigenous population. But

2000).

27 Lorena Walsh, “Slavery in the North American Mainland Colonies,” in Eltis and Engerman (eds.), *Cambridge World History of Slavery*, 407-430; Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*, 332-344; Philip Morgan, “Two Infant Slave Societies in the Chesapeake and the Lowcountry,” in Rick Halpern and Enrico Dal Lago (eds.), *Slavery and Emancipation* (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 18-34; Betty Wood, *Slavery in Colonial America, 1619-1776* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005).

28 William Smyth, “The Western Isle of Ireland and the English Seaboard of America: England’s First Frontiers,” *Irish Geography* 11 (1978), 1-22; Canny, “Origins of Empire,” 9. Also see Andrew Hadfield, “Irish Colonies and America,” in Robert Appelbaum and John Wood Sweet (eds.), *Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 172-193. For a systematic comparison of Ulster and Virginia in the first half of the seventeenth century, see Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea*.

the Virginian colony's fortunes changed for the better following John Rolfe's discovery, around 1616, that tobacco could be grown in the region. This crop was already in rising demand throughout western Europe following its earlier importation from the Caribbean. In response to this demand, many of the Jamestown colonists established farms where they concentrated primarily on the cultivation of tobacco for export. During the years and decades that followed, as Ira Berlin and others have shown, tobacco was the cause of a "plantation revolution" in the Chesapeake colonies—first in Virginia and later in Maryland—as settlers established landed estates that focused either largely or wholly on its production as a cash crop.²⁹

A distinctive feature of most New World plantations, including those that became common in seventeenth-century Virginia and Maryland, was their use of unfree labour. One of the major problems faced by British colonists throughout North America—to a much greater extent than their counterparts in Ireland—was a scarcity of workers. This constrained the early development of the Chesapeake-area tobacco plantations that promised to generate high returns for settlers and metropolitan merchants. Free labour proved an unprofitable mode of recruiting workers, since the laws of supply and demand inevitably led to high wages. As a result, Virginia's earliest planters experimented with a variety of forms of servitude on their landed estates and farms. They turned first to the native population as a source of labour, but—unlike what happened in Ireland—this proved unsustainable for a variety of reasons. Since the region's Native American women were traditionally assigned agricultural work, it was considered demeaning to the men to toil in the fields. Also, a combination of warfare and disease resulted in a sharp drop in the native population by the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Moreover, since enslaved Native Americans were typically more familiar

29 Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, 109-141; Lorena Walsh, *Motives of Honor, Pleasure, and Profit: Plantation Management in the Colonial Chesapeake, 1607-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 25-121; Karen Ordhal Kupperman, *The Jamestown Project* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 210-328; Allan Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986); Edmund Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1975).

with their environments than the colonists, they could and did easily escape from bondage.³⁰

In response to this situation, early-seventeenth-century Virginia's tobacco planters—resorting to a practice that was by then well established on Irish landed estates—appealed to England and Scotland to recruit agricultural labourers. This led, in the American case, to the creation of a large-scale system of indentured servitude. Indentured servants were individuals who entered into bondage temporarily, often voluntarily with a view toward improving their long term economic prospects. Those that migrated to seventeenth-century North America in large numbers were mostly drawn from Britain's lower classes, while some also came from Ireland. In return for the payment of their passage to the New World, indentured servants agreed to work for an established settler for a certain amount of time, usually between four and seven years. By the mid-1600s, indentured servitude became the main form of labour used on Virginian tobacco plantations; however, by the early 1700s it had been eclipsed by a racial form of slavery.³¹

The first recorded Africans to have been forcibly brought to the Chesapeake region arrived in Jamestown in 1619.³² In the half-century that followed, both as a result of the high cost of African slaves and the fact that European indentured servants adequately supplied the settlers' labour requirements, the former were generally used only as a supplemental source of labour on Virginian and Maryland plantations and farms. Beginning in the late seventeenth

30 Edmund Morgan, "The Labor Problem at Jamestown, 1607-18," *American Historical Review* 76 (1971), 595-611; C.S. Everett, "They Shall be Slaves for their Lives: Indian Slavery in Colonial Virginia," in Alan Galloway (ed.), *Indian Slavery in Colonial America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 67-108; Joyce Chaplin, "Indian Slavery in Early America: Captivity Without the Narrative," in Elizabeth Mancke and Carole Shammas (eds.), *The Creation of the British Atlantic World: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 45-70; Almon Wheeler Lauber, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times Within the Present Limits of the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1913).

31 Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 6-9; Bush, *Servitude in Modern Times*, 57-68; David Galenson, *White Servitude in Colonial America: An Economic Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Russell Menard, *Migrants, Servants and Slaves: Unfree Labor in Colonial British America* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001). On Irish indentured servants in the early American South, see Kirby Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 137-168; David Gleeson, *The Irish in the South, 1815-1877* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 11.

32 John Rolfe, "The First Blacks Arrive in Virginia (1619)," in Halpern and Dal Lago (eds.), *Slavery and Emancipation*, 13.

century, however, the composition of the workforce in the North American colonies where tobacco cultivation had become widespread underwent a profound transformation. A general improvement in living conditions in western Europe—including Ireland—was responsible for a fall in the supply of indentured servants. At roughly the same time, the supply of African slaves increased as the transatlantic slave trade, now dominated by the British, boomed in response to New World demand for unfree labour. In Virginia, Bacon's rebellion—in which small farmers, indentured servants, and slaves banded together in opposition to the planter elite in 1676—provided an additional impetus for planters to use exclusively African slaves to cultivate their land, as Edmund Morgan has persuasively argued. Thus, the tobacco planters began to foster a racial divide between lower class whites and black slaves with a view toward discouraging their future cooperation.³³

Considerably different from Virginia and Maryland was the case of South Carolina, where slaves of African origin were used as the primary source of agricultural labour from the outset of the British colony's foundation. This was because, following King Charles II's grant of land in the Lowcountry region to eight of his aristocratic supporters—known as the Lords Proprietors—in 1660, South Carolina was settled largely by planters who migrated there with their slaves from Barbados, which was then experiencing problems of overpopulation. These slaveholders were eager to establish plantations that would earn them profits similar to those made by their peers in the Caribbean and Chesapeake; thus, in the words of Philip Morgan, “South Carolina had a labor force in search of a plantation economy.”³⁴ Although the region's

33 Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 10-14; Walsh, *Motives of Honor, Pleasure, and Profit*, 194-392; Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*, 315-332; T.H. Breen, “A Changing Labor Force and Race Relations in Virginia, 1660-1710,” *Journal of Social History* 7 (1973), 3-25; Russell Menard, “From Servants to Slaves: The Transformation of the Chesapeake Labor System,” *Southern Studies* 16 (1977), 355-390; Anthony Parent, *Foul Means: The Formation of a Slave Society in Virginia, 1660-1740* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003). On the slave trade, see Herbert Klein, *The Atlantic Slave Trade* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Kenneth Morgan, *Slavery and the British Empire: From Africa to America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 7-33. On the effect of Bacon's rebellion on the transition to African slavery in Virginia, see Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 327-328.

34 Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, 1. Also see Jack Greene, “Colonial South Carolina and the Caribbean Connection,” in Jack Greene (ed.), *Imperatives, Behaviors, and Identities in Early American Cultural History* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992), 68-86; Russell Menard, “The Africanization of the Lowcountry Labor Force, 1670-1730,” in Winthrop Jordan and Sheila Skemp (eds.), *Race and Family in the*

marshy coastlands were not suited to the cultivation of either sugar or tobacco, by the 1690s, the South Carolinian landowners had discovered—largely thanks to the African slaves who had accompanied them to the mainland from Barbados—that their environment was suited to the growth of rice, another commodity for which there was high demand in Europe at the time. As a result, many Lowcountry settlers established plantations that focused primarily on the production of that crop. The capital and labour intensive nature of rice cultivation meant that only already wealthy individuals could afford to establish themselves as rice planters and dictated that their estates were generally inhabited by a large number of slaves. By the 1720s, rice had become established as South Carolina's premier staple crop. Slave-worked rice plantations later spread southward to the coastal region of Georgia, a British colony founded in 1732, despite the fact that slavery was originally banned there.³⁵

Significantly, the combination of slavery and plantation agriculture only became a feature of those parts of North America where the environment allowed for the cultivation of cash crops with high international demand. Where that was the case—as in the southern colonies—plantations were created on land expropriated from Native Americans. After a period of experimentation with different forms of servitude during the seventeenth century, planters eventually settled on imported African slaves as the most effective way to profit from their land. Thus, although there were numerous important differences between the Chesapeake and Lowcountry—notably in terms of the crops produced, demographics, organisation of labour, and the degree of planter involvement with production—both regions became 'slave societies,' in which plantations focused on the production of staple crops using

Colonial South (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1987), 81-108. For more on seventeenth-century Barbados, see Russell Menard, *Sweet Negotiations: Sugar, Slavery, and Plantation Agriculture in Early Barbados* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006).

35 S. Max Edelson, *Plantation Enterprise in Colonial South Carolina* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 13-91; Judith Carney, *Black Rice: The African Origins of Rice Cultivation in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Peter Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 Through the Stono Rebellion* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974); Betty Wood, *Slavery in Colonial Georgia, 1730-1775* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984).

unfree labour.³⁶

Comparison reveals both similarities and differences between the origins of Irish tenancy and American slavery. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, British colonists migrated to Ireland and the various colonies that comprised the early American South with the common goal of generating wealth for themselves. Not finding precious metals or minerals in either case, the settlers turned to commercial agriculture in order to profit from their new environments. Although different commodities ended up being farmed on Irish landed estates and mainland North American plantations, using different types of agrarian labour, in both cases the colonists organised the production of agricultural commodities for export on land forcibly taken from native populations.³⁷ As a result, colonisation by England led to Ireland's and the American South's integration into the capitalist world-economy as peripheries.

Of course, the peripheral settler societies that developed in early modern Ireland and the American South diverged in many respects. Two major differences stand out above the rest: first, the native population was ultimately retained as a source of agricultural labour in Ireland but displaced in the American South; second, tenancy was established as the favoured labour arrangement on Irish landed estates, whereas slavery became prevalent on plantations in the southern colonies of British North America. Historical, demographic, and environmental differences between Ireland and the American South were responsible for these contrasts between the sources and forms of agrarian labour introduced in the two regions.³⁸

In comparison with the American South, Ireland's prior history of partial occupation

36 Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 29-32. On the similarities and differences between the slave societies that developed in the early colonial American South, see Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, 27-101; Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 28-63; Davis, *Inhuman Bondage*, 123-140; Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African American Slaves* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), 53-96.

37 Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 38-41. Also see Terrence Ranger, "Richard Boyle and the Making of an Irish Fortune," *Irish Historical Studies* 10 (1957), 257-297; Betty Wood, "The Origins of Slavery in the Americas, 1500-1700," in Heuman and Burnard (eds.), *Routledge History of Slavery*, 64-79.

38 See Theodore Allen, *The Invention of the White Race, Volume One: Racial Oppression and Social Control* (London: Verso, 1994), 71-76; Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea*; Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*, 57-60.

by England emerges as a significant causal variable that explains some of the differences between the two regions' sixteenth and seventeenth-century colonisations. The individuals who organised Ireland's plantations were familiar with the country and its inhabitants, which cannot be said for the British experience of early-colonial North America, as Audrey Horning has recently emphasised in her comparison of Ulster and Virginia. Thus, even though it is true that Ireland's indigenous population was often described as 'savage' and frequently equated or compared with Native Americans by British settlers during the 1500s and 1600s, the Irish were still a white Christian people who were considered more agriculturally advanced and closer to English notions of civility than the 'Indians' whom the Chesapeake and Lowcountry colonists encountered.³⁹ Also important was the fact that early modern Ireland included some semblance of a market economy for which there was no equivalent in North America. Largely as a consequence of Old English attempts to develop feudal estates in the medieval period, commercial agriculture and international trade were known to the Irish in a way that was not true of Native Americans.⁴⁰

The above factors go some way toward explaining why British settlers ended up recruiting the indigenous population of Ireland as agricultural labourers, but displaced their equivalent in the American South. Irish peasants were already accustomed to farming the livestock and grain whose production the new landowners commercialised by demanding rent in return for occupancy. As a result, even though the original intention of Ireland's 'planters' was to populate their estates with English and Scottish peasants, when the supply of those migrants proved deficient, they were content to keep the natives as tenants. Conversely, in the

³⁹ Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea*, 3. Also see Greene, *Peripheries and Center*, 8; Canny, *Kingdom and Colony*, 31-68. On sixteenth and seventeenth-century comparisons of the native Irish and Native American populations, see Nicholas Canny, "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America," *William and Mary Quarterly* 30 (1973), 575-598; James Muldoon, "The Indian as Irishman," *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 3 (1975), 267-289; James Doan, "An Island in the Virginian Sea: Native Americans and Irish in English Discourse, 1585-1640," *New Hibernia Review* 1 (1997), 79-99; D.B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966).

⁴⁰ In Denis O'Hearn's opinion, this rendered pre-Tudor Ireland a "contact periphery," a place where commercial agriculture, market relations, and foreign trade had precedents before full incorporation into the world-economy occurred in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. See Denis O'Hearn, *The Atlantic Economy: Britain, the U.S. and Ireland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 30-32.

Chesapeake and Lowcountry regions of the early American South, Britons settled among a native population whose land they expropriated, but whom they deemed unsuitable as an agricultural workforce; hence, in reverse pattern to the situation in Ireland, the settlers turned from experiments with native labour toward favouring British migrant workers, in the latter case as indentured servants. Eventually, when the supply of those servants diminished, planters in North America turned to the transatlantic trade in African slaves as their main source of labour.⁴¹ As we shall see, these differences between the sources of agrarian labour used on the landed estates in Ireland and the American South would have a dramatic effect on subsequent processes of class formation in the two locations. Crucially, however, it was the landowners who could be construed as ‘alien’ in Ireland, whereas African slaves were cast as the ‘outsiders’ in the mainland British American plantation colonies.⁴²

At the same time, differences between Ireland’s and the American South’s climates and geographies were responsible for the different types of commercial agriculture engaged in by the settlers in the two locations, since these environmental factors dictated what commodities could be farmed. With its fertile soils and warm climate, the Chesapeake region could produce tobacco as a cash crop, while South Carolina’s hot, marshy coastlands were suited to the growth of rice. By contrast, sixteenth and seventeenth-century Ireland’s ‘planters’ discovered no staple comparable to tobacco or rice; instead, the Irish environment dictated that a mixture of stock raising and tillage became the norm on their landed estates. In turn, the different agricultural commodities farmed in Ireland and the American South also explains why tenancy or slavery was established as the main form of agricultural labour on the landed estates in either case.

In Ireland, even though war and famine led to a drop in population in the first half of

41 Raymond Gillespie, “The Problems of Plantations: Material Culture and Social Change in Early Modern Ireland,” in James Lyttleton and Colin Rynne (eds.), *Plantation Ireland: Settlement and Material Culture, c. 1550-c. 1700* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), 43-60; Wood, “Origins of Slavery in the Americas,” 66-75.

42 On Irish landlords as ‘alien,’ see W.E. Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 11. On the importance of the slaves’ status as ‘outsiders’ in the American South, see Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 43-44, 99.

the 1600s, this was not considered a major problem by the Irish plantations' organisers, since they initially expected that English and Scottish peasants would populate their estates in large numbers. In practice, when the settler influx fell short of these expectations, the new landowners were content to keep the natives as tenants for the reasons discussed above. Interestingly, some of Ireland's earliest planters did suggest the enslavement of Ireland's native population—as G.A. Hayes-McCoy has pointed out—but the farming of livestock and grain on fragmented estates did not require anywhere near the same degree of labour control or mobility that was valued on American staple-producing plantations. In any event, the Irish population began to steadily increase after the mid-seventeenth century. In this context, renting land to free tenants proved a profitable way for the landowners to generate wealth.⁴³

Conversely, American plantations were relatively small and geared toward the intensive production of particular crops with high value on international markets using servile labour. Peter Kolchin has argued that modern systems of unfree labour, such as American slavery and Russian serfdom, typically developed in situations that were characterised by a low population density, the availability of land, and the ability to profit from commercial agriculture. In these circumstances, mainland North American planters resorted to forced labour as the most effective means of generating wealth from their land. Having displaced the native population and facing a shortage of indentured servants by the late 1600s, they required an alternative source of unfree labour; thus, once the transatlantic slave trade promised to satisfy the planters' demand for servile workers, African slavery became the main form of labour used on North American plantations.⁴⁴

43 G.A. Hayes-McCoy, "The Completion of the Tudor Conquest and the Advance of the Counter-Reformation, 1571-1603," in Moody, Martin, and Byrne (eds.), *New History of Ireland*, III, 96-97. Also see Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*, 33, 268, 361. Interestingly, in his influential post-restoration survey of Ireland, William Petty explicitly assigned Irish Catholics a monetary value equal to "slaves and negroes" (£15). See William Petty, *Political Survey of Ireland* (London: D. Browne, 1719 [1672]), 22.

44 Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 17-31. Also see Domar, "Causes of Slavery or Serfdom," 18-32; Barbara Solow, "Slavery and Colonization," in Barbara Solow (ed.), *Slavery and the Rise of the Atlantic System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 21-42; Herman Nieboer, *Slavery as an Industrial System: Ethnological Researches* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010 [1900]).

In turn, the differences between the types of landed estates and agrarian labour systems that were established in Ireland and the American South during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had an important bearing on the characters of the two peripheral regions' gentries. On one hand, the landowners in Ireland were *landlords* who profited from their decentralised estates chiefly through rent and had little direct involvement with agricultural production. Planters in the American South, on the other hand, were *labourlords* who were responsible for integrated agricultural enterprises, and who—even taking into account the differences between tobacco and rice plantations—typically played an important role in organising the production and marketing of their cash crops. Irish tenancy and American slavery both changed over time, but this basic difference between the two systems of 'rural subjection' and the elites that they supported remained constant.⁴⁵

'Creole' Elites in Eighteenth-Century Ireland and the American South

Between the 1600s and 1700s, the agrarian labour systems introduced into Ireland and the American South during the course of the previous two centuries became institutionalised, and the landed elites—whose fortunes remained closely tied to changing patterns of international demand for the different agricultural commodities produced on their estates—established themselves at the pinnacle of their social hierarchies. Mutually influenced by English culture, landlords in Ireland and planters in the southern colonies of British America consciously endeavoured to imitate the behaviour of the English aristocracy in this period.⁴⁶ Significantly, however, whereas England was characterised by rigid class distinctions, class relationships in

45 On some of the differences between American planters and *English* landlords, see Blackburn, *Making of New World Slavery*, 332-335; Bowman, *Masters and Lords*, 33-34. On American planters as 'laborlords,' see Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 1986), 17-50.

46 See Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English*; Toby Barnard, *A New Anatomy of Ireland: The Irish Protestants, 1649-1770* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004); Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, 117-118; Michal Rozbicki, *The Complete Colonial Gentleman: Cultural Legitimacy in Plantation America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1998). For comparisons of eighteenth-century Ireland and British North America, see Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 114-122; Canny, *Kingdom and Colony*, 103-134.

eighteenth-century Ireland and the American South were complicated by different ‘ethnic’ factors. In Ireland, most landlords were Protestant and the Irish population was predominantly Catholic; therefore, the chief distinguishing characteristic between the landowners and their labourers was religion. This distinction was formalised in Irish law between the 1690s and the 1720s, when Ireland’s Protestant landowners passed a series of acts—collectively known as the ‘Penal Laws’—that discriminated against the country’s Catholic majority. In the American South, by contrast, having displaced the native population and imported African slaves to work their plantations, slaveholders kept race as the chief distinguishing characteristic with their workers. From the 1660s onward, planters in all of the North American colonies where plantation agriculture had taken hold introduced ‘slave codes’ that legally tightened their ownership of their black labourers.⁴⁷

Remarkably, even as many landlords and planters attempted to replicate English landed society in Ireland and the American South during the eighteenth century, the two elites also underwent a similar process of acculturation and identity formation in their very different contexts. In Ireland, the descendants of the ‘planters’ who settled in the country in the 1500s and 1600s developed an Anglo-Irish identity over the course of the 1700s, which mirrored the Anglo-American identity that developed among the American South’s planter classes in the same period. In this respect, the concept of ‘creolisation’—often used by scholars to describe African slaves’ and European colonists’ cultural assimilation to the Americas—could be applied to the processes of identity formation undergone by the landed proprietors in Ireland and the American South between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In both cases, the elites negotiated their shared British heritage with elements of the different cultures that they encountered in their peripheral environments, thereby producing comparable syncretic

47 Sean Connolly, *Religion, Law, and Power: The Making of Protestant Ireland, 1660-1760* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Ian McBride, *Eighteenth-Century Ireland: The Isle of Slaves* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2009); Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 28-62; Daniel Littlefield, “Colonial and Revolutionary United States,” in Robert Paquette and Mark Smith (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 201-226.

identities. In turn, the emergence of these ‘creole’ identities was central to the landlords’ and slaveholders’ concurrent participation in patriotic movements that questioned their political relationships with England in the second half of the eighteenth century. The outcomes of these movements were markedly different, however. Ireland secured a limited degree of independence in 1782, only to be incorporated into the United Kingdom in 1801, whereas the southern colonies of mainland North America exited the British Empire in 1783, and subsequently participated in the creation of an independent republic: the United States.⁴⁸

In Ireland, the eighteenth century was the era of ‘Protestant ascendancy,’ the situation whereby a small minority of mostly British origin dominated the country’s social, economic, and political structures. We have already seen that the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries witnessed an influx of ‘New English’ settlers into Ireland—settlers who were differentiated from the indigenous population by religion as well as by geographic origin—but their rule of the country was contested until 1691. That year, Catholic Ireland suffered a definitive defeat when William of Orange vanquished James II in the war for the English throne generally known as the ‘Glorious Revolution.’ Subsequently, Irish Catholics were stripped of many of their legal rights by the New English elites, who took control of the country with the backing of the British state.⁴⁹

In the years and decades after the Glorious Revolution, the Irish parliament—an institution by then monopolised by Protestant landlords—passed a series of laws that

48 See Nicholas Canny, “Identity Formation in Ireland: The Emergence of an Anglo-Irish Identity,” in Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (eds.), *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 159-212; David Hayton, “Anglo-Irish Attitudes: Changing Perceptions of National Identity Among the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland, c. 1690-1740,” *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 17 (1987), 145-157; Trevor Burnard, *Creole Gentlemen: The Maryland Elite, 1691-1776* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Joyce Chaplin, “Creoles in British America: From Denial to Acceptance,” in Charles Stewart (ed.), *Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory* (Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2006), 46-65.

49 J.G. Simms, “The Establishment of Protestant Ascendancy, 1691-1714,” in Moody and Vaughan (eds.), *A New History of Ireland*, IV, 1-30; Patrick McNally, “Ireland: The Making of the ‘Protestant Ascendancy,’ 1690-1760,” in H.T. Dickinson (ed.), *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 403-413; John Childs, *The Williamite Wars in Ireland, 1688-1691* (London: Continuum, 2007); Thomas Bartlett, *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation, 1690-1830* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1992), 1-29.

effectively reduced Ireland's Catholic majority to the status of second-class citizens. These 'Penal Laws' covered a variety of aspects: they targeted the few remaining landowners of Gaelic Irish and Old English descent by making it illegal for Catholics to purchase land and by directing that the property that remained in their possession should be divided among all sons following the death of an owner; they disrupted the workings of the Irish Catholic Church by exiling its bishops; and they placed Irish governance solely in the hands of the Protestant minority by excluding Catholics (and Presbyterians) from political office and by disenfranchising them in 1728. Thus, the Penal Laws provided the legal basis for the confessionally defined system of social control that characterised eighteenth-century Ireland.⁵⁰

Having consolidated its rule, the landed class increasingly made its presence felt in the Irish countryside as the 1700s advanced. Ireland's landlords traditionally had a popular reputation for absenteeism, but Louis Cullen and A.P.W. Malcomson have challenged this perception and shown that—while some lived abroad or in Dublin—most resided on at least one of their estates at least part of the time.⁵¹ In fact, Irish landlords typically built extravagant 'Big Houses' on their estates during the eighteenth century, and many also paid for the creation of gardens and forests on their demesnes. In this respect, Ireland's landed class was consciously imitating the behaviour of the English aristocracy. During the eighteenth century, Irish landlords also frequently intermarried with their British counterparts and solicited titles from the Irish parliament in order to have their aristocratic status affirmed.⁵²

50 Maureen Wall, *The Penal Laws, 1691-1760* (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press, 1976); Bartlett, *Fall and Rise*, 17-29; Connolly, *Religion, Law, and Power*, 263-313; Charles Ivar McGrath, "Securing the Protestant Interest: The Origins and Purpose of the Penal Laws of 1695," *Irish Historical Studies* 30 (1996), 25-46; D.W. Hayton, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004).

51 Cullen, *Emergence of Modern Ireland*, 44-47; A.P.W. Malcomson, "Absenteeism in Eighteenth-Century Ireland," *Irish Economic and Social History* 1 (1974), 15-35. For contemporary examples of Irish landlords' reputation for absenteeism, see Thomas Prior, *A List of the Absentees of Ireland* (Dublin: R. Gunne, 1729); Maria Edgeworth, *The Absentee* (New York: Garland Publications, 1978 [1812]); Sydney Owenson, *Absenteeism* (London: Henry Colburn, 1825).

52 See Connolly, *Religion, Law and Power*, 41-73; Toby Barnard, "The Gentrification of Eighteenth-Century Ireland," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* 12 (1997), 137-155; Toby Barnard, *Making the Grand Figure: Lives and Possessions in Ireland, 1641-1770* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004); Jane Ohlmeyer, "Making Ireland English: The Seventeenth-Century Irish Peerage," in Brian MacCurtain (ed.), *Reshaping Ireland, 1590-1700: Colonisation and Its Consequences* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 131-146.

The wealth that sustained the Irish landlords' aristocratic lifestyles was mostly generated from the rents earned from the pursuit of commercial agriculture by the tenants who farmed their land. In the seventeenth century, Irish agriculture had been characterised by a focus on livestock farming and geared toward British markets. However, since Ireland's tenant-farmers produced similar items to those farmed in England and Scotland—which led to unwanted competition—Westminster passed a series of laws that limited England's imports of Irish cattle and wool in the second half of the 1600s. As a consequence, Irish landed estates were soon re-oriented toward supplying transatlantic markets; by the 1720s, they found a profitable niche in supplying the West Indies with salted beef and dairy provisions.⁵³ Later, after 1750, Irish agriculture entered a new phase. Largely in response to the rising demand for grain in England—then in the early stages of its industrial revolution and during its wars with France—tillage farming became increasingly common throughout Ireland, and Britain once again became the primary destination for Irish agricultural produce.⁵⁴

These economic trends formed the backdrop to the remarkable demographic changes that occurred in eighteenth-century Ireland, when the country's population rose from approximately two million in 1700 to four million by 1790, and continued to rapidly increase thereafter. This population boom—largely fuelled by the exponential growth of the predominantly Catholic tenant-farmer and agricultural labouring classes—was the result of a combination of factors. The general shift from pastoral to arable farming on Irish estates had significant demographic implications: since tillage was labour intensive, employment for

53 R.C. Nash, "Irish Atlantic Trade in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *William and Mary Quarterly* 42 (1985), 329-356; L.M. Cullen, "Economic Development, 1691-1750," in Moody and Vaughan (eds.), *A New History of Ireland*, IV, 123-158; Francis James, "Irish Colonial Trade in the Eighteenth Century," *William and Mary Quarterly* 20 (1963), 574-584. On direct trade between Ireland and the American South in this era, see Thomas Truxes, *Irish-American Trade, 1660-1783* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 122-126; John McCusker and Russell Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 130, 174.

54 L.M. Cullen, "Economic Development, 1750-1800," in Moody and Vaughan (eds.), *New History of Ireland*, IV, 159-195; L.M. Cullen, *Anglo-Irish Trade, 1660-1760* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968); Cormac Ó'Gráda, *Ireland: A New Economic History, 1780-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 24-29; Raymond Crotty, *Irish Agricultural Production: Its Volume and Structure* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1966), 13-28.

landless labourers increased and, as long as prices for grain remained high, it was feasible to subdivide estates among a large number of tenants and sub-tenants. These factors intersected with cultural changes among the Irish peasantry as marriage ages fell in conjunction with the ability of farmers' sons to establish themselves on small holdings. Another major reason for eighteenth-century Ireland's population boom was the potato; this highly nutritious tuber—imported from the New World the previous century—fit well into the tillage cycle. Over the course of the 1700s, potatoes became the predominant staple of the Irish peasantry's diet, which effectively allowed them to farm grain, livestock, and dairy commodities as cash crops that paid their rents.⁵⁵

Ireland's landlords assented to these developments with little interference. Typically, even when resident, they delegated the management of their estates almost wholly to land agents during the eighteenth century. Cormac Ó'Gráda has described the situation as follows: “[Irish landlords] were wholesalers rather than retailers in land, and therefore cared or knew little about the circumstances of individual farms.” This rentier mentality was encouraged by the emergence of the middleman system that became common on landed estates throughout Ireland by the mid-1700s. Middlemen were large tenants who were given long leases, often over ninety years, and then acted as de facto landlords themselves by re-letting their land to smaller tenants. Since they did not own the land outright and had an eye on profit, middlemen usually allowed their sub-tenants to further sub-divide their holdings. Over time, this led to a pyramidal structure of Irish land occupancy and contributed to the high population density that characterised much of the country by the end of the 1700s.⁵⁶

55 K.H. Connell, *The Population of Ireland, 1750-1845* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950); S.J. Connolly, “Marriage in Pre-Famine Ireland,” in Art Cosgrove (ed.), *Marriage in Ireland* (Dublin: College Press, 1985), 78-98; P.M.A. Bourke, “The Use of the Potato in Pre-Famine Ireland,” *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland* 21 (1967/1968), 72-96.

56 Ó'Gráda, *Ireland*, 30; Peter Roebuck, “The Economic Situation and Functions of Substantial Landowners, 1600-1815: Ulster and Lowland Scotland Compared,” in Rosalind Mitchison and Peter Roebuck (eds.), *Economy and Society in Scotland and Ireland, 1500-1939* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988), 81-92; David Dickson, “Middlemen,” in Thomas Bartlett and D.W. Hayton, (eds.), *Penal Era and Golden Age: Essays in Irish History, 1690-1800* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1979), 162-185. For an English agronomist's description of eighteenth-century Ireland's middleman system, see Arthur Young, *A Tour in Ireland* (London: H. Goldney, 1780), II, 94-100.

Despite the fact that the Protestant ascendancy always remained a numerical minority as a result of the increase in the Catholic population, Ireland's landowners nevertheless developed a distinctive 'Irish' identity over the course of the eighteenth century. This represented a reversal of earlier trends, since the New English community had generally perceived Ireland as a threatening place and associated negative connotations with 'Irishness' during the 1500s and 1600s. However, as time advanced, even though they always retained a strong sense of pride in their British heritage, the descendants of those settlers became content to regard themselves as 'Irish' or 'Anglo-Irish.' Since most landowners were born and lived in Ireland from the early eighteenth century on, and since they generally grew self-confident about their dominance of the country, they increasingly embraced this hybrid identity, as the work of Nicholas Canny, David Hayton, and Toby Barnard has shown. In effect, therefore, most members of Ireland's landed class underwent a process of 'creolisation,' or cultural assimilation to their settler society, during the course of the eighteenth century.⁵⁷

Since most Anglo-Irish landlords believed that Ireland was firmly under their control by the mid-1700s, they were increasingly prone to question their dependent political relationship with England. It was in this context that an elite-led patriot movement developed among eighteenth-century Ireland's Protestant community, which protested against the restrictions imposed on Irish trade and Westminster's authority over the Irish parliament. In the half decade between 1778 and 1783, when presented with leverage to press for a greater degree of independence from England during the American War of Independence, Anglo-Irish patriots successfully lobbied for the removal of restrictions on Ireland's trade and for legislative independence for their parliament.⁵⁸

57 Canny, "Identity Formation in Ireland," 159-213; Canny, *Upstart Earl*, 124-138; D.W. Hayton, *The Anglo-Irish Experience, 1680-1730: Religion, Identity and Patriotism* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), 25-48; Toby Barnard, "Protestantism, Ethnicity and Irish Identities, 1660-1760," in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c. 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 206-235.

58 Thomas Bartlett, "'A People Made for Copies Rather than Originals': The Anglo-Irish, 1760-1800," *International History Review* 12 (1990), 11-25; David Lammey, "The Growth of the 'Patriot Opposition' in Ireland during the 1770s," *Parliamentary History* 7 (1988), 257-281; R.B. McDowell, "Colonial Nationalism

Ireland's landed class generally backed the move to greater independence in the late 1770s and early 1780s. Subsequently, some influential figures from within the patriot movement called for the reform of the Irish parliament and the abolition of the Penal Laws. The Protestant ascendancy was internally divided over these issues, however, with the majority of landlords ultimately proving hostile to any alteration of the status quo within Ireland. Thus, even though the Irish parliament repealed many of the Penal Laws between the late 1770s and the early 1790s (largely at the insistence of the British government, which retained a strong influence in Irish politics), the campaign to alter parliamentary representation failed and full 'Catholic Emancipation'—the term that became associated with the complete abolition of the Penal Laws—remained elusive.⁵⁹

After the Irish aristocracy's opposition to social and political reform became apparent, a more radical movement for change emerged in late-eighteenth-century Ireland. 1791 saw the foundation of the United Irishmen, a nonsectarian organisation that agitated for the creation of an Irish republic. From 1794 on, the United Irishmen became increasingly militant and ultimately solicited French assistance in order to stage an insurrection in 1798. After this attempted revolution was suppressed, the English government decided to abolish the Irish parliament and to rule Ireland directly from Westminster. Having been reminded of the precariousness of their minority status and their ultimate reliance on England for security during the 1798 rebellion, most members of the Irish landed class backed the Act of Union and Ireland officially became part of the United Kingdom in 1801.⁶⁰

and the Winning of Parliamentary Independence, 1760-82," in Moody and Vaughan (eds.), *New History of Ireland*, IV, 196-235; Maurice O'Connell, *Irish Politics and Social Conflict in the Age of the American Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965).

59 Bartlett, *Fall and Rise*, 103-145; James Kelly, "Parliamentary Reform in Irish Politics, 1760-90," in David Dickson, Dáire Keogh and Kevin Whelan (eds.), *The United Irishmen: Republicanism, Radicalism, and Rebellion* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1993), 74-87; James Kelly, "'Era of Liberty': The Politics of Civil and Political Rights in Eighteenth-Century Ireland," in Jack Greene (ed.), *Exclusionary Empire: English Liberty Overseas, 1600-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 77-111; R.B. McDowell, *Ireland in the Age of Imperialism and Revolution, 1760-1801* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 209-350.

60 R.B. McDowell, "The Age of the United Irishmen: Reform and Reaction, 1789-94," and "The Age of the United Irishmen: Revolution and the Union, 1794-1800," in Moody and Vaughan (eds.), *New History of Ireland*, IV, 289-338, 339-373; Nancy Curtin, *The United Irishmen: Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin, 1791-1798* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); Patrick Geoghegan, *The Irish Act of Union: A Study in High*

One of the landlords to sit in the Irish parliament shortly before its abolition was Robert Dillon, first baron Clonbrock (1754-95). Dillon was of ‘Old English’ descent, his ancestors having originally settled in Ireland in the late twelfth century, after which they formed part of the Pale gentry. The branch of the family to which Clonbrock belonged purchased land in County Galway—in the west of Ireland—in the 1580s. Despite the wars and confiscations of the seventeenth century, the Dillons managed to retain ownership of most of their property and remained Catholic. In 1724, however, Clonbrock’s grandfather converted to Protestantism, presumably in order to circumvent the Penal Laws. This removed all legal impediments to the Dillons’ advancement, and the amount of land that they owned subsequently increased through a combination of purchase, marriage, and inheritance. Dillon also became a well known name in national politics during the eighteenth century, since a number of heads of the household served in the Irish House of Commons in those years. In 1790, Robert Dillon was awarded a peerage by the Irish parliament, which entitled him to sit in the House of Lords, bestowed on him the hereditary title baron Clonbrock, and confirmed once and for all his family’s place among the upper ranks of the Irish aristocracy.⁶¹

In comparison with Ireland’s landlords, the agrarian elite that dominated the American South during the eighteenth century was a larger and more heterogeneous class. Writing primarily about the nineteenth century, Peter Kolchin has argued that it is appropriate to speak of “many Souths” in order to capture the geographic, economic, and social diversity that existed within the region and among its inhabitants. The same reasoning also applies to the colonial era, when there were considerable differences between the slave societies that emerged in different parts of the North American mainland, as the work of Ira Berlin and Philip Morgan has

Politics, 1798-1801 (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1999).

61 Kevin McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual: Paternalism on the Clonbrock Estates, 1826-1908,” (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011), 12-13; Patrick Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society in Galway* (Dublin: De Búrca, 2012), 20-22; Charles Chenevix-Trench, *Grace’s Card: Irish Catholic Landlords, 1690-1800* (Dublin: Mercier Press, 1997), 98; Gerald Dillon, “The Dillon Peerages,” *Irish Genealogist* 3 (1958), 98-99.

shown. In turn, these differences led to considerable variation within the region's slaveholding classes, particularly between those who lived in the Upper South (Virginia and Maryland), the Lower South (South Carolina and Georgia), and the Lower Mississippi Valley (Louisiana and Mississippi).⁶²

In the Upper South, where tobacco was the main staple crop, plantations were generally small and worked by a small number of slaves. The nature of tobacco cultivation, which required close attention throughout the year, encouraged planters' residence on their estates and their active engagement with plantation management. Gang labour, whereby slaves were organised in small groups who worked in the fields from dawn until dusk, was the most common form of labour control used in the Chesapeake colonies. Yet, since tobacco caused rapid soil depletion, most of the planters who grew it faced an economic crisis by the middle of the eighteenth century; many responded to this situation by diversifying production and transitioning their plantations to the cultivation of wheat as a commercial crop.⁶³

In the Lower South, where commercial agriculture was oriented primarily toward the production of rice for most of the eighteenth century, plantations were usually larger and worked by a greater number of slaves than was common in the Chesapeake region. Also, the nature of rice cultivation dictated that most Lowcountry plantations used the 'task system' of labour organisation, whereby each slave was given a specific job to do each day, rather than working in gangs as most slaves did on tobacco plantations in the Upper South. Generally speaking, behaving in a comparable way to Irish landlords, the rice planters lived on their estates for part of each year, usually spending the summer months in regional urban centres, such as Charleston, South Carolina. As a result of the larger size of their operations and their

62 Peter Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 39-73; Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, 95-216; Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*.

63 Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves*, 78-163; Lorena Walsh, "Slave Work, Slave Life, and Tobacco Production in the Tidewater Chesapeake, 1620-1820," in Ira Berlin and Philip Morgan (eds.), *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993), 170-200; Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, 164-175, 187-194; Rhys Isaacs, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

partial absenteeism, they were more likely to hire overseers or agents to manage their estates than tobacco planters. However, even when physically absent, most slaveholders in the Lower South still paid close attention to plantation management. A fall in rice prices during the 1740s prompted some of them to experiment with indigo production, but, unlike tobacco, rice did not exhaust the soil; therefore, when prices recovered after 1750, rice regained its status as the main staple of the Lowcountry plantation economy.⁶⁴ By then, a third distinct North American slave society had also emerged in the Lower Mississippi Valley, where French, Spanish, and British settlers established plantations that focused primarily on tobacco and indigo cultivation from the 1720s onward.⁶⁵

Although it is important to acknowledge that there were many important variations between the labourlords in different parts of the eighteenth-century American South, they arguably had more in common than the features that distinguished them from each other. In the Upper South, the Lower South, and the Lower Mississippi Valley, slavery underpinned the planters' wealth, which was dependent on international market demand for their staple crops. Additionally, akin to landlords in Ireland, most planters strove to confirm their status as gentlemen by imitating the behaviour of the English aristocracy; for example, the wealthiest slaveholders typically built Big Houses on their estates and spent much of their profits on conspicuous consumption during the 1700s. At the same time, using the wealth and status generated from the sale of their slave-raised cash crops, planters also took control of politics in all of the southern slave societies.⁶⁶

64 Peter Coclanis, *The Shadow of a Dream: Economic Life and Death in the South Carolina Low Country, 1670-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 48-110; Peter Coclanis, "How the Low Country Was Taken to Task: Slave-Labor Organization in Coastal South Carolina and Georgia," in Robert Paquette and Louis Ferleger (eds.), *Slavery, Secession, and Southern History* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000), 59-78; Joyce Chaplin, *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730-1815* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 187-276; Edelson, *Plantation Enterprise in Colonial South Carolina*.

65 Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, 77-92, 195-216; Gwendolyn Midlo Hall, *Africans in Colonial Louisiana: The Development of African-Creole Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Baton Rouge: University State University Press, 1992); David Libby, *Slavery and Frontier Mississippi, 1720-1835* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2004); D. Clayton James, *Antebellum Natchez* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968); Charles Sydnor, *Slavery in Mississippi* (Gloucester: P. Smith, 1965 [1933]).

66 T.H. Breen, *Tobacco Culture: The Mentality of the Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of Revolution*

In the late 1600s and early 1700s, at roughly the same time that landlords secured the passage of the Penal Laws in Ireland, planters throughout the American South used their considerable social and political power to legalise and codify slavery. For much of the seventeenth century, the precise legal status of Africans who worked on mainland North American plantations had been undefined and black slaves had often worked alongside white indentured servants with little practical differentiation between the two groups. Beginning in the 1660s, however, harnessing their control of the colonial legislatures, planters secured the passage of ‘slave codes.’ These laws—common in various permutations in all the North American colonies where plantation agriculture took hold—stripped African slaves of their rights, classified them as property, and dictated that their bondage was both lifelong and hereditary.⁶⁷

Since African slavery became the favoured source of labour on North American tobacco and rice plantations by the end of the seventeenth century, the southern colonies’ black populations increased significantly during the 1700s. This growth was a result of the combination of two major factors: the transatlantic slave trade and natural reproduction. Although mainland North America was never as large a market for slaves as either the Caribbean or South America, according to David Eltis and David Richardson it was still the destination for roughly 472,000 African captives before the U.S. outlawed participation in the Atlantic slave trade in 1808.⁶⁸ Additionally, largely as a result of the generally healthier

(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 32-39; T.H Breen, “An Empire of Goods: The Anglicization of Colonial America, 1690-1776,” *Journal of British Studies* 25 (1986), 468-499; Lorena Walsh, *Motives of Honor, Pleasure, and Profit*, 394-471; Emory Evens, *A “Toppling” People: The Rise and Decline of Virginia’s Old Political Elite, 1680-1790* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009); Robert Olwell, *Masters, Slaves, and Subjects: The Culture of Power in the South Carolina Low Country, 1740-1790* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 17-56; Richard Waterhouse, *A New World Gentry: The Making of a Merchant and Planter Class in South Carolina, 1670-1770* (Charleston: History Press, 2005 [1989]).

67 Parent, *Foul Means*, 105-134; A. Leon Higginbotham, *In the Matter of Color: Race and the American Legal Process, the Colonial Period* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Thomas Morris, *Southern Slavery and the Law, 1619-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

68 David Eltis and David Richardson, *Atlas of the Transatlantic Slave Trade* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 200, 205. Also see Klein, *Atlantic Slave Trade*, 210-211; Trevor Burnard, “The Atlantic Slave Trade,” in Heuman and Burnard (eds.), *Routledge History of Slavery*, 91-92; Philip Curtin, *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).

climates, diets, and working conditions on plantations in the American South compared to those in the Caribbean and Brazil, North American bondspeople achieved natural reproduction in the 1700s. Consequently, the proportion of creole (or American-born) slaves began to increase. By the late 1790s, the mainland slave population had reached approximately 900,000, and continued to increase thereafter. Importantly, however, only in South Carolina—where rice plantations required large workforces—did the number of slaves grow to outnumber that of the free white population.⁶⁹

Just as their slaves were increasingly becoming American-born during the 1700s, so too did British American slaveholders undergo a similar creolisation process, since most planters were typically born and lived in North America in this period. As was the case with most of their landed contemporaries in Ireland, planters throughout the colonial American South generally retained a strong sense of their British heritage. And yet, also similarly to Irish landlords, those slaveholders developed local attachments and distinctive provincial identities over the course of the eighteenth century; by the mid-1700s, most considered themselves ‘Anglo-American.’⁷⁰

Comparable to what happened with landlords in eighteenth-century Ireland, the development of creole identities among planters in the American South was part of the reason for their participation in patriotic movements that sought greater independence from England. When the British government attempted to impose higher levels of taxation upon its North

69 Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 22-23; Allan Kulikoff, “A ‘Prolifick’ People: Black Population Growth in the Chesapeake Colonies, 1700-1790,” *Southern Studies* 16 (1977), 391-428; Peter Wood, “‘More Like a Negro Country’: Demographic Patterns in Colonial South Carolina, 1700-1740,” in Stanley Engerman and Eugene Genovese (eds.), *Race and Slavery in the Western Hemisphere: Quantitative Studies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 131-169. On the effect of the American South’s relatively favourable working conditions on slave demographics, see Laird Bergad, *The Comparative Histories of Slavery in Brazil, Cuba, and the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 96-131.

70 Jack Greene, *The Intellectual Construction of America: Exceptionalism and Identity from 1492 to 1800* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 143-173; Michael Zuckerman, “Identity in British America: Unease in Eden,” in Canny and Pagden (eds.), *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World*, 115-159; Carole Shammas, “English-Born and Creole Elites in Turn-of-the-Century Virginia,” in Thad Tate and David Ammerman, *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 274-296; Burnard, *Creole Gentlemen*, 205-236; Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 34-36.

American colonies after the Seven Years War (1756-63), many planters from the southern colonies joined their northern neighbours in protest. Ultimately, this dispute led to the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and to the American Revolution. Southern slaveholders, including such notable figures as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, played a leading role in the subsequent conflict. In 1783, the thirteen mainland colonies officially exited the British empire and went on to form the United States of America.⁷¹

The revolutionary era witnessed major challenges to American slavery from both internal and external sources. On one hand, for the first time in their history, a significant number of planters seriously questioned the morality of their labour system; having declared that all men are created equal, it became difficult for them to reconcile their statements about their rhetorical slavery to England with their ownership of human chattel. Not only did this ideological climate encourage the abolition of slavery in the north of the new United States, where slavery had always been marginal to the economy, but it also fuelled a wave of manumissions in the Upper South after the cessation of the American Revolution. On the other hand, the wars for American independence also caused disruptions on plantations throughout the southern colonies that weakened the slave system there. The British army actively fostered these disruptions by promising freedom to slaves who assisted them in their war with the American patriots. Additionally, thousands of slaves took the opportunity that the war afforded them to run away from their plantations and thereby escaped their bondage.⁷²

Ultimately, though, slavery survived the revolutionary era throughout the American

71 See Jack Greene, "Identity and Independence," in Jack Greene and J.R. Pole, (eds.), *A Companion to the American Revolution* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), 230-234; Laurent Dubois, "Slavery in the Age of Revolutions," in Heuman and Burnard (eds.), *Routledge History of Slavery*, 269-272; Woody Holton, *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves and the Making of the American Revolution in Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Robert Olwell, "'Domestik Enemies': Slavery and Political Independence in South Carolina, May 1775-March 1776," *Journal of Southern History* 55 (1989), 21-48.

72 Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 63-92; Davis, *Inhuman Bondage*, 157-174; David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolutions, 1770-1823* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975); McLeod, *Slavery, Race, and the American Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Sylvia Frey, *Water from the Rock: Black Resistance in a Revolutionary Age* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); Gary Nash, *The Forgotten Fifth: African-Americans in the Age of Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

South. In fact, the institution was actually *rejuvenated* in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, a development largely traceable to the cotton boom. Beginning in the 1790s, a combination of rising international (mostly British) demand for cotton and the suitability of much of continental North America's soil and climate to the growth of this crop led to a massive expansion of slave-worked cotton plantations in the 'Old Southwest.' In effect, cotton was the cause of a new American plantation revolution, while sugar plantations also became common in Louisiana from the second half of the 1790s onward.⁷³

Thus, at the end of the eighteenth century, the American South contained numerous slave societies of varying ages and stages of maturity. Just as there were differences between tobacco and rice zones, so too did cotton and sugar engender their own peculiarities in terms of plantation size, cultivation techniques, and the organisation of labour in the regions where their production took hold. Notwithstanding these specific variations, however, the post-revolutionary South's newest slave societies followed the same basic pattern that had been established during the colonial era: Native Americans were removed; land was converted into plantations and farms worked by slaves of African descent who raised staple crops for the market; and planters became the ruling class.⁷⁴

The fact that slavery and plantation agriculture were rejuvenated and began to expand in the late eighteenth century ensured that slaveholders remained an open elite in the American South. Thus it was that John A. Quitman, an immigrant's son, could become closely identified with slavery in antebellum Mississippi. Quitman's ancestors had established themselves in Westphalia (in the west of modern Germany) during the Reformation, having

73 Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 93-132; Joyce Chaplin, "Creating a Cotton South in Georgia and South Carolina, 1760-1815," *Journal of Southern History* 57 (1991), 171-200; Adam Rothman, *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005); James Miller, *South by Southwest: Planter Emigration and Identity in the Slave South* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002); Richard Follett, *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in Louisiana's Cane World, 1820-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005).

74 Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, 195-216; Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 140-157; Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 18-45; James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).

migrated there from Italy following their conversion to Protestantism. Sometime in the third quarter of the eighteenth century, Quitman's paternal grandfather occupied the post of inspector of dykes, harbours, and military roads for the Prussian government. During the 1780s, after becoming a Lutheran Reverend, Frederick Henry Quitman (1760-1832) moved to Curaçao, in the Dutch West Indies, to take up a ministry. In 1796, shortly after marrying Anna Elizabeth Hueck—daughter of the island's governor—he relocated to the recently created United States, where he settled in Rhinebeck, New York. Little did Frederick Henry Quitman know that his third son, John Anthony, born in 1799, would later become an influential member of the antebellum U.S. South's planter class.⁷⁵

When viewed in comparative perspective, striking parallels and contrasts between the histories of eighteenth-century Ireland and the American South become apparent. In both cases, this was the period when, at different rates of development, the peripheral settler societies established during the previous two centuries began to mature and the agrarian elites consolidated their rule. In both cases, the landowners' wealth remained heavily dependent on international market-demand for the different agricultural commodities produced on their estates, whether that was livestock and grain farmed by tenants throughout Ireland or the tobacco and rice grown by slaves in different parts of the American South. The consumers of those commodities converged and diverged at different times during the eighteenth century: Irish landed estates transitioned from serving British markets to West Indian ones and then back to serving British markets again by the late 1700s. Since they produced prized 'enumerated goods,' North American plantations, instead, were focused overwhelmingly on supplying Britain for the duration of the eighteenth century. Direct trade between Ireland and

⁷⁵ James McLendon, "Ancestry, Early Life and Education of John A. Quitman," *Journal of Mississippi History* 10 (1948), 271-274; J.F.H. Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Major-General, U.S.A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1860), I, 15-24; Robert May, *John A. Quitman: Old South Crusader* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 2-4.

the American South was limited in this period, since both regions were bound by the English mercantile system, which ensured that the most lucrative branches of imperial trade were channeled through British ports.⁷⁶

As they grew in wealth and power during the eighteenth century, landlords in Ireland and planters in the American South consciously mimicked the lifestyle of the English aristocracy. This mutual influence explains why the two elites engaged in remarkably similar social and cultural behaviour in their different environments, as is illustrated by their common expenditure on conspicuous consumption, such as the construction of impressive Big Houses on their estates. If the aim was to replicate English landed society in their peripheral environments, then Ireland's landlords came much closer than the American South's planters to achieving that goal. This was because the landowners in Ireland—having introduced tenancy on their estates—were rentiers after the English fashion, they imported peerages, and their families frequently intermarried with the British gentry. In contrast, planters in British North America established hierarchies based on the number of slaves (rather than the amount of land) one owned; they were generally compelled to take a greater interest in the management of their estates than was required of either English or Irish landlords; and a titled peerage was not established anywhere in British America. Still, in the common attempts to imitate the English aristocracy, certain aspects of Irish landlords' and American planters' material and intellectual cultures mirrored each other, and would continue to do so during the nineteenth century.⁷⁷

If religion was the basis for the system of social control that became institutionalised in eighteenth-century Ireland, then race clearly provided an analogous function in the American South. In both cases, discriminatory laws were introduced between the seventeenth

76 Nash, "Irish Atlantic Trade," 337-339; James, "Irish Colonial Trade," 574-584; Truxes, *Irish-American Trade*, 122-126.

77 Barnard, *New Anatomy of Ireland*, 21-40; Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English*; Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 43-44; Burnard, "The Planter Class," 188-194.

and eighteenth centuries with the common purpose of ensuring the ascent of the agrarian elites. Essentially, by fostering associations between Catholicism and peasant status in Ireland and between black skin and slavery in British America, the Penal Laws and the slave codes had the effect of disguising and complicating class relationships on landed estates in the two regions. In fact, Theodore Allen has examined Ireland's Protestant ascendancy and the American South's white supremacy in comparative perspective and concluded that both constituted systems of racial oppression.⁷⁸

Yet, there were also many important differences between the Penal Laws and the slave codes. Since land was the main source of wealth and power in eighteenth-century Ireland, the former primarily attacked Catholic landownership, whereas the fundamental purpose of the latter was to secure labour in the American South. As a result, even though the Penal Laws prompted many eighteenth-century observers to remark upon the apparent 'enslavement' of Ireland's Catholic peasants, when they are viewed in comparison with contemporaneous American slave codes, we can see that—although undeniably exploitative and unjust—servitude, defined by Michael Bush as “legally sanctioned subjection to the will of another,” was neither their intent nor their outcome. Additionally, most of Ireland's Penal Laws were repealed by the end of the eighteenth century, whereas the slave codes survived into the 1800s in the American South.⁷⁹

Comparison between Ireland and the American South has also highlighted the fact that the second half of the eighteenth century witnessed landlords' and planters' concurrent participation in patriotic movements that sought greater degrees of independence from England. During the 1700s, an increasing proportion of the two landed classes were born and lived in Ireland or the American South and viewed those places as their homes. In both cases,

78 Allen, *Invention of the White Race*, 71-90. Also see Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 184-189; Eugene Genovese, *The World the Slaveholders Made: Two Essays in Interpretation* (New York: Vintage, 1969), 103-113.

79 Bush, *Servitude in Modern Times*, x. Also see Connolly, *Religion, Law, and Power*, 263-303; McBride, *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 194-214.

this led to the development of ‘creole’ identities among the elites. Furthermore, as they grew in confidence, Anglo-Irish landlords and Anglo-American planters similarly argued that they should be treated as equals with their metropolitan cousins; however, trade restrictions, taxation policies, and political realities indicated otherwise. Thus, the move toward patriotism and calls for self-government among the two agrarian elites stemmed, somewhat ironically, from their shared belief that their rights as expatriated Englishmen were being denied. Anglo-Irish and Anglo-American patriotism were not only similar in this respect, but they were also connected: the former developed earlier and had a direct influence on the latter. In turn, it was the outbreak of the American Revolution that provided Ireland’s ‘Protestant patriots’ with the opportunity to demand and secure a greater degree of independence from England than they had hitherto enjoyed.⁸⁰

Despite these parallels and connections between eighteenth-century Ireland’s and the American South’s elite-led patriotic movements, after the early 1780s their political paths diverged. Compared to the situation of American planters, there were much stricter limits to the Irish landlords’ commitment to patriotism and independence. Demographics appears to have been the key to this difference. Due to the Protestant ascendancy’s numerical inferiority, Ireland’s landed elite could never envision complete independence from England without endangering their wealth, privilege, and power, as the United Irishmen’s rebellion appeared to prove. In the American South, by contrast, since whites were generally in the majority and desired to enter the ranks of the planter class, most slaveholders were prepared to support the creation of an independent American republic. Thus, in the particular historical contexts in which they were deployed, race evidently provided a more solid base on which to build a sustainable elite-led independence movement in the American South than religion did in

80 J.G. Simms, *Colonial Nationalism, 1698-1776: Molyneux’s The Case of Ireland Stated* (Cork: Mercier Press, 1976), 54-72; Canny, *Kingdom and Colony*, 122-125; Neil Longley York, “The Impact of the American Revolution in Ireland,” in Harry Dickinson (ed.), *Britain and the American Revolution* (New York: Longman, 1998), 205-232; Vincent Morley, *Irish Opinion and the American Revolution, 1760-1783* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Ireland. After opposing social and political reform and experiencing rebellion in 1798, Irish landlords had little choice but to consent to their incorporation into the United Kingdom, whereas American slaveholders were able to accept the principles of equality and democracy espoused in the Declaration of Independence, as long as they only applied them to the white population.⁸¹

Some of the differences between Ireland's and the American South's agrarian elites can be seen in microcosm through the prism of the Dillon and Quitman family histories. On one hand, the Dillons were a long-established landed family that was incorporated into the ranks of eighteenth-century Ireland's ruling class after they converted to Protestantism in 1724. Their economic, social, and political power was based on the ownership of land that was passed down through the generations from father to eldest son. Thus it was that Robert Dillon, third baron Clonbrock, would inherit a vast family patrimony in 1828. The Quitmans, on the other hand, had no connection to the American South's landed elite before the nineteenth century. In fact, they spent most of the 1700s living in northwest Europe. It was only in 1796 that Frederick Henry Quitman settled in the United States. Yet, he did so at a time when the American South's slave system was in the early stages of a massive expansion—one in which John A. Quitman would participate by buying plantations and slaves in antebellum Mississippi and Louisiana. The differences between the Quitmans and the Dillons reveals an insight into important contrasts between slaveholding in the American South and landlordism in Ireland: American slaveholders were a much larger and more open elite than the Irish landed class. As we shall see in subsequent chapters, these differences would have a significant bearing on the two elites' nineteenth-century histories.

Conclusion

At the end of the 1700s, Ireland and the American South were both firmly under the control of

⁸¹ Canny, *Kingdom and Colony*, 133; Canny, "Identity Formation in Ireland," 211; Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 380-386.

powerful gentry classes: landlords in the former case and planters in the latter. This chapter has highlighted some of the similarities, differences, and connections between these agrarian elites, the origins of their labour systems, and their contexts during the previous three centuries. We have seen that Irish landlordism and American slaveholding both owed their existence to the related processes of English colonialism and the expansion of the capitalist world-economy. Having colonised Ireland and the American South during the 1500s and 1600s, settlers of mostly British origin sought to profit from their environments by organising the production and export of agricultural commodities that were in demand on international markets. We have also seen how local circumstances dictated the establishment of different types of landed estates and agrarian labour systems geared toward the production of different items in the two regions. In the American South, at different times and in different ways, tobacco, rice, cotton, and sugar became the predominant staple crops and African slavery the main form of labour, whereas livestock and grain were farmed commercially by leaseholding, rent-paying tenants of mostly native origin throughout Ireland from the sixteenth century on.

Viewed in a wider context, Irish tenancy and American slavery can be seen as two of a variety of different market-oriented agrarian labour systems that came into being as a result of European expansion in the early modern era. Arguably, classifying all of these peripheral labour systems as different types of ‘rural subjection’ allows us to effectively compare them (or their constituent parts) without ignoring the fundamental differences between free and unfree labour. This finding accords with the perspective of Enrico Dal Lago, who has argued that “it might be useful to not think of the different modes of agricultural work [employed in peripheral regions of the world economy] as dependent on absolute categories such as freedom and unfreedom. Rather, we might think of them as different labor systems on a continuum scale.”⁸² The evidence provided by comparing the origins and development of Irish tenancy and American slavery suggests that they could both be located on this continuum of

82 Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 119-120.

agrarian labour systems—which I would call ‘rural subjection’—albeit at different points on the scale. Put another way, Irish peasants and African American slaves were exploited in different ways for the benefit of different landholding classes, but they were also part of a wider system of exploitation that characterised an international and capitalist division of labour.

During the two centuries that followed Ireland’s and the American South’s original incorporation into the capitalist world-economy in the 1500s and 1600s, the histories of the agrarian elites who presided over the systems of rural subjection established in the two regions followed comparable trajectories. Throughout this period, landlords in Ireland and planters in the American South were influenced by similar global forces, including English rule and fluctuating international market demand for the commodities farmed on their estates, but local circumstances continued to shape the development of two very different landed classes. Thus, at the dawn of the nineteenth century, Irish landowners were a numerically small, stable, and relatively homogeneous agrarian elite, whereas American slaveholders were a much larger, expanding, and socially mixed class of landed proprietors. By then, however, epochal changes that led to the transformation of Irish landlordism and American slaveholding were already underway.

CHAPTER TWO

Second Slavery and Second Landlordism: John A. Quitman's and Lord Clonbrock's Economic Attitudes and Behaviours

Beginning in the second half of the eighteenth century, the capitalist world-economy outlined by Immanuel Wallerstein and others underwent a new phase of expansion and reconfiguration, which profoundly affected both American planters and Irish landlords. In this period, due to a combination of different factors, England became the first country to industrialise; thereafter, Britain functioned as the world-economy's 'core'—a position that it retained until the late nineteenth century, when it was supplanted by the northeastern United States.¹ In turn, the Industrial Revolution led to a massive increase in international market demand for agricultural commodities to feed the factories and factory workers of Britain's growing cities and towns. Consequently, British industrialisation affected all of the different systems of 'rural subjection' established in peripheral regions by changing patterns of demand and prices for raw materials and foodstuffs, thereby impelling the intensification of their production on landed estates throughout the Americas and Europe, including the U.S. South and Ireland.²

-
- 1 Immanuel Wallerstein *The Capitalist World-Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 1-36; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System, Vol. 3: The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy, 1730s-1840s* (New York: Academic Press, 1989); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System, Vol. 4: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789-1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011). Also see Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution: Europe, 1789-1848* (London: Abacus, 1962); Lee Wyatt, *The Industrial Revolution* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2009); Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).
 - 2 See Shearer Davis Bowman, *Masters and Lords: Mid-Nineteenth-Century U.S. Planters and Prussian Junkers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 42-78; Enrico Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites: American Slaveholders and Southern Italian Landowners, 1815-1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 55-77; Marta Petrusiewicz, "The Modernity of the European Periphery; Ireland, Poland and the Two Sicilies, 1820-1870: Parallel and Connected, Distinct and Comparable," in Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor (eds.), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York: Routledge,

The Industrial Revolution was one major cause of the restructuring of the New World plantation complex that Dale Tomich and Michael Zeuske have called the “second slavery,” which was characterised by “the decline of old zones of colonial slavery and the formation of highly productive new zones of slave commodity production.” In particular, the second slavery highlights the importance of the expansion of plantation agriculture in three regions of the Americas where specific staple crops with high international demand were suitably cultivated: the U.S. South, where cotton and sugar plantations multiplied; Cuba, which became the world-leader in sugar production; and southern Brazil, where coffee production boomed. In each of these slave societies, regardless of the contrasts that stemmed from the differences between the requirements of cotton, sugar, and coffee cultivation, plantations were typically owned by entrepreneurial, profit-seeking individuals and geared mainly toward the production of cash crops for sale on international markets. Thus, as Anthony Kaye has written, “the second slavery was, in a word, modern.”³

According to Tomich and Zeuske, the Industrial Revolution was one of three major factors that led to the emergence of the second slavery in the U.S. South, Cuba, and Brazil.⁴ Since the first phase of industrialisation in Britain was primarily based on textile manufacturing, demand for cotton increased exponentially from the late eighteenth century onward. Beginning in the 1780s, South Carolinian and Georgian planters started to respond to the resulting opportunity to profit by directing their slaves to grow cotton as a commercial crop. Once technological innovations in the ginning process allowed for the efficient

2004), 145-163; Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010 [1982]), 267-295; Robert Allen, *The British Industrial Revolution in Global Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

- 3 Dale Tomich and Michael Zeuske, “Introduction, The Second Slavery: Mass Slavery, World Economy, and Comparative Microhistories,” *Review* 31 (2008), 91; Anthony Kaye, “The Second Slavery: Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century South and the Atlantic World,” *Journal of Southern History* 75 (2009), 626. Also see Dale Tomich, *Through the Prism of Slavery: Labor, Capital, and World Economy* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 56-71; Laird Bergad, *The Comparative Histories of Slavery in Brazil, Cuba, and the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- 4 Tomich and Zeuske, “Introduction,” 92-93. Also see Dale Tomich, “The ‘Second Slavery’: Bonded Labor and the Transformation of the Nineteenth-Century World Economy,” in Francisco Raimrez (ed.), *Rethinking the Nineteenth Century: Contradictions and Movements* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), 103-117.

production of short-staple cotton, which could be grown across a large area of continental North America, slave-worked cotton plantations and farms rapidly proliferated in the American South, spreading from South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi as far as Texas between the end of the eighteenth and the middle of the nineteenth century. Since U.S. participation in the Atlantic slave trade officially ended in 1808, this expansion of Southern plantation agriculture was facilitated largely by the development of a massive internal slave trade.⁵

Along with the rise of textile manufacturing in Britain, a second important factor that contributed to the rise of the second slavery was the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804). Since this led to the end of slavery in St. Domingue, which was the world's leading sugar producer, it seriously disrupted international supplies of this valuable commodity, thereby encouraging slaveholders in other parts of the Americas that were suited to the growth of sugar—such as Cuba and Louisiana—to fill the vacuum. Also, changing tastes and an increase in the number of wage earning consumers living in industrialising countries were largely responsible for elevating sugar and coffee from luxury commodities to products of mass consumption during the nineteenth century. This, in turn, provided the demand that fuelled the expansion of coffee plantations in southern Brazil.⁶ Thus, by considering the U.S. South within the context of the second slavery—as Anthony Kaye has done—we can see that its post-independence cotton

5 See Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 18-45; Adam Rothman, *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005); James Miller, *South by Southwest: Planter Emigration and Identity in the Slave South* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002); Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014), 98-120. On the U.S. Southern internal slave trade, see Walter Johnson, *Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999); Robert Gudmestad, *A Troublesome Commerce: The Transformation of the Interstate Slave Trade* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003).

6 Tomich and Zeuske, "Introduction," 92-93; Ada Ferrer, *Freedom's Mirror: Cuba and Haiti in the Age of Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 17-43; Richard Follett, *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in Louisiana's Cane World, 1820-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 14-45; Herbert Klein and Francisco Vidal Luna, *Slavery in Brazil* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 74-114. On the effect of European consumption trends on the production of sugar in the New World, see Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986 [1985]), 74-150; Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492-1800* (London: Verso, 1997), 558-562.

and sugar ‘plantation revolutions’ were part of a wider restructuring of New World slavery, which was itself related to the transformations in global capitalism that occurred during eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.⁷

Significantly, the same world-historical processes that contributed to the emergence of the second slavery in the Americas also affected other peripheral regions that functioned as suppliers of agricultural commodities for the world market, and for industrialising England in particular. Indeed, as Tomich and Zeuske acknowledge, the second slavery was in some respects analogous to the ‘second serfdom’—a concept that concerns the rejuvenation of servitude in eastern Europe between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries, partially as a result of rising international demand for grain.⁸ Building on this connection, Enrico Dal Lago has argued that the nineteenth century saw a ‘reconversion’ of agricultural production on landed estates throughout eastern and southern Europe for many of the same reasons that the American plantation system underwent the changes associated with the second slavery. Furthermore, by referring to U.S. Southern, Cuban, Brazilian, Russian, Prussian, southern Italian, and Spanish examples, Dal Lago has shown that the systemic transformation of global capitalism related to the Industrial Revolution had comparable effects in peripheral regions of both the Americas and Europe, particularly with respect to the agrarian elites’ management of land and labour and their pursuits of agrarian modernisation.⁹ Since nineteenth-century Ireland was also a periphery—one that provided a significant portion of Britain’s grain and livestock imports—and since it was affected by the same global trends, its landed estate

7 Kaye, “Second Slavery,” 627-650. Also see Enrico Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond: The U.S. “Peculiar Institution” in International Perspective* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2013), 63-91.

8 Tomich and Zeuske, “Introduction,” 91. On the ‘second serfdom’ see, Edgar Melton, “Manorialism and Rural Subjection in East Central Europe, 1500-1800,” in David Eltis and Stanley Engerman (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Vol. 3: AD 1420-AD 1804* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 297-322. For a systematic comparison of American slavery and Russian serfdom, see Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987).

9 Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 95-121; Enrico Dal Lago, “Second Slavery, Second Serfdom, and Beyond: The Atlantic Plantation System and the Eastern and Southern European Landed Estate System in Comparative Perspective, 1800-60,” *Review* 32 (2009), 391-420.

system should be included in this story.¹⁰

Despite the fact that Ireland was integrated into the United Kingdom in 1801—and therefore became part of the same state as the core of the capitalist world-economy—it remained overwhelmingly agricultural and continued to function as an economic periphery throughout the nineteenth century.¹¹ During the Revolutionary era and Napoleonic wars, Irish agriculture had benefited from high prices for grain, dairy, and livestock on British markets. Post-Waterloo, however, Irish agricultural produce—especially the grain farmed for commercial purposes by the majority of the country’s peasants—was increasingly subjected to European and American competition, which led to a general fall in prices and a sustained economic depression between 1815 and 1850. Despite the difficulties that accompanied this depression, Ireland’s population continued to increase, which led to intense competition for land among the farming classes, widespread poverty, and intermittent social unrest. In response to this situation, the country’s landowners—who had generally been detached from estate management during the eighteenth century—began to take a greater interest in managing and reforming their properties. In the first half of the 1800s, Irish landlords increasingly took back control of their estates from middlemen, hired professional land agents, and encouraged their tenants to adopt ‘improved’ farming methods and implements.¹²

Following Marta Petrusiewicz’s discussion of the utility of undertaking comparative history by transferring concepts from one historical context to another, I have called

10 Cormac Ó’Gráda, *Ireland: A New Economic History, 1780-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 112-121; Brinley Thomas, “Food Supply in the United Kingdom During the Industrial Revolution,” in Joel Mokyr (ed.), *The Economics of the Industrial Revolution* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1985), 137-150; Raymond Crotty, *Irish Agricultural Production: Its Volume and Structure* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1966), 35-65.

11 With the notable exception of the north-east of the country (Belfast and its hinterland), which became the centre of linen and ship-building industries during the 1800s. See E.R.R. Green, *The Lagan Valley, 1800-50: A Local History of the Industrial Revolution* (London: Faber and Faber, 1949); Denis O’Hearn, *The Atlantic Economy: Britain, the US and Ireland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 81-107.

12 Cormac Ó’Gráda, *Ireland Before and After the Famine: Explorations in Economic History, 1800-1930* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 1-97; James Donnelly, *The Land and the People of Nineteenth-Century Cork: The Rural Economy and the Land Question* (London: Routledge, 1975), 9-72; Crotty, *Irish Agricultural Production*, 35-65; L.M. Cullen, *The Emergence of Modern Ireland, 1600-1900* (London: Batsford Academic and Educational, 1981), 50-51, 130.

nineteenth-century Irish landowners' drive toward agricultural reform "second landlordism." This term is applicable for two reasons: first, because the years and decades after 1815 witnessed a sea change in a significant proportion of Irish landlords' economic behaviour; and second, because the primary impulse for elite-led economic reform in Ireland—as in the U.S. South under the second slavery—was related to the fluctuations in demand for peripheral agricultural commodities caused by the Industrial Revolution and its consequences. In other words, if the second slavery is defined as the formation of productive, modern new zones of plantation agriculture in the Americas as a result of transformations in global capitalism associated with British industrialisation, then the second landlordism was the parallel and comparable reorganisation of Irish agriculture, which prompted landowners to pursue economic modernisation in response to the same general trends.¹³

Of course, it is important to keep in mind that, in many respects, second slavery and second landlordism applied to very different situations and socioeconomic systems. In the U.S. South, slave-worked plantations were geared primarily toward the production of subtropical staple crops. In Ireland, by contrast, landed estates were farmed by free tenants and landless labourers who produced basic foodstuffs for the market. Notwithstanding these differences, however, we can recognise that the influence of the Industrial Revolution was an important common denominator that caused comparable changes in the economic attitudes and behaviours of U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In both cases, motivated by the need for profitability within the competitive world marketplace to either increase or maintain their wealth, progressive members of the two agrarian elites responded with an entrepreneurial ethos, particularly with regard to the management of their estates, their efforts to modernise agricultural production, and the diversification of their economic interests. This modern and capitalistic behaviour,

13 Petruszewicz, "Modernity of the European Periphery," 157-160; Cathal Smith, "Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity: A Comparison of Antebellum Mississippi and Nineteenth-Century Ireland," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 5 (2015), 204-230.

although already present among earlier generations of American slaveholders and Irish landlords to a certain degree, was sufficiently novel in nature and extent during the nineteenth century to warrant our understanding of the two agrarian elites within the context of a ‘second’ slavery and a ‘second’ landlordism.

In their treatment of the second slavery, Tomich and Zeuske have argued that locally focused studies and comparisons should be used to clarify and refine the concept by revealing its “temporal and spatial heterogeneity.”¹⁴ Likewise, local case studies can also be used to investigate second slavery and second landlordism by providing insights into some of the similarities and differences between their manifestation in specific historical contexts. To demonstrate this point, this chapter compares the economic attitudes and behaviours of two economically progressive members of the antebellum U.S. South’s and nineteenth-century Ireland’s agrarian elites: John A. Quitman, a planter from Natchez, Mississippi, and Lord Clonbrock, a landlord from County Galway, in the west of Ireland. Both of these individuals exhibited the entrepreneurial traits that were characteristic of second slavery and second landlordism—notably in the management of their estates, their reception of scientific agriculture and technological innovations, and their non-agricultural investments.¹⁵ A comparison of these aspects of Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s histories serves numerous purposes: it reveals how individuals in disparate parts of the nineteenth-century world were at once affected by and part of transnational trends; it contributes to our understanding of American planters’ and Irish landlords’ economic behaviour; and it allows for a close investigation of similarities and differences between the effects of the second slavery in the

14 Tomich and Zeuske, “Introduction,” 96. This is a call that they and others have already fulfilled by systematically comparing a number of different nineteenth-century American slave societies. See Tomich, *Through the Prism of Slavery*, 120-136; Michael Zeuske, “Comparing or Interlinking? Economic Comparisons of the Early Nineteenth-Century Slave Systems in the Americas in Historical Perspective,” in Enrico Dal Lago and Constantina Katsari (eds.), *Slave Systems: Ancient and Modern* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 148-183; Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 63-91. Also see Bergad, *Comparative Histories of Slavery*.

15 See Robert May, *John A. Quitman: Old South Crusader* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985); Kevin McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual: Paternalism on the Clonbrock Estates, 1826-1908,” (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011).

U.S. South and the second landlordism in Ireland.

Estate Management and Administration

Responding to the fluctuations in demand and prices for the produce of their estates that were related to the effects of British industrialisation, agrarian elites on both sides of the Atlantic increasingly approached the management of their estates with a focus on efficiency and profit during the nineteenth century.¹⁶ This was true of both the U.S. South under the second slavery and Ireland under the second landlordism, where progressive slaveholders and landowners endeavoured to run their properties in a business-like manner. In the American case, most slaveholders owned a single centralised plantation or farm, whose supervision they closely monitored, often in conjunction with overseers who managed the day-to-day labour activities. In the Irish case, landlords typically owned multiple large and fragmented properties, the management of which they delegated to land agents. In both cases, however, second slavery and second landlordism were associated with the rationalisation of land and labour management practices and administrative hierarchies on the part of economically progressive members of the agrarian elites.¹⁷

Mississippi's John A. Quitman and Galway's Lord Clonbrock were two such progressive landowners. Quitman was a first-generation slaveholder who used the money he made as a lawyer to purchase and develop a sugar plantation and three cotton plantations after he settled in Natchez in 1821. Clonbrock was a member of a long-established Irish landed

16 Dal Lago, "Second Slavery, Second Serfdom, and Beyond," 400-405; Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), 60-106; David Spring, *The English Landed Estate in the Nineteenth Century: Its Administration* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1963); Marta Petrusiewicz, *Latifundium: Moral Economy and Material Life in a Nineteenth-Century Periphery* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996 [1989]).

17 See Jacob Metzger, "Rational Management, Modern Business Practices, and Economies of Scale in Antebellum Southern Plantations," in Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman (eds.), *Without Consent or Contract: Technical Papers, Vol. 1, Markets and Production* (New York: Norton, 1992), 191-215; Mark Smith, *Debating Slavery: Economy and Society in the Antebellum American South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 60-70; Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 71-73; Donnelly, *Land and the People*, 52-72; W.A. Maguire, *The Downshire Estates in Ireland, 1801-1845: The Management of Irish Landed Estates in the Early Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 154-216; Smith, "Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity," 212-216.

family, who inherited numerous estates throughout Ireland in 1828, most of which were located in the vicinity of his home in east County Galway. Illustrative of the entrepreneurial approaches to the ownership of landed estates that became increasingly common among the U.S. South's and Ireland's agrarian elites during the second slavery and the second landlordism, Quitman and Clonbrock consistently endeavoured to ensure the profitability of their properties by rationalising their estate management and administrative practices. They did so, however, in ways conditioned by their considerably different local circumstances and labour systems.

New York-born John A. Quitman migrated to Mississippi in 1821 amidst the expansion of U.S. Southern plantation agriculture associated with the second slavery. He settled in Natchez with the intention of making his fortune as a lawyer, passed the state bar in 1823, and established a lucrative legal practice. By 1828, Quitman had married into the district's planter elite—known as the 'Natchez nabobs'—and purchased land and slaves in Louisiana with the intention of developing a sugar plantation, which he called Live Oaks. Six years later, in 1834, he bought Springfield, a functioning cotton plantation situated eight miles from Natchez. In 1842, Quitman invested in another Mississippi cotton plantation—Palmyra, in Warren County—which he co-owned with his brother-in-law. Finally, in the early 1850s, he purchased land in Yazoo County, northern Mississippi, which he developed into another cotton plantation, named Belen.¹⁸ Thus, Quitman was deeply enmeshed in the American South's cotton revolution, which recent scholarship has shown was a central component of the transition to industrial capitalism in Europe and in the United States.¹⁹

18 May, *John A. Quitman*, 42-44, 111, 133; William Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House: Elite Slaveholders of the Mid-Nineteenth-Century South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 446, 471. On the Natchez nabobs, see D. Clayton James, *Antebellum Natchez* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), 136-161; Morton Rothstein, "The Natchez Nabobs: Kinship and Friendship in an Economic Elite," in Hans L. Trefousse (ed.), *Toward a New View of America: Essays in Honor of Arthur C. Cole* (New York: Ayer Publishing, 1977), 97-111.

19 See Beckert, *Empire of Cotton*, 98-120; Edward Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014); Michael Zakim and Gary Kornblith (eds.),

Since Quitman lived in Monmouth—a suburban Natchez mansion that he bought in 1826—rather than on any one of his estates, he was not a resident planter. For this reason, Quitman utilised a complex network of partners and overseers to administer his plantations. His brother, Albert, managed Live Oaks between 1833 and 1845; thereafter, it was run by overseers until Quitman’s son assumed responsibility for its management in the mid-1850s. Close to Natchez, Springfield was generally run by overseers under Quitman’s supervision, while Palmyra was managed by his brother-in-law, Henry Turner, in conjunction with a succession of overseers. Finally, Belen—the northern Mississippi cotton plantation that Quitman began developing during the 1850s—was also left to overseers to run.²⁰

Despite the fact that the antebellum U.S. South witnessed a drive for the professionalisation of the overseer class as part of the general concern for efficient plantation management associated with the second slavery, planters were often dissatisfied with their overseers’ performance.²¹ Quitman was no exception. He regularly complained about the shortcomings of those whom he employed to run his plantations. These complaints ranged from general incompetence in matters of land or labour management, to drunkenness, thievery, and even, on at least one occasion, the murder of a slave.²² In 1852, after experiencing problems with a number of unsatisfactory overseers at Palmyra, Henry Turner asked Quitman to find and hire “a single man and one accustomed to river, land and the treatment of sick negroes as well as the management of them without being cruel.” Such ideal candidates were in short supply, however, and Quitman’s plantations were characterised by

Capitalism Takes Command: The Social Transformation of Nineteenth-Century America (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2012); Robin Blackburn, *The American Crucible: Slavery, Emancipation and Human Rights* (London: Verso, 2011), 99-120. For an older (much debated) elaboration of the idea that New World slavery facilitated the rise of European capitalism, see Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944).

20 May, *John A. Quitman*, 131-136.

21 See William Scarborough, *The Overseer: Plantation Management in the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1966); Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 65-68; Drew Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 123-126.

22 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 6 July 1855, 28 June 1856, FHQP; Henry Turner to John Quitman, 29 January 1843, 20 October 1844, 30 March 1852, 5 November 1853, QFP; Eliza Quitman to John Quitman, 15 November 1842, QFP. On the murder of a field slave by an overseer at Palmyra in 1844, see May, *John A. Quitman*, 138.

high rates of turnover in administrative personnel throughout the antebellum era.²³

Although Quitman delegated the day-to-day management of his plantations to others—largely so that he could focus on furthering his political career and his other business interests—he nevertheless played an important role in their management. Quitman visited each of his plantations frequently and demanded to be kept regularly informed about their fortunes. Additionally, he usually retained responsibility for ordering plantation supplies and for dealing with the New Orleans factors who marketed his cotton and sugar crops. The extent of Quitman’s involvement in plantation management was such that he once informed an overseer: “in your letters to me, which should be once a week, always mention how much sugar and molasses you have previously forwarded to market. Do not forget to send me as early as you can a full list of every article and supply that will be wanted during the whole of the season. In an emergency you can send directly to my merchants for any article but I prefer its passing through me.” This letter, and others like it, shows that, even though Quitman was usually physically absent from his plantations, he can be said to have exhibited a “resident mentality” in his involvement with their management.²⁴

By the mid-1850s, Quitman owned approximately four hundred slaves, the vast majority of whom worked on his plantations growing either cotton or sugar.²⁵ Although slavery has often been considered an inefficient mode of labour control, recent scholarship has demonstrated that it could be highly productive and profitable. As historians including Richard Follett and Mark Smith have shown, antebellum Southern slaveholders often applied techniques that closely resembled those employed in industrial settings to their plantations.

23 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 19 November 1852, QFP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 135-137.

24 John Quitman to N.D. Fuqua, February 1852, JAQPM. Also see John Quitman to Henry Quitman, 30 April 1835, 29 September 1839, QFP; John A. Quitman Daybook, 1839-1850, JAQPL; May, *John A. Quitman*, 111-112, 133-137. For correspondence between Quitman and his overseers and factors, see QFP; JAQPL; JAQPM. On planters’ involvement with the marketing of their crops, see Harold Woodman, *King Cotton and His Retainers: Financing and Marketing the Cotton Crop of the South, 1800-1925* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1968), 15-28. On the distinction between a resident mentality and an absentee mentality, see Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 59-61, 95-98.

25 May, *John A. Quitman*, 138.

This included using gang labour to sustain an intense pace when planting, harvesting, and processing staple crops, the systematic use of rewards and punishments to incentivise the slaves' labour, and the adoption of watches and clocks to control and regiment work.²⁶ Many of these techniques—typical of the second slavery—were deployed on Quitman's plantations, where field slaves were generally organised in gangs, which allowed for the close supervision and routinisation of their work. Yet, Quitman did not implement the gang system alone; when it was convenient, he also used the task system, whereby slaves were allocated individual jobs and paid for extra work undertaken in their spare time. This mixed system of labour control provided Quitman with flexibility in mediating between the cultivation of commercial and subsistence crops on his properties.²⁷

Although Quitman's plantations were focused primarily on the production of cotton and sugar as cash crops, he also devoted some of his resources to subsistence farming on each of his estates. This was particularly noticeable at Springfield, where, in response to diminishing cotton yields in the late 1830s, he re-oriented this plantation toward livestock and dairy production. Quitman also ensured that Live Oaks and Palmyra did not only respectively grow sugar and cotton, but also included the cultivation of corn, fruit, and potatoes, and that his slaves were assigned garden plots on which they farmed vegetables, poultry, and eggs. Thus, his plantations went some way toward self-sufficiency and supplied each other, as well as his Big House, with produce for domestic consumption. Even though Quitman's plantations never really attained full self-sufficiency, this attempt to limit dependence on the

26 Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 90-150; Mark Smith, "Old South Time in Comparative Perspective," *American Historical Review* 101 (1996), 1432-1469; Mark Smith, *Mastered By The Clock: Time, Slavery and Freedom in the American South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997). Also see Fogel and Engerman, *Time on the Cross*, 144-152, 191-209; Robert Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989), 74-80; Baptist, *Half Has Never Been Told*, 111-144.

27 See John Quitman to Albert Quitman, 9 May 1839, in J.F.H. Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Major-General, U.S.A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1860), I, 190; Henry Turner to John Quitman, 7 June 1842, QFP. Also see Steven Miller, "Plantation Labor Organization and Slave Life on the Cotton Frontier: The Alabama-Mississippi Black Belt, 1815-1840," in Ira Berlin and Philip Morgan (eds.), *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993), 155-169.

market for supplies was part of a more general concern for efficiency and profit—one shared by progressive slaveholders throughout the antebellum South—that their owner exhibited with regard to plantation management.²⁸

Quitman's focus on efficiency became especially marked in the early 1840s during a spell of chronic debt that resulted largely from a drop in cotton prices on world markets at the time. This forced Quitman to refocus his attention on his plantations' profitability. After investing in Palmyra in 1842, for example, he wrote that "in a few years by close attention to the disordered state of the affairs, and by rigid economy we shall be enabled to wipe out the debts and then we shall have one of the finest estates on the river." Quitman evidently maintained this business-like attitude thereafter; in 1856, he advised his son, then in charge at Live Oaks, that "we must strictly economise if we are to make anything." It was this mindset, together with his drive toward self-sufficiency and new forms of investment, that made John Quitman one of antebellum Mississippi's wealthiest planters.²⁹

In similar fashion to what happened on U.S. Southern plantations such as Quitman's, the transformation of the world-economy associated with the Industrial Revolution was the driving force behind the different, but equally profound, changes that occurred on Irish landed estates during the nineteenth century. Throughout Ireland, landlords responded to the post-1815 fall in prices for the grain widely farmed on their estates by taking a greater interest in the management of their property than had been typical of earlier generations of their class; by doing so, they contributed to the phenomenon that I have termed 'second landlordism.' Robert

28 May, *John A. Quitman*, 131-132; John Quitman to Albert Quitman, 9 May 1839, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 190. Also see Roderick McDonald, "Independent Economic Production by Slaves on Antebellum Louisiana Sugar Plantations," in Berlin and Morgan (eds.), *Cultivation and Culture*, 275-299. For discussions of other antebellum Southern planters who exhibited a business-like approach to plantation management, see Martha Brazy, *An American Planter: Stephen Duncan of Antebellum Natchez and New York* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006); William Dusinberre, *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).

29 John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 3 January 1842, QFP; John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 5 August 1856, FHQP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 134; Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 185-189.

Dillon, third baron Clonbrock—an Irish landowner from east County Galway—was one of these individuals. Representative of the movement toward direct management of Irish landed estates that was a notable feature of the second landlordism, Clonbrock systematically phased out the use of the middleman system on his properties after his inheritance in 1828. As we have seen in the previous chapter, middlemen were those large tenants—common on most Irish landed estates in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—who subdivided all or part of their holdings to smaller tenants. During the 1830s and 1840s, Clonbrock retook control of his land from these individuals by either buying out or declining to renew their leases. Since middlemen were usually blamed for the problems of sub-letting and overpopulation associated with Irish agriculture in the first half of the nineteenth century, Clonbrock’s decision to remove them from his property was one notable example of his concern for the proper management and reform of his estates.³⁰

At the same time, having inherited land scattered throughout Ireland when he turned twenty-one in 1828, Clonbrock also decided to centralise his estates with a view toward managing them more effectively. With this in mind, he sold the small properties that he owned in counties Tipperary, Limerick, and Westmeath and used the proceeds to buy estates closer to his home in east Galway. By 1878, Clonbrock was estimated to have been the owner of 28,246 acres of Irish land, most of which was situated near Clonbrock House in east County Galway. He was, therefore, a resident landowner, unlike Quitman who was an absentee planter. However, even after Clonbrock centralised his estates, they were not all contiguous; thus, he was considered a resident landlord but, in truth, he only lived on one of his many

30 See *Report of the Select Committee On the State of Ireland, with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 26, 1831-32, 456, 464-65; *Third Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland (Poor Inquiry)*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 31, 1836, appendix F, 143; Terence Dooley, *The Decline of the Big House in Ireland: A Study of Irish Landed Families, 1860-1960* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 2001), 32-34. For more on the middleman system, see David Dickson, “Middlemen,” in Thomas Bartlett and D.W. Hayton (eds.), *Penal Era and Golden Age: Essays in Irish History, 1690-1800* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1979), 162-185.

properties.³¹

As Clonbrock sold his distant estates in the 1820s and 1830s, he also shed the need for numerous land agents and ultimately centralised the administration of his properties in the hands of a single one: Thomas Bermingham, who worked for Clonbrock from 1826 to 1843. Bermingham became Clonbrock's chief land agent in 1830, after the latter directed that "no orders shall be given by any person in my employment but by Mr. Thomas Bermingham."³² Land agents had long been a feature of Irish estate management, but, during the second landlordism—mirroring what happened with overseers in the U.S. South during the second slavery—a more professional class of Irish agents emerged. These individuals were responsible not only for letting land and collecting rent—the main duties of Irish land agents before the 1800s—but also for reforming estates and maximising the profitability of landlords' properties.³³ Bermingham was an exemplary member of this new cadre. He brought a pragmatic and rational outlook to the management of Clonbrock's properties; in the early 1840s, for example, he embarked on a concentrated cost-cutting drive with a view toward efficiency and increasing profit.³⁴ In 1843, after Bermingham's retirement, Clonbrock appointed Charles Filgate as his primary land agent. During the 1840s and 1850s, Filgate maintained a business-like attitude with regard to the management of his employer's estates—

31 On Clonbrock's purchase and sale of land in the 1820s and 1830s, see Titles, Deeds and Conveyances, 1827-1865, Ms 35,702-35,709, CP; Papers Relating to the Account of Robert Dillon with George Kelly Regarding the Purchase of the Ballydonelan Estate, 1829, Ms 35,818 (9), CP; General Statements of Agents' Accounts, 1829-1842, Ms 35,724 (11), CP; Letters to Robert Dillon from Thomas Blackstock Concerning the Sale of the Bermingham Estate, 1836, Ms 35,727 (8), CP; Correspondence Concerning Robert Maunsell's offer to Purchase the Clonbrock Properties in County Limerick, 1830, Ms 35,727 (10), CP. For the estimation of the combined size of Clonbrock's estates, see U.H.H. De Burgh, *The Landowners of Ireland: An Alphabetical List of the Owners of Estates of 500 acres or £500 Valuation and Upwards in Ireland* (Dublin: Hodges, Foster and Figgis, 1878), 87.

32 Notice Written by Lord Clonbrock, 8 November 1830, in Estate, Farm and Household Account Books of the Clonbrock Estates, Co. Galway, 1827-1833, Ms 19,507, CP.

33 Donnelly, *Land and the People*, 173-187; K. Theodore Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society in Ireland, 1832-1885* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 138-144; Ciarán Reilly, *The Irish Land Agent, 1830-60: The Case of King's County* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2014); Desmond Norton, *Landlords, Tenants, Famine: The Business of an Irish Land Agency in the 1840s* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2006); Gerard Lyne, *The Lansdowne Estate in Kerry Under the Stewardship of William Stuart Trench, 1849-72* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2001).

34 Thomas Bermingham to Lord Clonbrock, 16 April 1841, Ms 35,732 (1), CP. For more on Bermingham, see Patrick Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society in Galway* (Dublin: De Búrca, 2012), 92-96.

a fact nowhere more evident than in the meticulous account books and rent rolls that he kept, most of which have survived in the archives.³⁵

Conforming to the general picture of Irish landed estates, Clonbrock retained some of his land for his own personal use, but most of his 28,000 plus acres was divided into tenancies of varying sizes. Larger tenants generally focused on cattle or sheep farming. Typical of the west of Ireland, however, most of Clonbrock's tenants held small plots of between one and ten acres, on which they grew corn, wheat, oats or barley as commercial crops and potatoes for subsistence purposes. In a trend that can be seen on the Clonbrock estates, the first half of the nineteenth century saw Irish landlords move from leasing their land to tenants toward apportioning it on an 'at-will' basis. The at-will system entitled farmers to hold land from year to year, instead of the longer leaseholds of thirty-one or ninety years that Irish peasants had traditionally enjoyed. Use of these yearly contracts gave landlords greater power to evict their tenants at short notice. Also, while payment for land in kind or with labour was often accepted in eighteenth-century Ireland, this became less common in the 1800s, when cash was usually demanded by landlords, including Clonbrock, as the sole form of rent. Typical of Irish landlords—and unlike slaveholders in the American South—Clonbrock had little official say in the crops farmed by his tenants and minimal remit to supervise or dictate the pace of their work; however, rent obligations, competition for their produce on British markets, and the threat of eviction did ensure the intensification of commercial production on his estates between the 1820s and the 1850s.³⁶

Among British political economists, Irish agriculture was widely considered

35 Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1843-1855, Ms 19,615-19,622, CP; Abstracts of the Accounts of Robert Dillon, Baron Clonbrock, with Charles Filgate, 1843-1852, Ms 35,724 (8), CP; McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 48; Dooley, *Decline of the Big House*, 32-33.

36 *Report from Her Majesty's Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Law and Practice in Respect to the Occupation of Land in Ireland (Devon Commission)*, pt. 2, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 21, 1845, 506-507. On changing patterns of Irish land tenure during the nineteenth century, see G.E. Christianson, "Landlords and Land Tenure in Ireland, 1790-1830," *Éire-Ireland* 9 (1974), 25-58; Maguire, *Downshire Estates*, 107-153; James Donnelly, "Landlords and Tenants," in W.E. Vaughan (ed.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 5: Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 334-349.

‘backward’ during the first half of the nineteenth century. One reason for this was the fact that the majority of tenants, including those who lived and worked on Clonbrock’s estates, held fewer than ten acres of land; this was often just enough to raise the commercial crops that paid their rent and the potatoes on which they subsisted, but it left little room for capital accumulation. Consequently, many political economists advised Irish landlords to clear their estates of small holders and ‘anglicise’ agriculture by leasing their land to large tenant-farmers.³⁷ This plan was impractical, however, given the misery and resistance that it would have caused. Instead, Clonbrock sought to remedy the problem by consolidating farms on his estates in an incremental manner during the 1830s and 1840s. He did this—or, rather, he directed his agents to do this on his behalf—in two main ways. First, Clonbrock implemented a ‘home colonisation’ scheme, which entailed the relocation of tenants from overcrowded parts of his estates to more sparsely populated areas with poorer quality land, which he then helped them to improve.³⁸ Second, following a practice that was widely adopted by Irish landlords in the first half of the nineteenth century, he paid for the passage of many of his smaller tenants to America. Once the ‘surplus population’ was reduced by these means, Clonbrock’s agents reorganised his land into larger, more economically viable farms. Ultimately, as a consequence of these reforms, Clonbrock avoided the indebtedness that bankrupted many of his fellow landlords during the nineteenth century and consolidated his position among the ranks of Ireland’s wealthiest men.³⁹

37 On nineteenth-century political economists’ belief in the ‘backwardness’ of Irish agriculture and the need for its ‘anglicisation,’ see R.D. Collison Black, *Economic Thought and the Irish Question, 1817-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 15-50; Peter Gray, “The Peculiarities of Irish Land Tenure, 1800-1914: From Agent of Impoverishment to Agent of Pacification,” in Donald Winch and Patrick Karl O’Brien (eds.), *The Political Economy of British Historical Experience, 1688-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 141-143.

38 For detailed descriptions of Clonbrock’s ‘home colonisation’ scheme, see Thomas Bermingham, *The Social State of Great Britain and Ireland Considered* (London: S.W. Fores, 1835), 9-10, 139-155; McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual,” 18-23.

39 McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual,” 20-22, 107-108; Dooley, *Decline of the Big House*, 33. For sums given to Clonbrock’s tenants to enable them to emigrate to America, see Clonbrock Estate Accounts, Ms 19,600, Ms 19,602, Ms 19,604, CP. For more on Irish landlords who payed for tenants to emigrate, see Gerard Moran, *Sending Out Ireland’s Poor: Assisted Emigration to North America in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), 35-69; Patrick Duffy, “‘Disencumbering Our Crowded Place’: Theory and Practice of Estate Emigration Schemes in Mid-Nineteenth Century Ireland,” in Patrick Duffy (ed.), *To and*

As the above discussion demonstrates, Quitman and Clonbrock exhibited entrepreneurial attitudes—attitudes characteristic of the second slavery and the second landlordism—with regard to the management of their estates. Since both men owned multiple properties, they established hierarchical chains of command in order to manage them effectively. Quitman’s administrative system was more complex than Clonbrock’s, as the former landed proprietor required managers and overseers for each of his plantations. Conversely, Clonbrock simplified his command structure and centralised the administration of his numerous estates by placing their management in the hands of one land agent after 1830. Interestingly, Quitman also seems to have experienced more problems with his overseers than Clonbrock did with his agents, a fact best illustrated by the high rate of turnover in administrative personnel in the former case and the relative stability in the latter. This difference can be explained by the fact that Southern plantations were far more difficult to run than Irish landed estates; even though Irish land agents generally managed larger and more fragmented properties than overseers in the U.S. South, the former were not responsible for either agricultural production or the supervision of labour as the latter were. Nevertheless, despite these differences, it is notable that both Quitman and Clonbrock utilised rational administrative hierarchies in order to run their estates, since these were indicative of the entrepreneurial attitudes that were a central feature of the second slavery and the second landlordism.⁴⁰

Significantly, Quitman played a much more active role in plantation management than Clonbrock did in the running of his estates—a circumstance that provides an insight into an important difference between U.S. Southern slaveholding and Irish landlordism. While

from Ireland: Planned Migration Schemes, c. 1600-2000 (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2004), 79-104. On the debt that affected many of the Irish landowners who did not successfully reform their finances, see L.P. Curtis, “Incumbered Wealth: Landed Indebtedness in Post-Famine Ireland,” *American Historical Review* 85 (1980), 332-367; W.E. Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 130-138.

⁴⁰ See Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 102-105; Eric Richards, “The Land Agent,” in G.E. Mingay (ed.), *The Victorian Countryside* (London: Routledge, 2000 [1981]), II, 439-456; Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 71-72, 103.

Clonbrock was certainly an example of an economically progressive Irish landowner, he still depended largely on his agents to manage his estates in an efficient and profitable manner. Quitman, by contrast, even though usually absent from his plantations, exhibited business acumen and a desire to micro-manage his estates from afar. It was Quitman, for example, who initiated a drive for efficiency on his plantations in the early 1840s, and he was involved with issues of ordering supplies and marketing crops in a way Clonbrock never was or needed to be. The differences between the labour systems extant on their estates explain this contrast. Since plantation-based slavery was a direct type of labour exploitation in which the workers were unfree and the landowner bore the full risk of production for the market, planters were compelled to take more than a passing interest in the running of their estates, even when absentee, as Quitman was. Irish tenancy, by contrast, was a more indirect form of labour control by which the landowners profited from the tillers of their soil chiefly through rents, while the tenants—who were legally free and marketed their own crops—bore most of the risk of commercial production. This made Irish landlords—even those who exhibited the entrepreneurial mindset characteristic of the second landlordism—far more detached from the day-to-day running of their estates than American planters typically were.⁴¹

The extent of the landed proprietors' involvement with estate management and agricultural production were not the only differences between U.S. Southern slavery and Irish landlordism. By using a mixture of gang and task systems of labour organisation on his plantations, Quitman was able to maximise his expropriation of the slaves' labour in response to fluctuations in market demand for cotton and sugar, while simultaneously maintaining flexibility in his pursuit of self-sufficiency. In comparison, Clonbrock had much less control over his legally free tenants, who were not subject to strict supervision. However, even though he could not directly dictate the pace of his tenants' work or the crops that they farmed,

41 See Michael Bush, *Servitude in Modern Times* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000), 71; Joel Mokyr, "Uncertainty and Pre-Famine Irish Agriculture," in T.M. Devine and David Dickson (eds.), *Ireland and Scotland, 1600-1850: Parallels and Contrasts in Economic and Social Development* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1983), 89-101.

Clonbrock did secure a greater amount of control over their behaviour by moving from extending leases to the ‘at will’ system of tenure. At the same time, Quitman responded to diminishing cotton yields at Springfield by reorienting this plantation toward livestock and dairy production, while Clonbrock met the proliferation of small holdings on his estates with a drive for consolidation. While different in form, these actions represented rational approaches to labour and land management and a willingness to adapt to changing circumstances—features that became increasingly common among American planters and Irish landlords during the nineteenth century. Thus, even taking into account the many differences between U.S. Southern slavery and Irish tenancy, it is possible to see in Quitman and Clonbrock the entrepreneurial approaches to the management of landed estates that characterised the second slavery and the second landlordism.

Agrarian Modernisation and Technological Innovation

Throughout the Euro-American world, the transformation of the world economy related to the Industrial Revolution motivated progressive agrarian elites not only to rationalise their estate management and administrative practices, but also to invest in the modernisation of agricultural production on their properties.⁴² Evidence of this process can be found in both the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland, where the most entrepreneurial slaveholders and landowners typically took heed of agronomy—the application of scientifically informed farming methods to agriculture—and introduced technological innovations among their workers with a view toward increasing the commercial output and bettering the profitability of their estates. At the same time, progressive American planters and progressive Irish landlords also founded societies and journals through which they circulated

42 Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 104-106; Dal Lago, “Second Slavery, Second Serfdom, and Beyond,” 411-416; Bowman, *Masters and Lords*, 52-66; Marta Petruszewicz, “Land-Based Modernization and the Culture of Landed Elites in the Nineteenth-Century *Mezzogiorno*,” in Enrico Dal Lago and Rick Halpern (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 95-110; Sarah Wilmot, “*The Business of Improvement*”: *Agriculture and Scientific Culture in Britain, c. 1770-c. 1870* (Bristol: Historical Geography Research Group, 1990).

ideas and discussed the best ways to achieve agricultural reform. The resulting movements for agrarian modernisation—or ‘improvement’ as it was generally known to the elites—were central components of both the second slavery and the second landlordism. Representative of these phenomena in two local contexts, John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock participated in the antebellum U.S. South’s and nineteenth-century Ireland’s agronomic movements and invested in the modernisation of agricultural production on their landed estates in a comparable manner.⁴³

By the early 1830s, plantations in those parts of the U.S. South where commercial cotton production had been practiced for multiple generations—including the Natchez district of Mississippi, where Quitman lived—began to experience problems of diminishing returns after repeated seasons of cotton-cropping led to soil erosion and exhaustion.⁴⁴ Some slaveholders responded to these problems by purchasing new land in frontier regions and moving westward, a move that contributed to the locust-like trend of planter migration identified by James Oakes and James Miller.⁴⁵ To limit this phenomenon and maintain the slave system’s long-term viability, agricultural societies were founded throughout the South in the antebellum period, which advised planters about the importance of crop rotations and crop diversification. Additionally, numerous journals—including *DeBow’s Review*, the *American*

43 Steven Collins, “System, Organization, and Agricultural Reform in the Antebellum South, 1840-1860,” *Agricultural History* 75 (2001), 1-27; Cathal Smith, “Apostles of Agricultural Reform: The Ballinasloe Agricultural Improvement Society in an Era of High Farming and Famine, 1840-1850,” *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* 64 (2012), 128-145; Smith, “Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity,” 216-220. On the concept of ‘improvement’ as it was understood by English landlords, see Sarah Tarlow, *The Archaeology of Improvement in Britain, 1750-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 10-22.

44 Joseph Holt Ingraham, *The Southwest: By a Yankee* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835), II, 87-89; Eugene Genovese, “Cotton, Slavery, and Soil Exhaustion in the Old South,” *Cotton History Review* 2 (1961), 3-17; Eugene Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967 [1965]), 85-105; Christopher Morris, *Becoming Southern: The Evolution of a Way of Life, Warren County and Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1770-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 156-168.

45 Oakes, *Ruling Race*, 69-95; Miller, *South by Southwest*. Also see John Majewski, *Modernizing a Slave Economy: The Economic Vision of the Confederate Nation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 22-80.

Cotton Planter, and the *Southern Agriculturalist*—also discussed the need for slaveholders to embrace agricultural reform.⁴⁶ During the 1830s and 1840s, especially following the ‘Panic of 1837’ and the subsequent drop in cotton prices on world markets, many southwestern planters took heed of this advice, moving away from the “slash-and-burn” farming that Christopher Morris has noted characterised Mississippi agriculture in the early nineteenth century and toward farming their land in a more sustainable manner.⁴⁷ To this end, progressive slaveholders throughout the antebellum South introduced a variety of agronomic reforms that were characteristic of the second slavery: they introduced crop rotations and encouraged crop diversification; they applied soil conservation techniques to their plantations and farms; they invested in modern technologies and agricultural implements; and they experimented with biological innovations in cotton and sugar varieties.⁴⁸

During his lifetime, John Quitman was a member of at least two agricultural societies that promoted these reforms: the Jefferson College Agricultural Society and the Mississippi State Agricultural Society, founded in 1839 and 1841 respectively. These organisations, which included such nationally renowned ‘improving’ planters as Benjamin L.C. Wailes and Martin Philips, urged Mississippi slaveholders not to kill the proverbial goose for its golden egg, as Philips once wrote of their excessive focus on the monocropping of cotton.⁴⁹ Since Quitman retired from the public sphere in the first half of the 1840s, to concentrate on extracting

46 Genovese, *Political Economy of Slavery*, 124-144; Oakes, *Ruling Race*, 88-90; Miller, *South by Southwest*, 40-59; Theodore Rosengarten, “The *Southern Agriculturalist* in an Age of Reform,” in Michael O’Brien and David Moltke-Hansen (eds.), *Intellectual Life in Antebellum Charleston* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1986), 279-294. A similar phenomenon had also characterised tobacco-growing regions of the Upper South at an earlier date. See David Allmendinger, *Ruffin: Family and Reform in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

47 Morris, *Becoming Southern*, xviii, 35, 157.

48 John Hebron Moore, *The Emergence of the Cotton Kingdom in the Old Southwest: Mississippi, 1770-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 10-14, 18-72; Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams*, 151-159, 180-185; Kaye, “Second Slavery,” 633-635; Alan Olmstead and Paul Rhode, *Creating Abundance: Biological Innovation and Modernity in American Agricultural Development* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 98-133.

49 *American Cotton Planter*, December 1853, 377. Also see Charles Sydnor, *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L.C. Wailes* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1938); Genovese, *Political Economy of Slavery*, 125-131; John Hebron Moore, *Agriculture in Ante-Bellum Mississippi* (New York: Octagon Books, 1971).

himself from the chronic debt in which he found himself at that time, and since there is no record of his having served on their organising committees, his active involvement in the Jefferson College and Mississippi State Agricultural Societies seems to have been limited. Nevertheless, Quitman was certainly subject to the influence of the two organisations and the wider Southern agronomic movement of which they were a part; indeed, he applied much of their advice to his own estates.⁵⁰

Even though he delegated the day-to-day management of his plantations to others, Quitman was well-versed in agricultural procedures.⁵¹ An avid gardener who spent much of his time at Monmouth tending flowers and fruit trees, he was scientific in his approach to horticulture and transferred this experimental proclivity to his plantations. Quitman's letters show that he availed of the biological innovations in varieties of cotton and sugar cane that characterised Southern agriculture in the antebellum era, which Anthony Kaye has identified as a signal feature of the second slavery. Additionally, after witnessing diminishing returns of cotton at Springfield during the 1830s, Quitman sought to sustainably manage Palmyra after he invested in the latter plantation in 1842; to this end, he organised for crop rotations between cotton and corn there. He did this not only as part of his effort to achieve self-sufficiency, but also to avoid the soil-depleting effects of cotton monoculture.⁵²

Demonstrating another characteristic feature of the second slavery, Quitman also invested in a variety of modern technologies for his plantations. Live Oaks conformed to the general pattern of antebellum Louisiana sugar estates, which were highly mechanised, as

50 John Quitman to Henry Quitman, 17 October 1835, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 138; Robert May, "John A. Quitman and His Slaves: Reconciling Slave Resistance with the Proslavery Defense," *Journal of Southern History* 46 (1980), 553n.

51 Illustrative of his intimate knowledge of cotton cultivation, Quitman once wrote to a friend: "I recommend that in planting you roll the seed. It goes further and makes a more certain stand. The process is to dampen a pile of the seed on a smooth piece of ground, by sprinkling it with water and then sack it in loose dry earth, until the seed is coated with the earth." See John Quitman to Elias Jenkins, 18 January 1839, JAQPM.

52 John Quitman to Sarah Turner, 31 March 1825, W.R. Smither to John Quitman, 5 February 1853, QFP; Kaye, "Second Slavery," 634; May, *John A. Quitman*, 135-137. For more on biological innovations in antebellum Southern cotton and sugar varieties, see Alan Olmstead and Paul Rhode, "Biological Innovation and Productivity Growth in the Antebellum Cotton Economy," *Journal of Economic History* 68 (2008), 1123-1171; John Hebron Moore, "Cotton Breeding in the Old South," *Agricultural History* 30 (1956), 95-104; Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams*, 151-154; Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 22.

dictated by the requirements of sugar production and processing; boilers, rollers, and rail were all part of the sophisticated operation developed there.⁵³ Typical of the antebellum South's larger cotton plantations, Palmyra included gins and presses that were used to bale cotton on site before its shipment, via the adjacent Mississippi river, to New Orleans for sale. Additionally, steam engines and rail were also deployed at Palmyra from the early 1840s onward.⁵⁴ Evidently, therefore, Quitman perceived the virtue of applying both agronomic and technological innovations to his plantations with a view toward maximising the production of the staple crops upon which his wealth largely depended, while simultaneously ensuring the long-term viability of his land.

John Quitman's drive toward agricultural modernisation on his plantations in antebellum Mississippi and Louisiana, characteristic of the second slavery, was paralleled by a concurrent movement for agricultural improvement among Irish landowners—a movement that was central to the second landlordism. Competition for grain on British markets and a consequential drop in prices for corn, oats, wheat, and barley created an impulse to reorient Irish agriculture toward livestock production after 1815. However, population pressure made a wholesale move to grazing impossible on most Irish estates, at least before the onset of the Great Famine (1845-52), which provided landlords with an opportunity to rid themselves of unwanted small holders and relet their land to large graziers. As a result, in the pre-Famine era, there were moves toward making small tillage farms more productive, since progressive

53 John Quitman to Henry Quitman, 7 December 1836, Albert Quitman to John Quitman, 25 November 1844, 28 December 1844, QFP; May, "Quitman and His Slaves," 556. On the mechanisation of antebellum Louisiana sugar plantations, see Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 102-105; Richard Follett, "Slavery and Technology in Louisiana's Sugar Bowl," in Susanna Delfino and Michele Gillespie (eds.), *Technology, Innovation, and Southern Industrialization: From the Antebellum Era to the Computer Age* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008), 78-96; John Heitmann, *The Modernization of the Louisiana Sugar Industry, 1830-1910* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987).

54 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 27 November 1841, 15 April, 11 June, 18 June, 25 July, 19 August 1842, QFP. Also see B.L.C. Wailes, *Report on the Agriculture and Geology of Mississippi* (Jackson: E. Barksdale, 1854), 155-180; Gavin Wright, *The Political Economy of the Cotton South: Households, Markets, and Wealth in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978), 26-28; Angela Lakwete, *Inventing the Cotton Gin: Machine and Myth in Antebellum America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

landlords recognised that it was in their self-interest to take the lead in modernising their tenants' farming techniques with a view toward increasing their own profit from rents. With this agenda, numerous agricultural societies were founded throughout Ireland during the 1830s and 1840s by progressive landlords, such as Galway's Lord Clonbrock, who sought to popularise the introduction of scientific farming techniques and modern agricultural implements on the country's landed estates.⁵⁵

Clonbrock was a vice-president of both the Ballinasloe Agricultural Improvement Society and the Royal Agricultural Improvement Society of Ireland—organisations established in 1840 and 1841, just as similar ones were being founded in Mississippi at roughly the same time. These Irish agricultural societies were conspicuous examples of the culture of 'improvement' that became widespread among Irish landowners during the second landlordism.⁵⁶ Additionally, similarly to what happened in the U.S. South, early-Victorian Ireland also saw the proliferation of periodicals and journals that were dedicated to the discussion of agriculture and economic reform; notable examples include the *Irish Farmers' Gazette and Journal of Practical Horticulture* and the publications of the transactions of the Royal Agricultural Improvement Society. Together with the agricultural societies, these publications attempted to convert Irish landlords and tenants to the cause of agricultural improvement.⁵⁷

55 Cormac Ó'Gráda, "Poverty, Population, and Agriculture, 1801-45," in Vaughan (ed.), *New History of Ireland*, V, 127-130; Smith, "Apostles of Agricultural Reform," 128-145; Ronan Lynch, *The Kirwans of Castlehacket, Co. Galway: History, Folklore and Mythology in an Irish Horseracing Family* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006), 118-124; Jonathan Bell and Mervyn Watson, *Irish Farming Implements and Techniques, 1750-1900* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986). On the 'clearances' of small tenants that occurred during the Famine, see James Donnelly, "Mass Eviction and the Great Famine: The Clearances Revisited," in Cathal Póirtéir (ed.), *The Great Irish Famine* (Dublin: Mercier Press, 1995), 155-173.

56 McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 64-76; Smith, "Apostles of Agricultural Reform," 128-145; Enda Delaney, *The Curse of Reason: The Great Irish Famine, 1845-52* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2012), 35-38; Enrico Dal Lago, "Count Cavour's 1844 *Thoughts on Ireland*: Liberal Politics and Agrarian Reform Through Anglo-Italian Eyes," in Niall Whelehan (ed.), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (London: Routledge, 2015), 88-105. On British agricultural improvement, which heavily influenced Irish agricultural societies, see Nicholas Goddard, *Harvests of Change: The Royal Agricultural Society of England, 1838-1988* (London: Quiller Press, 1988); T.M. Devine, *Clearance and Improvement: Land, Power and People in Scotland, 1700-1900* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2006).

57 See, for example, *Transactions of the Royal Agricultural Improvement Society of Ireland, and Annual Report and Proceedings of the Council for the Year 1844* (Dublin: William Curry & Co., 1845); Thomas Skilling, *The Science and Practice of Agriculture* (Dublin: James McGlashan, 1846); James Clapperton, *Instructions*

Even before joining and playing a leading role in the Ballinasloe and the Royal Agricultural Improvement Societies, Clonbrock demonstrated a desire to improve the standard of farming on his own estates. During the 1830s, for example, he spent large sums of money on wasteland reclamation and drainage schemes in order to make his land more productive.⁵⁸ Clonbrock also discouraged his tenants from taking multiple grain crops from the same fields over successive years, a practice that depleted the soil's fertility. Instead, he backed 'green-cropping'—a system of scientifically informed crop rotations that became popular among agricultural reformers in Ireland during the 1830s and 1840s—which advised farmers to alternate between oats, wheat, barley, potatoes and so-called green crops, including clovers and artificial grasses. This promised to increase the productive potential of small farms by replenishing the soil's nitrogen content and increasing the amount of manure available to apply to tillage land.⁵⁹

A related feature of the second landlordism that can be seen on the Clonbrock estates was the technological innovation that accompanied the movement for the modernisation of Irish agricultural production. For example, similarly to Quitman, Clonbrock invested in laying rail on his property, with moveable tram lines used when reclaiming a large tract of bogland near his demesne during the 1830s.⁶⁰ Clonbrock also paid for the construction and maintenance of corn mills on a number of his estates, purchased modern iron ploughs for his tenants' use, and hired a succession of agricultural experts to tutor them on best-practice

for the Small Farmers of Ireland, on the Cropping and Culture of their Farms (Dublin: W. Curry, 1847). Also see Nicholas Goddard, "The Development and Influence of Agricultural Periodicals and Newspapers, 1780-1880," *Agricultural History Review* 31 (1983), 116-132.

58 Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1827-1844, Ms 19,585-Ms 19,616, CP; *Poor Inquiry*, Appendix F, 357; Hely Dutton, *A Statistical and Agricultural Survey of the County of Galway* (Dublin: R. Graisberry, 1824), 18-19; Smith, "Apostles of Agricultural Reform," 134; McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 72-73. For more on Irish drainage and land reclamation schemes, which were among the most capital intensive examples of agricultural reform, see Katherine Hull, "To Drain and to Cultivate: Agriculture and 'Improvement' at Ballykilcline," in Charles Orser (ed.), *Unearthing Hidden Ireland: Historical Archaeology at Ballykilcline, County Roscommon* (Bray: Wordwell, 2006).

59 William Blacker, *An Essay on the Improvements to be Made in the Cultivation of Small Farms* (Dublin: W. Curry, Jun. and Co., 1837 [1833]); *Poor Inquiry*, appendix F, 358-359; Smith, "Apostles of Agricultural Reform," 132-133; McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 65-71.

60 Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1835-1836, Ms 19,598, CP; *Devon Commission*, Part II, 507.

farming methods.⁶¹

Clonbrock's considerable expenditure on agricultural improvement placed him among the most economically progressive members of his class. However, it appears that he was in a minority, since—as Cormac Ó'Gráda and W.E. Vaughan have argued—most Irish landlords seem to have ignored opportunities to invest substantially in their estates or to pursue agricultural modernisation during the 1800s.⁶² Thus, the improving milieu of which Clonbrock was a member characterised only a minority of nineteenth-century Ireland's landed class. It was a substantial minority, though, which grew in number during the second landlordism, as evinced by the significant number of landlords who joined and took heed of the advice of the new agricultural societies that were founded throughout Ireland during the 1830s and 1840s.⁶³

At a fundamental level, Quitman's and Clonbrock's attempts to modernise agricultural production on their estates were related to British industrialisation and the resulting changes in patterns of demand for the different commodities upon which their wealth depended—cotton and sugar in the former case, grain and livestock in the latter. In fact, even though agricultural improvement had long pedigrees in the American South and Ireland, it was pursued in a systematic manner and by significant numbers of nineteenth-century slaveholders and landowners in response to economic depressions: a prolonged contraction in prices for Irish grain in the years 1815-50 and a shorter dip in Southern cotton prices in the late 1830s and early 1840s, both closely related to British demand for those commodities. Notably, in

61 For sums spent by Clonbrock on corn mills, ploughs and agriculturalists, see Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1836-1843, Ms 19,600-Ms 19,614, CP. Also see McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 64-67, 76.

62 Cormac Ó'Gráda, "The Investment Behaviour of Irish Landlords, 1850-75: Some Preliminary Findings," *Agricultural History Review* 23 (1975), 139-155; W.E. Vaughan, "An Assessment of the Economic Performance of Irish Landlords, 1851-81," in F.S.L. Lyons and R.A.J. Hawkins (eds.), *Ireland Under The Union: Varieties of Tension* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 173-199. Also see Jonathan Bell and Mervyn Watson, *A History of Irish Farming, 1750-1950* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008), 15-17.

63 Smith, "Apostles of Agricultural Reform," 142; Oliver MacDonagh, "Economy and Society, 1830-45," in Vaughan (ed.), *New History of Ireland*, V, 221; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 118-125.

both cases, agronomic movements coalesced around dedicated agricultural publications and societies that aimed to convince the elites of the virtues of economic reform. Quitman and Clonbrock were members of these agricultural societies and they also applied agronomic and technological innovations to their own estates. Aware that soil exhaustion resulted from excessive focus on the cultivation of cash crops, both men recognised the need to strike a balance between the short-term maximisation of production and the long-term fertility of their land, illustrated by their attempts to introduce scientifically informed and practically proven crop rotations. As such, Quitman's and Clonbrock's investments in agricultural modernisation provide another example of the entrepreneurial and business-like mindsets that became increasingly common among American planters during the second slavery and among Irish landlords during the second landlordism.⁶⁴

The U.S. Southern and Irish movements for elite-led agricultural modernisation in which Quitman and Clonbrock participated were not only similar in the above respects, but also connected. Their national and local agronomic cultures were influenced, directly or indirectly, by the same sources—including the writings of such internationally renowned agronomists and political economists as Arthur Young and Albrecht Daniel Thaer. Additionally, since scientific farming techniques and technologies were often applicable to a wide range of contexts, they were frequently transferred between countries. Therefore, as Enrico Dal Lago and Marta Petrusiewicz have argued, nineteenth-century agronomy was a transnational phenomenon. The comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock suggests that this included the progressive U.S. Southern and Irish landholders who sought to modernise agriculture on their properties during the 1800s. As such, whether they realised it or not, Quitman and Clonbrock both drew from, and contributed to, an international agronomic culture that linked the second slavery and second landlordism.⁶⁵

64 See Moore, *Emergence of the Cotton Kingdom*, 18-36; MacDonagh, "Economy and Society," 219-221.

65 See Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 113, 118; Dal Lago, "Count Cavour's 1844 *Thoughts on Ireland*," 99-101; Petrusiewicz, "Land-Based Modernization," 95-96; Petrusiewicz, "Modernity

There were also many notable differences between Quitman's and Clonbrock's agronomic innovations, especially since the advice proffered by agricultural societies and journals and executed by individuals in either context was invariably tailored to the particular requirements of the very different geographies, crops, climates, and labour systems extant in the Deep South and in the west of Ireland. Although Quitman and Clonbrock both invested in modern technologies, for example, the potential for the large-scale mechanisation of agriculture was far more pronounced in the antebellum U.S. South than it was in nineteenth-century Ireland. This was dictated by the particular requirements of the commercial crops farmed in either region, since cotton and sugar production, processing, and packaging necessitated more sophisticated machinery than did grain and livestock. Also, the barriers to agricultural improvement were more substantial in Ireland, because landlords there were required (and often failed) to convince skeptical, free tenant-farmers of the utility of the measures that they advised in order to effect agricultural improvement. By contrast, due to the nature of unfree labour, Southern planters had a much greater ability to compel slaves to follow their directions if they decided that it was in their self-interest to pursue agricultural modernisation.⁶⁶

Investments and Economic Diversification

The entrepreneurial attitudes that became increasingly common among the U.S. South's and Ireland's agrarian elites during the second slavery and the second landlordism were not confined solely to their estates. In different degrees, progressive Southern planters and Irish landlords invested some of their wealth in speculative business ventures during the nineteenth century, notably in the improvement of their regions' transport infrastructures. Interestingly,

of the European Periphery," 154-155.

⁶⁶ Smith, "Apostles of Agricultural Reform," 136-137; Justin Roberts, *Slavery and the Enlightenment in the British Atlantic, 1750-1807* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 36. Also see Bowman, *Masters and Lords*, 73.

however, this fact jars with traditional stereotypes of the two elites, since both were typically depicted in popular culture as aristocrats, or aristocratic pretenders, who tended to favour unremunerative spending on conspicuous consumption at the expense of profitable investment opportunities. These stereotypes have found support from a number of prominent American and Irish historians. Eugene Genovese and Cormac Ó'Gráda have respectively argued that most U.S. Southern planters and Irish landlords spent the money generated from their estates on living lives of luxury and refinement, thereby missing out on the chance to increase their wealth through capital accumulation.⁶⁷ And yet, to a greater or lesser extent, members of both agrarian elites did invest in a range of speculative ventures during the nineteenth century. John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock were two such individuals; although they both indulged in a certain amount of conspicuous consumption—notably through the development of their Big Houses and gardens—they also invested much of their wealth outside the realm of agriculture during their lifetimes. An analysis of these investments offers another perspective on Quitman's and Clonbrock's economic attitudes and behaviours, which, in turn, contributes to our understanding of the effects of the second slavery in the antebellum U.S. South and the second landlordism in nineteenth-century Ireland.⁶⁸

From the time that John Quitman became wealthy in the mid-1820s—first as a lawyer and then as a planter—he consistently exhibited a propensity to invest in speculative business ventures. Perhaps the sector in which he invested most of his fortune—aside from plantations and slaves—was infrastructural development. As president of the Mississippi Railroad Company, Quitman was central to the plans for the construction of a railroad from Natchez to Jackson between 1834 and 1840. Thus, he was an early participant in the “railway mania” that

67 Genovese, *Political Economy of Slavery*, 16-18; Ó'Gráda, *Ireland*, 29-31. For literary representations of American slaveholders' and Irish landowners' stereotypical lack of business acumen, see John Pendleton Kennedy, *Swallow Barn, or A Sojourn in the Old Dominion* (Philadelphia: Carey & Lea, 1832); Maria Edgeworth, *Castle Rackrent: An Hibernian Tale Taken from Facts and From the Manners of the Irish Squires Before the Year 1782* (London: J. Crowder, 1800).

68 Smith, “Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity,” 220-222.

historian William Thomas has identified, which wrought a modern transport network throughout the U.S. South by the 1850s.⁶⁹ During the 1830s, Quitman also acted as director of his local Planter's Bank and was closely involved with the Mississippi Importing Company and the Natchez Steam Packet Company—two enterprises that attempted to foster a direct trade between Natchez and Europe.⁷⁰

Unfortunately for Quitman, the financial crisis associated with the Panic of 1837 adversely affected these ventures, especially the railroad company in which he was heavily invested. By the mid-1830s, U.S. cotton was not only the most important supplier of English textile mills and factories, but it had also become central to an international system of trade, finance, and banking. The rapid expansion of cotton production in the antebellum U.S. South proved extremely volatile, however. Most of the slaveholders who populated the Old Southwest during the second slavery depended on credit to establish their plantations and farms. Due to a confluence of factors, including rampant speculation and banking reforms, the cotton bubble burst in 1837 and many U.S. banks subsequently crashed. Over the following years, in the absence of credit, cotton prices fell. This led to a recession that hit Southern planters, including Quitman, particularly hard.⁷¹

As the Mississippi Railroad Company encountered difficulty securing capital during the resulting economic crisis, Quitman sailed for Europe in May 1839 to find buyers for the company's stock. He found no investors, however, only a lesson on the interdependent nature

69 May, *John A. Quitman*, 65-66, 94-105; William Thomas, "'Swerve Me?': The South, Railroads, and the Rush to Modernity," in L. Diane Barnes, Brian Schoen, and Frank Towers (eds.), *The Old South's Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 180. For more on Southern rail construction in the antebellum era, see William Thomas, *The Iron Way: Railroads, the Civil War, and the Making of Modern America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 17-36; Aaron Maars, *Railroads in the Old South: Pursuing Progress in a Slave Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).

70 May, *John A. Quitman*, 100; Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House*, 219, 228, 233; James, *Antebellum Natchez*, 195-196; Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 138.

71 Baptist, *Half Has Never Been Told*, 90-94, 261-307; Beckert, *Empire of Cotton*, 219-224; Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams*, 281-282; Scott Reynolds Nelson, *A Nation of Deadbeats: An Uncommon History of America's Financial Disasters* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012), 95-125; Joshua Rothman, *Flush Times and Fever Dreams: A Story of Capitalism and Slavery in the Age of Jackson* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012).

of global finance at the time. Soon after arriving in England, Quitman wrote to his wife that “the severe pressure which was felt in the United States several years since has also reached this country ... from all I can learn there is not now the least earthly possibility of succeeding in the great object of my mission.”⁷² In this context, Quitman’s subsequent trip around Europe in order to find willing investors was to no avail. As a result, he returned home to Mississippi empty-handed and resigned as president of the railroad company in 1840, shortly before its collapse.⁷³

Further evidence of Quitman’s entrepreneurial attitude can be found in his investments in land speculation. He purchased land in northern Mississippi in the early 1830s as part of a syndicate, as well as in the Galveston Bay region of Texas in 1836, on the assumption—in the latter case—that the territory would be incorporated into the United States and the land would increase in value.⁷⁴ Quitman also ran a lumber and sawmill operation at Palmyra and he established a ferry service at Springfield, which shuttled people and goods across the Mississippi River for a set fare. These examples demonstrate that Quitman was entrepreneurial not only in relation to the business of plantation management, but also in the diversification of his interests outside agriculture. In this respect, Quitman seems to have been representative of a significant proportion of his fellow Southern slaveholders, who—as a number of scholars have suggested—engaged in similar capitalistic behaviour in the antebellum period; thus, he represents another dimension of the entrepreneurial ethos that was widespread among American planters during the second slavery.⁷⁵

72 John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 26 June 1839, QFP. Also see Jessica Lepler, *The Many Panics of 1837: People, Politics, and the Creation of a Transatlantic Financial Crisis* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

73 May, *John A. Quitman*, 101-112; Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 185-191; James, *Antebellum Natchez*, 191-192.

74 Agreement Between James C. Wilkins, John A. Quitman, John T. McMurrin and J.B. Womack, October 1835, MSS 38-343 (11), John Anthony Quitman Papers, Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 15, 29 April, 5 May 1836, QFP; John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 7 May 1836, JAQPM; May, *John A. Quitman*, 42, 87; Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House*, 132-133.

75 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 27 November 1841, 29 July 1842, QFP; Springfield Plantation Account Book, JAQPM; May, *John A. Quitman*, 131-133. For other planters who exhibited similar entrepreneurial proclivities as Quitman, see Brazy, *An American Planter*; Morton Rothstein, “The Changing Social Networks

Just as the second slavery witnessed a propensity to invest in speculative business ventures among economically progressive American slaveholders such as John Quitman, so too did progressive Irish landlords—including Lord Clonbrock—engage in comparable capitalistic behaviour during the second landlordism. In fact, similarly to Quitman, Clonbrock was involved in a failed railroad company. In 1831, he was appointed president of Ireland’s Western Railroad and Navigation Company, which was established with the aim of constructing railroads and canals in County Galway.⁷⁶ This enterprise proved short-lived, but that did not end Clonbrock’s involvement with infrastructural improvement schemes. During the 1830s and 1840s, mirroring what was happening in the U.S. South, numerous railroad companies were established in Ireland as part of what Tom Ferris has described as a “railway mania.” Clonbrock was a prominent participant in this ‘mania.’ Indeed, his land agent—Thomas Bermingham—was one of early-Victorian Ireland’s foremost campaigners for infrastructural development. In the late 1820s and early 1830s, Bermingham was involved with efforts to construct canals throughout Ireland and introduce steamboats on the country’s major rivers. After 1835, he increasingly turned his attention to the construction of an Irish rail network.⁷⁷

In April 1839, mere weeks before Quitman arrived in England to court investors for the Mississippi Railroad Company, Bermingham organised a meeting in London where the

and Investment Behavior of a Slaveholding Elite in the Antebellum South: Some Natchez Nabobs, 1800-1860,” in Sidney Greenfield, Arnold Stricken and Robert Aubey (eds.), *Entrepreneurs in Cultural Context* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979), 65-84; Laurence Shore, *Southern Capitalists: The Ideological Leadership of an Elite, 1832-1885* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 16-41. For the argument that Southern planters were not as open to speculative ventures as some historians have suggested, see Scott Reynolds Nelson, “Who Put Their Capitalism in My Slavery?,” *Journal of the Civil War Era* 5 (2015), 299-302.

76 *First Report of the Committee on the Western Rail-Road and Navigation Company* (Dublin: T. Flanagan, 1831).

77 Tom Ferris, *Irish Railways: A New History* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 2008), 8-9. On Bermingham’s involvement with Irish infrastructural development, see Thomas Bermingham, *Report on the State of the River Shannon* (London: S.W. Fores, 1831); Thomas Bermingham, *Additional Statements on the Subject of the River Shannon to the Reports Published in 1831* (London: S.W. Fores, 1834); Thomas Bermingham, *Irish Railways: A Full and Interesting Report of the Public Proceedings on this Important Question* (London: Messers Fores, 1839); Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 246-250.

prospect for Irish rail companies to do the same was discussed. There Bermingham learned that—as Quitman was soon to discover—English investors were disinterested in the prospect of backing foreign rail construction at the time. As a consequence, Bermingham looked to the British government as a source of capital for the Irish railroad companies with which he and Clonbrock were involved.⁷⁸ Initially, in the laissez-faire climate that pervaded British politics during the 1830s and 1840s, government assistance was not forthcoming. Yet, eventually—in 1849—an act was passed in Westminster that provided loans to a number of Irish railroad companies. One of the largest of these companies was the Midlands Great Western Railroad, which completed a line from Dublin to Galway in 1851.⁷⁹ Clonbrock was a prominent backer of this venture, named as he was in 1863 as an investor with shares valued above £2,000.⁸⁰

Comparably to Quitman, Clonbrock's speculative investments were not limited to infrastructural improvement schemes. He also engaged in commercial forestry on part of his land and, like Quitman, he owned a profitable sawmill on one of his estates. Furthermore, capitalising on his engagement in large-scale wasteland reclamation schemes on his own property, Clonbrock established a business that manufactured tiles used for draining land.⁸¹ During the 1840s and 1850s, he also invested thousands of pounds in British government stock, and, in the later nineteenth century, he and his family bought shares in numerous foreign businesses, including an Indian mine and an Argentinian railroad company.⁸² In the

78 See Thomas Bermingham, *A Report of the Proceedings at Two Public Meetings, Held at the Thatched House Tavern on the 13th and 20th of April 1839, for the Purpose of Taking into Consideration the Necessity of Forming Railways Throughout Ireland* (London: Fores & Co., 1839); Thomas Bermingham, *Statistical Evidence in Favor of State Railways in Ireland* (Dublin: John Chambers, 1841).

79 Joseph Lee, "The Provision of Capital for Early Irish Railways, 1830-53," *Irish Historical Studies* 16 (1968), 33-63; Ferris, *Irish Railways*, 23-30; John Cunningham, *A Town Tormented By the Sea: Galway, 1790-1914* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2004), 65-67; Ernest Shepherd, *The Midland Great Western Railroad of Ireland: An Illustrated History* (Leicester: Midland Publishing, 1994).

80 *Report of the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company's Thirty-Sixth Half-Yearly Meeting* (Dublin: n.p., 1863), in Ms 35,816 (4), CP. Also see Correspondence and Papers Relating to the Extension of the Midland Great Western Railway, 1855-1864, Ms 35,816 (4), CP.

81 For Clonbrock's forestry and sawmill accounts, see Abstracts of the Accounts of Robert Dillon with Charles Filgate, 1843-1852, Ms 35,724 (8), CP; Clonbrock Estate Account Books, 1844-1845, Ms 19,616-19,617, CP. On his tile business—the Gailey tile works—see, *Western Star*, 21 July 1850; *Commissioners of the Board of Works, 26th Report*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 26, 1857-58, 545-46; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 253.

82 Receipts for Dividends Drawn from Government Stock, 1847-1857, Ms 35,816 (2), CP; Correspondence, Papers and Receipts Relating to the Purchase of Stocks and Shares, 1870-1924, Ms 35,816 (5), CP.

process, Clonbrock developed an international investment portfolio that was funded by the wealth generated from his Irish estates. Thus, Victorian Ireland's landed class may well have generally ignored non-agricultural investment opportunities—as Cormac Ó'Gráda and Joseph Lee have both argued—but Clonbrock and a minority of his fellow landlords certainly exhibited a capitalistic attitude in their willingness to invest in speculative ventures.⁸³ As such, Clonbrock hardly fits the stereotypical image of the insular and improvident Irish landlord. Rather, in diversifying his economic interests, he revealed another aspect of the entrepreneurial ethos that was a hallmark of the second landlordism.

The fact that two historians—William Thomas and Tom Ferris—have independently used the term 'railway mania' to describe the movements for infrastructural improvement that emerged in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland is telling. These 'manias,' in which John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock participated, were partially fuelled by the entrepreneurial mindsets that became increasingly common among U.S. Southern slaveholders during the second slavery and among Irish landowners during the second landlordism. The underlying motivation for Quitman's and Clonbrock's investments in the expansion and amelioration of their region's transport networks was similar in both cases: to provide cheaper and more expedient access to those markets where the different agricultural commodities farmed on their estates were in demand—primarily Britain—and to profit from the conveyance of those commodities to their destination. The most obvious contrast between Quitman's Mississippi Railroad Company and Clonbrock's Midland Great Western Railroad is that the former failed and the latter successfully completed its projected rail line. This is not an indication of the overall success or failure of infrastructural development in the U.S. South and Ireland, however; by the late 1850s, extensive rail networks had been constructed in both

⁸³ Ó'Gráda, *Ireland*, 125-129, 324-330; Lee, "Provision of Capital for Early Irish Railways," 63; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 81; Lynch, *Kirwans of Castlehacket*, 137-138.

regions. These—along with the concurrent introduction of steamboats—ultimately rendered the U.S. South and Ireland more tightly integrated into the global capitalist system.⁸⁴

Another striking correlation between Quitman's and Clonbrock's investment behaviours lies in the fact that—while they both demonstrated that they were willing to invest in speculative ventures—they evidently shared a preference for projects that would complement agriculture rather than foster industrial development. This neglect of industry was representative of most, though not all, American slaveholders and Irish landlords, who generally ignored or avoided investing in factories during the nineteenth century. As a result of these preferences, despite the emergence of modernising landed elites during the second slavery and second landlordism, the U.S. South and Ireland remained overwhelmingly agricultural and rural throughout the nineteenth century.⁸⁵

Comparison also reveals numerous contrasts between Quitman's and Clonbrock's investments, largely conditioned by the differences between their particular contexts. Given the frontier nature of the antebellum U.S. South, Quitman logically engaged in land speculation during the 1820s and 1830s in a way that Clonbrock could not do in long-settled, densely populated Ireland. Also, unlike Clonbrock, most Irish landlords seem to have invested little of their wealth in non-agricultural economic activities, despite ample opportunities to profitably do so. In the U.S. South, however, a greater proportion of planters seem to have shared Quitman's willingness to develop interests outside agriculture in the antebellum era. Thus, it appears that—as was the case with agricultural improvement—Quitman's investment

84 Thomas, "Swerve Me," 180; Ferris, *Irish Railways*, 9. Also see Robert Gudmestad, *Steamboats and the Rise of the Cotton Kingdom* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011); Peter Solar, "Shipping and Economic Development in Nineteenth-Century Ireland," *Economic History Review* 59 (2006), 717-742.

85 Fred Bateman and Thomas Weiss, *A Deplorable Scarcity: The Failure of Industrialization in the Slave Economy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981); Genovese, *Political Economy of Slavery*, 180-220; Ó'Gráda, *Ireland*, 273-348; Andy Bielenberg, *Ireland and the Industrial Revolution: The Impact of the Industrial Revolution on Irish Industry, 1801-1922* (New York: Routledge, 2009). For exceptions to the general rule, see Robert Starobin, *Industrial Slavery in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); Cormac Ó'Gráda, "Industry and Communications, 1801-45," in Vaughan (ed.), *New History of Ireland*, V, 137-157. Also see Shearer Davis Bowman, "Industrialization and Economic Development in the Nineteenth-Century U.S. South: Some Interregional and Intercontinental Comparative Perspectives," in Susanna Delfino and Michele Gillespie (eds.), *Global Perspectives on Industrial Transformation in the American South* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 76-104.

behaviour was representative of an entrepreneurial attitude that was common, although by no means ubiquitous, among American planters, whereas Clonbrock's analogous behaviour characterised only a small proportion of Irish landlords.⁸⁶ Still, Quitman's and Clonbrock's investments—along with the rational management of their landed estates and their attempts to modernise agricultural production—add further credence to the proposition that they were entrepreneurial and cosmopolitan individuals.

Conclusion

Clearly, there were both similarities and differences between John Quitman's and Lord Clonbrock's economic attitudes and behaviours. Yet, a comparison of their estate management practices, pursuits of agrarian modernisation, and non-agricultural investments not only tells us about our two case studies; it also provides insights into the economic histories of the antebellum U.S. South's and nineteenth-century Ireland's agrarian elites, and into the wider phenomena of the second slavery and the second landlordism.

First, if we accept that Quitman and Clonbrock were representative of the economically progressive sections of their respective classes, then a comparison between them can contribute to the resolution of the debates over whether U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords should be considered 'modern' or 'backward.'⁸⁷ If modernity and backwardness are set in diametric opposition and the former is represented exclusively by British-style industrial capitalism, then Quitman's and Clonbrock's common failure to invest in large-scale manufacturing ventures would seem to paint them as backward. Yet, such a view assumes that agrarian regions were *necessarily* retrograde. The evidence provided by comparing Quitman and Clonbrock suggests otherwise, however, since, in the management of

86 See Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House*, 218-237; Joel Mokyr, *Why Ireland Starved: A Quantitative and Analytical History of the Irish Economy, 1800-1850* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983), 197-213.

87 See Peter Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 80.

their estates, their investments in agricultural modernisation, and their speculative investments, the two landowners consistently acted in a manner that can legitimately be seen as ‘modern.’ This is not to claim that economically progressive Southern planters and Irish landlords were *wholly* modern, however. In common with the majority of their respective classes, Quitman and Clonbrock were socially and politically conservative individuals who valued hierarchical, rural social orders. As a result, they neither desired nor sought modernity as it was defined in industrialised regions. Instead, they selectively embraced certain capitalistic ideas and practices. In the process, Quitman and Clonbrock defined for themselves comparable versions of *agrarian modernity*—versions that combined capitalist and pre-capitalist features in different permutations.⁸⁸

Assuming that progressive planters and landlords fashioned distinct but comparable versions of agrarian modernity in the U.S. South and Ireland during the 1800s, the comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock also provides us with an opportunity to assess the modernity of their two classes in relative terms. In this respect, it is important to emphasise that Quitman’s entrepreneurial attitude seems to have been widely shared by his fellow Southern planters, whereas Clonbrock’s economic behaviour was characteristic of a minority of Irish landlords. This is not to suggest that *all* American slaveholders backed economic reform; in fact, according to Eugene Genovese and William Mathew, the antebellum U.S. South’s reform movement failed to attract a majority of slaveholders. Still, relatively speaking, a greater proportion of antebellum American planters can be said to have consistently exhibited entrepreneurial behaviour than was the case with their Irish landed

88 For discussions that accord with this conclusion, see L. Diane Barnes, Brian Schoen, and Frank Towers, “Introduction: Reimagining the Old South,” in Barnes, Schoen, and Towers (eds.), *Old South’s Modern Worlds*, 3-19; Richard Follett, “On the Edge of Modernity: Louisiana’s Landed Elites in the Nineteenth-Century Sugar Country,” and Bruce Levine, “Modernity, Backwardness, and Capitalism in the Two Souths,” both in Dal Lago and Halpern (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno*, 73-94, 233-240; Ó’Gráda, *Ireland*, 347-348; Petruszewicz, “Land-Based Modernization,” 108-110; Marta Petruszewicz, “Ex-Centric Europe: Visions and Practices of Harmonious Modernization in the 19th-Century European Peripheries (Ireland, Norway, Poland and Two Sicilies),” in Luca Giuliani and Dieter Grimm (eds.), *Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin Jahrbuch, 2006/07* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008), 278-293; S.N. Eisenstadt, “Multiple Modernities,” *Daedalus* 129 (2000), 1-29.

contemporaries. One explanation for this difference relates to the structural differences between U.S. Southern plantations and Irish landed estates: profiting from rent rather than participating directly in the world market allowed for the persistence of an ‘absentee mentality’ among many Irish landlords during the 1800s, something that was comparatively rare among American slaveholders as a consequence of their stronger market ties. Nevertheless, the very existence of comparable elite-led reform movements in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland is significant. In both cases, it was the common stimulus of transformations in global capitalism that fuelled the development of entrepreneurial mindsets and behaviours among landowners often considered to have been backward, encouraging them to adapt to changing circumstances by managing their estates rationally and by investing in agricultural modernisation, infrastructural development, and economic diversification.⁸⁹

Arguably, the similarities and differences between Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s economic behaviour can be best made sense of within the frameworks of the second slavery and the second landlordism. These concepts have the potential to show how, more than just representing the entrepreneurial attitudes that characterised economically progressive U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords during the 1800s, Quitman and Clonbrock were also participants in wider drives toward agrarian modernisation that, in different ways and to varying extents, included their landed counterparts in peripheral regions throughout the Americas and Europe. In this respect, the concurrent nature of the second slavery and the second landlordism is important, since both phenomena were related to the systemic transformation of the world-economy wrought by the Industrial Revolution and the consequent changes in patterns of international demand for the raw materials generated by systems of ‘rural subjection,’ not only in the U.S. South and Ireland, but also in peripheral

⁸⁹ Genovese, *Political Economy of Slavery*, 124-145; William Mathew, *Edmund Ruffin and the Crisis of Slavery in the Old South: The Failure of Agricultural Reform* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988). Also see Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 95-121.

regions throughout the Americas and Europe.⁹⁰

A final important point with regard to the second slavery and the second landlordism is that, although both concepts emphasise the economic changes that occurred in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland, many of the ‘modern’ features that they identify were not completely unprecedented in either context. North American plantations and Irish landed estates had long been integrated into global capitalism and their owners had often exhibited entrepreneurial behaviours and pursued agricultural improvements *before* the late eighteenth century. Therefore, it would be accurate to suggest that second slavery and second landlordism represented an acceleration and modification of modern impulses already extant among planters in the American South and landlords in Ireland during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this respect, the second slavery and the second landlordism can conceivably trace continuity as well as change in particular regional and local contexts. In other words, we can acknowledge that the entrepreneurial behaviours represented by Quitman and Clonbrock had precedents in the American South and Ireland, while simultaneously recognising that the constantly changing global, national, and local contexts in which the two specific landowners lived gave their actions a new meaning and importance.⁹¹

In sum, from the evidence provided by the micro-level comparison of John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock, the macro-historical concepts of the second slavery and second landlordism emerge as complex, protean, and flexible paradigms that facilitate the identification of striking similarities, amidst equally striking differences, between U.S. Southern slaveholders’ and Irish landowners’ economic mindsets and behaviours. Crucially,

90 Smith, “Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity,” 223; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 61; Dal Lago, “Second Slavery, Second Serfdom, and Beyond,” 391-420; Petruszewicz, “Modernity of the European Periphery,” 145-156; Kaye, “Second Slavery,” 627-650.

91 See Joyce Chaplin, *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730-1815* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Roberts, *Slavery and the Enlightenment*; Toby Barnard, *Improving Ireland? Projectors, Prophets and Profiteers, 1641-1786* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008); James Livesey, “A Kingdom of Cosmopolitan Improvers: The Dublin Society, 1731-1798,” in Koen Stapelbroek and Jani Marjanen (eds.), *The Rise of Economic Societies in the Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 52-72.

however, these concepts need not only provide us with frameworks for the comparison of the two elites' economic histories. In both cases, the emergence of the reform movements associated with the second slavery and second landlordism also had dramatic implications for the planters' and landlords' ideologies, which are the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

Planter and Landlord Ideologies: John A. Quitman, Lord Clonbrock, and Paternalism

In the U.S. South and Ireland, the second slavery and the second landlordism were characterised by the increasing prevalence of entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviours among the landed proprietors. Significantly, these economic trends were accompanied by ideological reconfigurations in both contexts, as the world-views of most American planters and Irish landlords underwent changes associated with a shift from patriarchalism to paternalism. It is no coincidence that these economic and ideological developments were concurrent, since paternalism was arguably a progressive ideology that complemented the elites' modern features.¹ In this respect, American planters and Irish landlords can be considered part of the wider process of ideological modernisation of agrarian elites worldwide that occurred between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this period, as a number of historians have demonstrated, progressive landed elites in different parts of the Americas and Europe—especially those who were resident on their properties—often embraced paternalistic ideas and practices as part of their efforts to reform their labour systems.² In all of these cases, including the American South and Ireland, the resulting ideological reconfiguration typically manifested itself both in the landowners' family lives and on their estates.

1 It should be noted that the interpretation of paternalism as a progressive/modern ideology is very much contested, especially among historians of the American South. For an overview of this debate, see Mark Smith, *Debating Slavery: Economy and Society in the Antebellum American South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 15-30.

2 See Enrico Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites: American Slaveholders and Southern Italian Landowners, 1815-1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 98-179; Marta Petrusiewicz, "Ex-Centric Europe: Visions and Practices of Harmonious Modernization in the 19th-Century European Peripheries (Ireland, Norway, Poland and Two Sicilies)," in Luca Giuliani and Dieter Grimm (eds.), *Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin Jahrbuch 2006/07* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008), 278-293; Justin Roberts, *Slavery and the Enlightenment in the British Atlantic, 1750-1807* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Before the nineteenth century, most American planters' and Irish landlords' world-views were characterised by patriarchalism. This ideology typically conceptualised society as a vertical hierarchy and emphasised the need for supposedly inferior individuals and groups—including women, children, and working classes—to show deference and obedience to their 'superiors'—usually male heads of households and property owners. Accordingly, relations between patriarchal American slaveholders and patriarchal Irish landowners and their families were generally formal and detached, while their relationships with their labourers tended to be authoritarian.³ By the middle of the nineteenth century, however, despite the fact that vestiges of patriarchalism survived in the U.S. South and Ireland, paternalistic ideologies had become commonplace among the two regions' elites. Most scholars agree that the idea of reciprocity, which advocates for the recognition of the existence of rights and duties between dominant and subordinate groups, was the defining characteristic of paternalism in any historical context. Consequently, the transition to paternalistic ideology affected American planters' and Irish landlords' relationships with their families and with their labourers, which were typically characterised by an emphasis on mutual responsibilities and obligations in both cases.⁴

Paternalism became increasingly prevalent among the agrarian elites in the American South and Ireland between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries for a variety of reasons. On one hand, its emergence was prompted by internal developments that were peculiar to either

3 Philip Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 273-284; Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Mary O'Dowd, *A History of Women in Ireland, 1600-1800* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2005), 252-257; Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace, *Their Fathers' Daughters: Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth and Patriarchal Complicity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). For more on the concept of patriarchalism, see Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

4 Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, 284-296; Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage Books, 1974); Eugene Genovese and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Fatal Self-Deception: Slaveholding Paternalism in the Old South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); K. Theodore Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society in Ireland, 1832-1885* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 131-138; David Roberts, *Paternalism in Early Victorian England* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979); A.P. Thornton, *The Habit of Authority: Paternalism in British History* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1965). For a general discussion of paternalism, Mary Jackman, *The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994). For critical

society. In the American case, the residence of the majority of slaveholders on their plantations and farms led to close contact and frequent interactions between most masters and their slaves. As a consequence, planters generally developed a sense of responsibility for their workers, whom they came to regard as their ‘people’ over the course of the eighteenth century. Additionally, the interest shown by progressive slaveholders in the efficient management of labour—which, as we have seen, became especially marked during the second slavery—motivated many of them to embrace paternalistic ideas and practices as part of a conscious effort to minimise slave discontent and thereby contribute to the profitability of their plantations and farms. The resulting changes in Southern slaveholding ideology, already underway by the late 1700s, were accelerated by two important developments during the first half of the nineteenth century. First, the close of the Atlantic slave trade in 1808 accentuated American planters’ concern for their slaves’ welfare, since they had a greater interest in ensuring their bondspeople’s health and natural reproduction once the option of replenishing their workforces with African captives was no longer available to them. Second, the growing criticism of slavery in the U.S. North encouraged planters to continue to develop a paternalistic interpretation of the master-slave relationship as part of their effort to argue that the South’s ‘peculiar institution’ was moral and humane.⁵

In Ireland, a different permutation of factors led to a comparable shift from patriarchal to paternalistic world-views among the landed elites between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. There, the widespread tendency for the landowners to live on at least one of their estates generated local attachments and loyalties for the majority of them. Although Irish landlords rarely knew all of their tenants personally, their general residence was still an

views of the idea that U.S. Southern planters and Irish landlords were paternalistic classes, see Michael Tadman, “The Persistent Myth of Paternalism: Historians and the Nature of Master-Slave Relations in the American South,” *Sage Race Relations* 23 (1998), 7-23; Ciarán Ó’Murchada, *The Great Famine: Ireland’s Agony, 1845-52* (London: Continuum, 2011), 11-12.

5 See Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 3-112; Lacy K. Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 143-172; William Freehling, *The Road to Disunion, Vol. 1: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 59-76; Peter Kolchin, *American Slavery, 1619-1877* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2003 [1993]), 111-132.

important factor in fostering a sense of responsibility for the peasant classes that resided on their land. As with planters in the American South, these social developments were reinforced by economic considerations, since the desire for the efficient management of landed estates, which became increasingly common in Ireland during the second landlordism, encouraged the country's agrarian elites to embrace paternalism with a view toward limiting social conflict with their tenants and thereby increasing their profits. Finally, Irish landlords were also targets for criticism during the nineteenth century; as happened with slaveholders in the U.S. South, if not to the same extent, this criticism gave rise to an ideological defence on the part of Ireland's landed class at the heart of which was the paternalistic idea that they assumed a duty of care for their workers.⁶

On the other hand, the spread of paternalism among the agrarian elites in the American South and Ireland between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was also fuelled by a number of transnational influences that affected the two societies in comparable ways. Throughout the Americas and Europe there was a growth in concern for humanitarianism in the aftermath of the Enlightenment, which influenced both American slaveholders' and Irish landlords' views and treatment of their labourers. At the same time, prevailing ideas about family relations and gender also underwent changes that were related to the rise of paternalistic ideology; by the Victorian era, the concept of the 'affective family' had become common throughout the western world, and this led to a general softening of relationships between male landowners and their wives and children. Finally, as a number of historians have recently shown, the radicalism that characterised the Age of Revolutions (c. 1770-1820) had transnational implications, since the outbreak of a rebellion in one country often inspired social and political unrest in others. In turn, motivated by the fear of revolution, agrarian elites

6 Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society*, 131-138; Tom Dunn, "'A Gentleman's Estate Should Be a Moral School': Edgeworthstown in Fact and Fiction, 1760-1840," in Raymond Gillespie and Gerard Moran (eds.), *Longford: Essays in County History* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1991), 95-121; Conor McNamara, "'The Monster Misery of Ireland': Landlord Paternalism and the 1822 Famine in the West," in Laurence Geary and Oonagh Walsh (eds.), *Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015), 82-96.

on both sides of the Atlantic recognised the need to redefine and defend their privileges; as part of their efforts to do so, they often adopted paternalism and adapted its characteristic rhetoric of reciprocal rights and duties to the particular requirements of their local contexts.⁷

Thus, as a consequence of both local circumstances and transnational influences, two different versions of paternalism became commonplace among slaveholders in the antebellum U.S. South and landlords in nineteenth-century Ireland—versions that can be seen in the cases of Mississippi’s John A. Quitman and Galway’s Lord Clonbrock. Just as these individuals are emblematic of the economic behaviour of progressive American planters and Irish landlords during the second slavery and the second landlordism, so too are they representative of the related ideological reconfigurations of the two landed elites that were also underway during the nineteenth century. Although Quitman and Clonbrock came from very different backgrounds and lived in very different contexts, they nevertheless shared certain assumptions that proceeded from the logic of living among and profiting from exploited and potentially rebellious underclasses, as well as from the need to defend themselves from criticism. Quitman and Clonbrock responded to these comparable stimuli by developing paternalistic attitudes, claiming, in both cases, that they were more akin to benevolent fathers—fathers who cared for and protected their families and their labourers—than to the cruel tyrants that many of their contemporaries claimed their classes were.⁸

To be clear, a distinction should be made between paternalistic ideology and its practical manifestation in any historical context. In general, as a number of scholars have pointed out, paternalism was used by elites to mask the systems of exploitation from which

7 On these subjects, see Lynn Hunt, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007); Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (New York: Penguin, 1977); David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “Introduction: The Age of Revolutions, c. 1760-1840: Global Causation, Connection, and Comparison,” in David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam (eds.), *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760-1840* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), xii-xxxii; C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 86-169.

8 See Robert May, *John A. Quitman: Old South Crusader* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 130-146; Kevin McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual: Paternalism on the Clonbrock Estates, 1826-1908,” (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011).

they profited.⁹ This was certainly true of planters in the antebellum U.S. South and landlords in nineteenth-century Ireland, who often idealised themselves and their relationships with their ‘dependents’ in paternalistic terms, but rarely, if ever, met the high standards of behaviour that they insisted characterised the majority of their respective classes. Indeed, to different degrees, it was common for members of the two elites to pay lip-service to paternalism without substantiating their words with their actions. Thus, for those American slaveholders and Irish landlords who considered themselves paternalists, the ideology was as much a way of viewing themselves and their worlds as it was a way of behaving. With this distinction in mind, this chapter compares the ways in which John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock saw themselves, their families, and their workers, while the related question of how their world-views corresponded to the reality of labour relations on their estates is the subject of the next chapter. Since U.S. Southern slaveholders’ and Irish landlords’ ideologies typically manifested themselves within their homes and on their estates—two contexts in which they had power over ‘subordinates’—the substance of Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s paternalistic world-views can be discerned from an analysis of their relationships with both their families and their labourers.

Paternalism and Family in Monmouth, Mississippi and in Clonbrock House, Ireland

During the nineteenth century, as a consequence of the transitions from patriarchal to paternalistic ideologies that were then occurring among the U.S. South’s and Ireland’s agrarian elites, family life in the two regions’ Big Houses underwent profound changes. In both contexts, the landowners—who were heads of their households—increasingly sought to foster reciprocal relationships with their wives and children by arguing that respect for mutual

⁹ Jackman, *Paternalism*, 11-15; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 3-7; Freehling, *Road to Disunion*, I, 59-76; Shearer Davis Bowman, *Masters and Lords: Mid-Nineteenth-Century U.S. Planters and Prussian Junkers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 162-183; Howard Newby, “Paternalism and Capitalism,” in Richard Scase (ed.), *Industrial Society: Class, Cleavage, and Control* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1977), 59-73.

duties and responsibilities should characterise their interactions. As a result, paternalistic American planters' and Irish landlords' family relations were usually intimate, while their correspondences with their wives and children generally stressed themes of love and trust. And yet, in both cases, social convention continued to emphasise the importance of the maintenance of traditional gender roles, based on the concept known to historians as 'separate spheres.' According to this idea, which rose to prominence among upper and middle classes throughout the Euro-American world during the eighteenth century and formed a central element of Victorian culture, women were expected to confine themselves to the home, or private sphere, where they could find fulfilment as dutiful wives and mothers, while men were trained from a young age for life in the public arena. Mutually subject to the influence of this Victorian gender convention, most of the American slaveholders and Irish landlords who adopted paternalistic attitudes maintained these assumptions, even as family relations in their households were redefined in more reciprocal and sentimental terms during the 1800s.¹⁰

The comparable effects of these ideological developments on paternalistic U.S. Southern planters' and Irish landlords' family lives emerges clearly from an examination of John Quitman's and Lord Clonbrock's relationships with their wives and children. Three years after moving to Mississippi, Quitman married an heiress named Eliza Turner and subsequently began a family in Monmouth—the suburban Natchez mansion that he purchased in 1826. Clonbrock married Caroline Spenser, eldest daughter of England's Lord Churchill, in 1830, after which he took up residence at Clonbrock House, in east County Galway, and fathered twelve children. In both of these cases, the head of the household enjoyed

10 See Anne Rose, *Victorian America and the Civil War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 145-192; Peter Bardaglio, *Reconstructing The Household: Families, Sex and the Law in the Nineteenth-Century South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Deborah Wilson, *Women, Marriage, and Property in Wealthy Landed Families in Ireland, 1750-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008); Maeve O'Riordan, "Home, Family and Society: Women of the Irish Landed Class, 1860-1914. A Munster Case Study," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Cork, 2014). On the concept of 'separate spheres,' see Linda Kerber, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Women's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," in Linda Kerber (ed.), *Toward an Intellectual History of Women: Essays* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 159-199; R.B. Shoemaker, *Gender in English Society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (London: Longman, 1998).

sentimental and affectionate relationships with their families. However, Quitman and Clonbrock were also members of classes who valued the maintenance of strict gender roles; as a result, they always endeavoured to keep control over their wives and children. To do so, Quitman and Clonbrock both emphasised the idea—characteristic of paternalism—that reciprocal duties and mutual affection existed between themselves and their families; in turn, they expected their wives and children to respect their wishes and comply with their requests.

John Quitman's correspondence with his wife provides abundant evidence that he embraced the paternalistic ethos which was widespread among antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders. In 1823, after meeting Eliza Turner (1808-59), a young heiress to a Mississippi cotton plantation, Quitman—then making a name for himself in Natchez as a lawyer—began to court her intently. He visited her home at Woodlands plantation on numerous occasions, and the two exchanged letters in which they repeatedly professed their love for each other. In September 1824, for example, Quitman received a note from Eliza that he praised for containing “the language of unaltered love. It was the language of my own feelings, and sank deeply into my heart.” After receiving permission to wed from Eliza's mother, Quitman informed his fiancé that “soon the tenderest of ties will bind us together forever, yes *forever*; for when that tie is broken, I shall cease to exist.” The two were married on Christmas eve, 1824.¹¹

While it could be alleged that Quitman sought out an heiress for strategic reasons—in order to marry into the ‘nabob’ planter class that dominated antebellum Natchez society—he himself would have denied that he was motivated by such mercenary instincts. In fact, he had earlier written to his brother that “money and splendor will never bias my choice [of wife],

11 John Quitman to Eliza Turner, 20 September 1824, QFP. For more of Quitman's pre-marital professions of his love for Eliza, see John Quitman to Eliza Turner, 17 November 1824, 26 November 1824, QFP; Catherine Clinton, *The Plantation Mistress: Woman's World in the Old South* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 67. On antebellum Southern courtship practices, see Steven Stowe, *Intimacy and Power in the Old South: Ritual in the Lives of the Planters* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 50-121; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 199-225.

and, until my heart is thoroughly touched, I shall prefer the solitary yet snug elbow chair of a bachelor.”¹² Indeed, so confident was Quitman of his prospects as a lawyer that he was content to sign a prenuptial agreement that protected Eliza’s interests in advance of their wedding. Thus, it appears that Quitman—demonstrating the reciprocal view of matrimony that was related to the spread of paternalistic ideology—married for love and not economic gain.¹³

Yet, even though Quitman once told Eliza that “I can live for a while, but not long, away from my dear wife,” these proved empty words.¹⁴ Despite idealising his home as “the heart’s only paradise,” Quitman was often absent from Monmouth. A highly ambitious man who was hungry for fame and high political office, he pursued a public career as a judge, a politician, a volunteer soldier in the Texan Revolution (1835-36), and a General in the Mexican-American War (1846-48). These commitments, combined with the necessity of visiting his plantations and attending to his other business interests, meant that Quitman was frequently away from home for extended periods. This, in turn, placed an immense strain on his marriage.¹⁵

During Quitman’s absences, Eliza was left in charge of Monmouth, and was also required to keep an eye on the running of Springfield plantation. As many of her letters attest, this was a role that she disliked immensely. Consequently, Eliza frequently pleaded with her husband to spend more time at home.¹⁶ Quitman continued to assure his wife of his love for

12 John Quitman to his brother, 11 March 1823, in J.F.H. Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Major-General, U.S.A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1860), I, 78. On the nabobs, see Morton Rothstein, “The Natchez Nabobs: Kinship and Friendship in an Economic Elite,” in Hans Trefousse (ed.), *Toward a New View of America: Essays in Honor of Arthur C. Cole* (New York: Ayer Publishing, 1977), 97-111.

13 Indenture-Marriage Contract Between John A. Quitman, Eliza Turner, Sarah Turner, Edward Turner, and William Griffith, 20 December 1824, MSS 38-343 (5), John Anthony Quitman Papers, Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; May, *John A. Quitman*, 25-26. For more on the nabobs’ use of prenuptial contracts, see Joyce Broussard, “Naked Before the Law: Married Women and the Servant Ideal in Antebellum Natchez,” in Martha Swain, Elizabeth Payne, and Marjorie Spruill (eds.), *Mississippi Women: Their Lives, Their Histories* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010), II, 57-76.

14 John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 7 January 1828, QFP.

15 John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 12 October 1832, QFP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 72-75, 109-111.

16 See Eliza Quitman to John Quitman, 12 July 1834, 5 December 1835, QFP. For more on slaveholders’ wives who were required to manage plantation affairs, see Clinton, *Plantation Mistress*, 16-35; Marli Weiner,

her, but he proved unwilling to suspend his public pursuits for any extended period of time in compliance with her requests. Instead, he urged her to support his political career and thus, he argued, “instead of repining at my absence you will feel an interest in the character and reputation of your husband which will gain you happiness instead of sorrow.” Implicit here was Quitman’s belief that his duty was to provide for his family and pursue fame and honour on their behalf, whereas his wife’s duty was to support his ambitions in return. In other words, Quitman used the paternalistic idea of the need to respect reciprocal obligations as part of a conscious attempt to manipulate Eliza into accepting the gender role that Southern society expected her to play: that of a dutiful wife and a devoted mother.¹⁷

Significantly, despite the fact that Eliza Quitman was consistently unhappy in her allotted role, it appears that she always endeavoured to do her duty out of a sense of obligation to her husband. In 1836, during one of Quitman’s many absences from Monmouth, Eliza wrote to him about her “domestic troubles,” but she also explained that she had tried not to bother him with the information earlier because she wished to avoid distracting him from his political endeavours. Evidently, Eliza tried to put her husband’s needs before her own, even though this often caused her great mental anguish. Another notable example of this dynamic comes from the second half of the 1840s, when Quitman volunteered for a position of command in the U.S. army after the outbreak of the Mexican-American War. Eliza, then in grief as a consequence of the recent death of one of their children, pleaded with her husband

Mistresses and Slaves: Plantation Women in South Carolina, 1830-80 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 23-50; Charles Joyner, “Elizabeth Allston Pringle: A Woman Rice Planter,” in Marjorie Spruill, Valinda Littlefield, and Joan Johnson (eds.), *South Carolina Women: Their Lives and Times* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009), 184-213.

17 John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 3 December 1835, QFP. Also see John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 26 January 1828, 9 December 1835, 20 December 1840, 21 September 1850, QFP; Robert May, “Southern Elite Women, Sectional Extremism, and the Male Political Sphere: The Case of John A. Quitman’s Wife and Female Descendants, 1847-1931,” *Journal of Mississippi History* 50 (1988), 251-285. For more on gender conventions in the antebellum South, see Anya Jabour, *Scarlett’s Sisters: Young Women in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 181-238; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 192-241; Weiner, *Mistresses and Slaves*, 53-71; Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 226-253; William Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House: Elite Slaveholders of the Mid-Nineteenth-Century South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 91-121.

not to leave her, but to no avail. And yet, even though she initially resented his enlistment and subsequent two-year absence from home, Eliza wrote Quitman during the war to tell him that “you did right in going into the army ... my dear husband I have long since forgiven you, and am resigned to my fate.” In this case, as in numerous others like it, Eliza ultimately gave her consent to her husband’s selfish behaviour—consent that Quitman elicited through use of the rhetoric of reciprocal rights and duties. Thus, notwithstanding her frequent complaints, Eliza Quitman can be said to have internalised the paternalistic ideology that was prioritised by her husband.¹⁸

Quitman’s paternalistic ideology also affected his relationships with his children. Typical of planters throughout the antebellum South, he took particular interest in the conduct and education of his eldest son, F. Henry Quitman (1830-84). “I look to you, my dear boy, as the representative I shall leave behind me in this world, both of my character and my name,” Quitman told Henry when the latter was twelve years old, “and you may imagine with what interest I regard you, that your character may be unsullied with a stain, that you may be true, honourable, and virtuous, [and] that you may be faithful and dutiful to your father and mother.” As Henry was Quitman’s only son who survived past childhood, his behaviour affected his father’s reputation, which was especially important to Quitman because the progress of his political career depended upon it. As a result, Quitman frequently reminded Henry of his responsibility to bring honour to his family; he usually did so with an affectionate tone, however, since—as befitted his paternalistic attitude—Quitman generally sought to persuade Henry to fulfil his filial duties out of a sense of reciprocal obligation and mutual respect, rather than demand that he do so.¹⁹

18 Eliza Quitman to John Quitman, 21 February 1836, 19 February 1847, QFP. Also see Joan Cashin, “Introduction: Culture of Resignation,” in Joan Cashin (ed.), *Our Common Affairs: Texts from Women in the Old South* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 1-42.

19 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 19 July 1843, FHQP. For more on planters’ relationships with their sons, see Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 149-198; Lorri Glover, *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007); Jane Turner Censer, *North Carolina Planters and their Children, 1800-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1984).

In his youth, Henry did his best to meet the high standards set for him by his father, despite proclivities for laziness and hot-hotheadedness hinted at by his sister.²⁰ “I have great confidence in your intellect and good sense, but not so much in your habits,” Quitman told his son in 1847, while imploring him to “conquer” his aversion to hard work and his temper with a view toward becoming a distinguished member of the Southern gentry in his adulthood.²¹ Despite claiming on one occasion that he disliked “letter-moralizing,” Quitman consistently attempted to influence his son’s behaviour through their correspondence during the latter’s youth and adolescence, especially after Henry was sent to study at Princeton University in 1849. In this respect, Quitman was typical of paternalistic Southern planters, who, Stephen Stowe has noted, routinely used their letters to their sons to impart advice and define standards of behaviour.²²

Freed from his father’s direct influence while at Princeton, however, Henry Quitman sometimes sought independence in ways that challenged the paternalistic ideal. When touring the U.S. North during the summer of 1849, for example, he deviated from the itinerary set out for him by his father and went months without contacting home. This disappointed Quitman, who responded to Henry’s disobedience by explaining that it was necessary for father and son to be in frequent contact so that he could impart “the benefit of my experience and observation.” He also endeavoured to persuade Henry to accept this arrangement by arguing that “while I must frankly point out errors in your conduct, you will ever find me an indulgent father.”²³ Henry initially responded to this criticism with what Quitman interpreted as “chilly pride that does not become a son in waiting to his father.” In response, Quitman told Henry that “all I desire of you is to become sensible of your faults.” Henry eventually accepted his

20 See Louisa Quitman to John Quitman, February 1847, QFP.

21 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 2 March 1847, FHQP.

22 John Quitman to his brother, 10 June 1821, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 64; John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 2 July 1849, FHQP; Steven Stowe, “Rhetoric of Authority: The Making of Social Values in Planter Family Correspondence,” *Journal of Family History* 73 (1987), 916-933. Also see Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 134-137; Censer, *North Carolina Planters*, 48-54.

23 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 7 September 1849, FHQP.

father's critique, saying that he was "heartily ashamed" of his behaviour, and promised to be a source of pride to his father in the future.²⁴ Doubtless, after receiving this submissive apology, Quitman would have been relieved; his authority remained intact, as did the mutual love and respect that he felt existed between himself and his son—which, under the logic of paternalism, justified that authority. "Whatever you have done amiss, let it be forgotten and forgiven, only remember ever to regard me as your best friend," Quitman told Henry after their reconciliation.²⁵ Once again, in the above exchanges, we can discern Quitman's use of the rhetoric of reciprocity to convince his family to comply with his wishes: he claimed to be his son's friend, but that friendship was ultimately contingent on Henry's good behaviour.

In his adulthood, Henry Quitman tried to be a source of pride to his father, as he promised he would after their disagreement in 1849. After graduating from Princeton, following a practice that was common among the antebellum South's planter elite, he embarked on a 'Grand Tour' of Europe. While visiting Ireland in 1853, Henry met Mary Gardner, who was the daughter of a wealthy Alabama planter. After returning to the United States, he informed his father of his intent to ask for her hand in marriage. Quitman was delighted with the match and gave his blessing. Soon after the resulting wedding, Henry took up residence at Live Oaks—his father's sugar plantation—and assumed responsibility for its management. This also pleased Quitman, who noted his approval of "our worthy son" in a letter that he wrote to Eliza in 1857. Ultimately, however, Henry Quitman never became the great man that his father had envisioned. He played a small role in the American Civil War, after which he sold Live Oaks and moved to Atlanta, Georgia. Henry never entered politics and spent the remainder of his life in relative obscurity, which—considering his father's ambitious nature—surely would have disappointed Quitman had he lived to see it. Therefore, as the case of Henry Quitman shows, while paternalistic Southern slaveholders used the

24 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 20, 24 September 1849, FHQP; F. Henry Quitman to John Quitman, 17 September 1849, QFP.

25 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 11 November 1849, FHQP.

discourse of reciprocity as part of an attempt to mould their sons into future planters and leaders of their society, it was by no means assured that it would work in the manner they intended.²⁶

Similarly to John Quitman in antebellum Mississippi, nineteenth-century Ireland's Lord Clonbrock also sought to develop the reciprocal relations that were characteristic of paternalism with his family. This is evident, first and foremost, in his relationship with his wife. In 1830, Clonbrock married Caroline Spencer (1805-64), daughter of Lord Churchill, of Oxfordshire, England.²⁷ Unfortunately, none of Lord and Lady Clonbrock's correspondence has survived, but enough traces of their relationship remain in the archives to infer that they enjoyed a generally happy marriage. According to the contents of Caroline's diary, she spent most of her days writing letters to her family, visiting friends, and travelling with Clonbrock. During those rare periods when she and her husband were apart from each other, Caroline wrote to and heard from him frequently; when Clonbrock went to England for a horse-racing festival in 1837, for example, she recorded the receipt of seven letters from him in less than a fortnight.²⁸ Although these letters have been lost, it is likely that the language used in them was informal and sentimental; as Clonbrock's granddaughter later remembered, "Caroline's name was shortened to 'Car' by her husband," which suggests that they enjoyed an affectionate relationship.²⁹ Indeed, according to A.P.W. Malcomson, such 'marriages of

26 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 17 March 1854, FHQP; John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 6 January 1857, QFP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 276-277; May, "Southern Elite Women," 276-277; Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House*, 40. For more on antebellum Southern planters' European tours, see Michael O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), I, 90-161; Daniel Kilbride, *Being American in Europe, 1750-1861* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013). On Southern planters' relationships with their adult sons, see Censer, *North Carolina Planters*, 96-118; Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor*, 175-198.

27 See Patrick Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society in Galway* (Dublin: De Búrca, 2012), 171. For more on courtship practices among Irish landed families, see A.P.W. Malcomson, *The Pursuit of the Heiress: Aristocratic Marriage in Ireland, 1740-1840* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 2006 [1982]).

28 Diary of Lady Caroline Dillon, 1836-1837, Ms 35,798 (2), CP.

29 Edith Dillon-Mahon, "The Dillons of Clonbrock," (Unpublished Manuscript, National Library of Ireland, Dublin, 1957), 48. Clonbrock also wrote about Caroline in affectionate terms in his letters to his son. See, for example, Lord Clonbrock to Luke Gerald Dillon, 9 July 1861, Ms 35,761 (2), CP.

affection' were common among the Irish landed class by the nineteenth century.³⁰ As in the case of John Quitman, therefore, Clonbrock's paternalistic ideology was reflected in the intimate manner in which he interacted with his wife.

Still, the embrace of paternalistic attitudes by Irish landlords such as Clonbrock did not cause them to recognise women as their equals. Mirroring the Victorian social convention prevalent in the antebellum U.S. South, female members of Irish landed families were expected to confine themselves to the domestic sphere and to function as dutiful wives, mothers, and daughters. Caroline Dillon seems to have conformed to these expectations. During the 1830s and 1840s she bore twelve children for Clonbrock, ten of whom survived past infancy. In 1855, Caroline received public commendations from her husband for her exemplary conduct as a mother. Speaking at his eldest child's coming-of-age celebration, Clonbrock declared that his son "had the unspeakable advantage of being blessed with a good mother, who, fully alive to the duties and responsibilities devolving upon him in life, had laboured successfully to impress upon his heart those early lessons, which it was alone a mother's province to impart." In making this remark, Clonbrock revealed his acceptance of the paternalistic idea—widely held by his class just as it was by antebellum American planters—that the duty of an elite woman was to support the perpetuation of the male-dominated social order and its values in return for the care and protection provided by fathers and husbands.³¹

At the same event, Caroline Dillon was also similarly toasted by Lord Clancarty, a neighbouring landlord and family friend; "coming from England she has made Ireland her home, and has employed herself in implanting those virtuous principles in her children by

30 Malcomson, *Pursuit of the Heiress*, 112-142. Also see Maria Luddy, *Women in Ireland, 1800-1918: A Documentary History* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1995), 30-31; Sean Connolly, "Family, Love and Marriage: Some Evidence from the Early Eighteenth Century," in Margaret MacCurtain and Mary O'Dowd (eds.), *Women in Early Modern Ireland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991), 276-290.

31 *Tuam Herald*, 16 June 1855. For more on gender conventions in nineteenth-century Ireland, see Luddy, *Women in Ireland*, 12-18; Roger Sawyer, *We Are But Women: Women in Ireland's History* (London: Routledge, 2002 [1993]), 22-46; Deidre Raftery and Susan Parkes, *Female Education in Ireland, 1700-1900: Minerva or Madonna* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2007); Judith Lewis, *In the Family Way: Childbearing in the British Aristocracy, 1760-1860* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1986).

which they shall ever be guided,” he said of Lady Clonbrock. Here, once again, Caroline’s function as a mother was publicly emphasised. Significantly, Clonbrock, rather than Caroline, thanked Clancarty for this compliment; talking on behalf of his wife—who was apparently either not expected or allowed to speak in public—Clonbrock stated his belief that “for many years she [Caroline] had endeavoured to conciliate the esteem and win the regard of all around her, and she accepted that demonstration today as proof that she had not been wanting in her duty and that her efforts had not been unrewarded.” That Clonbrock was the person who spoke for Caroline about her acceptance of her ‘duty’ is a telling indication of the persistence of imbalanced power dynamics within elite marital relationships in nineteenth-century Ireland. Even in landed families where the head of the household acted in a paternalistic manner—as Clonbrock did—women effectively remained subordinate to their fathers and husbands.³²

As among American planters such as Quitman, Irish landlords’ adoption of attitudes and behaviours related to the paternalistic ethos was partially intended to solicit female consent to their subordination. In this respect, it appears to have been successful in the case of Caroline Dillon; after her death in December 1864, one obituary that appeared in a leading Irish newspaper remarked that she was the “glory” of Clonbrock’s home and an “ornament” of high society.³³ Indeed, expected to appear passive, at least in public—much like Eliza Quitman in Mississippi—Caroline functioned largely as an ornament throughout her life.³⁴ Although Clonbrock seems to have been a loving and affectionate husband, he nevertheless held these expectations of his spouse, as he revealed when, after attending a fashionable party

32 *Tuam Herald*, 16 June 1855. Also see Stella Tillyard, *Aristocrats: Caroline, Emily, Louisa and Sarah Lennox, 1750-1832* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1994); Wilson, *Women, Marriage, and Property*, 7-14; Kowaleski-Wallace, *Their Fathers’ Daughters*, 109-137; Maria Luddy, “Women and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” in Maryann Valiulus and Mary O’Dowd (eds.), *Women and Irish History: Essays in Honour of Margaret MacCurtain* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1997), 89-108.

33 *Freeman’s Journal*, 24 December 1864.

34 This does not mean that Caroline was passive in private. As Maeve O’Riordain has argued, female members of Irish landed families generally played an important role in household management during the Victorian period. See Maeve O’Riordain, “Assuming Control: Elite Women as Household Managers in Late Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” in Ciaran O’Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), 83-98. Also see Dillon-Mahon, “Dillons of Clonbrock,” 48.

in Dublin in 1858, he complained to his son that “mama and the girls not liking to be enclosed did not go to the drawing room, which I am sorry for as all the world and his wife were there.” Apparently, Clonbrock felt that this was a missed opportunity for Caroline and his daughters to reflect credit upon him in public—which was one of their functions according to prevailing conceptions of proper gender roles as they were understood by most Irish landlords during the Victorian era.³⁵ In general, however, Caroline Dillon seems to have conformed to her gender role and internalised the paternalistic ethos; as her obituary noted, “the much esteemed and amiable Lady Clonbrock ... was distinguished for the exemplary manner in which she discharged all the duties of a wife and mother.”³⁶

Clonbrock’s belief in the desirability of reciprocal family relations also manifested itself in his interactions with his children. This is particularly clear in the case of Luke Gerald Dillon (1834-1917), who—as the eldest son in a landed family that followed the practice of primogeniture—was the sole heir to the Clonbrock title and estates. Since Luke Gerald was therefore an ambassador for his father and family in public, Clonbrock placed a high premium on his conduct and education, just as planters did with their sons in the U.S. South. In 1846, Clonbrock sent Luke Gerald to Eton—the prestigious English public school that was also his own *alma mater*—to begin his formal studies. Thereafter, Clonbrock received consistently positive reports about his eldest child’s academic progress and character; one teacher informed Clonbrock that “I am perfectly satisfied with his [Luke Gerald’s] general conduct and find him all I can wish in my house, both in behaviour and in disposition.” On another occasion, the same teacher remarked that “I trust that he will pass through Eton with profit to himself and to your satisfaction in every way.” Since the conduct and performance of Irish landowners’ sons at such prestigious schools reflected on their fathers, Luke Gerald evidently

35 Lord Clonbrock to Luke Gerald Dillon, 22 March 1858, Ms 35,761 (2), CP. Also see O’Riordan, “Home, Family and Society”; O’Dowd, *History of Women in Ireland*, 257-262; Jessica Gerard, *Country House Life: Family and Servants, 1815-1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 90-141; Kathryn Gleadle, *British Women in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 79-91.

36 *Freeman’s Journal*, 24 December 1864.

brought honour to Clonbrock from an early age.³⁷

After matriculating from Eton, Luke Gerald Dillon, still following in his father's footsteps, went on to study at Oxford University. After he graduated, Clonbrock informed Luke Gerald of his approval, saying that he was "much pacified" by a letter he received in which "one of your examiners spoke very highly of your examination which was very successful. So much so that they had thought it possible of making some special report in your favour." Revealingly, Clonbrock also wrote that this was "a reward for the trouble of your graduation and an inducement to further efforts," and hoped that it would motivate Luke Gerald to excel in life with the backing of his "affectionate father." These exchanges demonstrate that, as in the case of John and Henry Quitman, Clonbrock's relationship with his son was informal and affectionate, but he also expected Luke Gerald to act in a manner that earned his respect, according to the standard of reciprocity that characterised paternalistic family relationships in nineteenth-century Ireland.³⁸

Significantly, we know that Luke Gerald Dillon consciously endeavoured to reciprocate his father's advice and encouragement with affection and loyalty. After receiving a tender letter from Clonbrock on his twenty-first birthday, he replied as follows:

My dearest papa ... I wish that I could feel that I was more truly deserving of all your kind words and that I could look back to having given you some better return for all the kindness I have received from you, in a better and more usefully spent life. I hope that I shall do so hereafter, and never do anything unworthy of you or

37 E.H. Pickering to Lord Clonbrock, 22 November 1846, 26 July 1847, Ms 35,758 (4), CP. For more positive reviews of Luke Gerald's character and conduct during his time at Eton, see E.H. Pickering to Lord Clonbrock, 9 December 1847, 31 July 1848, 29 July 1849, 25 October 1851, Ms 35,758 (4), CP. On the education of Irish landlords and their sons, see Terence Dooley, *The Decline of the Big House in Ireland: A Study of Irish Landed Families, 1860-1960* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 2001), 70-74; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 198-199; Ciaran O'Neill, *Catholics of Consequence: Transnational Education, Social Mobility and the Irish Catholic Elite, 1850-1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

38 Lord Clonbrock to Luke Gerald Dillon, 29 July 1856, Ms 35,761 (1), CP. Also see Gerard, *Country House Life*, 65-89, Lewis, *In the Family Way*.

which may serve to lose your good opinion.³⁹

Clearly, Luke Gerald accepted the idea that it was his duty to repay his father's kindness with respect and by improving his family's reputation. Thus, it would be fair to say that he internalised the paternalistic ethos that was privileged by Clonbrock.

In the end, unlike Henry Quitman, Luke Gerald Dillon did meet his father's high expectations. After finishing his studies at Oxford he qualified for a diplomatic job at the British consulate in Berlin; after proving himself there, he was promoted to the post of second secretary in Vienna and was later assigned to the Hague.⁴⁰ In the process, the future fourth baron Clonbrock brought the Dillon family to previously unknown levels of notoriety and influence. He even came to the attention of George Villiers, fourth Earl of Clarendon, the famous English statesman best known for his roles as Ireland's Lord Lieutenant during the Great Famine and Britain's Secretary of State during the Crimean War. After hearing of Luke Gerald's qualification as a diplomat in 1855, Clarendon informed the Marquess of Clanricarde that "I am very glad that the profession [the British diplomatic service] ... is to have so good a member as Clonbrock's son appears to be. I hear all of his contemporaries speak of him in the highest terms which is always a good sign." Clanricarde forwarded this letter to Clonbrock, which surely pleased the latter and served to prove his earlier claim that his eldest son's conduct was "good and exemplary."⁴¹

In 1863, after serving with distinction in three European consulates, Luke Gerald returned home to Galway, where, as his father aged, he played an increasingly forward role in the running of the estates that he would later inherit. In 1865, he became High Sheriff of County Galway. The following year, Luke Gerald married Augusta Crofton, who was the

39 Luke Gerald Dillon to Lord Clonbrock, 18 March 1855, Ms 35, 758 (4), CP.

40 Certificates of Qualification and Appointment to the British Delegation at Berlin, Vienna and the Hague, Ms 35,760 (4), CP; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 193.

41 Lord Clarendon to Lord Clanricarde, 29 November 1855, Ms 35,758 (4), CP; *Tuam Herald*, 16 June 1855.

daughter of a neighbouring landlord and family friend. Since Augusta was of the same social rank as his son, it was a match that pleased Clonbrock and one to which he gave his blessing.⁴² Thus, by consistently acting in the manner expected of him by his father and his class, Luke Gerald appears to have been a model son and landlord-in-training. Throughout his life, providing a virtual archetype of the reciprocity that was characteristic of paternalism, he fulfilled the various duties expected of him as heir to the Clonbrock title and estates in return for his father's kindness, care, and affection.

In both Monmouth and Clonbrock House, then, we can see that the male head of household's adoption of paternalistic ideologies had comparable effects on family life. The idea of reciprocity conditioned Quitman's and Clonbrock's relationships with their wives and children, since the two men maintained that they fulfilled a moral obligation to provide love and protection for their family members and believed that they deserved love and compliance in return. These ideas heavily influenced their marital relationships, which were generally sentimental and affectionate in both cases. However, in neither case did paternalism serve to undermine established gender roles. While relationships between landowners and their wives were usually intimate among U.S. Southern and Irish landed families in which the head of the household privileged the paternalistic ethos, elite women, including Eliza Quitman and Caroline Dillon, were still confined to narrowly defined roles as wives and mothers and denied equality. In fact, paternalism arguably strengthened Quitman's and Clonbrock's control over their wives by soliciting Eliza's and Caroline's acceptance of their unequal place in society, and by redefining their subordination in positive terms.

Still, Quitman evidently experienced more trouble in convincing his wife to accept her subordinate role than Clonbrock did. Unlike Eliza Quitman, Caroline Dillon seems to have

⁴² See Lord Crofton to Lord Clonbrock, 16 May 1866, Ms 35,761 (2), CP; Dooley, *Decline of the Big House in Ireland*, 56.

been happy at home amidst her family during those periods when her husband was absent. This was partially because Caroline appears to have been a social person who enjoyed hospitality, while Eliza's correspondence shows that she found it difficult to make friends and suffered from bouts of depression.⁴³ Aside from personality, however, there were other reasons for the contrasts between Eliza's and Caroline's experiences that are revealed by a comparison between their marital relationships. Importantly, the behaviour of their husbands was quite different: Clonbrock generally only left home for short periods, whereas Quitman was frequently absent from Monmouth at length and even volunteered for dangerous military expeditions that caused Eliza concern of a sort that Caroline never had to contend with. In this respect, Quitman and Clonbrock were representative of their respective classes in their specific historical contexts. The fact that the United States was a democratic country with an expanding frontier encouraged men of ambition, as Quitman unquestionably was, to vigorously seek their personal advancement. Clonbrock was much less ambitious than Quitman, probably because he was born onto a high rung of nineteenth-century Ireland's social ladder and therefore did not exhibit the same impulse to pursue upward mobility. In turn, these factors impacted on Quitman's and Clonbrock's marriages and their wives' lives. Considerable demands were placed on Eliza in terms of running Monmouth and managing Springfield plantation during her husband's many absences from home, whereas Caroline was not required to concern herself with business matters to anywhere near the same extent.⁴⁴ This contrast between the two cases suggests that, while American planters and Irish landlords may have shared broadly similar idealised conceptions of femininity—whereby their wives and daughters were expected to live lives of genteel elegance—that ideal was closer to reality in nineteenth-century Ireland than it was in the antebellum U.S. South.⁴⁵

43 See Caroline Dillon Diary, 1836-1837, Ms 35,798 (2), CP; Dillon-Mahon, "Dillons of Clonbrock," 49-50; John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 18 February 1836, QFP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 73-74.

44 Although Maeve O'Riordain has emphasised the importance of elite Irish women in household management, they were generally not required to concern themselves with estate management during the nineteenth century, as the wives of American planters often were. See O'Riordain, "Assuming Control," 83-98.

45 See Clinton, *Plantation Mistress*, 16-35; Sally McMillen, *Southern Women: Black and White in the Old*

There were also many striking similarities and differences between Quitman's and Clonbrock's relationships with their sons, which shed further light on their paternalistic ideologies. Henry Quitman and Luke Gerald Dillon were both raised with the expectation that they would succeed their fathers as landed proprietors and in politics. With this in mind, they were both provided with expensive educations in prestigious institutions, the former at Princeton and the latter at Eton and Oxford. As their surviving letters reveal, Quitman and Clonbrock enjoyed generally informal and friendly relationships with their sons. Nevertheless, in both cases, they also expected that Henry and Luke Gerald would follow their advice and conform to the standards of behaviour set for them.

Yet, as was the case with their wives, Quitman had more trouble in making his son conform to his standards than Clonbrock did. The picture of Henry Quitman that emerges from the archives is one of a relatively more stubborn and wilful individual than Luke Gerald Dillon appears to have been. Henry sometimes disobeyed Quitman—as during his 1849 tour of the U.S. North when, contrary to his father's explicit directions, he went months without contacting home—and he did not show the same level of dedication to his studies or career as Luke Gerald did. Still, even though only Luke Gerald Dillon can be said to have fulfilled his father's expectations, the very fact that both he and Henry Quitman *tried* to please their fathers, and did so out of a mutual sense of duty to reciprocate their father's care for them with respect and loyalty, is important. This shows that the father/son relationship was based on respect for reciprocal duties and obligations in both cases. Altogether, then, even though Quitman's and Clonbrock's relationships with their wives and children were different in many respects, it is notable that they—along with significant numbers of their respective classes—used similar ideas of paternalistic reciprocity to attain their family's consent to a social order that placed them at the head of their households.

South (Arlington Heights: Harland Davidson, 1992), 107-110; Tillyard, *Aristocrats*; Johanna Cunningham, "An Idle and Deeply Fashionable Life? A Catholic Gentry Family and their World, 1820-1923," (M.A. thesis, National University of Ireland, Galway, 2008).

Paternalism and Labourers according to Quitman and Clonbrock

Antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders and their Irish landed contemporaries were not only heads of their households, they were also heads of their respective social systems. If the two elites felt the need to defend the unequal power dynamics that existed within their homes and to control their families, then it was even more important for them to justify the inequalities that characterised their estates and to control their labourers. For this reason, paternalistic planters and landlords projected the idea of reciprocity outward from their Big Houses and into society. Duties and rights bound them not only to their wives and children, these elites maintained, but also to their workers—whether they were slaves in the U.S. South or free but landless tenants and labourers in Ireland—whom they perceived as part of their wider communities of dependants. By adopting these ideas and applying them to their different contexts, paternalistic Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords could proclaim—to the outside world, to their labourers, and to themselves—that they were not the heartless exploiters that their critics claimed, but were rather ‘fathers’ of their estate communities who superintended hierarchal but beneficent social orders.⁴⁶

Typical of paternalistic American planters and Irish landlords, John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock developed reciprocal interpretations of their relationship with their labourers, and did so for comparable reasons.⁴⁷ On one hand, they both used the idea that they assumed a duty of care for their workers as a means of defending themselves and their labour systems from the criticisms that were often levelled at Southern slaveholders/slaveholding and Irish

46 Eugene Genovese, “‘Our Family, White and Black’: Family and Household in the Southern Slaveholders’ Worldview,” in Carol Bleser (ed.), *In Joy and Sorrow: Women, Family, and Marriage in the Victorian South, 1830-1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 69-87; Willie Lee Rose, “The Domestication of Domestic Slavery,” in William Freehling (ed.), *Slavery and Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 18-36; Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society*, 131-138; Howard Newby, *Property, Paternalism and Power: Class Control in Rural England* (London: Hutchinson, 1978).

47 For discussions of Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s opinions of their labourers, see Robert May, “John A. Quitman and His Slaves: Reconciling Slave Resistance with the Proslavery Defense,” *Journal of Southern History* 46 (1980), 551-570; Kevin McKenna, “Charity, Paternalism and Power on the Clonbrock Estates, County Galway, 1834-44,” in Geary and Walsh (eds.), *Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland*, 97-114.

landlords/landlordism during the nineteenth century. Thus, in its use as a means of defending the prevailing status quo, paternalistic ideology shared a conservative function in both cases. On the other hand, Quitman and Clonbrock also used the rhetoric of reciprocity that was characteristic of paternalism as part of conscious attempts to justify their privileged positions in the eyes of their labourers. This, in turn, was intended to secure peace and social stability on their properties and thereby complement the economically progressive behaviours associated with the second slavery and the second landlordism. In comparable terms, therefore, Quitman's and Clonbrock's paternalistic world-views were hybrid ideologies that combined conservative and progressive elements in ways shaped by their different contexts.⁴⁸

John Quitman's career as a paternalistic planter would probably not have been predicted his friends and family before he moved to Natchez in 1821.⁴⁹ In fact, although he became one of mid-nineteenth-century Mississippi's most famous 'fire-eaters'—the name often used to describe the antebellum U.S. South's most outspoken defenders of slavery and proponents of secession—Quitman seems to have harboured "slight antislavery leanings" in his youth, as Robert May has noted. In December 1821, soon after arriving in Natchez, the migrant Yankee penned his earliest documented thoughts about the 'peculiar institution' in his diary, where he recorded the bemusement that he felt upon witnessing slaves singing and dancing at a local plantation he had recently visited: "poor creatures!" he wrote, "yet they appear to be happy!!" On another occasion, Quitman noted his disapproval of slave auctions, where he witnessed firsthand the cruelty of separating slave families: "I never saw such profound grief as the poor

48 On U.S. Southern slaveholding paternalism as a hybrid ideology, see Richard Follett, *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in Louisiana's Cane World, 1820-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 4-8; Jeffrey Robert Young, *Domesticating Slavery: The Master Class in South Carolina and Georgia, 1670-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 5-11. On the comparability of antebellum American planters' hybrid ideologies with those of nineteenth-century European landowners, see Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 150-154.

49 Quitman was initially raised with the expectation that he would follow in his father's footsteps and become a Lutheran Reverend. He also worked as a teacher in Philadelphia and a lawyer in Ohio before he migrated to Mississippi. See May, *John A. Quitman*, 1-18; James McLendon, "Ancestry, Early Life, and Education of John A. Quitman," *Journal of Mississippi History* 10 (1948), 271-289.

creatures manifested,” he sympathetically wrote of one such scene. Apparently, Quitman had some reservations about the South’s slave system after moving to Mississippi in the early 1820s; his subsequent conversion to proslavery advocacy and career as a paternalistic planter therefore provides us with an excellent opportunity to investigate in microcosm the development of slaveholding ideology in the antebellum U.S. South.⁵⁰

Despite his early ambivalence about slavery, Quitman soon came to admire the wealthy and hospitable ‘nabob’ planter class after he settled in Natchez.⁵¹ As his regard for these slaveholders’ genteel culture grew, Quitman’s qualms about the institution on which that culture was founded quickly dissipated. In 1823, in response to the queries of a friend who asked about the veracity of the stories about Southern slavery that circulated in the U.S. North—stories of branded, underfed slaves and “harem[s] of darkies”—Quitman replied that “these ‘niggers,’ as you call them, are the happiest people I have ever seen ... so far from being fed on ‘salted cotton-seed,’ as we used to believe in Ohio, they are oily, sleek, bountifully fed, well-clothed, [and] well taken care of ... they are treated with great humanity and kindness.” Thus, even before Quitman became a planter, he seems to have accepted as fact the idea—then becoming increasingly popular throughout the South in tandem with the spread of paternalism—that slaveholders generally assumed and fulfilled a duty of care for their bondspeople.⁵²

It is unsurprising, therefore, that, once Quitman entered the ranks of the planter elite in the late 1820s, his support for slavery became absolute. Ownership of plantations and slaves

50 May, “Quitman and His Slaves,” 562; John Quitman Diary, 24 December 1821, QFP; John Quitman to Platt Brush, 23 August 1823, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 86. For Quitman’s reputation as a fire-eater, see Eric Walther, “Honorable and Useful Ambition: John A. Quitman,” in Eric Walther, *The Fire-Eaters* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992), 83-111.

51 Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 70-74, 83-87; May, *John A. Quitman*, 20-23. On the ‘Natchez nabobs,’ see D. Clayton James *Antebellum Natchez* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), 136-161.

52 Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 77, 85-86. On the development of paternalism in the antebellum South, see Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil*, 143-171, 505-534; Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 111-118; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*; Rose, “Domestication of Domestic Slavery,” 18-36; Drew Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 69-104.

was the main route to advancement in the Old South, and it is the one that Quitman ultimately followed. Yet he, along with most of his fellow antebellum slaveholders, conveniently believed that the labour system that generated his wealth and status was not simply a necessary evil—as many American planters had argued in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—but rather a positive good, an institution that benefited masters and slaves alike. In 1850, articulating a view of Southern slavery that had become all but ubiquitous among his fellow planters, Quitman publicly declared: “we do not regard it as an evil; on the contrary, we think that our prosperity, our happiness, our very political existence, is inseparably connected with it.”⁵³

Quitman’s commitment to defending slavery was intensified, rather than diminished, by the rise of radical abolitionism in the U.S. North after 1830. In common with the majority of antebellum Southerners, he deeply resented the charge—frequently made by Northern abolitionists—that slaveholders were sinful and inhumane. In 1831—the same year that William Lloyd Garrison launched the *Liberator*, a Boston-based newspaper that controversially argued for the immediate abolition of U.S. slavery—Quitman visited his birthplace in New York and toured the north-east. While there, he was filled with anger and revulsion at the anti-slavery sentiment that he encountered. “Here are clerks by the hundred, salaried liberally out of contributions wrung from pious and frugal persons in the South,” he complained in one letter written during this trip, “and these officials, like the majority of their theologians and divines, are inimical to our institutions, and use our money to defame and damage us!” Partially in response to this type of criticism, Quitman embraced the proslavery

53 John Quitman, “Inaugural Address of Governor John A. Quitman, Delivered Before Both Houses of the Mississippi Legislature, January 10, 1850,” in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, II, 23. Also see May, “Quitman and His Slaves,” 562-563. For more on the development of American proslavery ideology during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see Larry Tise, *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987); Jeffrey Young, “Proslavery Ideology,” in Robert Paquette and Mark Smith, *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 399-423; William Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960).

ideas that were then gaining currency among planters throughout the U.S. South.⁵⁴

Central to antebellum Southern proslavery ideology was the concept of paternalism. In basic terms, Southern slaveholding paternalism held that slavery was justified because the master provided protection and care for his slaves in return for the work that they performed for him. Thus, for Southern paternalists, master and slave were bound together by reciprocal rights and duties, much as husbands and wives and fathers and children were. Indeed, as a number of historians—including Eugene Genovese, Willie Lee Rose, and Jeffrey Robert Young—have shown, paternalistic American slaveholders tended to conceptualise slavery as a “domestic institution,” and many of them explicitly claimed that their slaves were members of their extended families.⁵⁵ Even though Quitman did not live on any of his plantations, he wholeheartedly embraced this idea, as he revealed when he wrote to his brother regarding his slaves that “they are of my household.” In turn, he justified slavery by claiming that he fulfilled a moral obligation to care for his bondspeople, whom he perceived as members of his family—albeit inferior members.⁵⁶

An important ingredient of Quitman’s proslavery ideology, and one that he shared with most of his fellow Southern slaveholders, was racism. Although race had been a feature of American slavery since the seventeenth century, racist ideas increased in importance in the antebellum era, especially after the emergence of the spurious ‘science’ of phrenology in the 1840s. According to these ideas—as formulated and popularised by racial theorists such as Louisiana’s Dr. Samuel Cartwright—black people were innately inferior to whites and

54 John Quitman to J.F.H. Claiborne, 6 August 1831, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 109-110. Also see Drew Faust, “Introduction: The Proslavery Argument in History,” in Drew Faust (ed.), *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), 1-20; Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil*, 481-504; John Daly, *When Slavery was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 30-72; Manisha Sinha, *The Counter-Revolution of Slavery: Politics and Ideology in Antebellum South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000). On Garrison and abolitionism, see Henry Mayer, *All On Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998).

55 Genovese, ““Our Family, White and Black,”” 69-87; Rose, “Domestication of Domestic Slavery,” 18-36; Young, *Domesticating Slavery*.

56 John Quitman to Albert Quitman, 16 January 1842, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 191. Also see John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 14 September 1853, FHQP.

therefore naturally suited for servitude.⁵⁷ Quitman incorporated these racist ideas into his own personal ideology. As early as 1823, he stated his belief that the South's slave population were "a happy, careless, unreflecting, good-natured race, who, left to themselves, would degenerate into drones or brutes, but, subjected to wholesome restraint and stimulus, become the best and most contented of labourers."⁵⁸ By the time Quitman became a politician of national stature in the late 1840s and 1850s, racial arguments were central to his defence of slavery. In a public speech that he delivered at Tammany Hall in New York in 1856, for instance, he described black people as "an inferior race, whose history for 5,000 years proves that they cannot take care of themselves, slinking back into barbarism unless under the protecting care and supporting intellect of the white Caucasian man." In making this statement, Quitman articulated a current of racist thought that was held, to different degrees, by the vast majority of antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders.⁵⁹

Racism and paternalism were in accord for Quitman—as they were for most Southern slaveholders—since the racist idea that black people were inferior to whites fit well with his paternalistic impulse to view and treat his slaves like children. In fact, Quitman made this explicit in his Tammany Hall speech, where he told the assembled crowd that "he believed it his duty to restrain this inferior race and provide for them as he would for children who are incapable of taking care of themselves." This racist sentiment was not simply rhetoric deployed for the purpose of propaganda on Quitman's part—though it certainly served that function—but it was also something that he actually seems to have believed; even in his private correspondence, he wrote that "the stoutest and most sensible and trustworthy of them

57 See, for example, Samuel Cartwright, "Slavery in the Light of Ethnology," in E.N. Elliott (ed.), *Cotton is King and Proslavery Arguments* (New York: Abbott & Looms, 1860), 690-728. Also see Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 192-193.

58 John Quitman to Platt Brush, 23 August 1823, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 84. Quitman was actually friends with Cartwright. See, for example, John Quitman to Samuel Cartwright, 9 September 1844, Samuel A. Cartwright and Family Papers, Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collection, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

59 *New York Times*, 23 February 1856. Also see May, "Quitman and His Slaves," 554; Faust, "Introduction: The Proslavery Argument in History," 14-17; George Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1987 [1971]), 43-96.

[his slaves] must be watched like children.”⁶⁰

Along with these racist arguments, Southern slaveholders also developed a religious defence of slavery based on a selective reading of the Bible, which, they noted, condoned slavery. In addition, planters often claimed that they fulfilled a missionary function by converting their slaves to Christianity. This feature of Southern slaveholding ideology became particularly pronounced as a result of the religious reform movement known as the Second Great Awakening (c. 1790-1840), the influence of which motivated many paternalistic planters to assume responsibility for their slaves’ religious indoctrination as part of their duty as masters.⁶¹ Peculiarly, considering that he was the son of a Lutheran Reverend, Quitman—who joined the Episcopalian Church soon after settling in Natchez—did not emphasise his slaves’ religious education to nearly the same extent as many of his fellow planters; indeed, he rarely mentioned the topic of religion in his vast surviving correspondence.⁶² Yet, although noticeably quiet about the subject, Quitman certainly allowed his slaves to practice Christianity; he organised for an Episcopal minister to officiate at his body-servant’s marriage in 1848, for example, indicating that his house slaves shared their master’s religion.⁶³ Ultimately, even though Quitman did not dwell on ‘Christianising’ his slaves, the fact that he could use religion to defend slavery—as he did in his address to the Mississippi legislature after his election as governor in 1849—was important. This served to strengthen commitment

60 *New York Times*, 23 February 1856; John Quitman to Albert Quitman, 9 May 1839, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 190. Also see Samuel Cartwright, “Report on the Diseases and Physical Peculiarities of the Negro Race,” *DeBow’s Review* 11 (1851), 67-68; Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987), 134.

61 See Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Slaveholders’ New World Order* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 409-527; Stephen Haynes, *Noah’s Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Mitchell Snay, *Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997 [1993]).

62 For Quitman’s views on religion, see John Quitman to J.F.H. Claiborne, 6 August 1831, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 108-119; John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 12 May 1850, FHQP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 18. Also see Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House*, 53-65.

63 *Mississippi Free Trader*, 19 December 1848; May, *John A. Quitman*, 141. Also see Blake Touchstone, “Planters and Slave Religion in the Deep South,” in John Boles (ed.), *Masters and Slaves in the House of the Lord: Race and Religion in the American South, 1740-1870* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988), 99-126.

to the ‘peculiar institution’ throughout the antebellum South and formed an aspect of slaveholding paternalism that was more or less accentuated depending on the emphasis of individual masters.⁶⁴

Quitman’s paternalistic conception of his relationship with his slaves was motivated not only by his desire to defend slavery from external criticism, but also by his need to justify bondage in the eyes of his slaves and thereby ensure peace and social stability on his plantations. This was particularly evident during certain special occasions that were designed as rituals in order to dramatise the existence of reciprocal relations between the master and his slaves. To this end, following a practice that was widespread among antebellum Southern slaveholders, Quitman allowed periodic holidays on his plantations that fulfilled this function.⁶⁵ One of the better documented of these events is the Christmas holiday that took place at Live Oaks between December 1856 and January 1857. Quitman himself was absent on this particular occasion—as a result of his Congressional responsibilities in Washington at the time—but the rest of his family assembled in the sugar plantation’s Big House. There, the Quitmans spent time among Live Oaks’s field slaves, who were busy preparing for an annual ‘ball’ that they were permitted to hold in the plantation’s boiler house as a reward for their hard work during the arduous sugar harvesting and processing season. From Live Oaks, Quitman’s eldest daughter, Louisa, reported to her father:

as you may suppose the negroes were perfectly delighted to see us and exclaimed continually that ‘at last their prayers were answered, that they might see us all

64 “Inaugural Address of Governor John A. Quitman, Delivered Before Both Houses of the Mississippi Legislature, 10 January 1850,” in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, II, 23. Also see Thornton Stringfellow, “The Bible Argument: or, Slavery in the Light of Devine Revelation,” in Elliott (ed.), *Cotton is King*, 459-546; Genovese and Fox-Genovese, *Fatal Self-Deception*, 75-79; Albert Raboteau, *Slave Religion: The “Invisible Institution” in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 151-176; Charles Irons, *The Origins of Proslavery Christianity: White and Black Evangelicals in Colonial and Antebellum Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).

65 May, “Quitman and His Slaves,” 557. For more on these holidays, see Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 162-172; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 475-482; Steven Hahn, *A Nation Under our Feet: Black Political Struggle in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), 30-31; Stephen Nissenbaum, *The Battle for Christmas* (New York: Vintage, 1996), 158-300.

here.’ Many inquired about ‘Master’ and they wanted to know ‘if he never was coming to see them no more!’ I have never seen a finer looking, healthier, or happier lot than they are.⁶⁶

Quitman was greatly pleased with this description of cordial interactions between what he perceived as his white and black families; “the poor negroes,” he subsequently wrote in a letter to Eliza, “what a new life opened to them by seeing among them my whole family.”⁶⁷ Thus can we see that, even though Quitman was an absentee planter, he still developed a paternalistic interpretation of his relationship with his field slaves. Furthermore, according to Louisa Quitman’s description of their behaviour, the slaves seem to have understood the “faithful, obedient, and affectionate” manner in which her father expected them to behave in order to substantiate the paternalistic ideology that he developed with a view toward justifying his exploitation of their labour.⁶⁸

Similarly to U.S. Southern slaveholders in general, and Quitman in particular, Irish landlords also felt an increasingly acute need to defend themselves from criticism as the 1800s advanced, and many of them embraced paternalistic ideology as part of their attempt to do so. Although they faced no organised opposition comparable to U.S. abolitionism, Ireland’s landed elites were widely seen as exploitative and inhumane, especially by Victorian England’s middle classes. Unsurprisingly, most landlords were outraged at this characterisation, especially because—no less than Southern slaveholders—they felt that their institutions and way of life were being unfairly misrepresented by their critics. As happened

66 Louisa Chadborne to John Quitman, 6 January 1857, QFP. For similar descriptions of this holiday written by another of Quitman’s daughters, see Anna Rosalie Quitman Diary, 26, 29 December 1856, 10 January 1857, QFP.

67 John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 6 January 1857, QFP.

68 John Quitman to J.F.H. Claiborne, 27 January 1840, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 186. Also see May, *John A. Quitman*, 146; Genovese and Fox-Genovese, *Fatal Self-Deception*, 67-75; Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 103-104.

with planters in the U.S. South, many Irish landowners made paternalism the centrepiece of their self-defence. Embracing the rhetoric of reciprocity, paternalistic landlords claimed that rights, duties, and mutual responsibilities existed between themselves and their tenants and labourers; indeed, they often described themselves as ‘fathers’ of their estate communities.⁶⁹ Yet, since Irish landlords were more detached from the running of their properties, and since they generally harboured no real fear that criticism of their behaviour might lead to governmental interference with their property rights, paternalism never reached the same level of importance for the elites in nineteenth-century Ireland as it did in the antebellum U.S. South. Also, for the same reasons, Irish landlords’ paternalistic ideologies were usually far less explicit than those developed by American planters.

Illuminating in this respect is Galway’s Lord Clonbrock, who was not only a paternalistic husband and father, but also a paternalistic landlord who took an interest in both the running of his properties and the condition of the farming classes that lived and worked on his land. In fact, echoing the language used to describe slavery by Quitman and other paternalistic Southern planters, Clonbrock once referred to his tenants as “my people.”⁷⁰ The image of the landlord as a metaphorical public father that Clonbrock implicitly drew from was widespread in Ireland during the nineteenth century. A poem written about Christopher Redington, a Galway landlord who died in 1823, referred to the “fatherly feelings of kindness and care” that had characterised this well-remembered proprietor, for instance, while Denis Kirwan—a contemporary and neighbour of Clonbrock’s—described the landlord-tenant relationship as akin to that of a “parent to a child.” Paternalistic Irish landlords embraced this idea, although, unlike Southern slaveholders, they usually did not go so far as to explicitly

69 See Edward Lengel, *The Irish Through British Eyes: Perceptions of Ireland in the Famine Era* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002), 70-78, 101-104; L.P. Curtis, “Demonising the Irish Landlords Since the Famine,” in Brian Casey (ed.), *Defying the Law of the Land: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin: History Press Ireland, 2013), 20-43; Peter Gray, *Famine, Land and Politics: British Government and Irish Society, 1843-1850* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1999); Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society*, 131-138.

70 Lord Clonbrock to Lord Naas, 22 April 1859, Ms 11,036, Mayo Papers, National Library of Ireland. Also see McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual,” 17-51.

envision or describe their tenants and labourers as children or members of their extended families. Instead, they generally saw themselves as part of a community of interest—one in which the fortunes of all residents of their estates were inexorably linked and in which they ought to receive loyalty in return for their leadership.⁷¹

Paternalistic Irish landlords' acceptance of the idea that they were responsible for their 'people' was succinctly captured by Clonbrock's neighbour and friend, Lord Clancarty. In a public address to his fellow landowners written in 1845, Clancarty argued that

the owner of the soil is the natural protector and instructor of those, who, by the dispensation of Providence, depend upon him for the land by the fruits of which they live. In that position he is recognised by society and by the law, and it is from the conscientious fulfilment of the duties of that function that the most honourable distinction and the purest pleasure can be derived.⁷²

Here, Clancarty articulated the sense of reciprocity that was central to paternalistic Irish landowners' world-views during the 1800s, just as it was central to the paternalistic ideology then growing in influence among slaveholders in the U.S. South. It was a sentiment with which Clonbrock agreed; he too believed that "by each other should they [landlords and tenants] rise or fall," and embraced the idea that reciprocal rights and duties existed between himself and his labourers.⁷³

Similarly to Quitman, in conceptualising his relationship with his workers in paternalistic terms, Clonbrock was partially reacting to the moralistic condemnations of his

71 *Connaught Journal*, 5 March 1827; Denis Kirwan quoted in Ronan Lynch, *The Kirwans of Castlehacket, Co. Galway: History, Folklore and Mythology in an Irish Horseracing Family* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006), 114; Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society*, 133.

72 *Irish Farmers' Gazette*, 13 December 1845. For more on Clancarty, see Brian Casey, "Land, Politics and Religion on the Clancarty Estate, East Galway, 1851-1914," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011).

73 *Tuam Herald*, 29 September 1843. Also see McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 17-51.

class that became increasingly common during his lifetime. In 1843, referring to the many unflattering articles about Irish landlords that were then appearing in British newspapers, he complained that “the conduct pursued by some of the journals on the other side of the water is disgusting, a few isolated cases of tyranny or oppression [are] selected and the whole class of Irish landlords is assailed for the misconduct of a few.” Instead, Clonbrock thought that, contrary to popular belief in England, he and most of his fellow landlords took their duty to their tenants and labourers seriously. As a result, alluding to the possibility of a parliamentary investigation into Irish landlordism mooted at Westminster at the time, he asserted that “so far from having any objection to an inquiry, he would court the fullest, and had no doubt but that the Irish landlords would get an acquittal.”⁷⁴

This parliamentary inquiry was indeed established in 1843, and it collected information about landlord-tenant relations throughout Ireland during the following two years. The resulting report of the Devon Commission—as the inquiry became known—identified many problems with the country’s agricultural system and issued a number of recommendations, including advocating for a greater number of landowners to invest substantially in agricultural improvement and identifying the need for the consolidation of small tenancies. Yet, as Clonbrock predicted, the Devon Commission also absolved his class of many of their perceived faults, concluding as it did that “there has been much exaggeration and mis-statement in the sweeping charges which have been directed against the Irish landlords.”⁷⁵ This was an unsurprising result, however, since the commission was dominated by members of Ireland’s landed class, which led Daniel O’Connell to liken their inquiry to “a board of foxes deliberating gravely over a flock of geese.”⁷⁶ Nevertheless, Clonbrock was delighted with the Devon Commission’s findings; at an 1845 meeting of the Ballinasloe

74 *Tuam Herald*, 29 September 1843.

75 *Report from Her Majesty’s Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Law and Practice in Respect to the Occupation of Land in Ireland (Devon Commission)*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 19, 1845, 20.

76 O’Connell quoted in Gray, *Famine, Land and Politics*, 58.

Agricultural Improvement Society he toasted its report and said that “he could not but feel proud when he remembered that the landlord class were blamed of late years for the poverty and wretchedness of some of the peasantry throughout the country.”⁷⁷ Clonbrock’s moment of vindication was short-lived, however, since the publication of the Devon report coincided with the appearance of a potato blight that precipitated the Great Famine (1845-52), which saw the criticism of Irish landlordism intensify in Britain and further afield.⁷⁸

While American planters developed explicitly racist ideas about their slaves as part of their defence of their class in the antebellum era, most of their Irish landed contemporaries held an altogether more ambivalent view of their tenants’ and labourers’ ‘race.’ To be sure, even though no distinction in skin colour differentiated the landowners from their labourers in Ireland, a racial stereotype of the Irish ‘Paddy’ was widely disseminated in Victorian culture. According to Thomas Carlyle, for example, Ireland’s degenerate peasants, descended from the Celts, were “white and not black, but it is not the colour of skin that determines the savagery of a man.”⁷⁹ Furthermore, as L.P. Curtis has pointed out in his discussion of anti-Irish prejudice in nineteenth-century England, the same phrenological ideas that ‘scientifically’ classified black people as an inferior race in the United States also located Ireland’s lower classes on a racial scale somewhere between the ‘undeveloped’ African and the ‘developed’ Saxon in British (and American) popular consciousness.⁸⁰ Well-educated and

⁷⁷ *Tuam Herald*, 4 October 1845.

⁷⁸ See James Donnelly, “Irish Property Must Pay For Irish Poverty: British Public Opinion and the Great Irish Famine,” in Chris Morash and Richard Hayes (eds.), *Fearful Realities: New Perspectives on the Irish Famine* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1996), 60-76; Enda Delaney, *The Curse of Reason: The Great Irish Famine, 1845-52* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2012), 166-184; Christine Kinealy, *The Great Irish Famine: Impact, Ideology and Rebellion* (New York: Palgrave, 2002).

⁷⁹ Thomas Carlyle, “Repeal of the Union (1848),” in Percy Newberry (ed.), *Rescued Essays of Thomas Carlyle* (London: Leadenhall Press, 1892), 50. For more on Carlyle’s opinions of the Irish, see Julie Dugger, “Black Ireland’s Race: Thomas Carlyle and the Young Ireland Movement,” *Victorian Studies* 48 (2006), 461-485. Also see Michael de Nie, *The Eternal Paddy: Irish Identity and the British Press, 1798-1882* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004); Roy Foster, *Paddy and Mr. Punch: Connections in Irish and English History* (London: Penguin, 1995 [1993]).

⁸⁰ L.P. Curtis *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England* (Bridgeport: University of Bridgeport Press, 1968), 121. For more on racial perceptions of Ireland’s lower classes in nineteenth-century England, see L.P. Curtis, *Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Culture* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1971); Richard Lebow, *White Britain and Black Ireland: The Influence of Stereotypes on Colonial Policy* (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1976). On racial stereotypes of the Irish in the United States, see, Dale Knobel, *Paddy and the Republic: Ethnicity and*

cosmopolitan, Clonbrock was doubtlessly aware of these ideas; Luke Gerald Dillon was even the subject of a phrenological examination at Clonbrock House in 1845. And yet, unlike John Quitman and the vast majority of slaveholders in the antebellum U.S. South, there is no evidence that Clonbrock incorporated *explicitly* racist stereotypes of his tenants and labourers into his personal ideology. In this respect, he seems to have been typical of his class. While nineteenth-century Ireland's landlords certainly saw themselves as superior to the country's supposedly uncivilised and lazy peasantry, they seem to have been reluctant to declare themselves a separate race, even though most could easily have done so by virtue of their British ancestry. Perhaps, this was because Clonbrock and his fellow landowners were trying to claim a contested Irish identity for themselves during the nineteenth century—one that required validation from their tenants and labourers, who were part of their country's body politic in a way that American slaves were not.⁸¹

Yet, despite Irish landlords' apparent reluctance to alienate themselves from their labourers by publicly articulating the 'Paddy' stereotype, there existed a religious dichotomy in Ireland during Clonbrock's lifetime that included racial undertones.⁸² As a result of the confiscations and conversions of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, most Irish landowners were Protestant while the majority of their tenants and labourers were Catholic. This was the situation on the Clonbrock estates, since the Dillon family had converted to the Church of Ireland during the 1720s. As in the case of John Quitman, Clonbrock lived during an era of religious revival—which, in Ireland, was known as the Second Reformation. This motivated some Irish landlords—especially paternalistic

Nationality in Antebellum America (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1986); Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

81 Report of a Phrenological Examination of L.G. Dillon by James Quilter Rumball, 1 March 1845, Ms 35,760 (1), CP. Also see McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 62-64. For more on the contested nature of Irish landlords' identities, see Chapter Five.

82 See Theodore Allen, *Invention of the White Race, Volume One: Racial Oppression and Social Control* (London: Verso, 1994). Writing in the late 1830s, Gustave de Beaumont—the French aristocrat who also had previous experience of the U.S. South—noted that "the [Irish] Protestant is not only the descendent of conquerors ... he believes himself of a race superior to that of the Irish; and as in Ireland religion marks the race, Protestantism is regarded as a species of nobility." Gustave de Beaumont, *Ireland: Social, Political, and Religious* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006 [1839]), 125.

individuals such as Galway's Lord Clancarty and Denis Kirwan—to try to convert their tenants to Protestantism as part of their self-proclaimed duty toward them. However, this type of proselytism was usually resented and resisted by nineteenth-century Ireland's majority Catholic population, which had grown in strength in the aftermath of the repeal of the Penal Laws.⁸³ As a consequence, Clonbrock always refrained from attempting to indoctrinate his tenants and labourers in the Protestant faith; indeed, in marked contrast to the situation with slaveholders in the U.S. South, the smooth functioning of paternalism on his estates required him to avoid interfering with his workers' religious beliefs entirely. Thus, unlike Quitman, Clonbrock could not claim a missionary function as part of either his defence of his class or duty to his labourers.⁸⁴

Significantly, as in the case of Southern slaveholders such as John Quitman, Clonbrock's embrace of paternalism was intended to appeal particularly to his workers and solicit their consent to the prevailing social order. This was especially apparent during those times when Clonbrock invited his tenants to his Big House to celebrate certain special occasions. On Irish landed estates—as on U.S. Southern plantations—holidays, weddings, and birthdays were often used by paternalistic landowners as opportunities to gather their 'dependents' around them and engage in ritualised displays of reciprocity that were designed to validate the elites' power and privilege. As Kevin McKenna and Patrick Melvin have both observed, such events were a regular occurrence on Clonbrock's estates. In June 1855, for instance, he invited all of his tenants to his demesne for a banquet and festivities in celebration of Luke Gerald Dillon's coming-of-age. During this event a deputation of tenants

83 Casey, "Land, Politics and Religion on the Clancarty Estate," 61-93; Lynch, *Kirwans of Castlehacket*, 131-136; Irene Whelan, *The Bible War in Ireland: The 'Second Reformation' and the Polarization of Protestant-Catholic Relations* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005); Desmond Bowen, *The Protestant Crusade in Ireland, 1800-70: A Study of Protestant-Catholic Relations Between the Act of Union and Disestablishment* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1978). On the effect of the repeal of the Penal Laws on Ireland's Catholic population, see Thomas Bartlett, *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation, 1690-1830* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1992), 268-342.

84 For Clonbrock's reputation for religious tolerance, see *Galway Weekly Advertiser*, 5 June 1841; *Nation*, 10 October 1846; *Tuam Herald*, 14 July 1855; *Western News*, 16 December 1893. On the antagonistic relationship between religion and paternalism on the Clonbrock estates, see McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 53-64, 160-169, 250.

presented a written address to Luke Gerald, in which they stated their loyalty to Clonbrock, “who has at all times with much zeal and justice, discharged his duties as a landlord, and who, intimately acquainted with the requirements of the tenant farmer, has ever been ready with his purse and advice to advance the true interests of those who are placed under him.” Implicit here was the tenants’ recognition of the idea that Clonbrock assumed responsibility for the residents of his estates and that they, in return, accepted their subordinate status.⁸⁵

Later, during the toasts that followed the banquet, a tenant named John Connolly reiterated this theme of reciprocity by proclaiming that “there was not one of his lordship’s [Clonbrock’s] tenants that was not comfortable and happy owing to his paternal care and solicitude for them.” Such declarations indicate that (at least in public) Clonbrock’s tenants validated their landlord’s credentials as a paternalist. In response, Clonbrock, addressing his assembled tenants directly, said that “in the years past by, there were many errors and shortcomings to lay at his door ([cries of] ‘no, no’) but they were all overlooked in the belief, which, he trusted was the case, that they were errors of the head and not of the heart.” Furthermore, Clonbrock explicitly referred to his attempts to fulfil his duties to his tenantry—duties that he claimed would be inherited by his heir. As such, Luke Gerald Dillon’s twenty-first birthday celebration functioned as a public demonstration of the reciprocal social contract that supposedly existed between landowner and peasants on the Clonbrock estates. Indeed, to underscore this paternalistic subtext, fireworks blazed short epithets in the night sky, including: “happy union between landlord and tenant,” and “Clonbrock, the tenant’s friend.”⁸⁶

85 *Tuam Herald*, 16 June 1855; Kevin McKenna, “Elites, Ritual, and the Legitimation of Power on an Irish Landed Estate, 1855-90,” in O’Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century*, 68-82; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 220-239. For a similar tenants’ address to an Irish landlord with estates in County Monaghan, see “To Evelyn P. Shirley Esq., Our Good and Respected Landlord,” September 1838, D3531/P/2, Shirley Papers, Public Records Office of Northern Ireland, Belfast. Also see Howard Newby, “The Deferential Dialectic,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 17 (1975), 139-164.

86 *Tuam Herald*, 16 June 1855; McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual,” 118-134; McKenna, “Elites, Ritual, and the Legitimation of Power,” 70-73. For more of Clonbrock’s tenants’ declarations of loyalty to their landlord, see *Tuam Herald*, 6 April 1867; *Western Star*, 12 September 1890.

The evidence indicates that John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock were both paternalistic landed proprietors, since they both embraced the idea that reciprocal rights and duties existed between themselves and their labourers. One shared reason why they did so was to defend either Southern slaveholders or Irish landlords from the criticism the two agrarian elites were subjected to during the nineteenth century. Both Quitman and Clonbrock believed that the perception of their classes among their critics did not correspond to reality. Instead, they argued that their institutions were overwhelmingly positive, which they inferred chiefly from their personal experiences on their own estates. By developing a sense of responsibility for their workforces, whom they viewed as their ‘people,’ Quitman and Clonbrock were able to claim that their self-interest was tied to a community that they did not exploit—as many critics of Southern slavery and Irish landlordism alleged—but rather guided and chaperoned in magnanimous and mutually beneficial fashion. Thus, the U.S. Southern and Irish versions of paternalism represented by Quitman and Clonbrock were conservative in their function as metaphorical shields with which to deflect the attacks that planters and landlords were subjected to during the 1800s.

Yet, the fact that the spread of paternalism among slaveholders in the antebellum U.S. South and landlords in nineteenth-century Ireland was partially motivated by the two elites’ conservative desire to defend themselves from criticism does not imply that those ideologies were pre-modern. Although Quitman and Clonbrock were socially conservative, they were also economically progressive representatives of the second slavery and the second landlordism, as we have seen in the previous chapter. It is no coincidence that they sought agrarian modernisation and developed paternalistic world-views simultaneously: Quitman and Clonbrock both used paternalism to justify the inequalities that characterised their estates and to solicit their labourers’ consent to the prevailing social orders—as seen during the Christmas holiday that occurred at Live Oaks in 1856 and at Luke Gerald Dillon’s twenty-first birthday

celebration in 1855. This, in turn, was intended to secure peace and social stability on Quitman's plantations and Clonbrock's estates, and thereby complement their drives for agrarian modernisation. In both cases, therefore, paternalism was a hybrid ideology that combined conservative and progressive features.

Quitman's and Clonbrock's paternalistic world-views can also be described as hybrid ideologies on the basis that they both incorporated ideas about race and religion, though in considerably different ways. In nineteenth-century Ireland, religion arguably provided an analogous function to race in the antebellum U.S. South, in that it provided a social distinction between most of the agrarian elites and their labourers. In the words of Peter Kolchin, "race was a device that dominant social groups found useful for legitimizing their treatment of others as outsiders, but it was by no means essential to that task. Throughout history religion, language, culture, and ostensibly criminal behavior have served as acceptable substitutes for race in giving sanction to slavery."⁸⁷ The example of Ireland—where the landowners were mostly Protestant and the peasants mostly Catholic—indicates that religion could be used to justify not only slavery, but also exploitation in a more general sense. There were, however, many significant differences between religious oppression in nineteenth-century Ireland and racial oppression in the antebellum South. Although the dividing lines between Catholics and Protestants and blacks and whites hardened in either location during Clonbrock's and Quitman's lifetimes, Irish Catholic peasants constituted a majority of their country's population and increasingly regained the rights they had been denied in previous generations, whereas African American slaves were a minority in the U.S. South and their legally sanctioned servitude remained absolute until their emancipation in 1863-65. Additionally, Quitman was able to rely on Christianity as a common bond with his slaves, as most antebellum Southern planters did. Conversely, Clonbrock found it necessary to refrain from interfering with his Catholic tenants' religious beliefs for fear of provoking the resistance that

⁸⁷ Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 188.

some of his fellow Protestant landowners incurred when they tried to proselytise among their ‘people.’ Thus, religion was a conduit for the development of paternalism in the antebellum U.S. South, whereas the opposite was the case in nineteenth-century Ireland.⁸⁸

At a fundamental level, however, race and religion disguised and complicated what were essentially class relationships on Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s properties, as on landed estates throughout the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland. Although the unfree/free distinction between the slaves and peasants was unquestionably very important, U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords ultimately profited from the extraction of surplus value from different types of agrarian working classes. This interpretation accords with Peter Kolchin’s findings in *Unfree Labor* (1987), since, after comparing American slavery with Russian serfdom and highlighting the presence of racial discourse among the elites in both cases, Kolchin identified “the class nature of what appeared to be a racial stereotype; although its manifestation in America was racial, this stereotype was similar to that held by noblemen of peasants, rich of poor, colonists of subject peoples.”⁸⁹ The comparison of Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s ideologies supports this conclusion, since, even though Quitman explicitly drew upon racist ideas in order to defend himself and his class from criticism while Clonbrock did not, both held similar opinions about the ‘uncivilised’ nature of their labourers, and comparable racial stereotypes of those workers were also present in their wider contexts.⁹⁰ In turn, Quitman and Clonbrock assimilated these different amalgams of ideas about class, race, and religion with their belief in the desirability of reciprocal relationships between themselves and their labourers, thus producing, in either case, two distinct but comparable paternalistic world-views.

88 See Eugene Genovese and Douglas Ambrose, “Masters,” in Robert Paquette and Mark Smith (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 538; Virginia Crossman, *Politics, Law and Order in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 1996), 15.

89 Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 186.

90 For a comparison of the development of racial stereotypes in Ireland and the American South, see Kieran Quinlan, *Strange Kin: Ireland and the American South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 164-190.

Conclusion

In his 1998 overview of the history and historiography of U.S. Southern slavery, Mark Smith described paternalism as “a plastic concept.”⁹¹ While Smith was referring specifically to Eugene Genovese’s influential interpretation of its manifestation in the American South, his observation also applies to the ideology of paternalism itself, which was a highly complex and flexible world-view that was applicable to a wide range of contexts. The comparison of John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock suggests that this was as true of the version of paternalism that developed among landlords in nineteenth-century Ireland as it was of its antebellum U.S. Southern iteration. In neither context did paternalism constitute a coherent and uniform set of beliefs; rather, the Southern and Irish versions of the ideology represented by Quitman and Clonbrock can best be described as comparable prisms through which the agrarian elites viewed themselves and their worlds. In both cases, the paternalistic idea of the need for reciprocal relations between dominant and subordinate individuals and classes was equally applicable to different types of relationships between heads of households and their families and between landowners and their unfree or free labourers. In both cases, although in considerably different ways, paternalism incorporated other values and ideas, such as gender, religion, and race. In both cases, paternalistic ideology was particularly attractive to landed proprietors who were subject to sustained criticism, and who were therefore eager to justify and defend the different types of exploitative labour systems from which they profited.

Yet, while the comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock reveals a number of parallels between elite ideology in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland, there was also an important relative difference between the minds of their respective classes: as a consequence of the contrasts between their historical contexts and labour systems, paternalistic ideology was far stronger among American slaveholders than it was among Irish

⁹¹ Smith, *Debating Slavery*, 20.

landlords. In the U.S. South, as Eugene Genovese and Douglas Ambrose have noted, “paternalism became, for the masters, the basis of their understanding of themselves, their households, and their distinct social order.” Thus, Quitman was a paternalistic member of a paternalistic master class.⁹² In Ireland, however, paternalism never reached the same level of importance for the landowners as it did for their counterparts in the American South. By the mid-nineteenth century, Irish landlords generally spoke of themselves in paternalistic terms, but a significant number also continued to regard their tenants primarily as a source of income and retained marked absentee tendencies. Therefore, Clonbrock is most appropriately understood as a paternalistic member of a rentier class that expressed paternalistic pretensions.⁹³

Still, regardless of the difference between the strength of paternalism in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland, it is significant that the transitions from patriarchal to paternalistic ideologies represented by Quitman and Clonbrock were concurrent with, and tightly linked to, the emergence of the second slavery and the second landlordism. This suggests that entrepreneurial American planters and Irish landlords considered paternalism to have been compatible with their desire to profit from their properties, while simultaneously contributing to the perpetuation of their positions at the pinnacle of hierarchical societies. In neither case was paternalism simply a philosophical or rhetorical exercise, however. Those slaveholders and landowners who claimed that respect for reciprocal rights and duties existed between themselves and their workforces were expected to substantiate their words with their actions. Paternalism, therefore, did not only characterise Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s world-views; it also conditioned labour relations on their estates.

92 Genovese and Ambrose, “Masters,” 536. Also see Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 661-662; Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 103-156; Drew Faust, “The Peculiar South Revisited: White Society, Culture, and Politics in the Antebellum Period, 1800-1860,” in John Boles and Edward Nolen (eds.), *Interpreting Southern History: Historiographical Essays in Honor of Sanford W. Higginbotham* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 78-119.

93 See McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual”; Ó’Murchada, *Great Famine*, 11-12; McNamara, “Monster Misery of Ireland,” 82-96.

CHAPTER FOUR

Varieties of Paternalism in Practice: Labour Relations on the Quitman Plantations and Clonbrock Estates

The difference between paternalistic ideology among the agrarian elites in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland had crucial repercussions for labour relations on the landed estates in the two locations. In general, American planters took an interest in the condition of their bondspeople that reflected their strong belief in the reciprocal nature of the master-slave relationship, whereas only a minority of Irish landlords made a sustained effort to fulfil their self-proclaimed ‘duties’ to their tenants and labourers. William Smith O’Brien, one of the few members of the Irish landed class who personally visited the American South, recognised this difference. When he toured the United States in 1859, O’Brien—a landlord and politician best remembered for his leadership of the failed Young Ireland rebellion of 1848—was reportedly informed by President James Buchanan that there was “no peasantry in Europe better clothed and better fed than the slaves at the South.” To prove the validity of this assertion, Buchanan encouraged O’Brien to visit the slave states and personally assess their “domestic institution.”¹ It was an invitation that the Irish revolutionary accepted; in March 1859, he set out southward from Washington, D.C., subsequently stopping in Richmond, Charleston, Montgomery, Mobile, and New Orleans. He also spent time at Maunsel White’s Deer Range sugar plantation in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana. Although O’Brien had previously been a critic of slavery, his personal observations of the U.S. South appeared to support the president’s claim that the region’s bondspeople were well treated, particularly in

¹ James Buchanan quoted in *Nation*, 26 March 1859. For more on Buchanan’s opinions of slavery, see Elbert Smith, *The Presidency of James Buchanan* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1975).

comparison with Irish peasants. In fact, he even wrote in a letter to his wife: “you know how anxious I am to cultivate the kindly sympathies of our tenants and labourers, but I confess that I am outdone by the barbarous slave driver of the South.”²

O’Brien was one of the many Victorian Irish landlords who embraced and espoused the paternalistic idea that reciprocal rights and duties existed between themselves and their tenants.³ And yet, his experience in the American South led him to two different but related verdicts: American slaves were generally treated better by their masters than most Irish peasants were treated by their landlords, and stable relations between agrarian elites and their labourers were more common in the South as a consequence. In other words, O’Brien recognised the fact that, in practice, paternalism was much stronger on U.S. Southern plantations than it was on Irish landed estates. What he failed to realise, however, was that this also had negative consequences for American slaves—since it led to regular interference in their lives to a degree that Irish peasants rarely had to contend with—while the ‘kindly sympathies’ that appeared to have resulted from paternalism in the U.S. South and Ireland were little more than veiled or repressed hostility from the perspective of the rural labourers.⁴

As we have seen in the previous chapter, paternalistic ideologies became increasingly common among American planters and Irish landlords between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In both cases, significant numbers within the two agrarian elites declared—as John

2 William Smith O’Brien, *Lectures on America Delivered in the Mechanics Institute, Dublin, November 1859* (Dublin: A.M. Sullivan, 1860), 3-4; William Smith O’Brien to Lucy O’Brien, 27 March 1859, quoted in Nini Rodgers, *Ireland, Slavery and Anti-Slavery, 1612-1865* (London: Palgrave, 2007), 315. Also see Richard Davis, “William Smith O’Brien and the American Civil War,” *Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* 19 (1993), 45-53; Richard Davis, *Travels of William Smith O’Brien in Europe and the Wider World, 1843 to 1864* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2013), 137-146. On Maunsel White, see Clement Eaton, *The Mind of the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964), 69-74.

3 See William Smith O’Brien, *Plan for the Relief of the Poor in Ireland, with Observations on the English and Scottish Poor Laws, Addressed to the Landed Proprietors of Ireland* (Dublin: John S. Folds, 1831); Richard Davis, *Revolutionary Imperialist: William Smith O’Brien, 1803-1864* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1998), 20-21, 61.

4 For more on paternalism and interference in the antebellum South and nineteenth-century Ireland, see Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987), 127-140; K. Theodore Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society in Ireland, 1832-1885* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 129-137. On the general hollowness of affection between dominant and subordinate classes, see James Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

Quitman and Lord Clonbrock did—that they assumed a responsibility to care for and protect their workers. In theory, this was supposed to foster gratitude and loyalty among slaves and peasants and thereby lead to peace and social stability on the landed estates. However, it was one thing for slaveholders and landlords to make these claims; it was another for them to substantiate their words with their actions or for the workers to respond to paternalism as the elites wished. As such, important questions remain to be answered regarding the comparative effects that paternalistic Southern slaveholders’ and Irish landlords’ ideologies had on labour relations on their properties. How did the two agrarian elites actually treat their workers? How did the slaves and peasants interpret paternalism and resist the designs to control them that were central to the ideology in both contexts? And how did paternalism interact with the interest shown by progressive slaveholders and landlords in the capitalistic estate management practices that were part of the second slavery and second landlordism?

These are questions that have already been the subject of debate among historians of the U.S. South and Ireland. In the scholarship on American slavery, paternalism has been a particularly contentious concept. According to some historians—foremost among them Eugene Genovese—antebellum Southern planters’ common belief in the ideology of paternalism conflicted with their capitalist features, since it frustrated their desire for efficiency and profitability by allowing the slaves to work at a pace well below their nominal capacity.⁵ This thesis has come under fire, however, notably from Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, who argued that paternalism complemented Southern planters’ capitalist agendas by providing a system of rewards and punishments that incentivised work and improved productivity on their plantations. Other historians, such as James Oakes and William Dusenberre, have argued that paternalism was little more than rhetoric for most antebellum

5 Eugene Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967 [1965]), 13-35; Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage, 1974), 661-665. Also see Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *Fruits of Merchant Capital: Slavery and Bourgeois Property in the Rise and Expansion of Capitalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983); Douglas Egerton, “Markets Without a Market Revolution: Southern Planters and Capitalism,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 16 (1996), 207-221.

slaveholders, who generally acted as calculating businessmen and treated their plantations and farms as ‘factories in the fields’ while brutally exploiting their slaves.⁶ In recent years, however, a number of scholars have shown that it is possible to reconcile these apparently contradictory schools of thought. In practice—Mark Smith, Richard Follett, and Jeffrey Young have suggested—most antebellum planters intended paternalism as a means to diffuse labour conflict on their plantations and thereby increase their profits. According to Smith, “the capitalist characteristics of the Old South identified and documented by Fogel and Engerman and Oakes and the precapitalist aspects of southern society noted by Genovese are not mutually exclusive. Rather, they existed side-by-side in the antebellum period and were integral to the complex evolution of southern society.” In fact, recent studies have argued that the resulting hybrid of paternalistic and capitalistic elements was a signal feature of the second slavery in the U.S. South.⁷

In the historiography on nineteenth-century Ireland, debates about the relationship between elite ideology and behaviour are far less developed and sophisticated than in the scholarship on the antebellum American South; nevertheless, a number of historians have asked similar questions about Irish landlordism as those that have preoccupied scholars of American slavery. On one hand, some have argued that Irish landowners acted in a paternalistic manner toward their tenants and labourers during the nineteenth century. Significantly, many of the historians who have advanced this argument have also noted that paternalistic Irish landowners were often the same individuals who pursued economic ‘improvement,’ suggesting that there was a correlation between paternalism and capitalism on

6 Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), 73-78; James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982), xvii-xix, 153-191; William Duminberre, *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

7 Mark Smith, *Debating Slavery: Economy and Society in the Antebellum American South* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 93; Richard Follett, *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in Louisiana's Cane World, 1820-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 4-8, 151-194; Jeffrey Young, *Domesticating Slavery: The Master Class in South Carolina and Georgia, 1670-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); Enrico Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond: The U.S. "Peculiar Institution" in International Perspective* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2013), 72-73.

Irish landed estates.⁸ For Ciarán Ó’Murchada, on the other hand, paternalism was completely undermined throughout rural Ireland by the drive for modernisation that took hold among the country’s landowners during the first half of the nineteenth century; in his opinion “the emergence of the cold, dispassionate principles of estate consolidation, with its absence of human feeling for those affected by it, must be seen as marking the end of any emotional engagement between landlords and those who payed them the rent.” In other words, Ó’Murchada believes that Irish landowners’ paternalistic pretensions proved incompatible with their capitalist characteristics.⁹ Yet, given that the second slavery was characterised by hybrid features on U.S. Southern plantations, so too may we recognise that a comparable combination of paternalistic and capitalistic features emerged on Irish estates during the second landlordism.

Considering that comparable questions have been asked of paternalism by historians of the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland, we can learn a great deal by comparing its effect on labour relations in the two regions. Taking John A. Quitman and Lord Clonbrock as case studies, this chapter explores similarities and differences between the practices of paternalism on Southern plantations and Irish landed estates. The first half of the chapter examines the nature and extent of Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s efforts to provide material comfort for their workers in fulfilment of the paternalistic ‘duties’ that they both purported to uphold. It also shows that, since it was used by the elites as a mechanism of social control, paternalism had a punitive dimension in both cases. However, while paternalistic U.S. Southern planters and Irish landlords intended reciprocity as means to

8 See Gearóid Ó’Tuathaigh, *Ireland Before the Famine, 1798-1848* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 1972), 132; Gerard Moran, *Sir Robert Gore Booth and his Landed Estate in County Sligo, 1814-1876: Famine, Emigration, Politics* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006); Tom Dunn, “A Gentleman’s Estate Should Be a Moral School: Edgeworthstown in Fact and Fiction, 1760-1840,” in Raymond Gillespie and Gerard Moran (eds.), *Longford: Essays in County History* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1991), 95-121; Enda Delaney, *The Curse of Reason: The Great Irish Famine, 1845-52* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2012), 35-39.

9 Ciarán Ó’Murchada, *The Great Famine: Ireland’s Agony, 1845-52* (London: Continuum, 2011), 12. Also see James Donnelly, *The Land and the People of Nineteenth-Century Cork: The Rural Economy and the Land Question* (London: Routledge, 1975), 100-120; David Roberts, *Paternalism in Early Victorian England* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979), 271-276.

control their workers, they were only ever partially successful in this aim. Therefore, the second half of the chapter investigates slave and peasant resistance on Quitman's and Clonbrock's properties and considers how this resistance related to paternalism in either case. By examining these subjects in comparative perspective, I believe we can come to a better understanding of labour relations on American plantations and Irish landed estates and therefore gain an appreciation of the different practices of paternalism in different historical contexts.

The Practice of Paternalism on the Quitman Plantations and on the Clonbrock Estates

An American former slave named Harriet Jacobs wrote the following in 1852: “far better to have been one of the starving poor of Ireland whose bones had to bleach on the highways than to have been a slave with the curse of slavery stamped upon yourself and children.”¹⁰ In contrast, Irishman Ebenezer Shackleton had written twelve years earlier: “in America the slave is called a slave—he is black and is flogged; in Ireland he is called a labourer—is white and is *only* starved.”¹¹ Although they were arguably laced with irony, Jacobs's and Shackleton's remarks represent well the tendency—widespread by the mid-nineteenth century—to compare Ireland's farming classes with U.S. Southern slaves and to evaluate their conditions in relative terms.¹² Most American slaveholders and Irish landowners resented

10 Harriet Jacobs to Amy Post, [1852], quoted in Jean Fagin Yellin, “Texts and Contexts of Harriet Jacobs's *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl Written by Herself*,” in Charles David and Henry Gates (eds.), *The Slave's Narrative* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 262. Jacobs was born into slavery in North Carolina in 1813 and escaped to the U.S. North in 1842. See Harriet Jacobs, *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl: Written by Herself* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988 [1861]).

11 *Freeman's Journal*, 26 August 1840. Shackleton, a mill owner from Moone, County Kildare, was a prominent Irish abolitionist and a brother of the noted author and diarist Mary Leadbeater. See Rodgers, *Ireland, Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, 315.

12 See, for example, James Henry Hammond, “Letter from James Henry Hammond to the Free Church of Glasgow, on the Subject of Slavery, 21 June 1844,” in *Selections from the Letters and Speeches of the Hon. James H. Hammond* (New York: John F. Throw & Co., 1866), 108-110; Frances Ann Kemble, *Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984 [1863]), 3-4; Harriet Martineau, *Society in America* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1837), II, 336. Also see Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *Slavery in White and Black: Class and Race Relations in the Southern Slaveholders' New World Order* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 132-133; Rodgers, *Ireland, Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, 312-330.

these unflattering comparisons and rejected the underlying premise that they exploited or mistreated their labourers. Instead, paternalistic members of both classes argued that they upheld a moral obligation to protect and provide for their workers in return for their loyalty and obedience. In both cases, this reciprocal ideal was little more than a rhetorical fiction used to defend exploitation and control labourers, but it was also a fiction in which the majority of mid-nineteenth-century American slaveholders and Irish landlords believed. This, in turn, led most members of the two elites to proclaim that they took an interest in the amelioration of their labourers' living conditions. Yet, in practice, the degree to which paternalism actually guided the behaviour of American slaveholders and Irish landlords varied considerably, both within and between the two agrarian elites.

A comparison of John Quitman's and Lord Clonbrock's treatment of their rural labourers can provide new insights into this issue, and thereby into the histories of U.S. Southern slavery and Irish landlordism. As we have seen in Chapter Three, Quitman and Clonbrock were among those slaveholders and landlords who developed a reciprocal interpretation of their relationship with their labourers and saw themselves as paternalists. Consequently, to a greater or lesser extent, they both assumed some responsibility for their workers' material condition. However, in neither case was the landowner's paternalistic behaviour a manifestation of their 'benevolence'; rather, it stemmed from their shared desire to control the rural labourers who generated their wealth. Thus, it is significant that Quitman and Clonbrock exercised the ability to punish their slaves or tenants whenever they (or their overseers/agents) wished, typically by means of corporal punishment in the former case and with economic sanctions in the latter. Ultimately, though, as a consequence of the differences between slavery and tenancy, together with the contrasts between historical conditions in the U.S. South and Ireland, paternalism proved to be far weaker in the latter context.¹³

13 For discussions of Quitman's and Clonbrock's treatment of their labourers, see Robert May, *John A. Quitman: Old South Crusader* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 138-142; Kevin McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual: Paternalism on the Clonbrock Estates, 1826-1908," (PhD diss.,

In the antebellum U.S. South, due to both the political economy of the region's plantation system and the strength of paternalism, slaveholders typically provided for the upkeep of their slaves. Ever since the first phase of the North American 'plantation revolution' in the seventeenth century, Southern planters had forced most of their slaves to concentrate on the production of different marketable cash crops. Consequently, notwithstanding the fact that slaves often engaged in independent production in their spare time, the American South's bondpeople were generally not primarily responsible for their own subsistence, as slave and peasant communities in other times and places often were.¹⁴ Furthermore, as paternalistic ideology became increasingly prevalent among American slaveholders between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the provision of adequate food, shelter, and medicine for slaves became *de rigueur*, since planters claimed a duty to 'care for' their bondpeople as part of their reciprocal interpretation of the master-slave relationship. Although this rendered U.S. Southern slaves no less exploited or vulnerable to abuse, it did ensure that the majority of them lived in material conditions that compared favourably with labouring classes in many other parts of the nineteenth-century world.¹⁵

John Quitman was a planter who took his paternalistic duty to care for his slaves seriously. Regarding their nutrition, he provided corn and pork rations as the staple diet, either by farming these items on his plantations or by purchasing them on the market. These rations were augmented with seasonal vegetables and fruit, such as the potatoes that were farmed at

National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011).

14 Michael Bush, *Servitude in Modern Times* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000), 106-109; Ira Berlin and Philip Morgan, "Introduction," in Ira Berlin and Philip Morgan (eds.), *The Slaves' Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas* (London: Frank Cass, 1995 [1991]), 1-27; Roderick McDonald, *The Economy and Material Culture of Slaves: Goods and Chattels on the Sugar Plantations of Jamaica and Louisiana* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993). On the North American 'plantation revolution,' see Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998), 95-216.

15 See Peter Kolchin, *American Slavery, 1619-1877* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1989), 111-118; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*; Drew Gilpin Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 69-104. For a compilation of sources that elaborated on the expectation for U.S. Southern planters to treat their slaves well, see James Breeden (ed.), *Advice Among Masters: The Ideal in Slave Management in the Old South* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1980).

Palmyra and the oranges that were grown at Live Oaks. In addition, the slaves would probably also have supplemented their diet with a portion of the produce of the garden plots that Quitman encouraged them to keep with a view toward achieving self-sufficiency on his plantations.¹⁶ To be sure, there were times when, with an eye on profit, Quitman ordered his slaves' rations to be cut if the market price of provisions became too costly. In 1852, for example, he informed N.D. Fuqua—who was then the overseer at Live Oaks—that “pork is exceedingly high, while it is so we must reduce the allowance a little.” Significantly, though, Quitman also told Fuqua in the same letter to “make it [the shortfall in the slaves' rations] up in molasses or sugar.” The fact that Quitman was willing to offset a temporary reduction in his slaves' rations with portions of his valuable cash crops indicates that he did not consider their diet to be an item of discretionary expenditure. Therefore, while the subject of Southern slaves' nutrition has been the source of considerable debate among historians, it appears that Quitman's slaves were usually well fed.¹⁷

Throughout the antebellum American South, paternalistic planters also commonly claimed responsibility for their slaves' housing as one of their 'duties.' Quitman was no exception in this respect; on each of his estates, he built and maintained cabins for his bondspeople. Together, these cabins resembled small villages. After traveling through Louisiana in the late 1840s, an agriculturalist named Solon Robinson described one sugar

16 See Henry Turner to John Quitman, 15 April 1842, QFP; Palmyra Account Book, 23 February 1846, QFP; Springfield Plantation Account Book, 1 March 1842, JAQPM; John A. Quitman Daybook, 17 January 1839, 17 March 1840, JAQPL; Janet Sharp Hermann, *The Pursuit of a Dream* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999 [1981]), 24, 26. On the impact of garden plots on Southern master-slave relations, see Roderick McDonald, “Independent Economic Production by Slaves on Antebellum Louisiana Sugar Plantations,” in Ira Berlin and Philip Morgan (eds.), *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993), 275-299; Steven Hahn, *A Nation Under our Feet: Black Political Struggle in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), 24-30.

17 John Quitman to N.D. Fuqua, February 1852, JAQPM. For positive general accounts of antebellum slave diets, see Fogel and Engerman, *Time on the Cross*, 109-115; Robert Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989), 132-138; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 62-63, 535-540; Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 113. For scholarly accounts that question the idea that Southern slaves were well fed, see Dusinberre, *Them Dark Days*, 179-184; Kenneth Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution: Negro Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South* (New York: Vintage, 1956), 282-289; Edward Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014), 118.

plantation's "neatly whitewashed frame houses, with brick chimneys, built in regular order upon both sides of a wide street."¹⁸ Slave lodgings on Quitman's properties closely resembled this description. An overseer once described the slave quarters at Palmyra as follows: "the negro quarters are good and comfortable and being arranged in rows, each house separate, all whitewashed, had a very neat appearance forming a street with houses uniform on either side."¹⁹ These cabins (and those on Quitman's other plantations) were assigned to individual slave families as part of an attempt to ensure social stability among the workforce and to encourage procreation.²⁰ The dwellings also functioned as symbols of Quitman's mastery, since—as Richard Follett has argued of slave lodgings on sugar plantations in Louisiana—they were intended to foster feelings of dependence among the bondsmen and women by providing a physical representation of the planter's power and by facilitating close supervision of the slaves in their non-working hours.²¹

Paternalistic Southern planters' concerns for their slaves' welfare were particularly evident in the realm of medicine. Since Quitman's wealth was closely tied to his bondpeople's capacity to effectively cultivate and process cotton or sugar, it was in his interest to maintain their good health. Outbreaks of cholera and yellow fever were common in Mississippi and Louisiana during the antebellum era. These diseases intermittently struck Quitman's plantations, and caused the death of many slaves, who were, fundamentally, highly valuable capital investments. Therefore, in order to limit these fatalities, Quitman payed large sums of money for physicians to attend to his slaves when they were sick or injured. In

18 Robinson quoted in Herbert Anthony Keller (ed.), *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturalist: Selected Writings* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1936), II, 180. Also see *DeBow's Review* 7 (1849), 381-382; Fogel and Engerman, *Time on the Cross*, 115-116.

19 Henry Rowntree quoted in May, *John A. Quitman*, 139. For another positive description of slave lodgings at Palmyra, see William Wood, *Autobiography of William Wood* (New York: J.S. Babcock, 1895), I, 459.

20 At Springfield, for example, slaves were listed in the plantation records per family per cabin. See "A True and Correct List of the Negroes on Springfield Plantation on the first of Dec. 1853," in Springfield Plantation Account Book, JAQPM. Also see Hermann, *Pursuit of a Dream*, 249.

21 Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 179-185. For more on this point, see Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 524-534; John Valch, *Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

addition, he organised for regular medical check-ups at Live Oaks and Palmyra.²² During outbreaks of disease, his infected slaves were also quarantined in custom-built ‘hospitals’ that were common on large plantations throughout the South in the antebellum era. However, it should be noted that Quitman’s slaves disliked being quarantined and often refused to take medicines, factors that Henry Turner—Quitman’s brother-in law and partner in Palmyra—blamed for the high number of slave fatalities that resulted from an outbreak of cholera that struck Mississippi in 1849.²³

As well as establishing plantation hospitals and paying for physicians to regularly examine his slaves, Quitman also personally tended to their medical needs on occasion, running the risk of contracting illness himself in the process. This hands-on care for his slaves, common among paternalistic Southern planters, was particularly evident during a virulent yellow fever epidemic that spread through the Natchez district in 1853. By Quitman’s own account, he spared no effort in diligently “nursing and prescribing for sick negroes” for over a month during this epidemic, after which he lamented the loss of “poor Flora” who died despite his best efforts to restore her health.²⁴ Indeed, Quitman often described himself as stricken upon the death of his slaves, even field slaves whom he did not know well. After multiple fatalities at Live Oaks in 1839, for example, he wrote of his disappointment in a letter to Albert Quitman, who was then managing the Louisiana sugar plantation, and directed

22 May, *John A. Quitman*, 140-141. In 1847 a doctor was contracted to visit Live Oaks twice a week for an annual sum of \$200 and another was paid \$709.50 for his visits to Palmyra during 1851. See Eliza Quitman to John Quitman, 28 June 1847, QFP; Henry Turner to E.J. Noulén, 12 February 1852, QFP. For mention of slave sickness and deaths from various diseases on Quitman’s plantations, see Henry Turner to John Quitman, 19 August 1842, QFP; John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 24 May 1849, 6 July 1852, FHQP; F. Henry Quitman to John Quitman, 30 January 1852, JAQPM.

23 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 20 April 1849, QFP. According to Turner, the slaves “had no confidence in our treatment. They said it was certain death to take our medicine and we were compelled to stand by and see them die.” See Henry Turner to Sarah Tyler, 27 April 1849, QFP. For more on medical care for Southern slaves in these years, see Katherine Bankole, *Slavery and Medicine: Enslavement and Medical Practices in Antebellum Louisiana* (New York: Garland, 1998); Todd Lee Savitt, *Medicine and Slavery: The Diseases and Health Care of Blacks in Antebellum Virginia* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978); Steven Stowe, *Doctoring the South: Southern Physicians and Everyday Medicine in the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

24 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 14 September, 26 October 1853, FHQP. For discussion of other paternalistic Southern masters who personally tended to their slaves’ medical needs, see Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 133, 137-138; Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 77-82.

him to “attend to the sick, and let them have every possible comfort.”²⁵

Ultimately, as Eugene Genovese and Drew Faust have argued, Southern slaveholders’ paternalistic practices were motivated primarily by their desire to control their slaves, and this appears to have been the case on Quitman’s plantations.²⁶ “Clothe them well, make them be clean and neat in their persons and dwellings, encourage them to have gardens and fruit trees and vines, regulate their little domestic dissensions, and grant them every indulgence consistent with discipline,” Quitman once advised his brother while the latter was in charge of Live Oaks. Significantly, he concluded this advice with the observation that “harshness makes the negro stubborn; praise, and even flattery, and, more than all, kindness, make them pliable and obedient.”²⁷ Thus, we can see that, at heart, Quitman’s paternalistic treatment of his bondspeople was consciously designed to minimise social conflict and establish an efficient mechanism of workforce management on his plantations; as such, it fitted well with the capitalistic ideas and practices that characterised the second slavery. Arguably, this attitude was representative of paternalistic planters throughout the antebellum South, who, as a number of historians have suggested, often came from the more economically progressive section of the region’s elite and believed in a strong correlation between the humane treatment of slaves and profit.²⁸

Importantly, though, despite Quitman’s claim that harshness made slaves “stubborn,” his plantations were by no means free of violence. Whippings, or the threat of whippings, were a routine feature of life for the majority of Quitman’s slaves, as revealed in his

25 John Quitman to Albert Quitman, 22 November 1839, in J.F.H. Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Major-General, U.S.A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1860), I, 190. Also see Eugene Genovese and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Fatal Self-Deception: Slaveholding Paternalism in the Old South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 79-80.

26 Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 146-149; Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 72-104.

27 John Quitman to Albert Quitman, 9 May 1839, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 190.

28 See Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 151-194; William Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House: Elite Slaveholders of the Mid-Nineteenth-Century South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 176-206; Enrico Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites: American Slaveholders and Southern Italian Landowners, 1815-1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 150-166. For a critical view of the idea that paternalism coexisted with and complemented Southern masters’ capitalist characteristics, see Dusinberre, *Them Dark Days*, 49-84, 201-206.

correspondence with his partners and overseers. In an 1843 letter, for example, Henry Turner wrote—while defending an overseer for his use of corporal punishment at Palmyra—that “it is impossible to manage any set of negroes without resorting to the whip at times. The very best of them require it.” Similarly to plantations throughout the antebellum South, whippings were meted out on Quitman’s properties for a variety of infractions, from disobeying orders, to working slowly, to picking “trashy” cotton.²⁹

These punishments did not contravene Quitman’s paternalistic credentials, however, at least in the eyes of his fellow slaveholders. As Eugene Genovese has written, “the typical planter went to his whip often—much more than he himself would usually have preferred.” Under the logic of slaveholding paternalism, such corporal punishment was justified as a necessary tool to keep supposedly childlike slaves in line. Even though Quitman and other paternalistic Southern slaveholders may have preferred to limit the use of the whip, they almost always deemed at least some whippings necessary on their plantations. What distinguished paternalistic planters from others was their desire to avoid *excessively* cruel punishments, which they thought counterproductive, since they aroused resentment among the bondspeople and ran the risk of injuring them beyond their capacity to work. Instead, Edward Baptist has argued, most antebellum slaveholders attempted to use whippings rationally, as part of a ‘pushing system’ that pressured slaves to work harder and faster. This was true also of slave punishments on Quitman’s plantations, as Henry Turner revealed when he wrote of his displeasure with an overseer named W.R. Smither for “getting to be too severe with the negroes—too fond of his whip and the use of the stocks—the latter should not be used except in extreme cases.” Evidently, Turner recognised that there was a need to limit and rationalise punishments at Palmyra, just as Quitman and most other paternalistic Southern slaveholders maintained. By combining these punishments with the provision of food, housing, and

²⁹ Henry Turner to John Quitman, 12 October 1843, 26 October 1843, QFP; Robert May, “John A. Quitman and His Slaves: Reconciling Slave Resistance with the Proslavery Defense,” *Journal of Southern History* 46 (1980), 555-556.

medicine, Quitman was able to ensure that his slaves consistently worked at a high level of efficiency and productivity.³⁰

In contrast with the self-appointed imperative for U.S. Southern planters to provide sustenance, shelter, and medical care for their slaves, Irish landlords were not directly liable for the upkeep of their tenants and labourers, who were both free and self-supporting.

Nevertheless, Irish landlords were *expected* to take some responsibility for the residents of their estates, especially when they began to embrace and articulate paternalistic ideas in large numbers during the first half of the nineteenth century.³¹ The poverty of Ireland's peasantry in these years is deservedly notorious. While there were certainly some prosperous tenants to be found throughout the country, the vast majority of Irish peasants farmed small plots of land, lived in squalid conditions, and subsisted mostly on a potato diet.³² Potatoes—which formed one element of a relatively varied diet for many American slaves but were the sole item of consumption for a large proportion of Ireland's farming classes—were nutritious. The major problem with the potato in nineteenth-century Ireland was overdependence, since, relying almost exclusively on this one crop for their subsistence, tenants and labourers experienced distress when a year's supply was consumed or a harvest failed.³³ Such failures were common

30 Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 64; Baptist, *Half Has Never Been Told*, 111-144; Henry Turner to John Quitman, 16 March 1853, QFP. Also see May, "Quitman and His Slaves," 555-556; Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 82, 120-126, 130-131; Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 99-100; Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 173-178; [James Henry Hammond], "Governor Hammond's Instructions to His Overseer," in Willie Lee Rose (ed.), *A Documentary History of Slavery in North America* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999 [1976]), 247, 354.

31 As one prominent Irish agricultural reformer wrote in an 1835 publication, it was widely acknowledged that "the superfluities of the one class [landlords] should administer to the necessities of the other [tenants]." Martin Doyle, *The Works of Martin Doyle, Vol. 1: An Address to the Landlords of Ireland, on Subjects Connected with the Melioration of the Lower Classes* (Dublin: W. Curry, Jun. and Co., 1836 [1835]), 15.

32 See Cormac Ó'Gráda, *Ireland Before and After the Famine: Explorations in Economic History, 1800-1925* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 12-22; Ó'Murchada, *Great Famine*, 1-26; Donnelly, *Land and the People*, 9-72; Joel Mokyr, *Why Ireland Starved: A Quantitative and Analytical History of the Irish Economy, 1800-1850* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983), 6-29.

33 L.A. Clarkson and Margaret Crawford, *Feast and Famine: Food and Nutrition in Ireland, 1500-1920* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 59-87, 111-163; Cormac Ó'Gráda, *Ireland: A New Economic History, 1780-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 13-23; Roderick Floud, Kenneth Wachter, and Annabel Gregory, *Height, Health, and History: Nutritional Status in the United Kingdom, 1750-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 298.

during the 1800s; most famous were those that caused the Great Famine (1845-52), but many localised potato failures also occurred in the preceding and subsequent decades. As Christine Kinealy and other historians have pointed out, Irish landlords were not required to feed their tenants and labourers in ‘normal’ seasons, but they were expected to provide for them during times of scarcity or famine; indeed, such philanthropy was a central element of the paternalistic ‘duties’ that many of them claimed to assume.³⁴

This was a duty that Galway’s Lord Clonbrock generally fulfilled. As Kevin McKenna has discussed at length, charity was a major feature of everyday life on the Clonbrock estates during the third baron’s lifetime. Clonbrock provided annual pensions to many of the widows and elderly residents of his estates, and he regularly gave small sums of money to people who went hungry when a year’s potato crop was consumed. His philanthropic role increased in importance when crops failed, especially during the Great Famine. Typical of Ireland’s landed class, Clonbrock was not overly concerned when the potato blight first appeared in 1845, since seasonal subsistence crises were a routine feature of Irish society in this era. However, after the blight reappeared in 1846 and the scale of the catastrophe became apparent, Clonbrock responded admirably. He increased his charitable expenditures and created extra jobs on his estates in order to provide small farmers and labourers with money that they could use to buy food. He also sold his horses and hounds and distributed the proceeds among the poorest residents of his estates. These actions reinforced Clonbrock’s popular reputation as a ‘good’ landlord and went some way toward substantiating his self-image as a paternalist.³⁵

34 Christine Kinealy, *The Great Irish Famine: Impact, Ideology and Rebellion* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 64-66; Conor McNamara, “‘The Monster Misery of Ireland’: Landlord Paternalism and the 1822 Famine in the West,” and Joanne McEntee, “Pecuniary Assistance for Poverty and Emigration: The Politics of Irish Landed Estate Management and Philanthropy in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” both in Laurence Geary and Oonagh Walsh (eds.), *Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2014), 82-96, 115-132; Timothy O’Neill, “Minor Famines and Famine Relief in County Galway, 1815-25,” in Gerard Moran (ed.), *Galway History and Society: Interdisciplinary Essays on the History of an Irish County* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 1996), 445-485.

35 McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual,” 77-113; Kevin McKenna, “Charity, Paternalism and Power on the Clonbrock Estates, County Galway, 1834-44,” in Geary and Walsh (eds.), *Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland*, 97-114; Edith Dillon-Mahon, “The Dillons of Clonbrock,” (Unpublished Manuscript, National Library of Ireland, Dublin, 1957), 50; *Third Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland (Poor Inquiry)*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 31, 1836,

Other Irish landowners, however, neglected or ignored their social responsibility to provide for their tenants during times of crisis; in fact, many used the opportunity provided by the Famine to clear their estates of unwanted small tenants.³⁶

Similarly to Quitman, Clonbrock also assumed responsibility for the construction and maintenance of housing for his labourers as one of his paternalistic duties. According to Jonathan Binns, an Englishman who toured Ireland in the mid-1830s, “the cottages recently erected on the estates of Lord Clonbrock ... are superior to the generality.” Clonbrock rented these buildings to his labourers, and he also subsidised the larger houses built by his most prosperous tenants.³⁷ As a result, the residents of his estates lived in better conditions than most Irish peasants, a significant proportion of whom inhabited crude mud hovels. It is, therefore, unsurprising that, when passing through one of Clonbrock’s estates in 1842, William Thackeray, the famous English novelist, was impressed enough by what he saw to make note of the scene. He likened the village of Ahascragh—located near Clonbrock House—to those found in his native country and observed that “the houses are as trim and white as the eye can desire ... forming on the whole such a picture of comfort and plenty as is rarely to be seen in the part of Ireland I have traversed.” One reason why Thackeray found this village so remarkable is that most Irish landlords, unlike most Southern slaveholders, did not take any responsibility for their workers’ lodgings; Clonbrock was in a minority among his peers in this respect.³⁸

appendix F, 81. For detailed information on Clonbrock’s expenditure on charity, see Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1827-1855, Ms 19,585-19,622, CP.

36 See James Donnelly, *The Great Irish Potato Famine* (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2001), 132-186; Christine Kinealy, *This Great Calamity: The Irish Famine, 1845-52* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1994); Christine Kinealy and Tomás O’Riordan, “Private Responses to the Great Famine: Documents,” in Donnchadh Ó’Corráin and Tomás O’Riordan (eds.), *Ireland, 1815-70: Emancipation, Famine and Religion* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), 95-128; John Conwell, *A Galway Landlord During the Great Famine: Ulick John de Burgh, First Marquis of Clanricarde* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003).

37 Jonathan Binns, *The Miseries and Beauties of Ireland* (London: Longman, Orman, Brown and Co., 1837), II, 10; *Evidence Taken before Her Majesty’s Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Law and Practice in Respect to the Occupation of Land in Ireland (Devon Commission)*, pt. ii, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 19, 1845, 507; Patrick Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society in Galway* (Dublin: De Búrca, 2012), 95. For expenses incurred by Clonbrock on providing housing for his tenants and labourers, see Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1827-1843, Ms 19,585-19,608, CP.

38 William Thackeray, *Irish Sketch Book* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1869 [1843]), 229. Also see W.E.

Another practical manifestation of paternalism on the Clonbrock estates was the fact that, similarly to Quitman, Clonbrock provided medical care for his labourers. In general, this related to the funding of his locality's dispensaries. By contributing annual subscriptions to these de facto hospitals established on or near his estates, Clonbrock ensured that his tenants and labourers had access to medical care if they became ill.³⁹ Also similarly to Quitman, Clonbrock paid physicians to treat sick residents of his estates. For instance, one entry in his 1836-37 account book shows that he paid a doctor "for attendance and medicine for sick people."⁴⁰ While certainly an example of humane behaviour on Clonbrock's part, this expenditure on medical care for his tenantry was also partially motivated by self-interest, since disease did not discriminate between the higher and lower classes—a fact as true in Ireland as it was in the U.S. South. Indeed, it was often the same diseases, such as typhus and cholera, that affected both regions during the nineteenth century and spurred their resident landed elites to take an interest in the health of their workers. As happened with slaves in the U.S. South, infected fever victims in Ireland were often quarantined in order to limit the spread of contagion. The majority of the rural Irish poor were confined in government-funded institutions, but Clonbrock also erected 'fever sheds' on his own property—reminiscent of Quitman's construction of hospitals on his plantations.⁴¹

Together with the provisions of alms and housing, Clonbrock's expenditure on medicine was part of a paternalistic system of estate management that was designed to foster

Vaughan, "An Assessment of the Economic Performance of Irish Landlords, 1851-81," in F.S.L. Lyons and R.A.J. Hawkins (eds.), *Ireland Under The Union: Varieties of Tension, Essays in Honour of T.W. Moody* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 192-195; Ó'Grada, *Ireland*, 29-32, 122-130.

39 For sums spent by Clonbrock on subscriptions to dispensaries, see Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1827-1843, Ms 19,585-19,608, CP.

40 Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1836-1837, Ms 19,599, CP. Also see Thomas Bermingham, *Letter Addressed to the Right Honorable Lord John Russell Containing Facts Illustrative of the Good Effects from the Just and Considerate Discharge of the Duties of a Resident Landlord in Ireland* (London: Trelawney Saunders, 1846), 8-9.

41 Clonbrock Estate Accounts, 1834-1835, Ms 19,605, CP; McKenna, "Charity, Paternalism and Power," 100-101, 107-109. On Irish dispensaries and fever hospitals, see Laurence Geary, *Medicine and Charity in Ireland, 1718-1851* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2004), 45-92; Ronald Cassell, *Medical Charities, Medical Politics: The Irish Dispensary System and the Poor Law, 1836-1872* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997); Ó'Tuathaigh, *Ireland Before the Famine*, 94-95. Also see Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 186.

gratitude and dependence among his tenantry. Comparably to U.S. Southern slaveholding paternalism during the second slavery, therefore, Clonbrock's paternalistic behaviour was motivated primarily by his desire to control his labourers and thereby achieve the aim of efficient estate management that characterised the second landlordism. Thomas Bermingham, Clonbrock's land agent between 1826 and 1843, betrayed this intent in his public appeals to Ireland's landlords to acknowledge and fulfil their 'duties' to their tenants. In one of the many pamphlets Bermingham penned on the subject of Irish social and economic conditions, he declared that, if others were to imitate Clonbrock's paternalistic behaviour, then Ireland's farming classes would become "like those of Castle Sampson [one of Clonbrock's estates], peaceable and industrious cultivators."⁴² In practice, however, Bermingham's appeals for more landlords to emulate his employer met with little success. Despite the fact that Ireland's landed class loudly declared its paternalistic credentials, a large number of Clonbrock's fellow landowners—for a variety of reasons ranging from indebtedness to callousness—neglected or ignored their various 'duties' to their tenants and labourers.⁴³

Recognising Irish landlords' general failure to fulfil their duties, the British government established a workhouse system, based on an English model and funded by local taxes, in Ireland after 1838.⁴⁴ Clonbrock, similarly to most of his fellow Irish landlords, opposed the introduction of these workhouses. He did so both because he worried about their cost and because he understood that the centralised nature of this charity would affect the dynamics of paternalistic reciprocity on his estates. Indeed, as Kevin McKenna has shown, in the years after the passage of the Irish Poor Law in 1838, Clonbrock's philanthropic

42 Thomas Bermingham, *Additional Statements on the Subject of the River Shannon to the Reports Published in 1831* (London: S.W. Fores, 1834), 15. Also see Thomas Bermingham, *The Social State of Great Britain and Ireland Considered* (London: S.W. Fores, 1835); Bermingham, *Duties of a Resident Landlord in Ireland*; McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 17-76; McEntee, "Pecuniary Assistance for Poverty," 115-132.

43 See W.E. Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 124-130; Conor McNamara, "'This Wretched People': The Famine of 1822 in the West of Ireland," in Carla King and Conor McNamara (eds.), *The West of Ireland: New Perspectives on the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: History Press Ireland, 2011), 26-29; Ó'Tuathaigh, *Ireland Before the Famine*, 132, 146-147.

44 Peter Gray, *The Making of the Irish Poor Law, 1815-43* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).

expenditure declined as a result of the requirements to make substantial contributions to the upkeep of his locality's new workhouses. Nevertheless, Clonbrock still continued to spend more on charity than most Irish landlords, and this ensured that his tenants and labourers generally enjoyed a better standard of living than the majority of his country's farming classes in this era.⁴⁵

Significantly, in nineteenth-century Ireland, as in the antebellum U.S. South, the elites' practice of paternalism also allowed room for punishments. Although Arthur Young noted in the late eighteenth century that any Irish landlord could "punish [a tenant] with his cane and his horsewhip with the most perfect security," the actual occurrence of corporal punishment on Ireland's landed estates was rare, certainly relative to U.S. Southern plantations, where whippings were commonplace.⁴⁶ This was primarily because Irish peasants were legally free, and therefore entitled to due process under the law. But Irish landlords were able to discipline their tenants and labourers in other ways. They could call in the 'hanging gale'—the six month's rent Irish tenants traditionally deferred payment of when they took possession of a farm. They could also raise rents or refuse employment to recalcitrant tenants and labourers. The most extreme punishment available to an Irish landowner, however, was eviction.⁴⁷

Even though Clonbrock was generally considered a 'good' landlord, he was not above exercising these powers to discipline his tenants and labourers whenever he considered it necessary. In 1861, for example, Clonbrock evicted a tenant named Pat Barrett for angering him by protesting against the burial of a Protestant corpse in a Catholic cemetery. This

45 McKenna, "Charity, Paternalism and Power," 104-114. Also see Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 253-267; Gray, *Making of the Irish Poor Law*, 50-53; Henry Inglis, *A Journey Throughout Ireland During the Spring, Summer and Autumn of 1834* (London: Whittaker and Co., 1838 [1834]), 213.

46 Arthur Young, *A Tour in Ireland: With General Observations on the Present State of that Kingdom* (London: H. Goldney, 1780), II, 127. For a discussion of violence on Irish landed estates during the nineteenth century, see Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society*, 341-423.

47 Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants*, 29-34; Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society*, 144-151; Gerard Lyne, *The Lansdowne Estate in Kerry Under the Stewardship of William Stuart Trench, 1849-72* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2001), 175-230. According to one early-nineteenth-century commentator, the hanging gale was "one of the great levers of oppression by which the lower classes are held in a state of perpetual bondage." Edward Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1812), I, 244.

episode is particularly well documented because it sparked a debate in the Irish press. Citing Barrett's eviction as evidence of a larger system of injustice, the *Nation* argued that "if landlords are allowed to proceed in their present course, the tenant people of Ireland are doomed to a slavery more ignoble, more destructive to human happiness, and more debasing to human nature than any existing on the face of the earth." In truth, the evidence suggests that Clonbrock rarely resorted to these types of punitive evictions. Still, regardless of the frequency of eviction, Irish landlords' *ability* to evict, or to punish their tenants and labourers in numerous other ways, unquestionably invested them with considerable power over the residents of their estates. As was the case with Quitman, Clonbrock's paternalistic behaviour was intended to disguise, but did it not undermine or weaken, his power.⁴⁸

A comparison of the practices of paternalism on Quitman's plantations and Clonbrock's estates reveals a number of interesting similarities and differences. Over the past five decades, several historians have argued that, strictly in terms of their material conditions, American slaves generally fared better than most of the world's working classes during the first half of the nineteenth century. In particular, Eugene Genovese has suggested that they enjoyed a better standard of living than Irish peasants.⁴⁹ This suggestion is empirically supported by a comparison between Quitman's plantations and Clonbrock's estates. The two landowners acted in a paternalistic manner and provided for the tillers of their soil, but paternalism was far stronger in the American case, with positive and negative consequences for the labourers in both cases. Although Clonbrock's tenants enjoyed higher living standards than the majority of Irish peasants as a result of their landlord's paternalistic behaviour, most of them still lived at subsistence level and were regularly subject to hunger and privation in a way that was rare

48 *Nation*, 12 January 1861. For more on Barrett's eviction, see McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 134-141.

49 Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 58-59, 526. Also see Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 134; Fogel and Engerman, *Time on the Cross*, 109-126; Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House*, 176; Eric Snow, "Who Was Better Off? A Comparison of American Slaves and English Agricultural Workers, 1750-1875," (M.A. thesis, Michigan State University, 1997).

for Quitman's slaves. Even more important, Quitman's paternalistic behaviour was representative of a large portion of his class, whereas Clonbrock's behaviour was only characteristic of a minority of Irish landlords, whose paternalistic rhetoric was far less likely to translate into concrete material gains for the rural labourers.⁵⁰

At the root of these divergences between the practices of paternalism employed by the agrarian elites in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland is the fact that American slaveholders had a direct economic stake in the well-being of their workforce, while Irish landlords did not. It was in Quitman's self-interest to keep his slaves well fed, sheltered, and healthy, both because he owned them and also to maximise the labour he could extract from them. In contrast, Clonbrock may well have had economic motives for implementing paternalistic practices—as part of his effort to modernise his estates while simultaneously avoiding conflict with his workers—but, crucially, he did not lose capital if his tenants or labourers were to suffer deprivations or die. Indeed, since nineteenth-century Ireland had a rapidly expanding population and a finite supply of land, the country's peasants were often deemed expendable by their landlords. For this reason, while there was an expectation for Irish landowners to ameliorate their tenants' and labourers' living conditions—as Clonbrock did—the fulfilment of this 'duty' varied considerably from one estate to the next.⁵¹

In fact, unlike what happened in the American South, the wealth of the Irish landed class was often pitted *against* the well-being of the workers during the nineteenth century. Since Ireland's landed estates were widely considered overpopulated, most landlords had an interest in ridding themselves of their small tenants. This motivated the mass evictions and

50 See Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 111-118; Ó'Tuathaigh, *Ireland Before the Famine*, 132.

51 Interestingly, many of the Irish migrants who settled in the U.S. South during the antebellum period were also deemed expendable by planters, who often hired them for jobs considered too dangerous for valuable slaves. See Frederick Law Olmsted, *The Cotton Kingdom: A Traveller's Observations on Cotton and Slavery in the American Slave States, 1853-1861* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1953 [1861]), 27, 70, 215; David Gleeson, *The Irish in the South, 1815-1877* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 38-54; Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 85-86.

contributed to the high levels of mortality that occurred during the Great Famine.⁵² Aside from the theoretical case of a complete collapse in prices for staple crops produced on American plantations—never likely at any point during the antebellum era—an analogous situation would have been unthinkable in the U.S. South. There, slaveholders such as Quitman were not only expected to ensure a reasonable standard of living for their labourers for ideological and humanitarian reasons—as was the case for Irish landlords—but also, to a much greater degree than in Ireland, they found it to be in their economic self-interest to do so, since their slaves were capital that they wished to increase through reproduction.⁵³ Hence the strength of paternalism in the antebellum U.S. South, its relative weakness in nineteenth-century Ireland, and the related difference between the majority of the slaves’ and peasants’ material conditions.

We should be careful, though, not to infer from the above observations that American slaves were ‘better off’ than Irish peasants in an overall sense. Such a conclusion would be tantamount to accepting the Southern proslavery ideologues’ warped logic. The fact that paternalism was stronger among slaveholders in the U.S. South than it was among landlords in Ireland also had negative consequences for the rural labourers in the former context. For example, Quitman’s bondspeople were frequently whipped, and these whippings were just one example of the slaves’ vulnerability to their master’s pervasive interference in their daily lives. In contrast, Clonbrock did not possess the authority to arbitrarily subject his free tenants or labourers to corporal punishment. Still, he did possess the ability to punish his workers in other ways, as evident from his eviction of Pat Barrett. Thus, Quitman and Clonbrock possessed comparable, but very different, powers over their workers’ lives—powers that

52 See Ó’Murchada, *Great Famine*, 113-134; Cormac Ó’Gráda, *Black ’47 and Beyond: The Great Irish Famine in History, Economy, and Memory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 84-121. On the theory that nineteenth-century Ireland was overpopulated, see R.D. Collison Black, *Economic Thought and the Irish Question, 1817-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 15-44; Mokyr, *Why Ireland Starved*, 30-80.

53 See Shearer Davis Bowman, *Masters and Lords: Mid-Nineteenth-Century U.S. Planters and Prussian Junkers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 182-183.

rendered those workers, whether legally unfree or free, dependent in both cases. Clonbrock's tenants and labourers may have been dependent to a lesser degree than Quitman's slaves, but they were dependent nonetheless.⁵⁴

In the end, then, any answer to the question of whether U.S. Southern slaves or Irish peasants were 'better off'—often asked in nineteenth-century sources—is entirely subjective. Indeed, framing the American slaves' and the Irish peasants' histories in this way arguably engenders a false dichotomy. Instead of pursuing the either/or logic that posing this question impels, it might be better to recognise that the two agrarian workforces were exploited in different ways for the benefit of two different, but comparable, landowning classes. Both Quitman and Clonbrock consistently acted in a paternalistic manner, which led to improved living standards for the labourers who lived and worked on their estates, but those labourers were no less exploited, albeit in very different ways, as a consequence. In fact, American slavery and Irish landlordism, as represented by Quitman and Clonbrock, were arguably more insidious forms of oppression, since paternalistic behaviour was intended by both to disguise exploitation and solicit the workers' consent to an unequal social order. In neither context, however, did the rural labourers passively accept the status quo; in both cases, they resented and resisted their exploitation.

Slave Resistance on Quitman's Plantations and Peasant Resistance on Clonbrock's Estates

If John Quitman's and Lord Clonbrock's paternalistic world-views had been true reflections of reality, then their estates would have been idyllic communities in which the landowners and the tillers of their soil lived in harmony. Yet, even though Quitman's slaves and Clonbrock's

⁵⁴ See Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 100; Piero Bevilacqua, "Peter Kolchin's 'American South' and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Some Questions About Comparative History," in Enrico Dal Lago and Rick Halpern (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 66-67. On the negative consequences of paternalism for slaves in the U.S. South, see Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 118-126.

tenants may have sometimes professed their loyalty—as happened during the special occasions discussed in the previous chapter—they had their own opinions of their social ‘superiors’ and developed their own interpretations of paternalism. As Theodore Hoppen has written of life on Irish landed estates during the nineteenth century, “daylight sycophants often became moonlight marauders.” By this, Hoppen meant that many of the same peasants who publicly showed deference to their landlords were often hostile to them in private. Hoppen’s remark is equally applicable to U.S. Southern plantations, where slaves generally feigned subservience, but resented their condition of servitude; in the words of Bertram Wyatt-Brown, for example, most Southern bondspeople wore a “mask of obedience.”⁵⁵ Crucially, in both the American South and Ireland, the rural labourers revealed their hostility toward the agrarian elites by resisting their exploitation in a variety of different ways.⁵⁶

Similarly to most other American slaveholders and Irish landlords, John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock encountered this resistance on a regular basis. An analysis of the patterns of slave and peasant protests that characterised their landed estates and wider contexts sheds light on an important aspect of labour relations in the U.S. South during the second slavery and in Ireland during the second landlordism. In both cases, the rural labourers influenced the elites’ behaviour by setting limits to the degree of exploitation to which they would consent. In the process, Quitman’s slaves and Clonbrock’s tenants and labourers revealed that they held comparable ideas of “moral economy”—a concept used by E.P. Thompson in order to explain the complex set of popular attitudes toward social justice that formed the background to food riots in eighteenth-century England. There, as Thomson demonstrated, the rural

55 Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society*, 136; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, “The Mask of Obedience: Male Slave Psychology in the Old South,” *American Historical Review* 93 (1988), 1228-1252. For a discussion of a similar phenomenon in a British context, see K.D.M. Snell, “Deferential Bitterness: The Social Outlook of the Rural Proletariat in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century England and Wales,” in Michael Bush (ed.), *Social Orders and Social Classes in Europe Since 1500: Studies in Social Stratification* (London: Routledge, 1992), 158-184.

56 Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 585-660; Douglas Egerton, “Slave Resistance,” in Robert Paquette and Mark Smith (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 447-464; Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants*, 177-216; Maura Cronin, *Agrarian Protest in Ireland, 1750-1960* (Dundalk: Economic and Social History Society of Ireland, 2012).

community held a general belief in the righteousness of protest in response to perceived breaches of an implicit social contract with the elites. Arguably, such ideas were common, in different permutations and to different extents, among free and unfree agrarian labourers throughout Europe and the Americas during the nineteenth century, including those who lived and worked on Quitman's and Clonbrock's properties. In both cases, when the slaves or peasants felt aggrieved or mistreated, they protested in different ways, contingent upon their local circumstances. However, in neither case did the labourers' resistance *necessarily* contradict paternalism. Rather, the versions of paternalism represented by Quitman and Clonbrock usually proved flexible enough to accommodate dissent on the part of slaves and peasants.⁵⁷

The following statement was written by John Quitman in 1839: "I love to hear a gang of hands singing at their work, whistling on their way home, and fiddling and dancing at night. This manifests a contented heart." It is another illustration of the fact that he saw the master-slave relationship through a paternalistic lens. Unsurprisingly, however, the slaves had a different view of the matter and were by no means as 'contented' as their owner liked to believe.⁵⁸ Even though there was little opportunity for them to participate in large-scale rebellions, Quitman's bondsmen and women still resisted their exploitation in a variety of ways. They complained about mistreatment, they engaged in sporadic acts of sabotage and theft, and many of them ran away. By doing so, Quitman's slaves made it clear that they did not share their master's interpretation of paternalism, and successfully negotiated a valuable

57 E.P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present* 50 (1971), 76-136; Alex Lichtenstein, "'That Disposition to Theft, With Which They Have Been Branded': Moral Economy, Slave Management, and the Law," *Journal of Social History* 21 (1988), 413-440; Michael Huggins, *Social Conflict in Pre-Famine Ireland: The Case of County Roscommon* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007). Also see James Scott, *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Subsistence and Rebellion in Southeast Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976); Victor Magagna, *Communities of Grain: Rural Rebellion in Comparative Perspective* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).

58 John Quitman to Albert Quitman, 9 May 1839, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 190. Also see Roger Abrahams, *Singing the Master: The Emergence of African-American Culture in the Plantation South* (New York: Pantheon, 1992).

degree of autonomy in the process.⁵⁹

Quitman's correspondence and plantation records contain frequent allusions to examples of resistance on the part of his slaves that demonstrate their 'agency.' These sources show that the slaves did not hesitate to demand what they considered their due or to complain about unfair treatment. In 1853, after sending some of the chickens that Palmyra's slaves farmed on their garden plots to Monmouth, Henry Turner asked Quitman to pay their bill immediately, since he knew from experience that "they are very troublesome in the way of asking for their dues when not paid."⁶⁰ As a result, Turner and Quitman were usually prepared to listen to their slaves' complaints; for example, they brought an overseer's cruelty to light by complaining about him "almost every day," which led Turner to intervene and consider his dismissal. As these examples indicate, typical of paternalistic Southern slaveholders, Quitman was keenly aware that accommodating and compromising with his bondspople whenever possible was usually preferable to risking more disruptive forms of resistance.⁶¹

However, as Turner intimated when he referred to Palmyra's slaves becoming "troublesome," when direct appeals to their owner failed or were deemed inappropriate, Quitman's slaves protested in different ways. Several historians of the antebellum U.S. South have highlighted the fact that slaves commonly engaged in acts of non-violent day-to-day resistance—including breaking agricultural implements, working slowly, and stealing—a category of protest that Peter Kolchin has called "silent sabotage."⁶² Examples of these actions can be found across Quitman's plantations and at his Big House. As Robert May has argued,

59 May, *John A. Quitman*, 144-146. For more on slave resistance, see Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 155-166; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 585-660; Stephanie Camp, *Closer to Freedom: Enslaved Women and Everyday Resistance in the Plantation South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); James Sidbury, "Resistance to Slavery," in Gad Heuman and Trevor Burnard (eds.), *The Routledge History of Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 204-219.

60 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 18 November 1853, QFP. Also see Anthony Kaye, *Joining Places: Slave Neighborhoods in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 95. For more on the complex subject of slave agency, see Walter Johnson, "On Agency," *Journal of Social History* 37 (2003), 113-124.

61 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 16 March 1853, QFP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 139. Also see Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 91, 275-276; Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 89-90; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 158-166.

62 Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 241-244. Also see Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 142-149; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 285-324.

entries in Quitman's plantation records such as "Sam[ue]l broke one of the new plows" may well have represented deliberate sabotage on the part of his slaves.⁶³ Many of the slaves also appear to have engaged in work slowdowns by playing on stereotypes of their laziness and ignorance. The best documented examples of this phenomenon come from Monmouth, where Eliza Quitman often complained about "lazy and impertinent" house servants. Occasionally, these slaves became "perfectly lawless," as in the case of two slaves named Alfred and Fred, who, Eliza once wrote, "go off whenever and wherever they please, get drunk and of course do no work." Yet, despite his wife's exasperation, Quitman usually rationalised this type of behaviour with the idea that his slaves were naturally lazy. As he remarked of two house slaves with a tone of surprise after hosting a successful dinner party in 1850, "Joe remained sober and cooked a good dinner, and Sam was not very, very stupid." Apparently, Quitman's view of his slaves as childlike allowed them to manipulate his expectations of their abilities as a form of passive resistance.⁶⁴

Circumstantial evidence also suggests that Quitman's slaves occasionally stole from their owner. One of Quitman's daughters recorded the theft of a turkey from Monmouth's garden in 1857; William Scarborough has interpreted this episode as an example of slave resistance. If it was indeed a slave who stole this turkey—as Rose Quitman and Scarborough have presumed—then the incident was part of a pattern of theft that appears to have been common among the antebellum South's slave population. According to Alex Lichtenstein, such pilfering was directly related to the bondspeople's idea of moral economy, since the slaves tended to justify stealing from their owners as due compensation for their unpaid labour.⁶⁵

63 Springfield Plantation Account Book, 15 January 1853, JAQPM; May, "Quitman and His Slaves," 560-561.

64 Eliza Quitman to John Quitman, 3 January 1836, 21 February 1836, QFP; John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 21 September 1850, QFP. Also see May, "Quitman and His Slaves," 565-566; May, *John A. Quitman*, 143-144; Kaye, *Joining Places*, 86-88; Genovese and Fox-Genovese, *Fatal Self-Deception*, 61-67.

65 Rose Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 3 May 1857, JAQPM; Scarborough, *Masters of the Big House*, 208; Lichtenstein, "That Disposition to Theft," 413-440. Also see Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 92-93; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 599-609.

Of all the examples of slave resistance on Quitman's plantations, some of the most significant and unambiguous concern slaves running away, since these incidents represented a clear repudiation of the idea that they were 'contented.' Remarks such as "Moses is still a runaway" and "Lewis Booth ran off last night" are a regular feature of Henry Turner's reports to Quitman about day-to-day operations at Palmyra.⁶⁶ The reasons why these slaves fled varied. Often it was out of fear of punishment, as in the case of a field slave named Denis who, in Turner's words, "picked a basket of very dirty cotton and as soon as it was discovered he made off before a word was spoken to him."⁶⁷ Permanent escape was well nigh impossible for most of Quitman's slaves, however, since they were far from any border or hinterland on which they could establish a maroon settlement. Also, the society in which they lived had developed a variety of effective safeguards against runaways, such as the institution of regular slave patrols and the requirement for slaves to carry passes from their masters when travelling off-plantation. As a consequence, the slaves who ran away from Quitman's plantations were usually either recaptured or returned of their own accord.⁶⁸

Although most runaways were recovered, even temporary truancy was still highly disruptive to discipline and productivity on Quitman's plantations—just as it was on plantations throughout the U.S. South. In 1843, Henry Turner complained about the expense caused by a particularly intense spate of slave runaways at Palmyra. The fact the slaves were aware that their actions had this effect was apparent to Turner; as he wrote when explaining the situation to Quitman, "the negroes determined if possible to have the upper hand and so they absconded for the most trifling causes." Significantly, while these runaways were

66 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 26 September 1842, 5 September 1845, QFP. Also see Henry Turner to John Quitman, 19 October 1843, 12 September 1845, QFP; John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 18 November 1842, QFP; May, "Quitman and His Slaves," 559.

67 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 12 October 1843, QFP.

68 See John Hope Franklin and Loren Schweniger, *Runaway Slaves: Rebels on the Plantation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 209-243; Sally Hadden, *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001). For an atypical example of one of Quitman's slaves who managed to escape permanently while the family were travelling in the North, see May, "Quitman and His Slaves," 561.

punished with whippings upon their return, Turner also decided that it would be necessary to offer the slaves some concessions in order to “prevent them running off and make them industrious and contented.” Therefore, in the same letter, he requested Quitman to send new shoes and clothes to Palmyra, presumably with the intent of satiating the discontent that existed among the workers at the time. This episode shows that the slaves’ ability to run away, even if only sporadically and temporarily, proved to be a powerful bargaining tool that they used to improve their living conditions.⁶⁹

The fact that Quitman’s slaves tended to engage in non-violent acts of resistance—as opposed to violent confrontations on an individual or communal basis—was typical of the antebellum U.S. South. To be sure, Southern slaves did sometimes lash out at their owners or overseers—a famous example being Frederick Douglass’s brawl with a ‘slave breaker’ during his captivity in Maryland. Different parts of the South were also host to numerous slave conspiracies and a handful of slave insurrections in the antebellum era. Most notable were those associated with Gabriel and Nat Turner in Virginia (1800 and 1831 respectively), Denmark Vesey in South Carolina (1822), and the so-called German Coast Rebellion that occurred in Louisiana (1811). However, for a variety of reasons, these prospective rebellions were always either discovered in advance or quickly suppressed. The numerical superiority of armed whites who supported slavery, the generally small size of plantations, the resident character of the master class, and the scattered nature of the slave population all conspired against the organisation and success of large-scale slave insurrections in the U.S. South.⁷⁰

Even though, by the late antebellum era, slaves made up a greater proportion of the

69 Henry Turner to John Quitman, 26 October 1843, QFP. Also see Kaye, *Joining Places*, 148-149; Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 94-95; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 648-658.

70 See Egerton, “Slave Resistance,” 447-461; Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 250-257; Eugene Genovese, *From Rebellion to Revolution: American Negro Slave Revolts in the Making of the Atlantic World* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979); Herbert Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943); James Sidbury, *Ploughshares Into Swords: Race, Rebellion and Identity in Gabriel’s Virginia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). For Douglass’s confrontation with the slave breaker, see Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave, Written By Himself* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009 [1845]), 76-78.

population in Mississippi and Louisiana than was the case in most Southern states, they had little ability to coordinate or participate in rebellions for the same reasons. That did not stop the region's slaveholders, including John Quitman, from worrying about the *potential* of slave rebellions, however. Partially in order to guard against this threat, Quitman was involved in the formation of an armed militia called the 'Natchez Fencibles' in 1824. Doubtless, one function of their periodic drills was to discourage any slave from considering planning or participating in a rebellion. In the winter of 1835-36, for instance, when Natchez was crippled by panic following rumours of a massive plot to incite the district's slaves to rebel, Quitman called the Fencibles into action. In the end, little came of this conspiracy save a few possible cases of arson and the Fencibles' forcible expulsion of the town's gamblers. Still, the mass hysteria caused by mere rumours revealed the Natchez nabobs' deep insecurities; for all of their paternalistic rhetoric, most planters were afraid of their supposedly loyal slaves.⁷¹

Unlike many of his neighbours, Quitman kept a cool head during the 'Panic of 1835.'⁷² Nevertheless, he too was well aware of the threat of rebellion posed by his slaves; although, he usually maintained that they would only rebel if incited to do so by radical abolitionists.⁷³ As a result, similar to many other Southern slaveholders, Quitman chose to bargain with his slaves as much as possible in order to avoid conflict. Paternalism facilitated the resulting process of day-to-day negotiation and compromise on Quitman's plantations and in his Big House in much the same way that Eugene Genovese has argued was the case throughout the

71 May, *John A. Quitman*, 40, 67-68; Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams*, 46-71; Christopher Morris, "An Event in Community Organization: The Mississippi Slave Insurrection Scare of 1835," *Journal of Social History* 22 (1988), 93-111; Joshua Rothman, *Flush Times and Fever Dreams: A Story of Capitalism and Slavery in the Age of Jackson* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012). For more on Quitman's involvement with the Fencibles, see Robert May, "John A. Quitman and the Southern Martial Spirit," *Journal of Mississippi History* 41 (1979), 159-160.

72 At the time, Quitman told his wife that he believed the conspiracy to have been "exaggerated." See John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 15 January 1836, QFP.

73 John Quitman to Henry Quitman, 17 October 1835, in Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, I, 138-139; John Quitman, "Interim Governor Quitman's Inaugural Address, 5 January 1836," *Mississippi Senate Journal* (1836), 34-38; May, *John A. Quitman*, 67-68; Robert Bonner, *Mastering America: Southern Slaveholders and the Crisis of American Nationhood* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 20-21. Also see Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 402-434.

U.S. South in the antebellum era. Although it was understood differently by Quitman and his slaves, paternalism was accepted by the latter because it provided them with the tools to negotiate with their master over the terms of servitude and to thereby turn ‘privileges’ into ‘rights.’ Yet, the slaves’ acceptance of paternalism also diffused class conflict and effectively stopped them from mounting a frontal challenge to the slave system.⁷⁴

Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that paternalism was successful in undermining the potential for Quitman’s slaves to participate in violent insurrections. Considering the futility of open rebellion, working within the system was arguably the best way for slaves to secure a greater degree of practical freedom in the antebellum South. This was true at least until the outbreak of the American Civil War, which provided Quitman’s slaves with an opportunity to resist on a larger scale. Between 1861 and 1865, they ran away in large numbers, some joined the Union Army, and others demanded pay. In the process, the slaves signalled their rejection of servitude in no uncertain terms, prompting one of Quitman’s daughters to write: “I am disgusted forever with the whole race. I have not faith in one single dark individual. They are all alike ungrateful and treacherous.” Quitman never had the opportunity to learn this lesson, however. He died in 1858, and went to his grave believing—or at least professing to believe—that his slaves were happy in their bondage. Yet, as Robert May has pointed out, the only way for Quitman to believe this was by either rationalising or ignoring copious evidence to the contrary.⁷⁵

Similarly to U.S. Southern slaveholders, Irish landlords and their representatives were usually

74 Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 3-7, 285-324. For an interpretation of Southern slaveholding paternalism as a form of negotiation between masters and slaves that stemmed from the masters’ economic imperatives, see Follett, *Sugar Masters*, 151-233.

75 Louisa Lovell to Joseph Lovell, 7 February 1864, QFP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 143-144. On Quitman’s slaves’ behaviour during the Civil War, see May, *John A. Quitman*, 353-355. For more on the impact of the war on Southern master-slave relations, see Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, 62-115; Faust, *James Henry Hammond*, 104; Hermann, *Pursuit of a Dream*, 37-60; Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African American Slaves* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), 246-270; James Roark, *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1977).

anxious to downplay the discontent that existed among the lower orders of their society during the nineteenth century. Speaking generally about Ireland's small farmers and agricultural labourers in a testimony he gave to a parliamentary inquiry in 1836, for example, Thomas Bermingham said that "they suffer more than human nature could almost be believed to endure, and yet they hardly repine."⁷⁶ But the idea that Irish peasants accepted their situations passively was simply not true, as Bermingham well knew from personal experience, both as Lord Clonbrock's land agent and as a local magistrate. In reality, Ireland's tenants and agricultural labourers—including those who lived and worked on the Clonbrock estates—frequently engaged in a variety of acts of protest and resistance.⁷⁷

As with slaves in the American South, it was common for Irish peasants to appeal directly to the landowners when they felt aggrieved or mistreated. Tenants often wrote letters to their landlords with a variety of requests, usually pertaining to issues of rent. The Clonbrock estate papers contain numerous examples of these petitions. In one illustrative example, a recently bereaved widow "most humbly and grievously begs leave to present to your Lordship that her husband died of a sudden sickness ... poor widow confides in your Lordship and hopes your benevolence will take into consideration her loss." Evidently, when such unforeseen circumstances befell Clonbrock's tenants, they felt that they had a right to some "consideration" from their landlord. Indeed, they had good reason to think so, since Clonbrock's responses to these petitions—which he often wrote on the back or in the margins—were usually favourable. In the above case of the widow, for instance, he directed her rent to be lowered.⁷⁸ Thus, in 1855, when remembering his time as Clonbrock's agent in a letter

⁷⁶ *Poor Inquiry*, appendix D, 1.

⁷⁷ See Joseph Lee, "Patterns of Rural Unrest in Nineteenth-Century Ireland: A Preliminary Survey," in L.M. Cullen and Francois Furet (eds.), *Ireland and France, 17th-20th Centuries: Towards a Comparative Study of Rural History* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1980), 223-237; Samuel Clark and James Donnelly (eds.) *Irish Peasants: Violence and Political Unrest, 1780-1914* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983). For a discussion of peasant resistance on the Clonbrock estates, see McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 142-149.

⁷⁸ Petitions from Tenants Seeking Concessions on Rent Payments, Ms 35,727 (6), CP. Also see Summaries of Applications, Ms 3,118, Farnham Papers, National Library of Ireland, Dublin; Robert Houston, *Peasant Petitions: Social Relations and Economic Life on Landed Estates, 1600-1850* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014).

published in the local press, Bermingham could write: “I can truly say that a proper case of distress was never brought under his lordship’s notice that was not at once relieved.” This relief of distress was one of the many responsibilities that Clonbrock fulfilled as part of his paternalistic duty to his tenants, and it led, according to Bermingham, to “the utmost tranquility, respect for the laws, and attachment to the landlord.”⁷⁹

Yet, despite the generally cordial relations that resulted from Clonbrock’s willingness to address his workers’ complaints, some of his tenants occasionally considered it necessary to protest against his actions. If rents were deemed too high, wages too low, or evictions unfair, the tenants and labourers could and did signal their displeasure. To do so, comparably to slaves in the American South, Ireland’s farming classes engaged in a variety of acts of protest that were designed to protect their rights. However, due to differences between the legal status of the labourers and the structural organisation of the landed estates, the types of workers’ resistance in nineteenth-century Ireland were often considerably different from those that predominated in the antebellum U.S. South. For example, since Irish tenants typically owned their own tools, or else rented them from the landlord, they gained nothing by breaking them as American slaves did. Additionally, Ireland’s farming classes had a reputation for laziness similar to that of slaves in the U.S. South, which could be attributed to an implicit protest against exploitation in both cases. However, unless they were day labourers who worked directly for a landlord or a large tenant, there was little reason for Irish peasants to work slowly on their own farms, since their rent was set in advance.⁸⁰

Instead, Irish peasant resistance typically focused on writing threatening letters and boycotting. When tenants and labourers had a particular grievance, they often anonymously warned landlords or their representatives to rectify the situation on pain of reprisal. Clonbrock

⁷⁹ *Tuam Herald*, 14 July 1855; Bermingham, *Duties of a Resident Landlord in Ireland*, 7.

⁸⁰ On Irish peasants’ reputation for laziness, see Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland*, II, 730, 759; Ó’Gráda, *Ireland*, 328-329, 340-342. For more on ‘laziness’ as a form of resistance, see James Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

received two such letters in 1847, which demanded that he dismiss an agriculturalist who had raised the ire of some of his tenants.⁸¹ If such threatening letters were ignored, then Irish peasants often responded with a boycott, a practice that involved the intimidation or social ostracism of individuals who breached the rural community's norms. In fact, the very term 'boycott' actually originated in the west of Ireland, on an estate where the tenants refused to deal with an agent named Charles Boycott after he served a number of eviction notices in 1880. Even though this type of peasant action did not become known as 'boycotting' until the late nineteenth century, the tactic was widely deployed against Irish landlords well before then. On the Clonbrock estates, instances of threatening letters and boycotting appear to have been rare, but the tenants' ability to resort to these forms of protest, combined with their occurrence on neighbouring estates, would certainly have pressured Clonbrock to fulfil the duties he claimed he owed to his workers, and to respect their rights.⁸²

An important difference between lower class resistance in Ireland and the U.S. South is the fact that, as a result of their free status and the decentralised nature of landed estates, Irish peasants were in a much better position to engage in communal acts of protest than American slaves. This contrast is clearly illustrated by the prevalence of agrarian secret societies in Ireland, which were at once the single most important manifestation of peasant resistance and a clear indication of its typically co-operative nature. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, these secret societies emerged in different parts of the country and went by different names—Whiteboys, Defenders, Rockites, Terry Alts, and Molly Maguires, to name some of the most important. By the mid-1800s they were all known under the general rubric of 'Ribbonism.' Usually, these organisations emerged in response to specific local

81 *Western Star*, 11 December 1847; McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 96. Also see Stephen Gibbons, *Captain Rock, Night Errant: The Threatening Letters of Pre-Famine Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004); Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants*, 150-156.

82 See Joyce Marlow, *Captain Boycott and the Irish* (London: Deutsch, 1973); Huggins, *Social Conflict in Pre-Famine Ireland*; Robert Scally, *The End of Hidden Ireland: Rebellion, Famine and Emigration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Pauline Scott, "Rural Radicals or Mercenary Men? Resistance to Evictions on the Glinsk/Creggs Estate of Allan Pollock," in Brian Casey (ed.), *Defying the Law of the Land: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin: History Press Ireland, 2013), 65-79.

complaints; often, they appealed to certain distinct sections of the peasantry and pursued contradictory agendas. Despite the internal differentiation between various strands of Ribbonism, however, there were certain features that united them. They were all oath-bound organisations designed to redress specific socio-economic grievances, and they were typically prepared to use violence to achieve their ends. The most extreme form that this violence took was assassination, which understandably struck fear into the hearts and minds of all resident Irish landlords and their agents.⁸³

Although it was usually peaceful, Clonbrock's locality in east County Galway was occasionally affected by these secret societies, most notably during the Ribbon campaign of the early 1820s and the Terry Alt disturbances of the early 1830s. Ultimately, Ireland's landlords depended primarily upon the constabulary or the military to deal with these threats, but, comparably to U.S. Southern slaveholders, they also established security measures on their own estates. One visitor to Clonbrock House during the particularly intense period of Ribbon activity that affected Galway in 1820 noted that Luke Dillon, second baron Clonbrock, "established a chain of signals by bonfires and patrols at the head of 40 well armed followers every other night at least, and on the least symptom of the approach of these rascals a fire is lighted and 300 or 400 fellows are, and have been, in less than an hour at some specific rendezvous."⁸⁴

By the time the third baron Clonbrock inherited his estates in 1828, the countryside in his vicinity had become peaceful again. This was due, in part, to the emergence of Daniel

83 See Michael Beames, *Peasants and Power: The Whiteboy Movements and their Control in Pre-Famine Ireland* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1983); James Donnelly, *Captain Rock: The Irish Agrarian Rebellion of 1821-1824* (Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2009); Joseph Lee, "The Ribbonmen," in Desmond Williams (ed.), *Secret Societies in Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1973), 26-35; G.E. Christianson, "Secret Societies and Agrarian Violence in Ireland, 1790-1840," *Agricultural History* 46 (1972), 369-384. On the assassination of Irish landlords, see Michael Beames, "Rural Conflict in Pre-Famine Ireland: Peasant Assassinations in Tipperary, 1837-1847," in C.H.E. Philpin (ed.), *Nationalism and Popular Protest in Ireland* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 264-283; Pdraig Vesey, *The Murder of Major Mahon, Strokestown, County Roscommon, 1847* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008).

84 Lord Talbot quoted in Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 275; David Ryan, "Ribbonism and Agrarian Violence in County Galway, 1819-1820," *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* 52 (2000), 120-134. Also see Virginia Crossman, *Politics, Law and Order in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 1996).

O’Connell’s Catholic Association in 1823, which channelled much of the discontent that existed among the Irish peasantry into the campaign for Catholic Emancipation. The success of O’Connell’s campaign in 1829 did little to help the average Irish farmer, however, and agrarian secret societies soon filled the power vacuum caused by the disbandment of the Catholic Association.⁸⁵ It was in this context that the Terry Alts—a society that appealed particularly to landless labourers—emerged and caused widespread unrest in the west of Ireland, including Clonbrock’s estates. In response, Thomas Bermingham warned the tenants: “if you allow such people to come in there, I will stop the buildings on the estate, and the drains and the improvements, and leave you to the military.” In other words, in true paternalistic fashion, the carrot would be removed and the stick applied if reciprocity collapsed. The Terry Alt disturbances were soon quelled, but they were just one instance of the threat that Ireland’s agrarian secret societies posed to the established social order. Lest they run afoul of these organisations and potentially become the target of an assassin’s bullet, the country’s landlords, including Clonbrock, were pressured to act in a manner that the agricultural labouring classes considered fair.⁸⁶

Yet, with the notable exception of the 1790s—when the French-inspired and middle class-led United Irishmen entered into an alliance with the peasant-dominated Defenders in order to ferment a revolution—Ireland’s agrarian secret societies did not try to stage any large-scale insurrections. Even though their impact could be considered national, their aims and activities were typically local. Thus, similarly to slave rebellions in the antebellum U.S. South, peasant insurrections were conspicuous by their absence in nineteenth-century Ireland.

85 Sean Connolly, “Mass Politics and Sectarian Conflict, 1823-30,” in W.E. Vaughan (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 5, Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 106-107. On O’Connell and the campaign for Catholic Emancipation, see Patrick Geoghegan, *King Dan: The Rise of Daniel O’Connell, 1775-1829* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2008); Oliver MacDonagh, *O’Connell: The Life of Daniel O’Connell, 1775-1847* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1991).

86 *Report of the Select Committee on the State of Ireland*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 26, 1831-32, 463; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 272-282; James Donnelly, “The Terry Alt Movement of 1829-31,” *History Ireland* 2 (1994), 30-35; Ó’Gráda, *Ireland*, 334-336; T.M. Devine, “Unrest and Stability in Rural Ireland and Scotland, 1760-1840,” in T.M. Devine, *Exploring the Scottish Past: Themes in the History of Scottish Society* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1995), 182-193.

To be sure, the country was the site of an attempted rebellion in 1848, but the Young Irelanders who planned it were mostly a middle class group that aimed at national liberation from England more than at social or economic reform. Combined with the fact that it was staged during the Famine—when survival was far more important to the country’s farming classes than politics—the Young Ireland rebellion was ill-supported by the peasantry and quickly suppressed by the British army.⁸⁷

The failure of the Young Irelanders points us toward the main reason for the lack of large-scale peasant rebellions in Ireland: similarly to slave rebellions in the U.S. South, they were highly unlikely to succeed. Unlike American slaves, Irish peasants formed the majority of their country’s population and many of them owned guns, but the presence of a standing army in the country still made open rebellion futile. For this reason, when Irish peasants—including those who lived on Clonbrock’s estates—chose to protest against their landlords, they tended to act through secret societies. Alternatively, many of them participated in Daniel O’Connell’s campaigns for Catholic Emancipation in the 1820s and for the Repeal of the Act of Union in the 1840s, which they hoped might lead to reforms that would benefit them. It was not until the late 1870s and 1880s—the time of the ‘Land War’—that Ireland’s peasantry successfully organised on a large scale in order to challenge the landed class and win significant rights to their farms.⁸⁸

The Land War dramatically changed relations between landlord and tenant on the Clonbrock estates, just as it did on landed estates throughout Ireland. Legislation prompted by the unrest awarded Irish peasants property rights to their farms and therefore decreased their

87 Richard Davis, *The Young Ireland Movement* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1988); Kinealy, *Great Irish Famine*, 182-210; Christine Kinealy, *Repeal and Revolution: 1848 in Ireland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009). On the alliance between the United Irishmen and the Defenders, see Nancy Curtin, *The United Irishmen: Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin, 1791-1798* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 145-173.

88 See Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants*, 208-216; Donnelly, *Land and the People*, 251-306; Samuel Clark, *Social Origins of the Irish Land War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Paul Bew, *Land and the National Question in Ireland, 1858-82* (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1979 [1978]); William Feingold, *The Revolt of the Tenantry: The Transformation of Local Government in Ireland, 1872-1886* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1984).

dependence on the landed class. This, in turn, ultimately led to a rejection of paternalism by most tenants on the Clonbrock estates.⁸⁹ Before the Land War, however, Irish peasants possessed minimal legal rights to the land they cultivated and could be evicted at short notice; in this context, reminiscent of the situation of the slaves on Quitman's plantations before the American Civil War, Clonbrock's tenants generally used the paternalistic system of rights and duties to protect their interests. In order to define and defend their rights and hold Clonbrock to his duties, the tenants used the tools of resistance that were available to them when they considered it necessary, but, in general, they lived in peace. Thus, on the Clonbrock estates at least, the peasants can be said to have come to terms with paternalism, although, similarly to Quitman's slaves, they interpreted it differently from the elites.

Despite the fact that U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords often idealised their relationships with their labourers, they were always aware of the rebellious potential of their slaves or peasants. Even on estates where the landowners acted in a paternalistic manner, such as those that belonged to Quitman and Clonbrock, the workers regularly reminded the elites of this threat by engaging in a variety of acts of resistance. It would be wrong to suggest that either the antebellum U.S. South or nineteenth-century Ireland were in a permanent state of rebellion or unrest, but there is no doubt that the agrarian underclasses who lived and worked on the landed estates in both regions routinely exercised the ability to protest against their exploitation. American slaves and Irish peasants may have been dependent workforces, but they were by no means powerless. In both cases, using their different degrees of power to protect their rights, the labourers played a critical role in defining the boundaries of

89 For a discussion of the short and long-term effects of the Land War on the Clonbrock estates, see McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual," 177-247. Also see L.P. Curtis, "Landlord Responses to the Irish Land War, 1879-87," *Éire-Ireland* 38 (2003), 169-186; Adam Pole, "Landlord Responses to the Irish Land War, 1879-82," (PhD diss., Trinity College Dublin, 2006); Brian Casey, "Land, Politics and Religion on the Clancarty Estate, East Galway, 1851-1914," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011), 160-211; W.E. Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants in Ireland, 1848-1904* (Dublin: Economic and Social History Society of Ireland, 1984).

paternalism.

The most basic indication of the agency of American slaves and Irish peasants was their ability to communicate and openly negotiate with the slaveholders and landlords. As we have seen in the cases of Quitman's plantations and Clonbrock's estates, informal channels of communication between the agrarian elites and their workers were commonplace in both the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland. Either through verbal interactions, typical in the South, or letters, more common in Ireland, slaves and peasants regularly informed the landed elites of their various grievances.⁹⁰ Quitman and Clonbrock usually endeavoured to address these complaints, chiefly because they understood that small concessions to their labourers could diffuse some of the tensions that naturally arose within the exploitative socioeconomic systems from which they profited.

If direct appeals to the slaveholders or landowners failed to elicit an acceptable response, the forms that resistance took among American slaves and Irish peasants diverged thereafter. Due to their greater degree of legal and practical freedom and the lesser degree of supervision to which they were subject, Clonbrock's tenants and labourers were in a better position than Quitman's slaves to protest against their oppression and to take action against specific abuses. Hence, in nineteenth-century Ireland, peasants tended to join or support secret societies that were designed to protect their interests, whereas in the antebellum South, slave resistance was usually limited to subtle acts of sabotage and temporary flight from plantations.

Significantly, despite the differences between the forms and extent of slave resistance in the antebellum U.S. South and peasant resistance in nineteenth-century Ireland, in neither context did the workers generally try to overthrow the existing regimes. Typically, they focused on rectifying immediate grievances rather than mounting revolutionary challenges to either slavery or landlordism. This was primarily a consequence of the fact that, in both cases,

⁹⁰ Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 275-278; Houston, *Peasant Petitions*, 87-93, 113-145.

insurrection was futile. But the above analysis of labour relations on Quitman's plantations and Clonbrock's estates also suggests that paternalism, where deployed in the day-to-day running of plantations and estates, was largely successful in undermining worker discontent and channelling resistance into forms that the elites considered acceptable. Slaves and peasants interpreted paternalism differently from Quitman and Clonbrock, but they sanctioned it in both cases because it allowed them to negotiate some rights in practice that did not exist in law.⁹¹

Arguably, therefore, one reason why lower class resistance was more of a problem for the agrarian elites in nineteenth-century Ireland than it was in the antebellum U.S. South was the greater relative strength of paternalism in the latter case. The fact that most American slaveholders lived on their centralised plantations and farms meant that they were able to consistently interfere in their slaves' lives and use paternalism to achieve a high degree of class control. Even when planters were absentee, as Quitman was, they still exercised considerable influence over their slaves through their overseers. In Ireland, by contrast, the decentralised nature of production on the landed estates and the failure of most landowners to fulfil their paternalistic 'duties' translated into a lower degree of class control. Even when they were resident, as in the case of Clonbrock, Irish landlords were not able to monitor their tenants and interfere in their daily lives to the same extent as American planters. Thus, paternalism was intended by the landed elites as a means to diffuse class conflict in both the American South and Ireland, but its success in this respect was heavily determined by the context in which it was deployed. Also, it must be emphasised that, on the Quitman plantations and the Clonbrock estates—two cases where mutual obligations were taken seriously by the landowner and his workers—the lower classes' validation of paternalism was not absolute. In both cases, when the opportunity arose for the slaves and peasants to systematically resist the agrarian elites in the second half of the nineteenth century—as

91 See Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 285-324; Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants*, 67-102.

happened during the American Civil War and the Irish Land War—the rural labourers jumped at the chance, proving that their prior acceptance of paternalism had been conditional.⁹²

Ultimately, then, although American slaves and Irish peasants were unquestionably exploited by agrarian elites, neither working class should be considered as passive victims by historians. Despite the differences between the forms that slave and peasant resistance took, its occurrence on the Quitman plantations and Clonbrock estates shows that, whether they were unfree or free, the workers played an important role in defining labour relations in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland. Consequently, any comprehensive comparative study of Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords should take into consideration the two elites' relationships with the different types of labourers from whom they profited and with whom they coexisted in a complex symbiosis.

Conclusion

In their respective comparisons of American slavery/slaveholders with Russian, Prussian, and southern Italian agrarian labour systems and landowners, Peter Kolchin, Shearer Davis Bowman, and Enrico Dal Lago have each provided different answers to the important question of the relationship between paternalism and capitalism among the landed elites. For Kolchin, in comparison with Russian *pomeshchiki*, antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders emerge as an authentic paternalistic class and American slavery as a pre-capitalist institution. Conversely, Bowman identified analogies between what he interpreted as the Southern slaveholders' and Prussian East-Elbian *Junkers*' capitalist character and concluded that it is not “advisable or appropriate to characterize the generality of relations between plantation or *Rittergut* owners and their labouring minions as ‘patriarchal’ or ‘paternalistic.’” Finally,

92 See Armstead Robinson, *Bitter Fruits of Bondage: The Demise of Slavery and the Collapse of the Confederacy, 1861-1865* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004), 163-188; Laurence Geary, “Anticipating Memory: Landlordism, Agrarianism and Deference in Late-Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” in Tom Dunne and Laurence Geary (eds.), *History and the Public Sphere: Essays in Honour of John A. Murphy* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2005), 127-139.

following recent scholarship that suggests the existence of a hybrid nature of labour relations on antebellum Southern plantations, Dal Lago has argued that capitalistic and paternalistic features coexisted in comparable fashion in the minds and behaviours of most slaveholders in the American South and of several landowners in southern Italy during the nineteenth century.⁹³ Having examined similarities and differences between labour relations on John Quitman's plantations and Lord Clonbrock's landed estates, this is an appropriate place to explicitly engage with these positions and to make some generalisations about the nature of paternalism in the antebellum U.S. South and nineteenth-century Ireland.

As we have seen in previous chapters, Quitman and Clonbrock were among those economically progressive American slaveholders and Irish landlords who exhibited entrepreneurial attitudes and practices that were characteristic of the second slavery and second landlordism; the two men consistently sought to manage their agrarian enterprises in an efficient and profitable manner and effectively represented different versions of agrarian modernity. At the same time, they also embraced and articulated comparable paternalistic world-views, claiming in both cases that mutual respect for reciprocal rights and duties characterised their relationships with their labourers. In theory, these developments were supposed to be complementary, since Quitman and Clonbrock both intended paternalism to foster gratitude and loyalty among their slaves and peasants, and to thereby diffuse class conflict on their properties. In practice, however, paternalism functioned considerably differently than the two elites wished to claim.

As we have seen, on Quitman's plantations and Clonbrock's estates, the landowners' desire for profit could and sometimes did come into conflict with their self-appointed mandate to 'care for' their labourers. Also, in neither case did the slaves or peasants share the same

93 Kolchin, *Unfree Labour*, 103-156, 359-363; Bowman, *Masters and Lords*, 42-111, 162-183 (quote at 182); Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 150-178. Also see George Fredrickson, *The Comparative Imagination: On the History of Racism, Nationalism and Social Movements* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 66-73; Peter Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 81.

interpretation of paternalism as the elites. However, generally speaking, Quitman's and Clonbrock's paternalistic ideologies *were* in tune with their desire to rationally manage their landed estates. Although they both might have increased their profits in the short term by abandoning all pretense of responsibility for their labourers and exploiting them in a more obvious manner, this would surely have led to an exponential increase in discontent and resistance among slaves and peasants. Understanding this, Quitman and Clonbrock used paternalism to negotiate unequal and contested social contracts with their workers, which ultimately contributed to the long-term profitability of their properties. As such, comparison of labour relations on the Quitman plantations and Clonbrock estates supports the contention that paternalism was a progressive ideology that coexisted with and complemented the landowners' modern/capitalist practices.

This is not to claim that the general compatibility of paternalistic and capitalistic features that characterised Quitman and Clonbrock was representative of *all* American slaveholders and Irish landlords, however. Members of both elites wrestled with the imperative to make a profit from their estates and the expectation that they should 'care for' the slaves or tenants and labourers who worked their land. As Peter Parish has written of the antebellum U.S. South, "the balance between paternalism and profit seeking varied from master to master according to a whole range of factors, including size of holding and economic conditions."⁹⁴ Parish's statement could very well be transferred to a nineteenth-century Irish context, where the landowners also endeavoured to strike an equilibrium between similar social and economic concerns. In this connection, it should be emphasised that—as a consequence of the differences between the political economies of U.S. Southern slavery and Irish tenancy, combined with demographic realities—paternalism was far more likely to come into conflict with or negate the landowners' desire for profit in nineteenth-century Ireland than it was in the antebellum American South. In other words, although the

94 Peter Parish, *Slavery: History and Historians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 54.

majority of Irish landlords claimed to support the paternalistic idea that “property has its duties as well as its rights,” as Thomas Drummond noted in 1838, those ‘duties’ were far more often nominal in Ireland than they were in the U.S. South.⁹⁵ Still, notwithstanding this important difference between Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s social classes, it is clear that U.S. Southern planters and Irish landlords used paternalism as part of a conscious attempt to mask their exploitation of their labourers. This was one element of the two elites’ efforts to ensure the perpetuation of the systems of ‘rural subjection’ that generated their wealth and status; another element was their control of politics, which is the subject of the next and final chapter.

95 Thomas Drummond to the Earl of Donoughmore, 22 May 1838, in John McLennan (ed.), *Memoir of Thomas Drummond, Under-Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1835 to 1840* (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1867), 322. For more on Drummond, who was a reforming Under-Secretary stationed at Dublin Castle during the second half of the 1830s, see Gearóid Ó’Tuathaigh, *Thomas Drummond and the Government of Ireland, 1835-41* (Dublin: National University of Ireland, 1977).

CHAPTER FIVE

“We Have Become a Second Ireland”: Elites, Unionism, and Nationalism in the Antebellum U.S. South and Nineteenth-Century Ireland

In the U.S. South and Ireland, paternalism was a central feature of the rejuvenation of the two regions' agrarian labour systems and elites that characterised the second slavery and second landlordism. As we have seen, economically progressive American planters and Irish landlords such as John A. Quitman and Lord Clonbrock endeavoured to reform their land and labour management practices in response to the transformations in global capitalism associated with the Industrial Revolution. At the same time, large numbers within the two landed classes embraced paternalistic ideologies—which they deployed in the management of their estates to different degrees—with a view toward justifying the exploitation of their slave or peasant workforces and minimising labour unrest on their properties. Significantly, since these developments led to the reaffirmation of the planters' and landlords' grip on power, the second slavery and second landlordism also had a profound impact on politics in the U.S. South and Ireland. In both cases, the elites' efforts to modernise were partially motivated by their desire to preserve what they saw as their prerogative to rule their societies.¹

1 On the political effects of the second slavery and second landlordism, see Enrico Dal Lago, “The End of the ‘Second Slavery’ in the Confederate South and the ‘Great Brigandage’ in Southern Italy: A Comparative Study,” in Javier Laviña and Michael Zeuske (eds.), *The Second Slavery: Mass Slavery and Modernity in the Americas and in the Atlantic Basin* (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2013), 73-92; Cathal Smith, “Apostles of Agricultural Reform: The Ballinasloe Agricultural Improvement Society in an Era of High Farming and Famine, 1840-1850,” *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* 64 (2012), 128-145. For a comparative perspective on ‘the reconstruction of social hierarchies’ throughout the world during the nineteenth century, see C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 395-431.

To be sure, planters and landlords were not only the dominant economic and social elites in the American South and Ireland—they also controlled politics within their respective regions for most of the nineteenth century. In the former case, tobacco and rice planters from the Chesapeake and Lowcountry regions took command of their colonial legislatures in the pre-Revolutionary era and maintained their grip on power throughout the antebellum period, while the newer section of the slaveholding elite that populated the U.S. southwest from the 1790s on also assumed control of their local and state governments. Likewise in Ireland, the landed class translated the wealth and status generated from their ownership of commercial agrarian enterprises into political power. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, landlords and their allies monopolised membership of the Irish parliament; even after its abolition in 1800, they continued to dominate local government in Ireland for nearly another century. From these positions of power, the two agrarian elites endeavoured to pursue comparable conservative agendas, which, despite many differences in terms of their content and contexts, had both as their central concern the protection of their social status and property rights.²

The U.S. Southern planters' and Irish landlords' political supremacies were not absolute, however. Significantly, the antebellum American South and nineteenth-century Ireland were both distinctive regions of larger political Unions: the United States and the United Kingdom. Thus, although the Southern and Irish landed elites enjoyed varying amounts of representation in their national assemblies—Congress in the former case, the British parliament in the latter—the locus of power lay outside their regions' borders and was subject to the influence of competing interests. Furthermore, in both cases, the elites faced comparable processes of governmental centralisation during the nineteenth century, which

2 See Ralph Wooster, *Politicians, Planters, and Plain Folk: Courthouse and Statehouse in the Upper South, 1850-1860* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975); Ralph Wooster, *The People in Power: Courthouse and Statehouse in the Lower South* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1969); K. Theodore Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society in Ireland, 1832-1885* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984); Virginia Crossman, *Local Government in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Belfast: Institute for Irish Studies, 1994).

they generally opposed and resisted in different ways and to different degrees. On one hand, Southern slaveholders played a leading role in American national politics from the creation of the United States in 1787 until 1860; as a result, they were mostly able to successfully protect their local autonomy from their national government's attempts to implement centralising measures, which the slaveholders saw as a threat to slavery. During the 1850s, however, the Southern elites began to lose their control of the federal government, a trend signalled most dramatically by the rise of the anti-slavery Republican Party after 1854 and the election of Abraham Lincoln as president in 1860. Ultimately, a majority of Southern planters responded to this loss of power by supporting their states' secession from the American Union and the foundation of an independent slaveholding republic: the Confederate States of America. In the process, the slaveholders elevated their regional identity as Southerners to a form of Confederate nationalism. Irish landlords, on the other hand, were relatively minor players in the governance of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland after its creation in 1801. Similarly to U.S. Southern slaveholders, they valued their local autonomy, which was also threatened by governmental centralisation during the nineteenth century. Yet, Irish landlords were unable to effectively resist administrative centralisation and reform; as time advanced, notwithstanding the British parliament's progressive erosion of their local autonomy and power, they generally remained loyal to the United Kingdom. To support this loyalty, most members of nineteenth-century Ireland's landed class subsumed their regional identity as Irishmen within an overarching British nationalism.³

The following chapter aims to explain how and why the majority of U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords, despite sharing a conservative social and political outlook and facing similar threats to their local autonomy from their central governments, arrived at

3 Elizabeth Varon, *Disunion!: The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008); Paul Quigley, *Shifting Grounds: Nationalism in the American South, 1848-1865* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Jim Smyth, *The Making of the United Kingdom, 1660-1800: State, Religion and Identity in Britain and Ireland* (Harlow: Longman, 2001); D. George Boyce, *Nationalism in Ireland* (London: Routledge, 1995 [1982]), 95-118.

opposite conclusions about the legitimacy of the existence of the United States and the United Kingdom by the early 1860s. To do so, the first section provides a general comparative overview of the two agrarian elites' political histories from the late eighteenth through the nineteenth century. My aim is to explain why, as a result of the differences between their historical contexts, loyalty to the United States was generally conditional among antebellum American slaveholders, whereas loyalty to the United Kingdom was virtually unconditional for most Irish landlords in the same period. Taking Mississippi's John A. Quitman and Galway's Lord Clonbrock as case studies, I then examine the comparable ways in which U.S. Southern slaveholders' and Irish landlords' political behaviours intersected with their regional and national identities. Both Quitman and Clonbrock opposed governmental centralisation, but Quitman became a vocal advocate of secession and a Southern nationalist in response, whereas Clonbrock always remained loyal to the United Kingdom and cultivated a British national identity during his lifetime. Clearly, these were different outcomes, but there were also crucial similarities in their premises and results. Akin to the majorities of their respective landed classes, Quitman and Clonbrock held similar political beliefs, such as patriotism, conservatism, and nationalism, but they assembled those concepts in different ways, depending on their particular local, regional, and national circumstances.

Patriot, Unionist, and Secessionist Elites in the American South and Ireland

For most of the eighteenth century, American planters' and Irish landlords' political histories followed parallel trajectories, as both groups established themselves at the apex of their societies' hierarchies. After the 1760s, having grown in self-confidence and developed 'creole' identities—Anglo-American in one case, Anglo-Irish in the other—during the preceding decades, significant numbers of the two landed elites participated in 'patriotic' movements that sought greater independence from their common British metropole.⁴ In

4 Nicholas Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins

different ways and to different extents, these movements were successful. Through protracted wars between 1775 and 1781, North American slaveholders secured themselves complete independence from English rule. In turn, partially as a consequence of the favourable political climate created by the American Revolution, Ireland's landlord-led patriot movement was able to lobby for legislative independence for their parliament in 1782-83, although the country remained part of the British empire.⁵

Subsequently, however, American planters' and Irish landlords' political paths diverge. The former southern colonies of British America participated in the creation of the United States and went on to prosper during the first half of the 1800s as part of a politically decentralised, geographically expanding federal republic. In comparison, Ireland's more limited 'independence' proved relatively short-lived. After an attempted republican revolution in 1798, the British government organised the abolition of the Irish parliament and incorporated the country into the United Kingdom in 1801.^{Therefore}, during the second slavery and the second landlordism, American planters and Irish landlords were citizens of different types political Unions, one a federal republic that the southern states joined voluntarily, the other a constitutional monarchy that was imposed on Ireland.

Upon the creation of the United States and the United Kingdom, the American South's and Ireland's landed classes attained considerable local autonomy and differing amounts of representation in their new national governments. Over the course of the 1800s, however, U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords faced threats to their autonomy and power from

University Press, 1988), 103-133; Jack Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986). For more on these points, see Chapter One.

5 See Walter Edgar, *Partisans and Redcoats: The Southern Conflict That Turned the Tide of the American Revolution* (New York: William Morrow, 2001); R.B. McDowell, "Colonial Nationalism and the Winning of Parliamentary Independence, 1760-82," in T.W. Moody and W.E. Vaughan (eds.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 4: The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 196-235. On the connection between the American Revolution and Irish parliamentary independence, see Neil Longley York, "The Impact of the American Revolution in Ireland," in Harry Dickinson (ed.), *Britain and the American Revolution* (New York: Longman, 1998), 205-232; Vincent Morley, *Irish Opinion and the American Revolution, 1760-1783* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Stephen Conway, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

governmental centralisation and reform. Members of both agrarian elites generally opposed these trends, but American slaveholders struggled against centralisation with a much greater degree of intensity than Irish landlords. In fact, after periodically resisting perceived threats to their power during the antebellum period, a majority of the South's slaveholders decided to secede from the United States in 1860-61. Conversely, in nineteenth-century Ireland, most landlords grudgingly consented to their central government's erosion of their local autonomy and remained loyal to the United Kingdom.⁶

Between the 1780s and the early 1860s, then, a majority of slaveholders in the United States underwent a general transformation from American patriots to Southern secessionists, whereas most of Ireland's landowners began this period as Irish patriots but became and remained British unionists after 1801. These divergent political paths were by no means predetermined, but were rather consequences of the different historical contexts in which the two elites lived and the particular challenges that they faced. At the same time, although the outcomes of U.S. Southern slaveholders' secessionism and Irish landlords' unionism are obviously very different—even opposite—there were also similarities in the conservative nature of the motives that influenced their political behaviour. These similarities and differences become clear from an examination of the two elites' changing relationships with their central governments and their responses to the major national political and constitutional crises that they confronted between the late-eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries.

In the antebellum United States, slaveholders, as well as dominating their local and state politics, also possessed considerable power within the federal government.⁷ In order to

6 William Freehling, *The Road to Disunion*, 2 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990-2007); Robert Bonner, *Mastering America: Southern Slaveholders and the Crisis of American Nationhood* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Jacqueline Hill, *From Patriots To Unionists: Dublin Civic Politics and Irish Protestant Patriotism, 1660-1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); D. George Boyce, "Weary Patriots: Ireland and the Making of Unionism," in D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day (eds.), *Defenders of the Union: A Survey of British and Irish Unionism Since 1801* (London: Routledge, 2001), 15-38.

7 See Leonard Richards, *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1790-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000); Don Fehrenbacher, *The Slaveholding Republic: An Account of the*

understand the reasons for this circumstance, we must look back at the creation of the American republic in the 1780s. At the Constitutional Convention of 1787, despite the fact that the end of U.S. participation in the Atlantic slave trade was set for 1808, representatives from the southern colonies secured crucial concessions. Importantly, they successfully lobbied to have a slave counted as three-fifths of a person for the purpose of determining the number of representatives that each state was entitled to send to Congress. Although the number of Northern congressmen always exceeded those from the South, the three-fifths clause did allow slaveholders to exercise an influence in the House of Representatives that was disproportionate to their numbers. Additionally, Southerners also controlled the Senate and the office of the presidency for most of the antebellum era, which effectively allowed the slaveholding elite to dominate national politics.⁸

Yet, the fact that the post-revolutionary United States was a geographically expanding country meant that the balance of national power was subject to frequent modification, since, when recently settled territories became states, congressional representation was reconfigured. Each new state that joined the Union was entitled to two senators, while the number of congressmen they were apportioned was determined by population. Thus, the territorial expansion of ‘the South’—largely predicated upon the massive increase in the number of cotton plantations associated with the second slavery—was motivated not only by economic factors, but also by political considerations, as slaveholders endeavoured to ensure that they retained their position of strength within the federal government by colonising new lands. This was especially important to American slaveholders in light of the fact that, by the second decade of the nineteenth century, all of the states in the U.S. North—where slavery was

United States Government's Relations to Slavery (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Donald Robinson, *Slavery and the Structure of American Politics, 1765-1820* (New York: Norton, 1979).

8 Paul Finkelman, “Slavery and the Constitutional Convention: Making a Covenant with Death,” in Richard Beeman, Stephen Botein, and Edward Carter (eds.), *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 188-225; George William Van Cleve, *A Slaveholders' Union: Slavery, Politics, and the Constitution in the Early American Republic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010); David Waldstreicher, *Slavery's Constitution: From Revolution to Ratification* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2009).

always marginal to the economy—had abolished bondage. Southern planters accordingly worried about the long-term prospects of their ‘peculiar institution,’ should anti-slavery advocates ever gain control of the federal government.⁹

The resultant tensions between Southern and Northern interests over the geographical expansion of slavery led to a first major political crisis in 1819. That year, after the territory of Missouri—where slavery was legal—sought admission to the United States, a group of Northern congressmen attempted to enforce a plan for gradual emancipation in Missouri as part of the criteria for its statehood. Most Southern planters were hostile to this proposition, since they worried about the precedent that congressional restriction of slavery in the southwest would set. In 1820, a compromise was negotiated, whereby it was agreed that Missouri and Maine would both join the United States—the former as a slave state and the latter as a free state—which maintained the existing balance of power between the South and the North within the federal government. The Missouri Compromise also set forth what portion of the Louisiana Purchase could be open to slavery, fixing the future boundary between free and slave territories at the latitude 36° 30'.¹⁰

As a range of historians have pointed out, many members of the Southern slaveholding elite interpreted the Missouri Crisis as a warning about the threat posed to slavery—and, by extension, to their wealth and power—by governmental centralisation. If Congress could place restrictions on where slavery was legal, then it was not unreasonable to speculate that it could also interfere with or even abolish the institution where it already existed. Thus, during the crisis of 1819-21 and in its aftermath, Southern slaveholders embraced and articulated

9 See Roger Ransom, *Conflict and Compromise: The Political Economy of Slavery, Emancipation, and the American Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 18-40; Van Cleve, *Slaveholders' Union*, 187-224; Matthew Mason, *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 158-176; James Miller, *South by Southwest: Planter Emigration and Identity in the Slave South* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 128-148; Bruce Levine, *Half Slave and Half Free: The Roots of the Civil War* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2005 [1992]).

10 William Freehling, *The Road to Disunion, Vol. 1: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 145-161; Glover Moore, *The Missouri Controversy, 1819-21* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1966); Robert Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise and Its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

states' rights arguments in greater numbers. According to this political philosophy, the federal government had no constitutional authority to interfere in the internal affairs of individual states. States' rights—which provided Southerners with a strong legal basis through which to indirectly defend slavery—drew from earlier notions of Jeffersonian Republicanism, which envisioned the U.S. as a decentralised confederation of separate sovereign entities rather than a single state with a strong central government. During the four decades that followed the Missouri Compromise, American slaveholders would develop and periodically deploy states' rights arguments in response to threats to their local autonomy and power.¹¹

An important step in this process occurred in South Carolina in the late 1820s and early 1830s, the time of the so-called Nullification Crisis. After Congress introduced tariffs in 1828—primarily to promote textile manufacturing in New England—a group of South Carolinian planters protested against the protectionist measures. Foremost among these individuals was the sitting vice-president, John C. Calhoun, who controversially argued that state legislatures possessed the power to 'nullify' federal laws that they judged contrary to their interests.¹² Four years later, after the introduction of new tariffs, South Carolina's nullifiers called a state convention in which they declared the tariffs of 1828 and 1832 unconstitutional and threatened to secede from the Union in response to any attempt to enforce their payment. President Andrew Jackson—although himself a slaveholder and generally favourable to moderate states' rights principles—viewed nullification as treasonous and resolved to enforce the law. The ensuing crisis almost led to a confrontation between the federal army and the South Carolinian militia in 1833, but a compromise on the tariffs,

11 Forbes, *Missouri Compromise*, 141-178; Levine, *Half Slave*, 160-176; Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 146-159; Enrico Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites: American Slaveholders and Southern Italian Landowners, 1815-1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 195-198; Forrest McDonald, *States' Rights and the Union: Imperium in Imperio, 1776-1876* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000); Lance Banning, *The Jeffersonian Persuasion: Evolution of a Party Ideology* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978).

12 [John C. Calhoun], "The South Carolina Exposition and Protest," in Thomas Cooper (ed.), *The Statutes at Large of South Carolina* (Columbia: A.S. Johnston, 1836), 247-273. Also see John Niven, *John C. Calhoun and the Price of Union: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 154-199; Manisha Sinha, *The Counterrevolution of Slavery: Politics and Ideology in Antebellum South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 33-62.

combined with a general lack of support for nullification in other parts of the U.S. South, persuaded South Carolina's would-be secessionists to back down. Still, the extreme states' rights position that the Palmetto State's nullifiers assumed in 1832-33 portentously demonstrated the willingness of some members of the Southern elite to threaten disunion in order to protect their interests, foremost among which was slavery.¹³

One major reason for the militancy of some South Carolinian slaveholders during the Nullification Crisis was the recent emergence of the 'new abolitionism' in the U.S. North and Europe. While abolitionism had a pedigree in the North that dated to the Revolutionary era, the late 1820s and early 1830s witnessed its rejuvenation there, largely as a consequence of the efforts of black activists such as David Walker. This new phase of American abolitionism was fuelled by William Lloyd Garrison's 1831 launch of *The Liberator*, a newspaper that radically demanded the immediate emancipation of all U.S. slaves.¹⁴ This was a development that troubled most American slaveholders, especially when a connection was made by some contemporaries between *The Liberator* and Nat Turner's bloody slave rebellion in Virginia in August 1831. Still, notwithstanding the consternation that they caused among Southerners, the abolitionists only characterised a small fringe of Northern public opinion, and the decade that followed the Nullification Crisis was one of relative calm in terms of sectional tension between the U.S. North and South.¹⁵ This entente was facilitated by the fact that the two major political parties that dominated national politics between the mid-1830s and the early 1850s—

13 William Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965); Lacy K. Ford, *Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Richard Ellis, *The Union at Risk: Jacksonian Democracy, States' Rights, and the Nullification Crisis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Robert Remini, *The Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 233-251.

14 Enrico Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond: The U.S. "Peculiar Institution" in International Perspective* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2013), 124; James Stewart, *Holy Warriors: The Abolitionists and American Slavery* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997 [1976]), 35-96; Henry Mayer, *All On Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998).

15 On the Southern response to the rejuvenation of Northern abolitionism, see Freehling, *Road to Disunion*, I, 289-352; Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*, 301-360; Varon, *Disunion*, 87-124; Lacy K. Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 481-504; Susan Wyly-Jones, "The 1835 Anti-Abolition Meetings in the South: A New Look at the Controversy over the Abolition Postal Campaign," *Civil War History* 47 (2001), 289-309.

the Democrats and the Whigs—supported the expansion of plantation agriculture associated with the second slavery.¹⁶

After 1845, however, the simmering mix of unresolved questions about slavery and states' rights once again came to the boil within American national politics. That year, the slaveholding republic of Texas was annexed by the United States, which led, in turn, to war with Mexico (1846-48). Given that the annexation of Texas was secured by the planter-President James K. Polk and his pro-slavery administration, many Northerners concluded that the Mexican War was calculated to expand the South's slave system and thereby increase slaveholders' power in Congress. Therefore, in 1846, in order to counteract this potential, Pennsylvania Congressman David Wilmot introduced an amendment—known as the Wilmot Proviso—that would have banned slavery from any territory acquired from Mexico.¹⁷

Although the Wilmot Proviso was not ratified by Congress in 1846, it set the agenda for U.S. national politics during the following years, when the question of slavery's territorial expansion caused the escalation of sectional tensions between the U.S. North and South. In the aftermath of the Mexican War, many Northern politicians, although generally unwilling to abolish slavery where it already existed, increasingly resolved to arrest its further spread. Indeed, 1848 witnessed the foundation of the Free Soil Party, which opposed the expansion of slavery in the American west. For their part, Southern planters tended to view the territorial limitation of slavery as an assault upon slavery itself, for most had come to believe that it was only by expanding their slave system that they could guarantee the long-term security of their

16 On the Democrats and Whigs, see Harry Watson, *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 1990); Michael Holt, *Political Parties and American Political Development: From the Age of Jackson to the Age of Lincoln* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992); Michael Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005).

17 See Joel Silbey, *Storm Over Texas: The Annexation Controversy and the Road to Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Frederick Merk, *Slavery and the Annexation of Texas* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1972); John Schroeder, *Mr. Polk's War: American Opposition and Dissent, 1846-1848* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1973); Eric Foner, "The Wilmot Proviso Revisited," *Journal of American History* 56 (1969), 262-279.

‘peculiar institution.’¹⁸

These issues reached a point of crisis when a decision had to be made about whether to allow or disallow slavery in the vast territories ceded to the United States by Mexico in 1848. Two years later, when President Zachary Taylor announced his intention to back California’s admission to the Union as a free state, slaveholders throughout the South were outraged. By then, the southwestern cotton and sugar planters who participated in the second slavery had grown in confidence and were consequently more willing to countenance resistance to unfavourable policies enacted by the federal government than they had been during the Nullification Crisis. In June 1850, delegates from nine of the South’s fifteen slaveholding states gathered at a Southern Convention in Nashville, Tennessee, where they debated how to respond to Taylor’s plan. Although some states’ rights extremists called for secession should California gain admission to the Union as a free state, the convention was divided on the issue and ultimately postponed deliberations for another meeting in November. In the intervening period, a compromise was negotiated in Congress, which stipulated that California would become a free state but the territories of New Mexico and Utah would be open to slavery on the basis of popular sovereignty. Additionally, a new Fugitive Slave Law—which made the recovery of runaway slaves from free states easier—was offered as a concession to slaveholders. The compromise appeased most members of the Southern slaveholding elite and the prospect of disunion abated.¹⁹

The Compromise of 1850 may have succeeded in averting secession, but American politics continued to polarise over the related questions of states’ rights and slavery during the

18 Bonner, *Mastering America*, 32-40; Levine, *Half Slave*, 177-198; Fehrenbacher, *Slaveholding Republic*, 253-294; Ransom, *Conflict and Compromise*, 97-108; David Potter, *The Impending Crisis, 1848-1861* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 63-88; John Ashworth, *The Republic in Crisis, 1848-1861* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). On the Free Soil Party, see Frederick Blue, *The Free Soilers: Third Party Politics, 1848-54* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973).

19 Freehling, *Road to Disunion*, I, 455-535; Ashworth, *Republic in Crisis*, 30-63; Varon, *Disunion*, 199-231; Holman Hamilton, *Prologue to Conflict: The Crisis and Compromise of 1850* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1964); Thelma Jennings, *The Nashville Convention: Southern Movement for Unity, 1848-51* (Memphis: Memphis State University Press, 1980).

following decade. In 1854, the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which stipulated that the legality of slavery in the two eponymous territories would be decided by means of a popular vote, sparked a fresh round of debate among Americans about slavery's expansion. The same year, a number of moderate Northern anti-slavery politicians founded the Republican Party, which adopted a platform that envisioned the toleration of slavery where it existed, but a strict limitation of its further spread. Thereafter, in place of a two party system that had solicited support from both Northern and Southern states, U.S. national politics was reorganised along largely sectional lines. The Democrats drew most of their support from the slave South and the Republicans appealed almost exclusively to voters in the free states; as a consequence, most American slaveholders' commitment to the United States became closely tied to the fortunes of the Democratic Party. In the second half of the 1850s, American politics continued to polarise over the question of slavery, while predictions of an 'irrepressible conflict' between the North and the South increased in frequency.²⁰

It was in this context that the election of Republican Abraham Lincoln as president in November 1860, combined with the fact that his anti-slavery party also gained control of Congress, was deemed sufficient cause for disunion by most members of the Southern elite. Between late 1860 and early 1861, confident that they would be unchallenged leaders in a new federal republic shorn of a competing free labour section, a majority of slaveholders from South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas supported their states' secession from the United States and the creation of the Confederate States of America. They were soon followed out of the Union and into the Confederacy by Virginia, Arkansas, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Thus, to protect their power, privilege, and autonomy,

20 See Michael Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978); William Freehling, *The Road to Disunion, Vol. 2: Secessionists Triumphant, 1854-1861* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); John Ashworth, *Slavery, Capitalism, and Politics in the Antebellum Republic, Vol. 2: The Coming of the Civil War, 1850-1861* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). On the Republican Party, see Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994 [1970]); William Gienapp, *The Origins of the Republican Party, 1852-1856* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

Southern planters precipitated the dissolution of a political Union that many of their fathers and grandfathers had a hand in establishing. Ironically, however, this put in motion the chain of events that led to the Civil War, the Emancipation Proclamation (1863), and the final abolition of American slavery in 1865.²¹

By the time most American slaveholders decided to secede from the United States in 1860-61, Irish landlords had earned a place among the foremost supporters of their own Union: the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. And yet, roughly eight decades earlier, when North American slaveholders were participating in the American Revolution, many members of the Irish landed class had also joined a ‘patriotic’ movement that sought greater independence from English rule. In 1782, these Irish patriots attained legislative independence for their parliament, although—unlike the United States—Ireland still remained part of the British empire and subject to English influence thereafter. Subsequently, the landlords who controlled the Irish parliament blocked most of the political and social reforms that were suggested by the liberal fringe of the country’s patriots. Motivated by the failure of reform and inspired by the example of the French Revolution, a republican movement emerged in Ireland in the early 1790s, which sought complete independence from English rule. In 1798, the United Irishmen, in league with the agrarian secret society known as the Defenders and a small contingent of French soldiers, staged a rebellion that was eventually suppressed by the British army.²²

21 Potter, *Impending Crisis*, 405-554; Freehling, *Road to Disunion*, II, 323-422; Fehrenbacher, *Slaveholding Republic*, 295-338; Charles Dew, *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001); William Davis, “A Government of Our Own”: *The Making of the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994); George Rable, *The Confederate Republic: A Revolution Against Politics* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Anne Rubin, *Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005); Stephanie McCurry, *Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

22 R.B. McDowell, *Ireland in the Age of Imperialism and Revolution, 1760-1801* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979); James Kelly, *Prelude to Union: Anglo-Irish Politics in the 1780s* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1992); R.B. McDowell, “The Age of the United Irishmen: Reform and Reaction, 1789-94,” and “The Age of the United Irishmen: Revolution and the Union, 1794-1800,” in Moody and Vaughan (eds.), *New History of Ireland*, IV, 289-338, 339-373; Nancy Curtin, *The United Irishmen: Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin*,

The 1798 rising proved to be a decisive turning point in British-Irish political relations, since it led to Ireland's incorporation into a new United Kingdom and the imposition of direct rule from London. For the English establishment, then in the midst of war with revolutionary France, the involvement of French troops in the Irish insurrection highlighted a major weakness in their domestic security. Their solution was to unify Britain and Ireland into one state by means of a legislative Act of Union. Since this plan included the abolition of the Irish parliament, it required the support of the landowners who controlled that institution. Since the recent rebellion had clearly demonstrated their vulnerability to attack from the Irish peasantry and their ultimate reliance on the British military to maintain law and order (combined with bribery and corruption), a majority of Ireland's landlords—many of whom had recently participated in the patriotic movement for greater independence from English rule—supported the Act of Union. In 1801, Ireland officially became part of the United Kingdom and was governed from Westminster thereafter.²³

In comparison with American slaveholders' entry into the United States, Irish landlords joined the United Kingdom in a much less powerful position. Whereas Southerners were outnumbered in the U.S. House of Representatives, but enjoyed numerical parity in the Senate and held the presidency for most of the antebellum era, under the terms of the Act of Union, Irish voters were only entitled to elect 100 of Westminster's 400 members of parliament, while Ireland's gentry were granted 28 permanent seats in the House of Lords. This meant that Irish landowners never expected to dominate their national politics as slaveholders did in the United States until the end of the 1850s. Crucially, however,

1791-1798 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); Marianne Elliott, *Partners in Revolution: The United Irishmen and France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

23 Patrick Geoghegan, *The Irish Act of Union: A Study in High Politics, 1798-1801* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1999); G.C. Bolton, *The Passing of the Irish Act of Union: A Study in Parliamentary Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966). Also see James Kelly, "We Were All to Have Been Massacred: Irish Protestants and the Experience of Rebellion," in Thomas Bartlett, David Dickson, Dáire Keogh and Kevin Whelan (eds.), *1798: A Bicentenary Perspective* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), 312-330; Stephen Small, "The Twisted Roots of Irish Patriotism: Anglo-Irish Political Thought in the Late Eighteenth Century," *Eire-Ireland* 35 (2001), 187-216.

representatives of the Irish landed class could and did ally with the powerful British aristocracy—with whom they had close social ties—which gave them a greater amount of influence at Westminster than their numbers may have suggested. At the same time, Irish landlords also held key positions within the two major political parties that dominated British politics for most of the nineteenth century: the Conservatives and the Whigs, though they disproportionately tended toward membership in the Conservative Party, which was effectively the political organ of the pan-U.K. landed interest. Thus, although Irish landowners' national power was small in comparison with slaveholders of the antebellum United States, it was by no means negligible.²⁴

Similarly to planters in the U.S. South, Irish landlords also possessed a considerable degree of control over their region's local administrative structures during the nineteenth century. In fact, this autonomy was part of the tacit arrangement that they struck with the British government at the time of the conception and creation of the United Kingdom. In the words of Gearóid Ó'Tuathaigh, "the English government had allowed the Irish ascendancy, in return for the surrender of its parliament, to retain undisturbed and exclusive control of the sources of power within Ireland." To be sure, members of the landed class dominated nineteenth-century Ireland's grand juries, its magistracy, and—in the decades after their creation in 1838—its Poor Law boards of guardians. In practice, however, Irish landowners' local autonomy proved to be neither undisturbed nor exclusive; comparable to the situation faced by slaveholders in the antebellum United States, their power was also threatened by governmental centralisation during the nineteenth century.²⁵

²⁴ See McDowell, *Ireland in the Age of Imperialism and Revolution*, 678-704; Geoghegan, *Irish Act of Union*, 25-53; D. George Boyce, *Nineteenth-Century Ireland: The Search for Stability* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2005 [1990]), 10-36; Oliver MacDonagh, *Ireland: The Union and its Aftermath* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977). On the Irish elite's involvement in British party politics, see Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society*, 257-340. For more on antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders' high degree of power in American national politics, see Van Cleve, *Slaveholders' Union*, 103-142; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 194-195; Richards, *Slave Power*.

²⁵ Gearóid Ó'Tuathaigh, *Ireland Before the Famine, 1798-1848* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 1972), 36; Crossman, *Local Government in Nineteenth-Century Ireland*. For a recent treatment of this process of governmental centralisation and its effect on the Irish landed class, see Joanne McEntee, "The State and the Landed Estate: Order and Shifting Power Relations in Ireland, 1815-1891," (PhD diss., National University

Whereas in the United States the Missouri Crisis (1819-21) was arguably the first major indication of the threat posed to the Southern slaveholding elite's interests by their central government, in Ireland, the campaign for Catholic Emancipation (1823-29) taught landlords a similar lesson. In basic terms, as it was understood in the early nineteenth century, Catholic Emancipation meant the right for Catholics to hold high political office, both within Ireland's local administrative structures and at Westminster. This reform had been promised by the English government at the time of the Act of Union in 1800, but its subsequent passage through parliament was successfully blocked by Irish landlords (in alliance with British interests that were also unfavourable to the idea). This failure became a running source of resentment among Ireland's Catholic majority during the years that followed, indicating as it did their second-class status within the United Kingdom. In 1823, having recognised that no government would rectify the grievance unless pressured to do so, Daniel O'Connell initiated a massive campaign of popular protest throughout Ireland in order to agitate for 'emancipation.' Although O'Connell was himself an Irish landowner, a significant proportion of his class (who were mostly Protestant) opposed the measure, primarily because they worried that it would loosen their grip on Irish politics. Even so, after O'Connell was elected to parliament in 1828 but was unable to take his seat because of his religion, the government was forced to address the problem. In 1829, the Catholic Relief Act removed the law that precluded Catholics from holding high political office throughout the United Kingdom.²⁶

The fact that Catholic Emancipation was passed against the wishes of the majority of Ireland's landlords reveals the limits of their power at Westminster in the first half of the

of Ireland, Galway, 2012).

26 Thomas Bartlett, *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation, 1690-1830* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1992), 327-342; Brian Jenkins, *Era of Emancipation: British Government of Ireland, 1812-1830* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988); Fergus O'Ferrall, *Catholic Emancipation: Daniel O'Connell and the Birth of Irish Democracy, 1820-30* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1985); Patrick Geoghegan, *King Dan: The Rise of Daniel O'Connell, 1775-1829* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2008). Interestingly, Catholic Emancipation had an indirect influence on events in the United States, since it was an important part of a broader British reform movement that also included the abolition of slavery throughout the British Empire (1833), which, in turn, gave a boost to U.S. abolitionism. See Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 123-144.

nineteenth century. However, they did succeed in softening the blow by securing the passage of accompanying legislation that raised the qualification to vote in Ireland to holders of property valued at ten pounds or more. This anti-democratic measure cut the Irish electorate from roughly 216,000 to 37,000 people. A large number of those who retained the franchise after 1829 were tenant-farmers who typically voted as their landlords directed them to. As a result, over the short term at least, Catholic Emancipation had little effect on the balance of political power in Ireland, which remained tipped toward the country's Protestant landowners until the late nineteenth century.²⁷

Irish landlords' response to the passage of the 1829 Catholic Relief Act illustrates their favoured political *modus operandi* during the Victorian era. Generally, they tried to use their influence at Westminster to block reforms that they believed adversely affected their interests for as long as possible; then, when the pressure for reform became irresistible, they endeavoured to limit its impact. Unlike U.S. Southern slaveholders, Irish landlords did not develop any equivalent of the states' rights arguments and—with the exception of a handful of individuals—they never threatened to either lead or support separatist movements. As a numerical minority who were keenly aware of their dependence on the British state for their protection, nineteenth-century Ireland's landed class simply did not have either the self-confidence or the popular support to mount an effective campaign of resistance to unfavourable policies introduced by their central government.²⁸

In retrospect, Catholic Emancipation proved to be one of a long series of government-imposed reforms that diminished Irish landowners' local autonomy during the nineteenth century. The 1830s were especially notable in this respect, since the Whig Party—which

27 K. Theodore Hoppen, *Ireland Since 1800: Conflict and Conformity* (New York: Longman, 1999 [1989]), 19-22; K. Theodore Hoppen, "Landlords, Society, and Electoral Politics in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Ireland," *Past and Present* 75 (1977), 62-93; J.H. Whyte, "Landlord Influence at Elections in Ireland, 1760-1855," *English Historical Review* 80 (1965), 740-760; Bartlett, *Fall and Rise*, 343-347.

28 For discussions of an atypical landlord who supported Irish separatism, see Robert Sloan, *William Smith O'Brien and the Young Ireland Rebellion of 1848* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000); Richard Davis, *Revolutionary Imperialist: William Smith O'Brien, 1803-1864* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1998).

formed the governments at Westminster between 1830 and 1841—introduced a number of measures directly aimed at reforming Ireland’s sociopolitical structures in this decade. The country’s national boards of education and works were created in 1831, its police force was reorganised in 1836, and the Poor Law—which established workhouses throughout Ireland—was passed in 1838. These centralising measures were introduced largely against the wishes of the Irish landed class, but—as with Catholic Emancipation—they ultimately consented to government interference in their local affairs.²⁹

Yet, even though Irish landlords’ autonomy was substantially eroded by the British state over the course of the nineteenth century, it could also be argued that they were successful in slowing the pace of their decline by preventing even more drastic social and political reforms. For example, the landed class was able to defeat the Repeal campaign that gathered momentum in 1830s and 1840s Ireland. Again led by Daniel O’Connell, Repeal—which, notably, was supported by many American slaveholders, at least until O’Connell began to publicly agitate for the abolition of U.S. slavery in the early 1840s—envisioned the dissolution of the United Kingdom and the reinstatement of the Irish parliament. Ireland’s predominantly Protestant landowners generally opposed the Repeal movement; cognisant of the rise of Catholic Ireland over the preceding decades, and with the trauma of 1798 still acute, they knew that they would not control an Irish parliament as their ancestors had in the eighteenth century. Indeed, most Irish landlords believed that social revolution would likely follow Repeal. Consequently, they successfully used their influence at Westminster to block the introduction of a Repeal bill and supported the hardline tactics adopted by Prime Minister Robert Peel in order to defeat the Repeal movement. In 1843, Ireland’s unionist landowners enjoyed decisive victories when Peel banned a climactic pro-Repeal political rally and

29 Virginia Crossman, *Politics, Law and Order in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 1996), 46-76; Donald Akenson, *The Irish Education Experiment* (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1970); Peter Gray, *The Making of the Irish Poor Law, 1815-43* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009); Ó’Tuathaigh, *Ireland Before the Famine*, 80-115; R.B. McDowell, *The Irish Administration, 1801-1914* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1964); McEntee, “The State and the Landed Estate.” Also see Ian Newbound, *Whiggery and Reform, 1830-41: The Politics of Government* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).

O'Connell was subsequently arrested for sedition. The campaign to repeal the Act of Union would live on in Irish politics for a few years, but its moment had passed; to most landlords' relief, the idea effectively died along with O'Connell in 1847.³⁰

The overwhelming opposition of Ireland's landowners to Repeal demonstrates that, by the early 1840s, they had decided that, even though Westminster posed a threat to their power and privilege, it was nevertheless preferable to live within the United Kingdom than in an independent Irish state. Thereafter, regardless of party affiliation, unionism remained the default political stance of Ireland's landed class. However, it was not until the late nineteenth century that their country's place in the U.K. was seriously threatened again.³¹ The 1870s and 1880s witnessed the emergence and spectacular rise of the Home Rule Party, which aimed to secure a limited form of devolved government for Ireland, and which controversially backed the popular campaign for land reform associated with the Land War (1879-82). In response, most of the country's landowners joined or supported the Irish Unionist Alliance, a political movement founded in 1885 in order to prevent Home Rule.³² By then, Irish landlords' local autonomy and power had been substantially eroded as a result of governmental centralisation and reform. Westminster had even controversially intervened in the issue of landownership by

30 Kevin Nowlan, *The Politics of Repeal: A Study in the Relations Between Great Britain and Ireland, 1841-50* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965); Patrick Geoghegan, *Liberator: The Life and Death of Daniel O'Connell, 1830-1847* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2010), 115-230; Lawrence McCaffrey, *Daniel O'Connell and the Repeal Year* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1966), 92-134. On U.S. Southern slaveholders' qualified support for Irish Repeal, see Angela Murphy, *American Slavery, Irish Freedom: Abolition, Immigrant Citizenship, and the Transatlantic Movement for Irish Repeal* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2010), 124-149; Christine Kinealy, *Daniel O'Connell and the Anti-Slavery Movement: The Saddest People The Sun Sees* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011), 75-111. On the links between O'Connell and American abolitionism, see Maurice Bric, "Daniel O'Connell and the Debate on Anti-Slavery, 1820-1850," in Tom Dunne and Laurence Geary (eds.), *History and the Public Sphere: Essays in Honour of John A. Murphy* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2005), 69-82; W. Caleb McDaniel, "Repealing Unions: American Abolitionists, Irish Repeal, and the Origins of Garrisonian Disunionism," *Journal of the Early Republic* 28 (2008), 243-269.

31 Mid-Victorian Ireland did witness a number of nationalist rebellions—notably those associated with Young Ireland in 1848 and the Fenians in 1867—but, though important, these were effectively dealt with by the army and posed no real threat to the status quo. See Richard Davis, *The Young Ireland Movement* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1988); R.V. Comerford, *The Fenians in Context: Irish Politics and Society, 1848-82* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1998 [1985]).

32 See Matthew Kelly, "Home Rule and Its Enemies," in Alvin Jackson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 582-602; Alan O'Day, *Irish Home Rule, 1867-1921* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998); Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule: An Irish History, 1800-2000* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

granting Irish tenants property rights to their farms through a series of Land Acts, the most important of which were passed in 1870 and 1881. And yet, notwithstanding the movement for elite-led economic and social reform that characterised the second landlordism, most members of Ireland's landed class remained convinced that they still needed protection from the British government to maintain law and order and prevent rebellions. For this reason, the majority of Irish landowners always remained unionists, despite their disagreement with many of their central government's actions. There was nothing, it seems, that Westminster could do to induce any significant number of Irish landlords to follow the example of their U.S. Southern counterparts and take a gamble on leading a movement for secession and the creation of an independent nation-state.³³

Viewing the antebellum U.S. South's and nineteenth-century Ireland's agrarian elites' political histories side by side reveals numerous similarities and differences. In general, American slaveholders and Irish landowners were conservative classes. In both cases, when it came to politics, most members of the two elites were primarily concerned with the protection of the bases of their wealth, status, and power: slaveownership in the U.S. South and landownership in Ireland. And yet, this conservatism ultimately led Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords to opposite conclusions about the legitimacy of their national governments. On one hand, after successfully resisting challenges to their local autonomy and national power from governmental centralisation during the first half of the 1800s, a majority of Southern slaveholders supported secession from the United States in response to the imminent threat

33 K. Theodore Hoppen, "Landownership and Power in Nineteenth-Century Ireland: The Decline of an Elite," in Ralph Gibson and Martin Blinkhorn (eds.), *Landownership and Power in Modern Europe* (London: HarperCollins Academic, 1991), 164-180; Terence Dooley, *The Decline of the Big House in Ireland: A Study of Irish Landed Families, 1860-1960* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 2001), 208-225; Patrick Buckland, *Irish Unionism, I: The Anglo-Irish and the New Ireland, 1885-1922* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1972); Fergus Campbell, *The Irish Establishment, 1879-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 137-190. On the Irish Land Acts, see Paul Bew, *Land and the National Question in Ireland, 1858-82* (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1978); Barbara Solow, *The Land Question and the Irish Economy, 1870-1903* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971).

they believed Abraham Lincoln's 1860 election posed to slavery. In Ireland, on the other hand, landlords faced a comparable process of governmental centralisation, which not only threatened, but actually diminished the high degree of local autonomy that they had enjoyed at the beginning of the 1800s; however, for the most part, they remained loyal to the United Kingdom. Clearly, these were very different outcomes, which comparison shows were consequences of the different demographic, geographic, and political contexts that the two elites inhabited during the nineteenth century.

Although American slaveholders and Irish landlords were both minorities within their respective regions, slaveholders comprised a far higher proportion of the U.S. South's population (approximately 385,000 people out of a total white population of eight million and an overall population of *circa* 12 million in 1860), than landowners in Ireland (who numbered around 10,000 individuals out of over eight million in 1840). Furthermore, due to the existence of a frontier in the United States—which allowed for the territorial expansion of plantation agriculture associated with the second slavery—the American South's slaveholding population constantly rose during the antebellum era, whereas in Ireland—where there was no frontier—landownership remained mostly concentrated in the hands of the same families during the second landlordism. This meant that American slaveholders were a more open elite than Irish landlords, and the former accordingly enjoyed greater popular legitimacy in the U.S. South than the latter did in Ireland.³⁴

As a result of these demographic and geographic variables, most antebellum Southern slaveholders could envision living in an independent republic while maintaining their own internal security. For this reason, they could retain the option of secession as an ultimate tool of resistance to their federal government without worrying about the possibility of a slave

³⁴ For statistics on the number of slaveholders in the South and landlords in Ireland, see Mark Smith, *Debating Slavery: Economy and Society in the Antebellum American South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 15; Hoppen, *Ireland Since 1800*, 37-38. For a relevant discussion, see Shearer Davis Bowman, *Masters and Lords: Mid-Nineteenth-Century U.S. Planters and Prussian Junkers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 158-161.

rebellion that would depose them from their positions of wealth and power. Conversely, as a small minority whose interests conflicted with those of their country's landless peasant majority, nineteenth-century Ireland's landed class knew that they were dependent on the British army to prevent revolution, as the 1798 rebellion had proven. Consequently, they were never in a strong enough position to oppose Westminster's centralising measures by either attempting or threatening secession from the United Kingdom.³⁵

If the main challenge to nineteenth-century Irish landlordism came from below—from Ireland's peasant masses—leading the country's landowners to rely on their central government for protection, then it is significant that the single biggest threat to antebellum American slavery—as most Southern slaveholders perceived it—came from anti-slavery and abolitionist interest groups concentrated in the U.S. North, and thus from without. Sectional tensions over slavery, which were present from the time of the foundation of the United States and intensified in the decades following the Missouri Crisis, convinced slaveholders—who entered their highly decentralised political system in a powerful position—of the need to maintain their power and resist moves toward governmental centralisation in order to defend their 'peculiar institution.' In contrast, despite the fact that Irish landlords were often criticised by the English press and public during the nineteenth century, they harboured no real fear that this would lead to governmental interference with their property rights (although they were eventually proven wrong in this assumption when Westminster passed the Land Acts of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries). Indeed, Victorian Irish landlords were usually confident of their ability to influence government policy by virtue of the fact that they formed part of a pan-United Kingdom landed interest; this, in turn, provided them with another reason to remain loyal to their Union. An analogous supra-regional alliance was lacking for antebellum American slaveholders, who—notwithstanding the fact that Southern slavery benefitted the entire United States economically—were concerned with protecting a strictly

35 Bonner, *Mastering America*, 15-22; Buckland, *Irish Unionism*, xxiv-xxv.

sectional institution.³⁶

Ultimately, therefore, in political terms, antebellum U.S. Southern slaveholders were far stronger and more independent, but also more isolated and embattled than their Irish landed contemporaries. As a result, although American planters' secessionism in 1860-61 was never predetermined, their unionism was generally conditional in the decades before the Civil War. Conversely, as a result of the specific historical context in which they lived, unionism was essentially unconditional for a permanent majority of Ireland's landowners throughout the nineteenth century.³⁷ Still, even though most American planters and Irish landlords arrived at opposite conclusions about the legitimacy of their central governments, they did so for similarly conservative reasons: to protect their power and privileges from perceived threats. In both cases, as we shall see, this conservatism manifested itself in the elites' perceptions of nationality and nationalism.

John A. Quitman, Lord Clonbrock, and Conservative Nationalism

U.S. Southern slaveholders' and Irish landlords' political histories were closely related to their identities. As distinctive peripheral elites that were citizens of larger political Unions, the two landed classes were required to mediate between an overlapping set of local, regional, and national loyalties during the nineteenth century. In the American South, having developed a sense of their 'Americanness' in the 1700s, slaveholders elevated this patriotic identity into U.S. nationalism during and after their war for independence from British rule. Largely as a result of its slave-based socioeconomic order, however, the South subsequently developed a

³⁶ On Irish landlords as members of a "supra-national" British aristocratic class, see Dooley, *Decline of the Big House in Ireland*, 74. For a recent discussion of how the U.S. North profited from slavery but ultimately turned against the institution, see Edward Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014), 309-342. On the importance of the external nature of the threat to American slavery, see Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987), 181.

³⁷ See Ashworth, *Slavery, Capitalism, and Politics*, II, 27-32; Shearer Davis Bowman, "Conditional Unionism and Slavery in Virginia, 1860-1861: The Case of Dr. Richard Eppes," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 96 (1988), 31-54; Boyce, *Nineteenth-Century Ireland*, 200-227; Joseph Spence, "Isaac Butt, Irish Nationality and the Conditional Defence of the Union, 1833-70," in Boyce and O'Day (eds.), *Defenders of the Union*, 65-89.

distinctive regional culture and society that was defined partially in opposition to the ‘free North.’ This was not initially considered a major problem for the Southern slaveholding elites; in the antebellum period, as long as they felt that both their national power and local autonomy were secure, they remained unionists and U.S. nationalists. Yet, by supporting secession and the creation of the Confederacy after Lincoln’s election in 1860, even though they generally retained a strong sense of American patriotism, most Southern slaveholders became Confederate nationalists.³⁸

In Ireland, instead, the landowners typically developed a strong sense of their ‘Irishness’ over the course of the eighteenth century. Similarly to North American slaveholders, this patriotic identity was both a cause and a consequence of their desire for greater independence from British interference in their affairs in the second half of the 1700s. However, by refusing to sanction reforms that would have given Ireland’s Catholic and Presbyterian populations an equal share in their vision of the Irish nation, the country’s Protestant landowners provoked a backlash that led to the 1798 rebellion. After the resulting Act of Union, Ireland became a region of the United Kingdom; from then on, while unionist landlords retained a sense of their ‘Irishness,’ they generally reconciled this patriotic identity with a form of British nationalism that was defined largely in opposition to the separatist nationalism that increasingly characterised Ireland’s Catholic majority.³⁹

Our understanding of American slaveholders’ and Irish landlords’ changing identities can benefit from being framed within the rich historiography on the concept of nationalism.

According to Benedict Anderson, all modern nations are “imagined communities,” meaning

38 Quigley, *Shifting Grounds*; John McCardell, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830-60* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979); Drew Faust, *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988); Peter Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 7-38.

39 Nicholas Canny, “Identity Formation in Ireland: The Emergence of an Anglo-Irish Identity,” in Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (eds.), *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 159-212; Boyce, *Nationalism in Ireland*, 95-118; Thomas Bartlett, “‘A People Made Rather for Copies than Originals’: The Anglo-Irish, 1760-1800,” *International History Review* 12 (1990), 11-25; Jennifer Ridden, “‘Making Good Citizens’: National Identity, Religion, and Liberalism Among the Irish Elite, c. 1800-1850,” (PhD diss., King’s College London, 1998).

that they are based on a sense of shared identity that is typically created through a process of social engineering.⁴⁰ From this perspective, antebellum Southern slaveholders imagined themselves as part of an American nation until their interests were threatened by an anti-slavery federal government, at which point a majority of them elevated their regional identity as Southerners into Confederate nationalism. Conversely, Ireland's Protestant landowners imagined themselves as part of an Irish nation until the prospect of sharing power with their country's potentially hostile Catholic majority caused most of them to reverse course and re-conceptualise their Irishness as a regional identity. Although these were obviously contrasting outcomes—outcomes that were closely related to the political developments outlined above and to the economic and social contexts discussed in previous chapters—American slaveholders' and Irish landlords' changing national identities were mutually rooted in the desire to protect their wealth, property, and power.⁴¹ As such, they were both examples of a phenomenon that might be appropriately termed 'conservative nationalism,' since these identities were defined primarily in negative relation to the challenges that the two nineteenth-century elites faced, while seeking to buttress the claims of the propertied classes to rule their societies in an era of increasing democratisation.

The similarities and differences between American slaveholders' and Irish landlords' comparable varieties of conservative nationalism are well illustrated by the two case studies of antebellum Mississippi's John A. Quitman and nineteenth-century Galway's Lord Clonbrock. Quitman was a Northern-born slaveholder who became one of the U.S. South's most famous secessionist advocates and Southern nationalists. Clonbrock was an Irish-born landlord who was a committed unionist and a British nationalist throughout his life. Thus,

40 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006 [1983]), 6-7. On nationalism as a product of 'social engineering,' see Eric Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," in Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1-14. Also see Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006 [1983]); Joep Leerssen, *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006).

41 See Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 183-184; Boyce, *Nineteenth-Century Ireland*, 200-227.

although there was considerable internal diversity within both U.S. Southern slaveholding and Irish landlordism, Quitman and Clonbrock are broadly representative of the processes of identity formation that characterised their respective classes during the nineteenth century.

John A. Quitman is best known to historians as a ‘fire-eater,’ a term usually applied to the antebellum South’s most zealous advocates of states’ rights and secession.⁴² It is a reputation that is well-deserved, for he was an early convert to (and evangelist for) the idea that slaveowners should protect their interests from the threat posed by governmental centralisation by retaining the right to secede from the United States. As early as 1836, in response to the growth of Northern abolitionism, Quitman publicly called for Mississippians to seek “a concert of action with our brethren of the slave holding States, to devise measures for the full and ample protection of our rights, our domestic happiness, and repose.” In 1850-51, he was among the South’s leading proponents of secession in response to California’s admission to the American Union as a free state. And yet, Quitman was not Southern by birth; he was born and raised in rural New York state and did not settle in Mississippi until he was twenty-two years old. How, then, did this ‘Yankee’ become a Southern nationalist?⁴³

To answer this question, we must begin by clarifying what it meant to be ‘Southern’ during Quitman’s lifetime. According to numerous historians of the American South, antebellum (white) Southern—and later Confederate—identity was based primarily upon a shared commitment to the preservation of slavery and its corollary, white supremacy. Over time, as the South’s ‘peculiar institution’ was threatened by Northern anti-slavery and

42 Eric Walther, “Honorable and Useful Ambition: John A. Quitman,” in Eric Walther, *The Fire-Eaters* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992), 83-111; James McLendon, “John A. Quitman, Fire-Eating Governor,” *Journal of Mississippi History* 15 (1953), 73-89; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 241. Interestingly, ‘fire eater’ is a term that was also commonly used in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Ireland, where it denoted dueling enthusiasts. See James Kelly, *“That Damn’d Thing Called Honour”: Duelling in Ireland, 1570-1860* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1995), 147-148.

43 John Quitman, “Interim Governor Quitman’s Inaugural Address, January 5, 1836,” *Mississippi Senate Journal* (Jackson: n.p., 1836), 34-35; Freehling, *Road to Disunion*, I, 521-526. Also see Christopher Morris, *Becoming Southern: The Evolution of a Way of Life, Warren County and Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1770-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

abolitionist interests, an increasing number of Southerners began to view and describe themselves as a distinct nation.⁴⁴ Arguably, this was a ‘civic’ rather than an ‘ethnic’ type of nationalism, since it was based on ideology more than on the criteria of language, religion, or shared history that characterised many other nineteenth-century nationalist movements.⁴⁵ Also, in its reactionary nature, this was a form of ‘conservative nationalism’ intended to justify the slaveholding elite’s social and political dominance, either within or without the American Union.

This perspective on the development of Southern nationalism becomes clear by looking at John Quitman. From the time he became a slaveowner in the 1820s, he identified himself as Southern. The intrinsic connection that Quitman perceived between the South and slavery is perhaps best illustrated by a letter he wrote to a friend during a tour of the U.S. northeast in the summer of 1831, shortly after American abolitionism had received an impetus from William Lloyd Garrison’s publication of *The Liberator*. Quitman was quick to recognise that anti-slavery sentiment was gaining traction among the general public in the North at the time; regarding New York city’s middle classes he wrote: “here are clerks by the hundred, salaried liberally out of contributions wrung from pious and frugal persons in the South; and these officials, like the majority of their theologians and divines, are inimical to our institutions, and use our money to defame and damage us!” Quitman’s use of language here is revealing; by “our institutions” he meant slavery and by “us” he meant Southerners. If there was any doubt of this, it is clarified by the fact that he went on to remark: “I am heartily tired of the North, and ... shall feel happy when I set my face home ward.”⁴⁶ Evidently, by 1831,

44 See McCardell, *Idea of a Southern Nation*, 3-4; Faust, *Creation of Confederate Nationalism*, 58-60; Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land*, 15-17, 88-93.

45 James McPherson, *Is Blood Thicker than Water? Crises of Nationalism in the Modern World* (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 1998); Don Doyle, *Nations Divided: America, Italy, and the Southern Question* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2002). Notably, some antebellum Southerners did attempt to define themselves in ethnic terms, but this was secondary to the importance of slavery as the South’s defining characteristic. See Quigley, *Shifting Grounds*, 50-86; Rollin Osterweis, *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South* (New Haven: P. Smith, 1964 [1949]); Ritchie Watson, *Normans and Saxons: Southern Race Mythology and the Intellectual History of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008).

46 John Quitman to J.F.H. Claiborne, 6 August 1831, in J.F.H. Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Major-General, U.S.A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi* (New York: Harper & Bros.,

Quitman felt alienated from his Northern roots and considered Mississippi his home.

Yet, the fact that Quitman developed a distinctive Southern identity after settling in Mississippi did not initially contradict his strong sense of American patriotism and nationalism. Throughout the 1830s and 1840s, he maintained a dual identity as both a Southerner and an American—a circumstance typical of antebellum slaveholders, as Paul Quigley and Peter Onuf have pointed out. Essentially, Quitman was a conditional unionist whose loyalty to the United States was predicated upon the protection of slavery—the institution that underpinned his wealth and status, as well as the distinctive Southern culture that he grew to cherish after settling in Natchez in 1821.⁴⁷ Therefore, at the same time that he was developing a paternalistic proslavery ideology, Quitman also dedicated himself to defending slavery in the political arena. To do so, he wholeheartedly embraced the states' rights ideas that became increasingly popular among white Southerners during the antebellum era.

In the early 1830s, Quitman publicly supported the Nullification movement that emerged in South Carolina. He was profoundly influenced by the ideas promulgated by John C. Calhoun, and speculated during the Nullification Crisis that President Jackson's response threatened to "consolidate all powers in the National Government, and to erect upon the ruins of the state governments a supreme and arbitrary national power against which there will be no redress, no appeal but to revolution." In 1834, to defend against this threat, Quitman participated in the foundation of a Mississippi States' Rights Party, which backed the principle of nullification. In general, however, Mississippians—like the majority of Southerners—rejected nullification. At that time, Mississippi was still a frontier society that benefitted from Jackson's policy of Indian removal, which ensured the continued expansion of cotton

1860), I, 109-110.

47 Quigley, *Shifting Grounds*, 16-49; Peter Onuf, "Antebellum Southerners and the National Idea," in L. Diane Barnes, Brian Schoen, and Frank Towers (eds.), *The Old South's Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 25-46; Robert May, *John A. Quitman: Old South Crusader* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), xvi, 228. Also see William Cooper, *Jefferson Davis, American* (New York: Vintage, 2000).

plantations and farms and thereby made fortunes for the migrants who continued to settle in the southwest in large numbers during the 1820s and 1830s. In this context, most Mississippians were willing to consent to federal taxation, and Quitman's States' Rights Party had little attraction for all but a few.⁴⁸

Bowing to this political reality, Quitman accepted that a States' Rights Party was a non-starter and instead aligned himself with the Whig Party, the national political organisation that emerged in the aftermath of the Nullification Crisis and appealed primarily to President Jackson's opponents. In 1835, Quitman accepted the Whigs' endorsement in his successful bid for a seat in the Mississippi state senate. Yet, Quitman never fit comfortably in the Whig Party. Although they initially attracted support among Southern slaveholders partially on the basis of their states' rights advocacy, by the late 1830s the Whigs had developed a political program that envisioned a prominent role for the federal government in the economy, particularly in sponsoring infrastructural improvements. This program clashed with Quitman's stated intention to "maintain and support the doctrines of state sovereignty and state interpretation against all the world." Thus, in 1838, notwithstanding his earlier disagreement with President Jackson's actions during the Nullification Crisis, Quitman broke with the Whigs and joined the Democratic Party. Thereafter, he consistently occupied the Democrats' most extreme proslavery and states' rights fringe.⁴⁹

Despite the fact that Quitman's views on nullification and state sovereignty earned him an early reputation as a fire-eating secessionist, it was not until 1850 that he truly transitioned from a states' rights advocate to an outright Southern nationalist. At that time, he was the

48 John Quitman to Nathan G. Howard, 14 January 1833, in Nathan G. Howard Papers, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson; May, *John A. Quitman*, 40-49, 59-60; Lucie Robertson Bridgforth, "Mississippi's Response to Nullification, 1833," *Journal of Mississippi History* 45 (1983), 1-21; Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*, 202-205, 265. On Jackson's policy of Indian removal, see Anthony F.C. Wallace, *The Long, Bitter Trail: Andrew Jackson and the Indians* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993).

49 John Quitman to J.F.H. Claiborne, 5 September 1834, QFP; May, *John A. Quitman*, 60-64, 98. For more on the Whigs' economic program, see Maurice Baxter, *Henry Clay and the American System* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004 [1995]). Also see William Cooper, *The South and the Politics of Slavery, 1828-1856* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978).

Governor of Mississippi, having been elected in 1849 largely because of the popularity he had gained for his role in the Mexican War, where he attained the rank of Major-General. Like most Southerners, Quitman was outraged by the proposition that California would be admitted to the American Union as a free state; as he told his wife in September 1850, “I am convinced that if we submit quietly, soon our property, liberties and our lives will be endangered.” Unlike most Southerners, however, Quitman was prepared to agitate for the creation of an independent slaveholding republic in response. In fact, he was involved in a conspiracy with Whitemarsh B. Seabrook, then the Governor of South Carolina, which sought to spark a mass movement for Southern independence. Seabrook—concerned that his state’s reputation for radicalism would alienate moderate slaveholders—secretly extended a call to the governors of a number of other slave states to take the lead in opposing the Compromise of 1850 by threatening secession. Quitman, long skeptical about the safety of slavery within the Union, accepted Seabrook’s request; “having no hope of an effective remedy for existing and prospective evils, but in separation from our Northern States, my views of state action will look to secession,” he assured his South Carolinian counterpart.⁵⁰

Using his prerogative as Governor of Mississippi, Quitman called for a state convention to discuss the prospect of secession, which was scheduled for November 1851. When he made this announcement in late 1850, Quitman believed that he enjoyed widespread support throughout Mississippi; “with the exception of the merchants, bankers, millionaires and their servile dependents, the people are opposed to submission,” he told a friend at the time. However, over the course of next year, the secessionist impulse abated throughout the Magnolia State, a fact that became clear during Quitman’s campaign for re-election as Governor in the summer of 1851. By then, Mississippi politics had been reorganised into two

50 John Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 21 September 1850, QFP; John Quitman to Whitemarsh B. Seabrook, 29 September 1850, Whitemarsh B. Seabrook Correspondence, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Also see John McCardell, “John A. Quitman and the Compromise of 1850 in Mississippi,” *Journal of Mississippi History* 37 (1975), 239-266; Freehling, *Road to Disunion*, I, 521-523; Ray Broussard, “Governor John A. Quitman and the Compromise of 1850 in Mississippi,” *Journal of Mississippi History* 28 (1966), 103-120.

distinct factions: those who opposed the Compromise of 1850 formed a Southern Rights Party, led by Quitman, and those who supported it coalesced into a Union Party. The latter nominated Henry S. Foote to challenge Quitman for Governor. Since this gubernatorial campaign took place in advance of the November state convention, it effectively became a proxy contest over how Mississippi should respond to the Compromise. It soon became apparent that the tide of popular opinion, which had appeared to be in favour of secession in 1850, had turned against the idea and therefore against Quitman. In September 1851, recognising that he was certain to lose the upcoming election, Quitman withdrew from the race. Foote won the Governorship and a majority of unionist delegates were returned to the subsequent state convention, where they voted in favour of accepting the Compromise of 1850.⁵¹

After this humiliating defeat, Quitman temporarily withdrew from politics; yet, it was not long before he was back in the public spotlight. In 1853, he took command of a filibustering expedition—in effect, a private army—that conspired to ‘liberate’ Cuba from Spanish rule. Quitman’s aim, widely supported by slaveholders throughout the South, as Robert May and Walter Johnson have shown, was to annex the valuable Caribbean slave society to the United States. If Southerners were not yet prepared to secede in response to the threat of Northern ‘aggression,’ Quitman believed, then the South should at least remain strong within the Union by expanding. By March 1855, however, his plan to invade Cuba had fallen apart, a victim of poor planning, delays, and political intrigue.⁵² Later in 1855, Quitman

51 John Quitman to Samuel Cartwright, 2 October 1850, Samuel A. Cartwright and Family Papers, Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collection, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge. Also see May, *John A. Quitman*, 228-263; Freehling, *Road to Disunion*, I, 525-528; McCardell, *Idea of a Southern Nation*, 295-305; Christopher Olsen, *Political Culture and Secession in Mississippi: Masculinity, Honor, and the Antiparty Tradition, 1830-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 39-54; William Barney, *The Secessionist Impulse: Alabama and Mississippi in 1860* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974).

52 May, *John A. Quitman*, 270-295; Matthew Pratt Guterl, *American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 24-26; Robert May, *Manifest Destiny's Underworld: Filibustering in Antebellum America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 330-365. For documents relating to this aborted expedition, see John Anthony Quitman Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge;

was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. There he spent the next three years endeavouring to defend the South from what he called “cute Yankee genius,” while waiting for another sectional confrontation—a “war to the knife”—that he believed was inevitable.⁵³

Time would prove Quitman’s predictions of disunion and conflict well founded. Yet, since he died in July 1858 (apparently as a result of accidentally consuming poison at a Washington hotel the previous year), he did not live to witness the crisis precipitated by Lincoln’s election in 1860. Doubtless though, had Quitman not died prematurely, he would have been an advocate for Confederate nationhood during the secession crisis of 1860-61. In fact, Quitman—a Northerner who became Southern as the white South slowly and unevenly developed a sense of its distinctiveness over the course of the antebellum era—would probably have been a contender for election as the first President of the Confederacy, a conservative slaveholding nation born in 1861, which he had played a small but important role in conceiving during the previous three decades.⁵⁴

Whereas John Quitman rose from a humble background as the son of a New York immigrant to become one of the antebellum U.S. South’s most powerful politicians, nineteenth-century Galway’s Lord Clonbrock was born into a landed family with a long history of participation in Irish politics. Clonbrock’s great-great-grandfather was elected to the Irish House of Commons in 1726, his grandfather had been a member of the late-eighteenth-century ‘patriot parliament,’ and his father was a leading figure in local politics within County Galway during

Southern Filibusters Collection, Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

53 Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman*, II, 216; John A. Quitman, *Speech of John A. Quitman, of Mississippi, on the Powers of the Federal Government with Regard to the Territories, Delivered During the Debate on the President’s Annual Message in the House of Representatives, December 18, 1856* (Washington: Congressional Globe Office, 1857), 4. On Quitman’s time in Congress, see May, *John A. Quitman*, 306-350; John Gonzales, “John Anthony Quitman in the United States House of Representatives, 1855-58,” *Southern Quarterly* 4 (1966), 276-288.

54 Quitman was nationally renowned as a war hero and had been considered for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1848. He was also a friend (and later rival) of Jefferson Davis. In practice, Quitman’s reputation as a fire-eater probably would have worked against him, but he would almost certainly have attained at least a high position in the government of the Confederacy had he lived and remained healthy past 1861.

the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Clonbrock himself was active in both local and national politics from the early 1830s onward. He was a prominent member of the Conservative Party, bastion of the British and Irish landed interests; he was elected to Westminster's House of Lords in 1838 as a representative peer (a lifetime appointment); and he became Lord Lieutenant of County Galway in 1874. In all of these positions, Clonbrock, like the vast majority of his fellow Irish landowners, was a committed unionist who used his influence to ensure that Ireland remained a part of the United Kingdom.⁵⁵

Much as historians of the antebellum United States must resist the tendency to overlook Southern secessionists' belief in their American nationality, so too must historians of nineteenth-century Ireland avoid the impulse to neglect unionist landowners' sense of Irishness.⁵⁶ There is no question that Clonbrock considered himself Irish. He was born and raised in Galway and his family had roots in the country that went back as far as 1185, as the many genealogies contained in his family records attest.⁵⁷ This emphasis on ancestry, common among gentry classes in different times and places, was particularly important to landlords in nineteenth-century Ireland, who were anxious to counteract the perception that they were an alien class—a problem that New York-born John Quitman never encountered in Mississippi, since it was African Americans who were considered 'outsiders' in the American South.⁵⁸ Even among Irish landowners, Clonbrock was particularly emphatic about his Irish ethnicity,

55 Kevin McKenna, "Power, Resistance, and Ritual: Paternalism on the Clonbrock Estates, 1826-1908," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011), 13; Patrick Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society in Galway* (Dublin: De Búrca, 2012), 293-295. For more on the Conservative Party, see Hoppen, *Elections, Politics, and Society*, 278-332; Andrew Shields, *The Irish Conservative Party, 1852-1868: Land, Politics, and Religion* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2007).

56 For an example of a study that mistakenly equates Irish unionism with English (rather than British) nationality, see Michael McConville, *Ascendancy to Oblivion: The Story of the Anglo-Irish* (London: Quartet Books, 1986). Also see David Potter, "The Historian's Use of Nationalism and Vice Versa," in David Potter, *The South and the Sectional Conflict* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), 34-83.

57 Dillon Family Genealogies, MS 35,800 (1-4), Clonbrock Papers, National Library of Ireland. Also see Gerald Dillon, "Cnoc Diolún: A Genealogical Survey of the Dillon Family in Ireland," *Irish Genealogist* 2 (1955), 361-367; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 20-22.

58 See Kolchin, *Unfree Labor*, 43-45, 99, 180, 196-200. Even though Quitman was born and raised in the U.S. North, this does not seem to have made him an 'outsider' in antebellum Mississippi. See Robert May, "Psychobiography and Secession: The Southern Radical as Maladjusted 'Outsider,'" *Civil War History* 34 (1988), 46-69.

since—notwithstanding his reputation as a relatively ‘good,’ paternalistic landlord—a popular myth circulated that claimed his family were cursed for the manner in which they had acquired their land in Galway in the late sixteenth century.⁵⁹ This curse, which implied that the Dillon family were interlopers, understandably caused Clonbrock to be particularly sensitive about his Irish credentials. Thus, at Luke Gerald Dillon’s coming-of-age celebration in April 1855, the tent erected for the occasion was conspicuously adorned with symbols of Irish nationality, including tricolours and banners bearing pictures of harps and Irish-language slogans such as ‘*Erin go bragh* [Ireland forever].’ Lest these displays of Irishness go unnoticed, during the after dinner toasts Clonbrock also spoke about his sense of Irish patriotism and publicly implored his heir to “ever be a true Irishman.”⁶⁰

And yet, Clonbrock’s Irish patriotism did not make him an Irish nationalist. During his lifetime, Ireland’s Catholic population—the majority of whom were tenants and agricultural labourers who were anxious for landownership above all else—were widely identified as the Irish nation. This development represented a startling reversal of fortunes, since Ireland’s Protestant minority had claimed Irish nationality during the eighteenth century, as the work of David Hayton, George Boyce, and Thomas Bartlett has shown. Between the late eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries, however, the piecemeal repeal of the Penal Laws, the 1798 rebellion, and Daniel O’Connell’s campaigns for Catholic Emancipation and Repeal all forged a strong association between Catholicism and nationalism in Ireland. This ethno-religious version of Irish nationality alienated many members of Ireland’s Protestant community, especially the country’s predominantly Protestant landowners, including Clonbrock. If Ireland

59 For contemporary mentions of this curse, which maintained that no head of the Clonbrock household would live to see his eldest son come of age because an ancestor had insulted the Gaelic chieftain whose land was supposedly confiscated by the English Crown, see *Nation*, 19 April 1851, 16 September 1855; *Galway Mercury*, 17 March 1855; *Western Star*, 17 March 1855. The curse was ‘broken’ in 1855 when Luke Gerald Dillon reached his twenty-first birthday and Clonbrock lived to witness the occasion. See McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual,” 142-148.

60 *Western Star*, 16 June 1855; *Tuam Herald*, 16 June 1855 (quote). Also see Kevin McKenna, “Elites, Ritual, and the Legitimation of Power on an Irish Landed Estate, 1855-90,” in Ciaran O’Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), 71-72; Peter Alter, “Symbols of Irish Nationalism,” in Alan O’Day (ed.), *Reactions to Irish Nationalism, 1865-1914* (London: Hambledon Press, 1987), 1-20.

was to ‘secede’ from the United Kingdom, as Irish nationalists wished, most of the country’s landlords feared that they would subsequently be overwhelmed and dispossessed of their properties by the Catholics whose exploitation they had long benefited from.⁶¹

For this fundamental reason, although Clonbrock and his fellow landowners considered themselves culturally and ethnically Irish, they generally opposed self-government for Ireland and identified themselves as British. According to Linda Colley, Britishness was characterised primarily—if not exclusively—by Protestantism during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.⁶² This fact allowed most of Ireland’s landlords, including Clonbrock (whose ancestor converted from Catholicism to the Church of Ireland in 1724), to locate themselves within the British nation following the passage of the Act of Union in 1800. However, to the majority nineteenth-century Britons, Irish Catholics remained anomalous ‘others,’ a fact that fuelled a sense of ethnic Irish nationalism—largely defined in opposition to Britishness—among the latter. Thus, even though the United Kingdom was envisioned by its architects as an act of national marriage—after which the whole of Ireland would be incorporated into the British nation—in practice only a fraction of the Irish population chose to (or were encouraged to) identify themselves as British during the 1800s; foremost among these ‘west Britons’ were Ireland’s Protestant landowners.⁶³ Comparable to John Quitman’s

61 David Hayton, “Anglo-Irish Attitudes: Changing Perceptions of National Identity Among the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland, c. 1690-1740,” *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 17 (1987), 145-157; Boyce, *Nationalism in Ireland*, 94-153; Thomas Bartlett, “The Rise and Fall of the Protestant Nation, 1690-1800,” *Éire-Ireland* 26 (1991), 7-18; Thomas Bartlett, “The Emergence of the Irish Catholic Nation, 1750-1850,” in Jackson (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History*, 517-543.

62 Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). Also see Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, “The Trials of the Chosen Peoples: Recent Interpretations of Protestantism and National Identity in Britain and Ireland,” in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c. 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 3-29; Liah Greenfield, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 27-88; John Wolfe, *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland, 1843-1945* (London: Routledge, 1994).

63 Kevin Whelan, “The Other Within: Ireland, Britain and the Act of Union,” in Dáire Keogh and Kevin Whelan (eds.), *Acts of Union: The Causes, Contexts and Consequences of the Act of Union* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 13-33; Thomas Bartlett, “Britishness, Irishness and the Act of Union,” in Keogh and Whelan (eds.), *Acts of Union*, 243-258; Ridden, “Making Good Citizens,” 204-238; Hugh Kearney, *Ireland: Contested Ideas of Nationalism and History* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 59-80; D. George Boyce, “The Marginal Britons: The Irish,” in Robert Colls and Philip Dodd (eds.), *Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880-1920* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014 [1986]), 255-278.

dual identity as both an American and a Southerner, therefore, Clonbrock saw himself as British and Irish simultaneously. To his mind, Ireland was simply a region of the United Kingdom, much like Scotland (or even Yorkshire), rather than a nation that required its own independent state.

Significantly, however, Clonbrock's British national identity was largely unarticulated and underdeveloped. It can be inferred chiefly from statements in which he referred to Ireland as part of Britain, such as when he declared that "Ireland's best blood was freely poured in defence of the country" during the Crimean War (1854-56). Clonbrock's self-identification as a member of the British nation can also be seen in the fact that, interspersed among the Irish tricolours and the banners emblazoned with 'Erin go bragh' that were displayed at Luke Gerald Dillon's aforementioned twenty-first birthday celebration, were others that declared 'Rule Britannia' and 'God Save the Queen.' This mixture of Irish and British motifs reveals Clonbrock's implicit belief that loyalty to both Ireland and the United Kingdom was compatible.⁶⁴

The implicit character of Clonbrock's British national identity was typical of his class. According to the influential theory first suggested by Eric Hobsbawm, nationalism is an "invented tradition" that elites in different times and places have typically deployed in response to threats to their power and privilege.⁶⁵ As we have seen, Quitman became a Southern nationalist in response to the threat posed to slavery by Northern abolitionism and governmental centralisation in the late-antebellum United States. In Ireland, by contrast, the single biggest threat to the landed class came from tenants and agricultural labourers, but the ethnic version of Irish nationalism that flourished among Ireland's landless peasants during the nineteenth century did not pose a significant danger to the integrity of the United Kingdom until the 1880s. Consequently, it was usually unnecessary for Clonbrock to choose between Irish patriotism and British nationalism; he was one of those landowners identified

64 *Tuam Herald*, 16 June 1855; McKenna, "Elites, Ritual, and the Legitimation of Power," 74.

65 Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," 1-14. Also see Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

by Jennifer Ridden in her study of nineteenth-century Irish landed identity for whom Irishness and Britishness “were given different and complementary parameters, and the elite were not immediately forced to make a choice of primary national identity.”⁶⁶

Whereas John Quitman became an outright Southern nationalist in response to the threat that he judged the Compromise of 1850 to pose for slavery, the first perceived threat that required Clonbrock to choose between his British and Irish identities was the Repeal movement of the 1830s and 1840s. Even though Daniel O’Connell implored his fellow landowners, Protestant *and* Catholic, to support his call for disunion and the restoration of the Irish parliament, most of the former associated Repeal with the end of their ‘ascendancy’ and accordingly worked against its success. Thus, in the words of Kevin Nowlan, “the great repeal movement was predominantly Catholic in membership, while the Protestant interest generally remained either hostile or aloof.”⁶⁷ Clonbrock can be numbered among the hostile; in 1831, soon after O’Connell first suggested the repeal of the Act of Union, he signed a petition that vehemently opposed the idea. By the time ‘The Liberator’ renewed and intensified his calls for Repeal in the early 1840s, Clonbrock had been elected to the House of Lords. There, he formed part of the powerful pan-U.K. landed aristocracy whose opposition to disunion was virtually unanimous. Since the Lords possessed veto power over all legislation passed by Westminster, Repeal was always unlikely to succeed in the face of the intractable opposition of Clonbrock and his fellow peers.⁶⁸

Thus, even though Clonbrock disliked the trend of governmental centralisation that

66 Ridden, “Making Good Citizens,” 229. Also see Jennifer Ridden, “Britishness as an Imperial and Diasporic Identity: Irish Elite Perspectives, c. 1820s-1870s,” in Peter Gray (ed.), *Victoria’s Ireland? Irishness and Britishness, 1837-1901* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), 88-105; D. George Boyce, “Trembling Solicitude: Irish Conservatism, Nationality and Public Opinion, 1833-86,” in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall, and Vincent Geoghegan (eds.), *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 124-145.

67 Nowlan, *Politics of Repeal*, 4. Also see Jenkins, *Irish Nationalism and the British State*, 43-72; Paul Bew, *Ireland: The Politics of Enmity, 1789-2006* (Oxford: Oxford university Press, 2007), 125-174.

68 *Connacht Journal*, 21 January 1831; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 302-307. Also see David Large, “The House of Lords and Ireland in the Age of Peel, 1832-50,” in Clyve Jones and David Jones (eds.), *Peers, Politics and Power: The House of Lords, 1603-1911* (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), 373-406; Richard Davis, *A Political History of the House of Lords, 1811-1846: From the Regency to Corn Law Repeal* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008), 215-227.

was in process in the first half of the nineteenth century, when presented with the choice between Irish nationalism and British unionism during the Repeal movement, he—like the vast majority of his fellow landlords—chose the latter.⁶⁹ It was a choice that Clonbrock would consistently make throughout the rest of his life. Unsurprisingly, having rejected the peaceful, constitutional version of Irish nationalism represented by O’Connell, he was resolutely opposed to the later revolutionary iterations of Irish nationalism associated with the Young Ireland and Fenian movements of the 1840s and the 1860s. Instead, akin to the majority of nineteenth-century Ireland’s landowners, Clonbrock attempted to combine Irish patriotism and British unionism within an overarching sense of British nationality.⁷⁰ Comparable to Quitman’s shifting American and Southern identities, therefore, Clonbrock’s compound of Britishness and Irishness was a form of ‘conservative nationalism’ that sought to perpetuate his class’s rule in a manner determined by local circumstances.

And yet, just as most American slaveholders only became Southern nationalists in response to the threat posed to slavery by the rise of the Republican Party and Lincoln’s election in 1860, it was only when the Home Rule Party rose to prominence in the 1880s that Ireland’s unionist landowners began to actively and systematically prioritise their sense of British nationalism. By then, Clonbrock was an old man, but his son, Luke Gerald, played a leading role in the Irish unionist movement that proved instrumental in delaying the passage of a Home Rule bill through Westminster until 1914. Thus, at the time of his death in 1893, Clonbrock remained a citizen of the United Kingdom and an Irish member of the British nation.⁷¹

69 Clonbrock’s opposition to governmental centralisation manifested itself in his opposition to the introduction of the Irish Poor Law, which he protested and voted against in 1838. See *Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates, Third Series*, vol. 44 (London: T.C. Hansard, 1838), 29-30; Thomas Bermingham, *Remarks on the Proposed Poor Law Bill for Ireland, Addressed to George Poulett Scrope, Esq., Member for Stroud* (London: Fores, 1838); McKenna, “Power, Resistance, and Ritual,” 34-42.

70 See Ridden, “Making Good Citizens,” 204-238; MacDonagh, *States of Mind: Two Centuries of Anglo-Irish Conflict, 1780-1980* (London: Pimlico, 1992 [1983]), 27-30; Alvin Jackson, “Loyalists and Unionists,” in Jackson (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 45-64.

71 For Luke Gerald Dillon’s involvement with Irish unionism, see Correspondence Relating to the Irish Loyal Patriotic Union, the Irish Unionist Alliance, and the Union Defence League, 1886-1893, MS 35,780 (1-3), CP; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society*, 401. On Irish nationalism during the Home Rule era, see John

In retrospect, Quitman and Clonbrock illustrate well the dialectical relationship between politics and identity that characterised U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords during the nineteenth century. Both men were social conservatives who wished to protect their wealth, status, and power, but the differences between their contexts heavily conditioned their political behaviours and, in turn, their choices of national self-identification. On one hand, Quitman—who was born into modest circumstances in rural New York—entered the ranks of a strong and independent regional elite when he became a planter in the 1820s. Clonbrock, on the other hand, was born into a much weaker regional elite, one heavily reliant on the British state for its protection throughout the nineteenth century. Seen from this perspective, we can better understand Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s contrasting reactions to the prospects of governmental centralisation that they both encountered during their lifetimes, as well as the opposite results of their negotiations between regionalism and nationalism. Quitman was always confident of Southern slaveholders’ ability to lead an independent republic and was therefore prepared to assume confrontational stances with the U.S. government in order to protect his class’s power and autonomy, as during the Nullification Crisis and the Crisis of 1850; ultimately, this self-confidence facilitated Quitman’s embrace of Southern nationalism. In contrast, Clonbrock appears to have believed that his class’s prospects would have been uncertain (if not bleak) in an independent Ireland and was therefore unwilling to challenge the prevailing political order by supporting any of the different Irish nationalist movements that emerged during his lifetime; instead, he developed a form of British nationalism that conceptualised Ireland as a region of the United Kingdom.

For Quitman and Clonbrock, therefore, nationalism followed political expediency,

Hutchinson, *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: The Gaelic Revival and the Creation of the Irish Nation State* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987); Anne Kane, *Constructing Irish National Identity: Discourse and Ritual During the Land War, 1879-1882* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011). On the unionist response, see Alvin Jackson, “Irish Unionism, 1870-1922,” in Boyce and O’Day (eds.), *Defenders of the Union*, 115-136; James Loughlin, *Ulster Unionism and British National Identity Since 1885* (London: Pinter, 1995).

rather than vice versa. In both cases, their identities were shaped, in large part, by perceived threats to their privileged positions, but the differences in the nature and locus of those threats—one external, the other internal—led to different outcomes. Even though Quitman was born and raised in New York, after moving to Mississippi and becoming a slaveholder, he developed a distinctive Southern identity largely in response to Northern abolitionism, and he became an outright Southern nationalist as a consequence of what he called “the California swindle [the Compromise of 1850],” which he interpreted as part of a sustained pattern of Northern assault upon the rights of Southerners.⁷² This motivated Quitman to argue in favour of Mississippi’s withdrawal from the United States in 1850-51. Although his calls were rejected by the majority of his fellow slaveholders at the time, Quitman nonetheless contributed to the emergence of a powerful, planter-led Southern nationalist movement that ultimately culminated in disunion not long after his death. Conversely, although Clonbrock was born and raised in Ireland and considered himself culturally and ethnically Irish, he also embraced British nationalism, primarily in response to the challenge to his interests posed by his country’s Catholic majority, who effectively claimed the title of Irish nation over the course of the 1800s. Yet, since Irish nationalism did not pose an imminent threat to Ireland’s position in the United Kingdom until the mid-1880s, it was usually unnecessary for unionist landlords such as Clonbrock to actively develop or emphasise their Britishness and thereby alienate themselves from the majority of their compatriots. In other words, the United Kingdom was a *fait accompli* and Clonbrock could accordingly support its continuation passively, as he did during the Repeal movement of the 1830s and 1840s.

Arguably, then, despite the differences, both Quitman’s Southern secessionism and Clonbrock’s British unionism were examples of a type of ‘conservative nationalism’ that sought to defend the status quo from the different threats that American slaveholders and Irish landlords faced during the nineteenth century. Just as Quitman’s and Clonbrock’s political

72 John Quitman to F. Henry Quitman, 5 August 1856, FHQP.

decisions were conservatively motivated, so too were the national identities that they embraced in order to legitimise those decisions. In this respect, it is notable that recent scholarship has demonstrated that there were numerous parallels and connections between U.S. abolitionism and Irish nationalism, epitomised by William Lloyd Garrison's and Daniel O'Connell's correspondence and friendship. Indeed, as Caleb McDaniel has shown, Garrison was directly influenced by O'Connell's repeal movement, which inspired him to call for disunion with the slaveholding states in the early 1840s. The fact that there were similarities and links between these two 'Atlantic progressives' and their causes arguably lends support to the conclusion that there were also parallels and connections between the reactionary behaviour of their conservative political opponents, including Quitman and Clonbrock.⁷³ By calling for secession once he arrived at the conclusion that slaveholders' power and autonomy were no longer secure within the American Union, Quitman supported a radical method to achieve a conservative aim. Clonbrock, instead, always preferred to work within the existing political system in order to secure the perpetuation of Irish landed power and privilege, and thereby supported a conservative means of achieving a comparable conservative end.

Conclusion

In support of his states' rights arguments, John Quitman once declared that the fate of Ireland awaited the U.S. South, should white Southerners submit to federal incursions upon their local autonomy.⁷⁴ He was by no means peculiar among mid-nineteenth-century American slaveholders in arguing that the U.S. South's relationship to the U.S. North resembled Ireland's relationship to England. In the words of an address published by the Central Southern Rights Association of Virginia in 1852, "we [Southerners] are a divided, depressed,

73 McDaniel, "Repealing Unions," 243-269; W. Caleb McDaniel, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery: Garrisonian Abolitionists and Transatlantic Reform* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2013), 76, 167-171; Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 123-144. Also see Douglas Riach, "Daniel O'Connell and American Anti-Slavery," *Irish Historical Studies* 20 (1976), 3-25; Kinealy, *Daniel O'Connell and the Anti-Slavery Movement*.

74 *Jackson Mississippian*, 9 April 1852; May, *John A. Quitman*, 231.

and discontented people; our property is wantonly purloined; our feelings outraged, and our interests degraded ... we have become a second Ireland.”⁷⁵ As Paul Quigley has recently shown, antebellum Southern secessionist advocates frequently used such transatlantic comparisons in order to support their claims for nationhood; Ireland represented a particularly attractive symbol to these ‘fire-eaters,’ since both Ireland and the American South could be portrayed as agricultural nations that suffered oppression at the hands of an industrialising foreign power. Indeed, these analogies were compelling enough to convince John Mitchel—the Irish nationalist leader who was exiled as a result of his connection with Young Ireland—to actively support the movement for Southern independence after he settled in the United States in 1853. And yet, U.S. Southern secessionists arguably had more in common with Irish unionists than they did with Irish nationalists during the nineteenth century.⁷⁶ John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock may have arrived at opposite conclusions about the legitimacy of their national governments, for example, but they did so for a similar reason: both men were concerned with the defence of privilege and hierarchy in an age of reform and increasing democratisation. However, since they faced different types of challenges, Quitman and Clonbrock adopted very different means of achieving a similar aim.

In his comparison of U.S. Southern slaveholders and southern Italian landowners, Enrico Dal Lago has identified a type of “peripheral nationalism,” which “conservatively pursued the protection of peripheral interests against governmental centralization.”⁷⁷ The comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock as representatives of antebellum American

75 “Petition of the Central Southern Rights Association of Virginia,” *DeBow’s Review* 12 (1852), 109. Also see Robert Turnbull, *The Crisis: or Essays on the Usurpations of the Federal Government* (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1827), 21; Daniel Wallace (ed.), *The Political Life and Services of the Hon. R. Barnwell Rhett, of South Carolina, by a Contemporary (the Late Hon. Daniel Wallace), and also, His Speech at Grahamville, S.C., July 4, 1859* (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), 42.

76 Paul Quigley, “Secessionists in an Age of Secession: The Slave South in Transatlantic Perspective,” in Don Doyle (ed.), *Secession as an International Phenomenon: From America’s Civil War to Contemporary Separatist Movements* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010), 151-173; Bryan McGovern, *John Mitchel: Irish Nationalist, Southern Secessionist* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2009); Bonner, *Mastering America*, xviii.

77 Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 267. Also see Thomas Bender, *A Nation Among Nations: America’s Place in World History* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006), 133-135.

slaveholders and nineteenth-century Irish landowners provides some insights into this concept, since it alerts us to the fact that regionally distinctive agrarian elites could renounce as easily as embrace peripheral nationalism if they decided that it was not in their best interests. To the extent that nationalism can be said to have predated the French Revolution, in the second half of the eighteenth century American slaveholders and Irish landlords could both be classified as peripheral nationalists, since they generally supported political movements that sought greater independence from their English metropole in this period. By the turn of the nineteenth century, however, the American South's and Ireland's agrarian elites' hitherto parallel political paths had diverged. For the most part, American slaveholders remained peripheral nationalists who were prepared to remain loyal to the United States on condition that they retained the power and autonomy they had secured for themselves at the time of its creation. Conversely, most Irish landlords abandoned peripheral nationalism, given that they resisted but ultimately acquiesced to governmental centralisation and continued to support the United Kingdom throughout the 1800s. In neither case did these decisions secure the landed elites' futures indefinitely, however. In the United States, Southern secession led to the American Civil War (1861-65), uncompensated government-imposed slave emancipation, Confederate defeat, and the end of the second slavery. In Ireland, landlords' unionism probably succeeded in slowing the pace of their decline, but the British government eventually organised for the mass transfer of Irish land to the country's tenant-farmers in the early twentieth century, bringing to an end the second landlordism; by co-operating, however, Irish landowners were able to ensure that they were well compensated.⁷⁸

⁷⁸ See Bruce Levine, *The Fall of the House of Dixie: The Civil War and the Social Revolution That Transformed the South* (New York: Random House, 2013); Paul Escott, *The Confederacy: The Slaveholders' Failed Venture* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2010); Campbell, *Irish Establishment*, 15-52; R.B. McDowell, *Crisis and Decline: The Fate of the Southern Unionists* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1997).

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this dissertation has been to demonstrate the comparability of U.S. Southern planters and Irish landlords through the systematic analysis of similarities and differences between the two case studies of Mississippi's John A. Quitman and Galway's Lord Clonbrock. Interestingly, it is likely that neither of these individuals would have been flattered at being compared with each other, since the hypothesis that there were analogies between American slaveholding and Irish landlordism was usually perceived as pejorative by members of the two agrarian elites during the nineteenth century. In fact, many antebellum American planters took pleasure in contrasting their slaves' material standard of living with the poverty of Ireland's peasantry, and used this trope as one example that they believed 'proved' the fundamental tenets of their proslavery arguments.¹ As a result, they generally considered themselves superior to Irish landlords and did not enjoy being equated with that supposedly rapacious bunch. For their part, members of Ireland's landed class tended to keep abreast of British public discourse and were therefore well aware of the anti-slavery and abolitionist movements that became widely popular in England from the late-eighteenth century onward. In this context, as Joseph Herson has argued, many Irish landlords accepted the argument that American slavery was a barbaric and archaic institution; accordingly, they generally considered it desirable, or at least fashionable, to state their distaste for American bondage, even if "their disapproval of slavery was at the most very shallow."² Thus, as a consequence

1 See Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *Slavery in White and Black: Class and Race Relations in the Southern Slaveholders' New World Order* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 132-133; Drew Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 201; *Mississippi Free Trader*, 15 March 1851; Randal MacGavock, *A Tennessean Abroad, or Letters from Europe, Africa, and Asia* (New York: Redfield, 1854), 63, 84-85.

2 Joseph Herson, *Celts, Catholics, and Copperheads: Ireland Views the American Civil War* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1968), 67-68, 77-78. The most famous abolitionist Irish landlord was Daniel

of American planters' and Irish landlords' generally negative reputations, if members of either landed elite compared themselves with each other during the nineteenth century it was usually to emphasise their differences.

Yet, the comparative study of Quitman and Clonbrock has revealed a complex but illuminating picture of both similarities and differences between their actions, their world-views, and their wider contexts. On one hand, analogies between Quitman and Clonbrock derived primarily from their membership among peripheral gentry classes that dominated distinctive regions of larger states. On the other hand, contrasts between the two case studies stemmed largely from the differences between their specific historical milieus and the political systems in which they lived. At the same time, while comparing Quitman and Clonbrock, numerous transnational connections between American planters, Irish landlords, and their societies have also become apparent.

Since Quitman and Clonbrock profited from market-oriented landed estates in an era when their social classes were increasingly condemned as backward and immoral, they were both required to adjust to a comparable set of interlocking local, national, and international developments during their lifetimes. In response to fluctuations in patterns of demand and prices for the commodities farmed on their properties, Quitman and Clonbrock attempted to modernise their economic behaviour by rationally managing their estates, investing in their improvement, and diversifying their interests outside agriculture. They also developed paternalistic ideologies for similar reasons: to defend their classes from the attacks of their many critics, to reassure themselves that those attacks were unwarranted, and, perhaps most importantly, as a strategy intended to minimise conflict with their workforces. In addition, with varying degrees of success, Quitman and Clonbrock both endeavoured to contribute to

O'Connell, although he was hardly representative of his class. See Christine Kinealy, *Daniel O'Connell and the Anti-Slavery Movement: The Saddest People The Sun Sees* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011). On the development of British abolitionism, see Christopher Leslie Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

the maintenance of their classes' positions of political power; in the process, they both drew from an ideology that I have called 'conservative nationalism,' which was characterised by a belief in the right of traditional elites and propertied classes to rule their societies. Thus, Quitman and Clonbrock, along with their fellow labourlords and landlords, faced many similar challenges during the 1800s and responded to those challenges in comparable ways.

In light of the above similarities between Quitman and Clonbrock, we can better understand why, even though they generally claimed to decry slavery and worried about the precedent that Southern secession set for Irish nationalists, a large number of Irish landlords supported the Confederacy during its war with the Union in the years 1861-65. We have no surviving evidence of Clonbrock's opinions about the American Civil War, which Quitman played a small role in precipitating, but he would certainly have had an opinion on this conflict, especially since it affected Ireland in a number of important ways. Regardless of whether he sympathised with the Confederacy or the Union, Clonbrock surely understood the slaveholders' justifications well, given that he routinely dealt with comparable issues as the American South's labourlords in his own daily life. In fact, it was a fellow Galway landlord and a friend of Clonbrock's—W.H. Gregory—who led the calls for British parliamentary recognition of the Confederacy in the House of Commons in the early 1860s.³

Unsurprisingly, the comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock has also revealed many contrasts between the two individuals, their social classes, and their contexts. While Quitman and Clonbrock both owned landed estates that supplied world markets with agricultural commodities, they also profited in different ways from the sale of different products: the

3 Herson, *Celts, Catholics, and Copperheads*, 83-86, 117-118; Brian Jenkins, "William Gregory: Champion of the Confederacy," *History Today* 28 (1978), 322-330. For correspondence between Gregory and some leading Confederates, see W.H. Gregory Papers, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University, Atlanta. For more on the British and Irish aristocracy's opinions on the American Civil War, see Richard Blackett, *Divided Hearts: Britain and the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 2001), 7, 65, 100, 142, 160-161; Don Doyle, *The Cause of All Nations: An International History of the American Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 2015), 8, 41; Howard Jones, *Union in Peril: The Crisis Over British Intervention in the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992). On the impact of the American Civil War on Ireland, see Douglas Egerton, "Rethinking Atlantic Historiography in a Postcolonial Era: The Civil War in a Global Perspective," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 1 (2011), 85; Charles Cullop, "An Unequal Duel: Union Recruiting in Ireland, 1863-1864," *Civil War History* 13 (1967), 101-113.

former's plantations were centralised enterprises that focused on the production of cotton and sugar as cash crops, whereas the latter's main source of income was the rent that his tenants earned from the sale of grain and livestock. Consequently, Quitman's commercial orientation was significantly more pronounced than Clonbrock's. Other major differences between their contexts relate to the issues of race and demography. In the antebellum U.S. South, most of the rural labourers were of African descent and comprised a minority of the population. Conversely, in nineteenth-century Ireland, although the religious divide between Protestants and Catholics was in some respects analogous to the racial distinction between whites and blacks in the American South, Catholic peasants of native origin constituted the overwhelming majority of the Irish population. As a result of these differences, Quitman and Clonbrock manifested politics that were sharply divergent, notwithstanding their common conservatism and mutual dislike of the threats to their power that emanated from their respective central governments. Quitman—though born and raised in the U.S. North—became a Southern nationalist and secessionist, while Clonbrock—though born and raised in Ireland—always remained a unionist and British nationalist. Comparison has shown that these opposite political decisions and processes of identity formation were strategic and related to the differing social and demographic circumstances that underpinned American slaveholders' self-confidence and Irish landlords' relative diffidence about their internal security.

Naturally, the most important difference between the U.S. South and Ireland prior to 1863-65 was the presence of slavery in the former region and its absence in the latter. This was a fundamental underlying contrast from which numerous other differences between Quitman and Clonbrock stemmed, since the legal status of the agrarian labourers affected all aspects of the American South's and Ireland's socioeconomic systems, as well as the political behaviours of the two regions' elites. Arguably, therefore, U.S. Southern planters may have had more in common with Irish landlords *after* the American Civil War than they did in the

antebellum period. Since the Confederacy's defeat and reintegration into the United States was accompanied by the abolition of slavery, but many planters retained their estates, the American South's slaveholding elite transitioned from labourlords to landlords after 1865. Most of them responded by reorganising production on their plantations with sharecropping and tenancy arrangements that resembled the decentralised nature of Irish landed estates. Additionally, the postbellum Southern planters' diminished national power and their control of local government more closely paralleled the political status of Victorian Ireland's landlords.⁴

Yet, as we have seen, Quitman and Clonbrock were members of gentry classes that were comparable even before the American Civil War, largely on the basis that U.S. Southern slavery and Irish tenancy were both forms of 'rural subjection,' or peripheral agrarian labour. Despite the fact that Clonbrock's tenants and labourers were legally free, they were still a dependent workforce as a result of their lack of property rights to the land they farmed—albeit to a much lesser degree of dependence than Quitman's slaves. Thus, this study contributes to the scholarship which argues that, in practice, 'freedom' on landed estates in different parts of Europe and the Americas was a matter of degrees and not absolutes.⁵ Even though Quitman and Clonbrock did not both preside over systems of legal servitude, both men did profit from the exploitation of landless agrarian labourers; accordingly, they can justifiably be said to have been members of master classes, one *de jure*, the other *de facto*.

4 On Southern planters' transformation from labourlords to landlords, see Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 1986), 17-50; Ronald Davis, *Good and Faithful Labor: From Slavery to Sharecropping in the Natchez District, 1860-1890* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1982); Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 101. Also see Shearer Davis Bowman, *Masters and Lords: Mid-Nineteenth-Century U.S. Planters and Prussian Junkers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 72, 220-221; Steven Hahn, "Class and State in Postemancipation Societies: Southern Planters in Comparative Perspective," *American Historical Review* 95 (1990), 75-98.

5 See Enrico Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites: American Slaveholders and Southern Italian Landowners, 1815-1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 76-77; Enrico Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond: The U.S. "Peculiar Institution" in International Perspective* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2013), 176-177; Piero Bevilacqua, "Peter Kolchin's 'American South' and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Some Questions About Comparative History," in Enrico Dal Lago and Rick Halpern (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 65-67; Michael Bush, *Servitude in Modern Times* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000).

As well as revealing similarities and differences between Quitman, Clonbrock, and their wider classes, this dissertation has also touched upon some of the many transnational connections between American planters and Irish landlords. The two agrarian elites emerged from an interconnected process of British colonialism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and both were therefore mutually influenced by English rule and intellectual culture for much of their histories. Even after North American planters exited the British Empire and joined the United States, they remained subject to the same English cultural influence that indelibly imprinted itself upon Ireland's landed class.⁶ Other connections between Quitman's and Clonbrock's classes and regions were more direct. For instance, the United States functioned as an important 'safety valve' for nineteenth-century Ireland's surplus population, especially during and after the Great Famine (1845-52).⁷ Clonbrock availed of this safety valve while reforming his own estates, since he personally payed for many of his smaller tenants to emigrate to America during the 1830s and 1840s. Those residents of the Clonbrock estates who settled in the United States joined a multitude of other Irish immigrants that, in the aggregate, dramatically affected the fortunes of their host country. Since most future Irish-Americans settled in the northeast, they contributed to the economic and political power of the North in the antebellum period, and many of them filled the ranks of the Union Army during the American Civil War. As a result, conditions in Ireland—including the Clonbrock estates—played a small role in the downfall of the U.S. South's slaveholding elite.⁸ Finally, the

6 Audrey Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013); Jack Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Jack Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986); Bowman, *Masters and Lords*, 35-36.

7 C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 133-134; Kerby Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 193-554. On the Irish emigrants who settled in the U.S. South, see David Gleeson, *The Irish in the South, 1815-1877* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

8 Roger Ransom, *Conflict and Compromise: The Political Economy of Slavery, Emancipation, and the American Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 127-146; Doyle, *Cause of All Nations*, 173-176; Susannah Bruce, *The Harp and the Eagle: Irish-American Volunteers and the Union Army, 1861-1865* (New York: New York University Press, 2006). On the Irish immigrants who fought for the

comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock has also suggested that both men were members of cosmopolitan classes that actively engaged with international intellectual and political discourses. As a result, they embraced many of the same ideas and ideologies, such as agronomy, paternalism, and nationalism. While these concepts were interpreted and applied in different ways by the elites in the antebellum U.S. South and in nineteenth-century Ireland, contingent upon their local circumstances, they were also shaped, in large measure, by transnational debates.⁹

Taking a broader view, I have argued in this dissertation that the many similarities, differences, and connections between Quitman and Clonbrock can be best understood within the frameworks of the ‘second slavery’ and ‘second landlordism.’ Building on the foundation that American slavery and Irish tenancy were comparable types of ‘rural subjection’ mutually affected by the global transformations associated with the Industrial Revolution, these concepts have facilitated the connection and highlighted the interrelation of the U.S. Southern and Irish agrarian elites’ world, national, regional, and local contexts. They emphasise the fact that Quitman and Clonbrock were both influenced by, and contributed to, international developments, but simultaneously recognise that they negotiated those stimuli with their particular local circumstances. In this way, the second slavery and second landlordism can be used to compare American planters and Irish landlords without distorting their histories. Arguably, the concepts could also be used to facilitate a diverse range of other ‘cross-national’ Euro-American comparisons, along the lines recently suggested by Enrico Dal Lago.¹⁰

Clearly, however, this dissertation does not represent a definitive cross-national

Confederacy, see David Gleeson, *The Green and the Gray: The Irish in the Confederate States of America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

9 On American planters’ engagement with international intellectual discourse, see Michael O’Brien, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860*, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004). For evidence of Clonbrock’s wide-ranging reading tastes, see Clonbrock Library Catalogues, 1807-1850, MS 19,947-19,949, CP.

10 Anthony Kaye, “The Second Slavery: Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century South and the Atlantic World,” *Journal of Southern History* 75 (2009), 627-650; Cathal Smith, “Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity: A Comparison of Antebellum Mississippi and Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” *Journal of the Civil War Era* 5 (2015), 204-230; Dal Lago, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond*, 13-16, 95-121.

comparative history of the U.S. South's and Ireland's agrarian elites and labour systems. As Peter Kolchin has written, there was considerable internal differentiation within the antebellum American South, to the extent that the region was, in reality, a composite of 'many Souths' and many Southerners. This included variety among slaveholders depending on time, place, crops produced on their properties, and a host of other variables. The same was also true of nineteenth-century Ireland; even though the Irish landed class was a smaller and more homogeneous elite than antebellum American planters, there too we can discern differences between landlords in different regions and historical eras. Accordingly, a comparison of a Virginian or South Carolinian planter with a landlord from Ulster or Leinster during the 1600s, 1700s, or 1800s would likely lead us to different conclusions than the ones extrapolated from the comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock. In a sense, then, adapting Kolchin's terminology, this dissertation has been a comparison of one of 'many Southerners' with one of many 'other Southerners.'¹¹

Yet, Kolchin has also reminded us that the task of the historian is to generalise in order "to impose pattern on chaos."¹² This is not an easy task, especially since, before we even begin to consider how representative Quitman and Clonbrock were of their respective social classes, we must first acknowledge that they both behaved in ways that can seem paradoxical, and that their ideologies and circumstances were in constant flux. Nevertheless, in their evident combinations of modern and pre-modern features, Quitman and Clonbrock seem to have represented a particular type of economically progressive but socially and politically conservative landowner that became increasingly common in the U.S. South and Ireland during the second slavery and the second landlordism. Antebellum Southern slaveholders and their Irish landed contemporaries lived in a world that feted 'modernity' and 'progress,' but how those concepts were defined was as vexed an issue in the nineteenth century as it is for

¹¹ Kolchin, *A Sphinx on the American Land*, 39-73.

¹² Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987), 105.

twenty-first-century historians. Quitman and Clonbrock were among those members of their classes who exhibited modern features, particularly with regard to their economic behaviours. And yet, they also rejected notions of social and political equality and egalitarianism often associated with modernity and attempted to perpetuate hierarchal social orders that seemed to many contemporaries to have been pre-modern. To square this apparent circle, we might recognise that progressive Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords negotiated their own ‘hybrid’ versions of agrarian modernity, which combined modern and non-modern features in different permutations in either case.¹³

This idea—that antebellum American slaveholders and nineteenth-century Irish landlords, as represented by Quitman and Clonbrock, exhibited hybrid features in their attempts to combine modern economic behaviour with pre-modern social orders—is in dialogue with the historiographies that have debated whether the U.S. South’s and Ireland’s agrarian labour systems and elites were either capitalist or pre-capitalist. Importantly, as Mark Smith has pointed out with reference to the American context, much of these debates have hinged upon differing definitions of capitalism. With that in mind, a number of historians of the American South have recently moved toward a consensus in arguing that most antebellum Southern slaveholders manifested a mixture of capitalist and pre-capitalist traits. Quitman fits with this view; he sought economic modernisation and exhibited capitalistic proclivities, but simultaneously valued a pre-modern social organisation. Remarkably, Clonbrock also exhibited a comparable mix of capitalist and pre-capitalist behaviours and ideologies, which suggests that American slaveholders’ hybridity was shared by Irish landlords during the nineteenth century.¹⁴

13 Smith, “Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity,” 224; Marta Petrusiewicz, “Ex-Centric Europe: Visions and Practices of Harmonious Modernization in the 19th-Century European Peripheries (Ireland, Norway, Poland and Two Sicilies),” in Luca Giuliani and Dieter Grimm (eds.), *Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin Jahrbuch, 2006/07* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008), 278-293. Also see Marta Petrusiewicz, “Land-Based Modernization and the Culture of Landed Elites in the Nineteenth-Century Mezzogiorno,” in Dal Lago and Halpern (eds.), *American South and Italian Mezzogiorno*, 95-111; Bayly, *Birth of the Modern World*, 80-82.

14 Mark Smith, *Debating Slavery: Economy and Society in the Antebellum American South*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 87-94; Richard Follett, *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in*

If we accept that Quitman and Clonbrock were representative of the economic and social ‘hybridity’ of progressive members of their classes, then it appears that the key to the coexistence of capitalist and pre-capitalist features among U.S. Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords was paternalism. Members of both agrarian elites owned estates whose primary purpose was to generate income; yet, they typically viewed themselves as far more than businessmen, but also as leaders of idealised hierarchical communities. In these circumstances, paternalism found fertile ground in the minds of nineteenth-century Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords, since it allowed the two elites to negotiate, with greater or lesser degrees of success, between their need to operate with a view toward profit and their visions of themselves as fair-minded masters of small kingdoms. In effect, the comparison of Quitman and Clonbrock suggests that paternalism allowed both elites to reconcile progress with conservatism, at least in their own minds. The resulting fusion of pre-modern and modern features—of paternalism and capitalism—was arguably common among Southern slaveholders and Irish landlords during the nineteenth century; exactly how common this was is a question that would surely provide a rich subject for scholars to investigate in comparative perspective.¹⁵

Comparing Quitman and Clonbrock has, thus, provided fresh insights and suggestions with regard to numerous aspects of the histories of American slaveholders and Irish landowners. Admittedly, though, while I have attempted to situate Quitman and Clonbrock within their wider chronological, geographic, and social contexts, the present study is strictly limited, in time, in place, and in its focus on the elites more-so than their workforces. It is, however, a first step toward a holistic cross-national comparison of American slaveholding

Louisiana's Cane World, 1820-1860 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 6-7; Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 57-58. Also see Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 53-58.

¹⁵ See Dal Lago, *Agrarian Elites*, 151-154; Enrico Dal Lago and Rick Halpern, “Two Case-Studies in Comparative History: The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno,” in Dal Lago and Halpern (eds.), *American South and Italian Mezzogiorno*, 7-10; Smith, “Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity,” 223-224.

and Irish landlordism.

Using Quitman and Clonbrock as case studies representative of their respective elites has allowed us to closely examine two threads of the comparable (and to some extent interwoven) histories of the American South and Ireland in general, and Southern slaveholding and Irish landlordism in particular. Those threads are part of a tapestry that extends backward and forward in time and outward in place from the nineteenth-century Lower Mississippi Valley and west of Ireland focus of this dissertation. If the basis of Quitman's and Clonbrock's comparability is that they were both members of peripheral, regionally distinctive landed elites, then a complete cross-national comparison of their classes, labour systems, and regions would begin with the connected colonisations of Ireland and mainland North America in the 1500s and 1600s. It would include a thorough discussion of the parallel and interactive historical developments of Ireland and the American South, their lords of land and labour, and their respective subaltern classes during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. It would also extend past the lifetimes of Quitman and Clonbrock and incorporate the stories of the ends of U.S. slavery and Irish landlordism. Finally, it could include a discussion of the legacies of slavery and landlordism, up to and including the civil rights movements that rose to prominence in the United States and in Northern Ireland during the 1950s and 1960s. Those comparable and connected movements challenged the endemic racism and sectarianism that persisted long after the expiration of the two peripheral agrarian socioeconomic systems that race and religion had historically been used to perpetuate in the American South and Ireland. As such, this dissertation's comparison of John Quitman and Lord Clonbrock represents a snapshot of a much deeper and wider picture.

In retrospect, then, despite the fact that Quitman was probably one of those American slaveholders who would have disliked being compared with an Irish landlord, it is reasonable

to speculate that he and Clonbrock would have understood each other well if they had ever met.¹⁶ Although a distance of over four thousand miles separated their Big Houses and estates, although they profited in different ways from the production and sale of different agricultural commodities, and although they inhabited very different contexts, Quitman and Clonbrock nevertheless had much in common as a result of their status as members of peripheral and regionally distinctive agrarian elites. The view from the windows of Monmouth and Clonbrock House may have been quite different, but the world-views and day-to-day experiences of their mid-nineteenth-century residents had much in common.

Had either Quitman or Clonbrock stayed in the other's mansion, as travelling members of their classes were wont to do, they could have swapped notes about the most up-to-date agricultural methods and conversed about their investments in railroads; they could have preached to the converted about the virtues of conservatism and paternalism; and they could have complained about the encroachments of their respective central governments on their local autonomy. Both individuals would surely also have understood and sympathised with the criticism that their visitor faced, despite his attempts to fulfil his 'duty' to his dependents. They might even have noticed that their host's insistence on the mutual 'love' or 'respect' that existed between himself and the residents of his estates masked a secret fear of revolt and retribution that, had Quitman and Clonbrock been truthful with each other or with themselves, they may well have both admitted harbouring.

Remarkably, the idea that Quitman and Clonbrock could have met is not as fanciful as it might first seem. Quitman actually passed within seventy miles of Clonbrock House when he made an unscheduled detour through Ireland on his way to England to solicit investors for the Mississippi Railroad Company in 1839.¹⁷ Furthermore, when the Mississippian eventually

16 When Quitman passed through Ireland in 1839, he was struck by the poverty of the country's peasantry; therefore, a comparison with an Irish landlord would likely have been perceived by the Mississippian as an insult. See J.F.H. Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Major-General, U.S.A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1860), I, 170.

17 On Quitman's journey from Cork to Dublin in June 1839, he passed through Limerick City, which is approximately 65 miles from Clonbrock House. See Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A.*

made it to London, he actually ended up within at least seventy yards of Clonbrock himself. On 5 July 1839, Quitman visited Westminster and sat in the gallery of the House of Lords observing proceedings. We know that Clonbrock was in attendance on the same day because he voted on a resolution on the topic of education that followed the debate described by Quitman in his letters home. Thus, the two men under discussion in this dissertation were in the same room at the same time at least once. It is therefore conceivable that they might have passed each other, or even met, in the halls of Westminster, especially since the person who invited Quitman to attend the House of Lords—Lord Lansdowne—was himself an Irish landowner and an individual with whom Clonbrock was acquainted.¹⁸ In addition, some years later, Quitman's eldest son, F. Henry, also visited Ireland. In Dublin, during the summer of 1853, the younger Quitman mingled in Ireland's landlord-dominated high society, and there he met Mary Gardner, daughter of an Alabama planter and, as it turned out, his future wife.¹⁹

There is a risk of overstating the significance of the fact that Quitman and his son both had a personal experience of Ireland and interacted with members of the Irish landed class, but it is also clear that those incidents were more than simply coincidences. Since U.S. Southern planters modelled their social and cultural behaviour, in part, on that of the English gentry, they shared an affinity with Irish landlords, who also endeavoured to emulate England's aristocracy.²⁰ Furthermore, some American slaveholders maintained social links and friendships with their British and Irish landed counterparts. Michael O'Brien tells us, for example, that members of the South's planter class commonly carried letters of introduction with them on their tours of the United Kingdom, which functioned as shibboleths that

Quitman, I, 171.

18 John Quitman to Henry Quitman, 5 July 1839, 8 July 1839, QFP; *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series*, vol. 48 (London: T.C. Hansard, 1839), 1234-1333.

19 F. Henry Quitman to Eliza Quitman, 29 June 1853, JAQPM; Robert May, *John A. Quitman: Old South Crusader* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 277.

20 See Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Slaveholders' New World Order* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 88-122; David Cannadine, *Aspects of Aristocracy: Grandeur and Decline in Modern Britain* (London: Penguin, 1995 [1994]), 9-36.

admitted them to the British and Irish versions of the elite circles they moved in at home.²¹

In light of American planters' and Irish landlords' mutual affinities and their overlapping social networks, it is perhaps not so surprising that Quitman was invited to Westminster by a member of Ireland's landed class, nor that his son met and courted the daughter of a fellow American planter in Dublin. Rather, these episodes are indicative of the many connections between the antebellum U.S. South's and nineteenth-century Ireland's agrarian elites, which existed alongside similarities and differences between the two groups. Therefore, given both their comparability and the transnational links between their classes and their regions, had Quitman's gaze alighted upon Clonbrock when he observed proceedings in the House of Lords in July 1839, he would have been looking at a person with whom he had more in common than he might have guessed.

²¹ O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order*, I, 101-102. Also see Daniel Kilbride, *Being American in Europe, 1750-1861* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscript Sources

Clonbrock Papers, National Library of Ireland, Dublin.

Crofton Papers, National Library of Ireland, Dublin.

F. Henry Quitman Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Farnham Papers, Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, Belfast.

John A. Quitman Papers, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson.

John Anthony Quitman Papers, Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

John Anthony Quitman Papers, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

John Quitman Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge.

Mayo Papers, National Library of Ireland, Dublin.

Nathan G. Howard Papers, Mississippi Department of Archives of History, Jackson.

Quitman Family Papers, Manuscripts Department, Southern Historical Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Samuel A. Cartwright and Family Papers, Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collection, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Shirley Papers, Public Records Office of Northern Ireland, Belfast.

Southern Filibusters Collection, Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

W.H. Gregory Papers, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University, Atlanta.

Whitemarsh B. Seabrook Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Newspapers and Journals

American Cotton Planter

Connaught Journal

DeBow's Review

The Irish Farmers' Gazette and Journal of Practical Horticulture

Freeman's Journal

Galway Mercury
Galway Weekly Advertiser
Mississippi Free Trader
Jackson Mississippian
Nation
New York Times
Tuam Herald
Western News
Western Star

Contemporary Printed Sources

Birmingham, Thomas, *A Report of the Proceedings at Two Public Meetings, Held at the Thatched House Tavern on the 13th and 20th of April 1839, for the Purpose of Taking into Consideration the Necessity of Forming Railways Throughout Ireland* (London: Fores & Co., 1839).

Birmingham, Thomas, *Additional Statements on the Subject of the River Shannon to the Reports Published in 1831* (London: S.W. Fores, 1834).

Birmingham, Thomas, *Letter Addressed to the Right Honorable Lord John Russell: Containing Facts Illustrative of the Good Effects from the Just and Considerate Discharge of the Duties of a Resident Landlord in Ireland, With Practical Suggestions for Legislative Enactments Necessary to Induce, if not Compel, the Fulfilment of Similar Duties by All Landlords* (London: Trelawney Saunders, 1846).

Birmingham, Thomas, *Irish Railways: A Full and Interesting Report of the Public Proceedings on this Important Question: With Extracts from the Statistical Journals of the Day, on Foreign (especially those in Belgium) and English Railways ... also Observations on the Advantageous Prospects on Forming Railways in Ireland* (London: Messers Fores, 1839).

Birmingham, Thomas, *Remarks on the Proposed Poor Law Bill for Ireland, Addressed to George Poulett Scrope, Esq., Member for Stroud* (London: Fores, 1838).

Birmingham, Thomas, *Report on the State of the River Shannon, Both as to the Navigation and the Drainage of the Adjoining Lands: Together with a Report on the Lakes of Galway and Mayo* (London: S.W. Fores, 1831).

Birmingham, Thomas, *The Social State of Great Britain and Ireland Considered, With Regard to the Labouring Population, &c &c.* (London: S.W. Fores, 1835).

Birmingham, Thomas, *Statistical Evidence in Favour of State Railways in Ireland: with the*

- Speech of Thomas Bermingham, Esq. of Caramana, Kilconnel, County of Galway, Late Chairman of the General Irish Railway Committee, and Author of 'The Good of Ireland and England Identified,' and of Several Works on Irish Railways, and Enforcing the Advantage of Employing the Poor,* (Dublin: John Chambers, 1841).
- Binns, Jonathan, *The Miseries and Beauties of Ireland*, 2 vols. (London: Longman, Orman, Brown and Co., 1837).
- Blacker, William, *An Essay on the Improvements to be Made in the Cultivation of Small Farms, by the Introduction of Green Crops and Housefeeding the Stock Thereon; Originally Published in an Address to the Small Farmers on the Estates of the Earl of Gosford and Colonel Close, in the County of Armagh* (Dublin: W. Curry, Jun. and Co., 1837 [1833]).
- Cairnes, John Elliot, *The Slave Power: Its Character, Career, and Probably Designs: Being an Attempt to Explain the Real Issues Involved in the American Context* (New York: Carleton, 1862).
- Carlyle, Thomas, "Repeal of the Union," in Newberry, Percy Edward (ed.), *Rescued Essays of Thomas Carlyle* (London: Leadenhall Press, 1892 [1848]).
- Cartwright, Samuel A., "Report on the Diseases and Physical Peculiarities of the Negro Race," *DeBow's Review*, Vol. 11 (July 1851), pp. 64-69.
- Cartwright, Samuel A., "Slavery in the Light of Ethnology," in Elliott, E.N. (ed.), *Cotton is King and Proslavery Arguments* (New York: Abbott & Looms, 1860), pp. 690-728.
- Clapperton, James, *Instructions for the Small Farmers of Ireland, on the Cropping and Culture of their Farms* (Dublin: W. Curry, Jun., and Co., 1847).
- Claiborne, J.F.H., *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Major-General, U.S.A., and Governor of the State of Mississippi*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1860).
- Commissioners of the Board of Works, 26th Report*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 26, 1857-58.
- Conditions to be Observed by British Undertakers of the Escheated Lands in Ulster* (London: Walter J. Johnson, 1610).
- Davies, Sir John, *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland Was Never Entirely Subdued, Nor Brought Under the Obedience of the Crowne of England, Until the Beginning of His Majesty's Happy Reign* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1988 [1612]).
- De Beaumont, Gustave, *Ireland: Social, Political, and Religious* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006 [1839]).
- De Burgh, U.H.H., *The Landowners of Ireland: An Alphabetical List of the Owners of Estates*

- of 500 acres or £500 Valuation and Upwards in Ireland* (Dublin: Hodges, Foster and Figgis, 1878).
- Douglass, Frederick, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave, Written By Himself* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986 [1845]).
- Dutton, Hely, *A Statistical and Agricultural Survey of the County of Galway, With Observations on the Means of Improvement* (Dublin: R. Graisberry, 1824).
- Edgeworth, Maria, *The Absentee* (New York: Garland Publications, 1978 [1812]).
- Edgeworth, Maria, *Castle Rackrent: An Hibernian Tale Taken from Facts and From the Manners of the Irish Squires Before the Year 1782* (London: J. Crowder, 1800).
- Evidence Taken before Her Majesty's Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Law and Practice in Respect to the Occupation of Land in Ireland (Devon Commission)*, pt. ii, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 19, 1845.
- First Report of the Committee on the Western Rail-Road and Navigation Company* (Dublin: T. Flanagan, 1831).
- Hammond, James Henry, "Governor Hammond's Instructions to His Overseer," in Rose, Willie Lee (ed.), *A Documentary History of Slavery in North America* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999 [1976]).
- Hammond, James Henry, *Selections from the Letters and Speeches of the Hon. James H. Hammond* (New York: John F. Throw & Co., 1866).
- Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series*, 356 vols. (London: Woodfall and Son, 1830-91).
- Ingraham, Joseph Holt, *The Southwest: By a Yankee*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1835).
- Jacobs, Harriet, *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl: Written by Herself* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988 [1861]).
- Keller, Herbert Anthony (ed.), *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturalist: Selected Writings, Vol. II: 1846-1851* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1936).
- Kemble, Frances Ann, *Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation in 1838-1839* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984 [1863]).
- Kennedy, John Pendleton, *Swallow Barn, or A Sojourn in the Old Dominion* (Philadelphia: Carey & Lea, 1832).
- MacGavock, Randal W., *A Tennessean Abroad, or Letters from Europe, Africa, and Asia* (New York: Redfield, 1854).
- Martineau, Harriet, *Society in America*, 3 vols. (London: Saunders and Otley, 1837).
- McLennan, John F. (ed.), *Memoir of Thomas Drummond, Under-Secretary to the Lord*

- Lieutenant of Ireland, 1835 to 1840* (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1867).
- Moryson, Fynes, *An History of Ireland, from the Year 1599 to 1603, with a Short Narration of the State of the Kingdom from the Year 1169, to which is Added a Short Description of Ireland*, 2 vols. (Dublin: S. Powell, 1735 [1617]).
- O'Brien, William Smith, *Plan for the Relief of the Poor in Ireland, with Observations on the English and Scottish Poor Laws, Addressed to the Landed Proprietors of Ireland* (Dublin: John S. Folds, 1831).
- O'Brien, William Smith, *Lectures on America Delivered in the Mechanics Institute, Dublin, November 1859* (Dublin: A.M. Sullivan, 1860).
- Olmsted, Frederick Law, *The Cotton Kingdom: A Traveller's Observations on Cotton and Slavery in the American Slave States, 1853-1861* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1953 [1861]).
- Owenson, Sydney, *Absenteeism* (London: Henry Colburn, 1825).
- Petty, William, *Political Survey of Ireland, with the Establishment of that Kingdom, when the Late Duke of Ormond was Lord Lieutenant* (London: D. Browne, 1719 [1672]).
- Prior, Thomas, *A List of the Absentees of Ireland and the Yearly Value of their Estates and Incomes Spent Abroad With Observations on the Present State and Condition of that Kingdom* (Dublin: R. Gunne, 1729).
- Quitman, John A., *Speech of John A. Quitman, of Mississippi, on the Powers of the Federal Government with Regard to the Territories Delivered During the Debate on the President's Annual Message, in the House of Representatives, December 18, 1856* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Globe Office, 1857).
- Report from Her Majesty's Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Law and Practice in Respect to the Occupation of Land in Ireland (Devon Commission)*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 19, 1845.
- Report of the Select Committee on the State of Ireland, with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 26, 1831-32.
- Skilling, Thomas, *The Science and Practice of Agriculture* (Dublin: James McGlashan, 1846).
- Stringfellow, Thornton, "The Bible Argument: or, Slavery in the Light of Devine Revelation," in Elliott, E.N. (ed.), *Cotton is King and Pro-Slavery Arguments* (Augusta: Pritchard, Abbott & Loomis, 1860), pp. 459-546.
- Thackeray, William Makepeace, *The Irish Sketch Book: And Notes of a Journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1869 [1843]).
- Third Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Condition of the Poorer Classes in Ireland*

- (*Poor Inquiry*), House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, vol. 31, 1836.
- Transactions of the Royal Agricultural Improvement Society of Ireland for the Year 1845* (Dublin: William Curry, Jun. & Co., 1846).
- Turnbull, Robert James, *The Crisis: or, Essays on the Usurpations of the Federal Government* (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1827).
- Wailles, B.L.C., *Report on the Agriculture and Geology of Mississippi, Embracing a Sketch of the Social and Natural History of the State* (Jackson: E. Barksdale, 1854).
- Wakefield, Edward, *An Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political*, 2 vols. (London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1812).
- Wood, William, *Autobiography of William Wood*, 2 vols. (New York: J.S. Babcock, 1895).
- Young, Arthur, *A Tour in Ireland: With General Observations on the Present State of that Kingdom: Made in the Years 1776, 1777, and 1778 and Brought Down to the end of 1779*, 2 vols. (London: H. Goldney, 1780).

Secondary Sources

Books

- Abrahams, Roger D., *Singing the Master: The Emergence of African-American Culture in the Plantation South* (New York: Pantheon, 1992).
- Akenson, Donald H., *The Irish Education Experiment* (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1970).
- Allen, Robert, *The British Industrial Revolution in Global Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Allen, Theodore W., *The Invention of the White Race, Volume One: Racial Oppression and Social Control* (London: Verso, 1994).
- Allmendinger, Jr., David F., *Ruffin: Family and Reform in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006 [1983]).
- Andrews, Kenneth R., *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
- Aptheker, Herbert, *American Negro Slave Revolts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943).
- Arrighi, Giovanni, *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times* (London: Verso, 1994).

- Ashworth, John, *The Republic in Crisis, 1848-1861* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- Ashworth, John, *Slavery, Capitalism, and Politics in the Antebellum Republic, Vol. 1: Commerce and Compromise, 1820-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Ashworth, John, *Slavery, Capitalism, and Politics in the Antebellum Republic, Vol. 2: The Coming of the Civil War, 1850-1861* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Bankole, Katherine, *Slavery and Medicine: Enslavement and Medical Practices in Antebellum Louisiana* (New York: Garland, 1998).
- Banning, Lance, *The Jeffersonian Persuasion: Evolution of a Party Ideology* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978).
- Baptist, Edward E., *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014).
- Bardaglio, Peter W., *Reconstructing The Household: Families, Sex and the Law in the Nineteenth-Century South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).
- Bardon, Jonathan, *The Plantation of Ulster* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2012).
- Barnard, Toby, *A New Anatomy of Ireland: The Irish Protestants, 1649-1770* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).
- Barnard, Toby, *Improving Ireland? Projectors, Prophets and Profiteers, 1641-1786* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008).
- Barnard, Toby, *Making the Grand Figure: Lives and Possessions in Ireland, 1641-1770* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).
- Barney, William L., *The Secessionist Impulse: Alabama and Mississippi in 1860* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974).
- Bartlett, Thomas, *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation, 1690-1830* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1992).
- Bartlett, Thomas, *Ireland: A History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Bateman, Fred and Weiss, Thomas, *A Deplorable Scarcity: The Failure of Industrialization in the Slave Economy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981).
- Baxter, Maurice G., *Henry Clay and the American System* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004 [1995]).
- Bayly, C.A., *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004).
- Beames, Michael R., *Peasants and Power: The Whiteboy Movements and their Control in Pre-Famine Ireland* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1983).

- Beckert, Sven, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014).
- Bell, Jonathan and Watson, Mervyn, *A History of Irish Farming, 1750-1950* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008).
- Bell, Jonathan and Watson, Mervyn, *Irish Farming Implements and Techniques, 1750–1900* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1986).
- Bender, Thomas, *A Nation Among Nations: America's Place in World History* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006).
- Bergad, Laird W., *The Comparative Histories of Slavery in Brazil, Cuba, and the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Berlin, Ira, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African American Slaves* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003).
- Berlin, Ira, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998).
- Berlin, Ira and Hoffman, Ronald (eds.), *Slavery and Freedom in the Age of the American Revolution* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1983).
- Bew, Paul, *Land and the National Question in Ireland, 1858-82* (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1978).
- Bew, Paul, *Ireland: The Politics of Enmity, 1789-2006* (Oxford: Oxford university Press, 2007).
- Bielenberg, Andy, *Ireland and the Industrial Revolution: The Impact of the Industrial Revolution on Irish Industry, 1801-1922* (New York: Routledge, 2009).
- Black, R.D. Collison, *Economic Thought and the Irish Question, 1817-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).
- Blackburn, Robin, *The American Crucible: Slavery, Emancipation and Human Rights* (London: Verso, 2011).
- Blackburn, Robin, *The Making of New World Slavery, 1492-1800: From the Baroque to the Modern* (London: Verso, 1997).
- Blackett, Richard J.M., *Divided Hearts: Britain and the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001).
- Blue, Frederick, *The Free Soilers: Third Party Politics, 1848-54* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973).
- Bolton, Geoffrey Curgenven, *The Passing of the Irish Act of Union: A Study in Parliamentary Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966).
- Bonner, Robert E., *Mastering America: Southern Slaveholders and the Crisis of American Nationhood* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

- Bottigheimer, Karl S., *English Money and Irish Land: The Adventurers in the Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).
- Bowen, Desmond, *The Protestant Crusade in Ireland, 1800-70: A Study of Protestant-Catholic Relations Between the Act of Union and Disestablishment* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1978).
- Bowman, Shearer Davis, *Masters and Lords: Mid-Nineteenth-Century U.S. Planters and Prussian Junkers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Boyce, D. George, *Nationalism in Ireland* (London: Routledge, 1995 [1982]).
- Boyce, D. George, *Nineteenth-Century Ireland: The Search for Stability* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2005 [1990]).
- Brazy, Martha Jane, *An American Planter: Stephen Duncan of Antebellum Natchez and New York* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006).
- Breeden, James O. (ed.), *Advice Among Masters: The Ideal in Slave Management in the Old South* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1980).
- Breen, T.H., *Tobacco Culture: The Mentality of the Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).
- Brown, Christopher Leslie, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
- Brown, Kathleen M., *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).
- Bruce, Susannah Ural, *The Harp and the Eagle: Irish-American Volunteers and the Union Army, 1861-1865* (New York: New York University Press, 2006).
- Buckland, Patrick, *Irish Unionism, I: The Anglo-Irish and the New Ireland, 1885-1922* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1972).
- Burnard, Trevor, *Creole Gentlemen: The Maryland Elite, 1691-1776* (New York: Routledge, 2002).
- Bush, Michael L., *The English Aristocracy: A Comparative Synthesis* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984).
- Bush, Michael L., *Servitude in Modern Times* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000).
- Campbell, Fergus, *The Irish Establishment, 1879-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Cannadine, David, *Aspects of Aristocracy: Grandeur and Decline in Modern Britain* (London: Penguin, 1995 [1994]).
- Cannadine, David, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (New York: Vintage Books, 1999 [1992]).

- Canny, Nicholas P., *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-76* (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1976).
- Canny, Nicholas P., *The Formation of the Old English Elite in Ireland* (Dublin: National University of Ireland, 1975).
- Canny, Nicholas P., *From Reformation to Restoration: Ireland, 1534-1660* (Dublin: Helicon, 1987).
- Canny, Nicholas P., *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).
- Canny, Nicholas P., *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Canny, Nicholas P., *The Upstart Earl: A Study of the Social and Mental World of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork, 1566-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- Carney, Judith, *Black Rice: The African Origins of Rice Cultivation in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).
- Cassell, Ronald, *Medical Charities, Medical Politics: The Irish Dispensary System and the Poor Law, 1836-1872* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997).
- Censer, Jane Turner, *North Carolina Planters and their Children, 1800-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1984).
- Chaplin, Joyce E., *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730-1815* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
- Chaffin, Tom, *Giant's Causeway: Frederick Douglass's Irish Odyssey and the Making of an American Visionary* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014).
- Chenevix-Trench, Charles, *Grace's Card: Irish Catholic Landlords, 1690-1800* (Dublin: Mercier Press, 1997).
- Childs, John, *The Williamite Wars in Ireland, 1688-1691* (London: Continuum, 2007).
- Clark, Samuel, *Social Origins of the Irish Land War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).
- Clark, Samuel and Donnelly Jr., James S. (eds.), *Irish Peasants: Violence and Political Unrest, 1780-1914* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983).
- Clarkson, L.A. and Crawford, E. Margaret, *Feast and Famine: Food and Nutrition in Ireland, 1500-1920* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Cleary, Joe, *Outrageous Fortune: Capital and Culture in Modern Ireland* (Dublin: Field Day Publications, 2007).
- Clinton, Catherine, *The Plantation Mistress: Woman's World in the Old South* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982).

- Coclanis, Peter A., *The Shadow of a Dream: Economic Life and Death in the South Carolina Low Country, 1670-1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
- Comerford, R.V., *The Fenians in Context: Irish Politics and Society, 1848-82* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1998 [1985]).
- Connell, K.H., *The Population of Ireland, 1750-1845* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950).
- Connolly, Sean J., *Contested Island: Ireland, 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Connolly, Sean J., *Divided Kingdom: Ireland, 1630-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Connolly, Sean J., *Religion, Law, and Power: The Making of Protestant Ireland, 1660-1760* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- Connolly, Sean J., *Religion and Society in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press, 1985).
- Conway, Stephen, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Conwell, John Joseph, *A Galway Landlord During the Great Famine: Ulick John de Burgh, First Marquis of Clanricarde* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003).
- Cooper, William J., *Jefferson Davis, American* (New York: Vintage, 2000).
- Cooper, William J., *The South and the Politics of Slavery, 1828-1856* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978).
- Cosgrove, Art, *Late Medieval Ireland, 1370-1541* (Dublin: Helicon, 1981).
- Cronin, Maura, *Agrarian Protest in Ireland, 1750-1960* (Dundalk: Economic and Social History Society of Ireland, 2012).
- Crossman, Virginia, *Local Government in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Belfast: Institute for Irish Studies, 1994).
- Crossman, Virginia, *Politics, Law and Order in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 1996).
- Crotty, Raymond D., *Irish Agricultural Production: Its Volume and Structure* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1966).
- Cullen, L.M., *Anglo-Irish Trade, 1660-1760* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968).
- Cullen, L.M., *An Economic History of Ireland Since 1660* (London: Batsford, 1972).

- Cullen, L.M., *The Emergence of Modern Ireland, 1600-1900* (London: Batsford Academic and Educational, 1981).
- Cullen, Mary and Luddy, Maria (eds.), *Women, Power and Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Attic Press, 1995).
- Cunningham, John, *A Town Tormented By the Sea: Galway, 1790-1914* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2004).
- Cunningham, John, *Conquest and Land in Ireland: The Transplantation to Connacht, 1649-1680* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011).
- Curtin, Nancy J., *The United Irishmen: Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin, 1791-1798* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Curtin, Philip, *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).
- Curtin, Philip, *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex: Essays in Atlantic History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990 [1998]).
- Curtis, L.P., *Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Culture* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1971).
- Curtis, L.P., *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England* (Bridgeport: University of Bridgeport Press, 1968).
- Dal Lago, Enrico, *Agrarian Elites: American Slaveholders and Southern Italian Landowners, 1815-1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005).
- Dal Lago, Enrico, *American Slavery, Atlantic Slavery, and Beyond: The U.S. "Peculiar Institution" in International Perspective* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2013).
- Daly, John Patrick, *When Slavery Was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002).
- Davis, David Brion, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Davis, David Brion, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolutions, 1770-1823* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975).
- Davis, Richard, *The Young Ireland Movement* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1988).
- Davis, Richard, *Revolutionary Imperialist: William Smith O'Brien, 1803-1864* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1998).
- Davis, Richard, *Travels of William Smith O'Brien in Europe and the Wider World, 1843 to 1864* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2013).
- Davis, Richard W., *A Political History of the House of Lords, 1811-1846: From the Regency to Corn Law Repeal* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008).

- Davis, Ronald F., *Good and Faithful Labor: From Slavery to Sharecropping in the Natchez District, 1860-1890* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1982).
- Davis, William C., *"A Government of Our Own": The Making of the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994).
- de Nie, Michael, *The Eternal Paddy: Irish Identity and the British Press, 1798-1882* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004).
- Delaney, Enda, *The Curse of Reason: The Great Irish Famine, 1845-52* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2012).
- Devine, T.M., *Clearance and Improvement: Land, Power and People in Scotland, 1700-1900* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2006).
- Dew, Charles B., *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001).
- Donnelly, James S., *Captain Rock: The Irish Agrarian Rebellion of 1821-1824* (Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2009).
- Donnelly, James S., *The Great Irish Potato Famine* (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2001).
- Donnelly, James S., *The Land and the People of Nineteenth-Century Cork: The Rural Economy and the Land Question* (London: Routledge, 1975).
- Donnelly, James S., *Landlord and Tenant in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1973).
- Dooley, Terence, *The Decline of the Big House in Ireland: A Study of Irish Landed Families, 1860-1960* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 2001).
- Doyle, Don H., *The Cause of All Nations: An International History of the American Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 2015).
- Doyle, Don H., *Nations Divided: America, Italy, and the Southern Question* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2002).
- Dusinberre, William, *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Eaton, Clement, *The Mind of the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964).
- Edelson, S. Max, *Plantation Enterprise in Colonial South Carolina* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Edgar, Walter, *Partisans and Redcoats: The Southern Conflict That Turned the Tide of the American Revolution* (New York: William Morrow, 2001).
- Elliott, Marianne, *Partners in Revolution: The United Irishmen and France* (New

- Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Ellis, Richard E., *The Union at Risk: Jacksonian Democracy, States' Rights, and the Nullification Crisis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Ellis, Steven G., *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998).
- Eltis, David, *The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Eltis, David and Richardson, David, *Atlas of the Transatlantic Slave Trade* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).
- Escott, Paul D., *The Confederacy: The Slaveholders' Failed Venture* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2010).
- Evens, Emory, *A "Toppling" People: The Rise and Decline of Virginia's Old Political Elite, 1680-1790* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009).
- Faust, Drew Gilpin, *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988).
- Faust, Drew Gilpin, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982).
- Fehrenbacher, Don E., *The Slaveholding Republic: An Account of the United States Government's Relations to Slavery* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Feingold, William L., *The Revolt of the Tenantry: The Transformation of Local Government in Ireland, 1872-1886* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1984).
- Ferrer, Ada, *Freedom's Mirror: Cuba and Haiti in the Age of Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- Ferris, Tom, *Irish Railways: A New History* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 2008).
- Finley, Moses I., *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology: Illustrated and Expanded Edition* (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1998 [1980]).
- Floud, Roderick, Wachter, Kenneth, and Gregory, Annabel, *Height, Health, and History: Nutritional Status in the United Kingdom, 1750-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Follett, Richard, *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in Louisiana's Cane World, 1820-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005).
- Fogel, Robert, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989).
- Fogel, Robert and Engerman, Stanley, *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974).

- Foner, Eric, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994 [1970]).
- Forbes, Robert Pierce, *The Missouri Compromise and Its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).
- Ford, Lacy K., *Deliver Us From Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Ford, Lacy K., *Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- Foster, Roy, *Paddy and Mr. Punch: Connections in Irish and English History* (London: Penguin, 1995 [1993]).
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth and Genovese, Eugene D., *Fruits of Merchant Capital: Slavery and Bourgeois Property in the Rise and Expansion of Capitalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983).
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth and Genovese, Eugene D., *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Slaveholders' New World Order* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth and Genovese, Eugene D., *Slavery in White and Black: Class and Race Relations in the Southern Slaveholders' New World Order* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Frame, Robin, *Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369* (Dublin: Helcion, 1981).
- Franklin, John Hope and Schweniger, Loren, *Runaway Slaves: Rebels on the Plantation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- Fredrickson, George, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1987 [1971]).
- Fredrickson, George, *The Comparative Imagination: On the History of Racism, Nationalism and Social Movements* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).
- Fredrickson, George, *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study of American and South African History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981).
- Freehling, William W., *Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992 [1965]).
- Freehling, William W., *The Road to Disunion, Vol. 1: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

- Freehling, William W., *The Road to Disunion, Vol. 2: Secessionists Triumphant, 1854-1861* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Frey, Sylvia R., *Water from the Rock: Black Resistance in a Revolutionary Age* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).
- Galenson, David W., *White Servitude in Colonial America: An Economic Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- Geary, Laurence M., *Medicine and Charity in Ireland, 1718-1851* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2004).
- Gellner, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006 [1983]).
- Genovese, Eugene D., "Cotton, Slavery and Soil Exhaustion in the Old South," *Cotton History Review*, Vol. 2 (1961), pp. 3-17.
- Genovese, Eugene D., *From Rebellion to Revolution: American Negro Slave Revolts in the Making of the Atlantic World* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979).
- Genovese, Eugene D., *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York: Vintage, 1967 [1965]).
- Genovese, Eugene D., *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976 [1974]).
- Genovese, Eugene D., *The World the Slaveholders Made: Two Essays in Interpretation* (New York: Vintage, 1969).
- Genovese, Eugene D. and Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth, *Fatal Self-Deception: Slaveholding Paternalism in the Old South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Geoghegan, Patrick M., *The Irish Act of Union: A Study in High Politics, 1798-1801* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1999).
- Geoghegan, Patrick M., *King Dan: The Rise of Daniel O'Connell, 1775-1829* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2008).
- Geoghegan, Patrick M., *Liberator: The Life and Death of Daniel O'Connell, 1830-1847* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2010).
- Gerard, Jessica, *Country House Life: Family and Servants, 1815-1914* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).
- Gibbons, Stephen R., *Captain Rock, Night Errant: The Threatening Letters of Pre-Famine Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004).
- Gienapp, William E., *The Origins of the Republican Party, 1852-1856* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Gillespie, Raymond, *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster, 1600-1641* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1985).

- Gillespie, Raymond, *Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Making Ireland Modern* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2006).
- Gillespie, Raymond, *The Transformation of the Irish Economy, 1550-1700* (Dublin: Economic and Social History Society of Ireland, 1991).
- Gleeson, David T., *The Green and the Gray: The Irish in the Confederate States of America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).
- Gleeson, David T., *The Irish in the South, 1815-1877* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).
- Glover, Lorri, *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007).
- Goddard, Nicholas, *Harvests of Change: The Royal Agricultural Society of England, 1838-1988* (London: Quiller Press, 1988).
- Gray, Peter, *Famine, Land and Politics: British Government and Irish Society, 1843-1850* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1999).
- Gray, Peter, *The Making of the Irish Poor Law, 1815-43* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).
- Green, E.R.R., *The Lagan Valley, 1800-50: A Local History of the Industrial Revolution* (London: Faber and Faber, 1949).
- Greene, Jack P., *The Intellectual Construction of America: Exceptionalism and Identity from 1492 to 1800* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
- Greene, Jack P., *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).
- Greene, Jack P., *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986).
- Greenfield, Liah, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).
- Gudmestad, Robert H., *A Troublesome Commerce: The Transformation of the Interstate Slave Trade* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003).
- Gudmestad, Robert H., *Steamboats and the Rise of the Cotton Kingdom* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011).
- Guterl, Matthew Pratt, *American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).
- Hadden, Sally E., *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas*

- (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).
- Hahn, Steven, *A Nation Under our Feet: Black Political Struggle in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003).
- Hall, Gwendolyn Midlo, *Africans in Colonial Louisiana: The Development of African-Creole Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Baton Rouge: University State University Press, 1992).
- Hamilton, Holman, *Prologue to Conflict: The Crisis and Compromise of 1850* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2005 [1964]).
- Hartz, Louis, *The Founding of New Societies: Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and Australia* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964).
- Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard and Kocka, Jürgen (eds.), *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009).
- Haynes, Stephen R., *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Hayton, David W., *The Anglo-Irish Experience, 1680-1730: Religion, Identity and Patriotism* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012).
- Hayton, David W., *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties*, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004).
- Hechter, Michael, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).
- Heitmann, John Alfred, *The Modernization of the Louisiana Sugar Industry, 1830-1910* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987).
- Hermann, Janet Sharp, *The Pursuit of a Dream* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999 [1981]).
- Hernon, Joseph M., *Celts, Catholics, and Copperheads: Ireland Views the American Civil War* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1968).
- Higginbotham, A. Leon, *In the Matter of Color: Race and the American Legal Process, the Colonial Period* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978).
- Hill, Jacqueline R., *From Patriots To Unionists: Dublin Civic Politics and Irish Protestant Patriotism, 1660-1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., *The Age of Capital, 1848-1875* (London: Abacus, 2008 [1975]).
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., *The Age of Revolution: Europe, 1789-1848* (London: Abacus, 1962).

- Hobsbawm, Eric J., *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Holt, Michael F., *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978).
- Holt, Michael F., *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- Holton, Woody, *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves and the Making of the American Revolution in Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).
- Hooker, Elizabeth R., *Readjustments of Agricultural Tenure in Ireland* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938).
- Hopkins, Keith, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
- Hoppen, K. Theodore, *Elections, Politics and Society in Ireland, 1832-1885* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).
- Hoppen, K. Theodore, *Ireland Since 1800: Conflict and Conformity* (New York: Longman, 1999 [1989]).
- Horning, Audrey, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).
- Houston, Robert A., *Peasant Petitions: Social Relations and Economic Life on Landed Estates, 1600-1850* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014).
- Howe, Daniel Walker, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Huggins, Michael, *Social Conflict in Pre-Famine Ireland: The Case of County Roscommon* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007).
- Hunt, Lynn Avery, *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: Norton, 2007).
- Hutchinson, John, *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: The Gaelic Revival and the Creation of the Irish Nation State* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987).
- Ignatiev, Noel, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995).
- Irons, Charles F., *The Origins of Proslavery Christianity: White and Black Evangelicals in Colonial and Antebellum Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).
- Isaacs, Rhys, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).
- Jabour, Anya, *Scarlett's Sisters: Young Women in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).
- Jackman, Mary R., *The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race*

- Relations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
- Jackson, Alvin, *Home Rule: An Irish History, 1800-2000* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Jackson, Alvin, *The Two Unions: Ireland, Scotland, and the Survival of the United Kingdom, 1707-2007* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- James, D. Clayton, *Antebellum Natchez* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968).
- Jenkins, Brian, *Era of Emancipation: British Government of Ireland, 1812-1830* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988).
- Jenkins, Brian, *Irish Nationalism and the British State: From Repeal to Revolutionary Nationalism* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006).
- Jenkins, William S., *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960).
- Jennings, Thelma, *The Nashville Convention: Southern Movement for Unity, 1848-51* (Memphis: Memphis State University Press, 1980).
- Johnson, Walter, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge: University of Harvard Press, 2013).
- Johnson, Walter, *Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).
- Jones, Howard, *Union in Peril: The Crisis Over British Intervention in the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).
- Jordan, Donald, *Land and Popular Politics in Ireland: County Mayo from the Plantation to the Land War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Jordan, Winthrop D., *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968).
- Kane, Anne, *Constructing Irish National Identity: Discourse and Ritual During the Land War, 1879-1882* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011).
- Kaye, Anthony, *Joining Places: Slave Neighborhoods in the Old South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).
- Kearney, Hugh, *Ireland: Contested Ideas of Nationalism and History* (New York: New York University Press, 2007).
- Kelly, James, *Prelude to Union: Anglo-Irish Politics in the 1780s* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1992).
- Kelly, James, *"That Damn'd Thing Called Honour": Duelling in Ireland, 1570-1860* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1995).

- Kilbride, Daniel, *Being American in Europe, 1750-1861* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013).
- Kinealy, Christine, *Daniel O'Connell and the Anti-Slavery Movement: The Saddest People The Sun Sees* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011).
- Kinealy, Christine, *This Great Calamity: The Irish Famine, 1845-52* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1994).
- Kinealy, Christine, *The Great Irish Famine: Impact, Ideology and Rebellion* (New York: Palgrave, 2002).
- Kinealy, Christine, *Repeal and Revolution: 1848 in Ireland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).
- Klein, Herbert S., *The Atlantic Slave Trade* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Klein, Herbert S. and Luna, Francisco Vidal, *Slavery in Brazil* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Knobel, Dale T., *Paddy and the Republic: Ethnicity and Nationality in Antebellum America* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1986).
- Kolchin, Peter, *A Sphinx on the American Land: The Nineteenth-Century South in Comparative Perspective* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003).
- Kolchin, Peter, *American Slavery, 1619-1877* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2003 [1993]).
- Kolchin, Peter, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987).
- Kowaleski-Wallace, Elizabeth, *Their Fathers' Daughters: Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth and Patriarchal Complicity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Kulikoff, Allan, *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986).
- Kupperman, Karen Ordhal, *The Jamestown Project* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007).
- Lakwete, Angela, *Inventing the Cotton Gin: Machine and Myth in Antebellum America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).
- Lauber, Almon Wheeler, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times Within the Present Limits of the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1913).
- Laviña, Javier and Zeuske, Michael (eds.), *The Second Slavery: Mass Slaveries and Modernity in the Americas and in the Atlantic Basin* (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2013).
- Lebow, Richard Ned, *White Britain and Black Ireland: The Influence of Stereotypes on Colonial Policy* (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1976).
- Leerssen, Joep, *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam

- University Press, 2006).
- Lengel, Edward G., *The Irish Through British Eyes: Perceptions of Ireland in the Famine Era* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002).
- Lenihan, Pádraig, *Consolidating Conquest: Ireland, 1603-1727* (Essex: Pearson Education Limited, 2008).
- Lennon, Colm, *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1994).
- Lepler, Jessica, *The Many Panics of 1837: People, Politics, and the Creation of a Transatlantic Financial Crisis* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- Lerner, Gerda, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- Levine, Bruce, *The Fall of the House of Dixie: The Civil War and the Social Revolution That Transformed the South* (New York: Random House, 2013).
- Levine, Bruce, *Half Slave and Half Free: The Roots of the Civil War* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2005 [1992]).
- Lewis, Judith Schneid, *In the Family Way: Childbearing in the British Aristocracy, 1760-1860* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1986).
- Libby, David J., *Slavery and Frontier Mississippi, 1720-1835* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2004).
- Loughlin, James, *Ulster Unionism and British National Identity Since 1885* (London: Pinter, 1995).
- Luddy, Maria, *Women in Ireland, 1800-1918: A Documentary History* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1995).
- Luraghi, Raimondo, *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation South* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1978).
- Lyne, Gerard G., *The Lansdowne Estate in Kerry Under the Stewardship of William Steuart Trench, 1849-72* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2001).
- Maars, Aaron W., *Railroads in the Old South: Pursuing Progress in a Slave Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).
- MacCarthy-Morrogh, Michael, *The Munster Plantation: English Migration to Southern Ireland, 1583-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).
- MacCurtain, Margaret and O'Dowd, Mary (eds.), *Women in Early Modern Ireland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991).
- MacDonagh, Oliver, *Ireland: The Union and its Aftermath* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977).
- MacDonagh, Oliver, *O'Connell: The Life of Daniel O'Connell, 1775-1847* (London:

- Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1991).
- MacDonagh, Oliver, *States of Mind: Two Centuries of Anglo-Irish Conflict, 1780-1980* (London: Pimlico, 1992 [1983]).
- Magagna, Victor V., *Communities of Grain: Rural Rebellion in Comparative Perspective* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).
- Maguire, W.A., *The Downshire Estates in Ireland 1801-1845: The Management of Irish Landed Estates in the Early Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).
- Majewski, John, *Modernizing a Slave Economy: The Economic Vision of the Confederate Nation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009).
- Malcomson, A.P.W., *The Pursuit of the Heiress: Aristocratic Marriage in Ireland, 1740-1840* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 2006).
- Marlow, Joyce, *Captain Boycott and the Irish* (London: Deutsch, 1973).
- Mason, Matthew, *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
- Mathew, William M., *Edmund Ruffin and the Crisis of Slavery in the Old South: The Failure of Agricultural Reform* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988).
- May, Robert E., *John A. Quitman: Old South Crusader* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985).
- May, Robert E., *Manifest Destiny's Underworld: Filibustering in Antebellum America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).
- May, Robert E., *The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire, 1854-1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973).
- Mayer, Henry, *All On Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1998).
- McBride, Ian, *Eighteenth-Century Ireland: The Isle of Slaves* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2009).
- McCaffrey, Lawrence J., *Daniel O'Connell and the Repeal Year* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1966).
- McCardell, John, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830-60* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979).
- McCavitt, John, *The Flight of the Earls* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2005).
- McConville, Michael, *Ascendancy to Oblivion: The Story of the Anglo-Irish* (London: Quartet Books, 1986).
- McCurry, Stephanie, *Confederate Reckoning: Power and Politics in the Civil War South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

- McCusker, John J. and Menard, Russell R., *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985).
- McDaniel, W. Caleb, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery: Garrisonian Abolitionists and Transatlantic Reform* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2013).
- McDonald, Forrest, *States' Rights and the Union: Imperium in Imperio, 1776-1876* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000).
- McDonald, Roderick A., *The Economy and Material Culture of Slaves: Goods and Chattels on the Sugar Plantations of Jamaica and Louisiana* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993).
- McDowell, R.B., *Crisis and Decline: The Fate of the Southern Unionists* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1997).
- McDowell, R.B., *Ireland in the Age of Imperialism and Revolution, 1760-1801* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).
- McDowell, Robert B., *The Irish Administration, 1801-1914* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1964).
- McGovern, Bryan P., *John Mitchel: Irish Nationalist, Southern Secessionist* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2009).
- McLeod, Duncan J., *Slavery, Race, and the American Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
- McMillen, Sally Gregory, *Southern Women: Black and White in the Old South* (Arlington Heights: Harland Davidson, 1992).
- McPherson, James M., *The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975).
- McPherson, James M., *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- McPherson, James M., *Is Blood Thicker than Water? Crises of Nationalism in the Modern World* (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 1998).
- Melvin, Patrick, *Estates and Landed Society in Galway* (Dublin: De Búrca, 2012).
- Menard, Russell R., *Migrants, Servants and Slaves: Unfree Labor in Colonial British America* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001).
- Menard, Russell R., *Sweet Negotiations: Sugar, Slavery, and Plantation Agriculture in Early Barbados* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006).
- Merk, Frederick, *Slavery and the Annexation of Texas* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1972).
- Miller, James David, *South by Southwest: Planter Emigration and Identity in the Slave South*

- (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002).
- Miller, Kerby A., *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).
- Mintz, Sidney W., *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1985 [1986]).
- Mokyr, Joel, *Why Ireland Starved: A Quantitative and Analytical History of the Irish Economy, 1800-1850* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983).
- Montaño, John Patrick, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Moody, T.W., *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609-41: The City of London and the Plantation in Ulster* (Belfast: William Mullan and Son, 1939).
- Moore, John Hebron, *Agriculture in Ante-Bellum Mississippi* (New York: Octagon Books, 1971).
- Moore, John Hebron, *The Emergence of the Cotton Kingdom in the Old Southwest: Mississippi, 1770-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988).
- Moran, Gerard, *Sending Out Ireland's Poor: Assisted Emigration to North America in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004).
- Moran, Gerard, *Sir Robert Gore Booth and his Landed Estate in County Sligo, 1814-1876: Famine, Emigration, Politics* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006).
- Morgan, Edmund S., *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1975).
- Morgan, Hiram, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1999 [1993]).
- Morgan, Kenneth, *Slavery and the British Empire: From Africa to America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Morgan, Philip D., *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).
- Morley, Vincent, *Irish Opinion and the American Revolution, 1760-1783* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Morris, Christopher, *Becoming Southern: The Evolution of a Way of Life, Warren County and Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1770-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Morris, Thomas D., *Southern Slavery and the Law, 1619-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).
- Murphy, Angela F., *American Slavery, Irish Freedom: Abolition, Immigrant Citizenship, and the Transatlantic Movement for Irish Repeal* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State

- University Press, 2010).
- Nash, Gary, *The Forgotten Fifth: African-Americans in the Age of Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Nelson, Scott Reynolds, *A Nation of Deadbeats: An Uncommon History of America's Financial Disasters* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012).
- Newbound, Ian, *Whiggery and Reform, 1830-41: The Politics of Government* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).
- Newby, Howard, *Property, Paternalism and Power: Class Control in Rural England* (London: Hutchinson, 1978).
- Nicholls, Kenneth W., *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2003 [1972]).
- Nieboer, Herman, *Slavery as an Industrial System: Ethnological Researches* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010 [1900]).
- Niehaus, Earl F., *The Irish in New Orleans, 1800-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965).
- Nissenbaum, Stephen, *The Battle for Christmas* (New York: Vintage, 1996).
- Niven, John, *John C. Calhoun and the Price of Union: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988).
- Norton, Desmond, *Landlords, Tenants, Famine: The Business of an Irish Land Agency in the 1840s* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2006).
- Nowlan, Kevin B., *The Politics of Repeal: A Study in the Relations Between Great Britain and Ireland, 1841-50* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965).
- Oakes, James, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).
- O'Brien, Michael, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860*, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).
- O'Connell, Maurice R., *Irish Politics and Social Conflict in the Age of the American Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965).
- O'Day, Alan, *Irish Home Rule, 1867-1921* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).
- O'Dowd, Mary, *A History of Women in Ireland, 1600-1800* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2005).
- Ó'Gráda, Cormac, *Black '47 and Beyond: The Great Irish Famine in History, Economy, and Memory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).
- Ó'Gráda, Cormac, *Ireland: A New Economic History, 1780-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

- Ó'Gráda, Cormac, *Ireland Before and After the Famine: Explorations in Economic History, 1800-1930* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988).
- O'Hearn, Denis, *The Atlantic Economy: Britain, the U.S. and Ireland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).
- O'Hegarty, Patrick S., *A History of Ireland Under the Union, 1801 to 1922* (London: Methuen, 1952).
- Ohlmeyer, Jane H., *Making Ireland English: The Irish Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).
- Olmstead, Alan L. and Rhode, Paul W., *Creating Abundance: Biological Innovation and Modernity in American Agricultural Development* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Olsen, Christopher J., *Political Culture and Secession in Mississippi: Masculinity, Honor, and the Antiparty Tradition, 1830-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Ó'Murchada, Ciarán, *The Great Famine: Ireland's Agony, 1845-52* (London: Continuum, 2011).
- Osterhammel, Jürgen, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).
- Osterweis, Rollin Gustav, *Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South* (New Haven: P. Smith, 1964 [1949]).
- Ó'Tuathaigh, Gearóid, *Ireland Before the Famine, 1798-1848* (Dublin: Gill & MacMillan, 1972).
- Ó'Tuathaigh, Gearóid, *Thomas Drummond and the Government of Ireland, 1835-41* (Dublin: National University of Ireland, 1977).
- Parent, Anthony S., *Foul Means: The Formation of a Slave Society in Virginia, 1660-1740* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).
- Parish, Peter J., *Slavery: History and Historians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989).
- Patterson, Orlando, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).
- Perceval-Maxwell, M., *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994).
- Perceval-Maxwell, M., *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1973).
- Petrusewicz, Marta, *Latifundium: Moral Economy and Material Life in a Nineteenth-Century Periphery* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996 [1989]).
- Pomfret, J.E., *The Struggle for Land in Ireland, 1800-1923* (Princeton: Princeton University

- Press, 1930).
- Potter, David M., *The Impending Crisis, 1848-1861* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976).
- Quigley, Paul, *Shifting Grounds: Nationalism in the American South, 1848-1865* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Quinlan, Kieran, *Strange Kin: Ireland and the American South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005).
- Quinn, David Beers, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966).
- Quinn, David Beers, *Ireland and America: Their Early Associations, 1500-1600* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1991).
- Rable, George C., *The Confederate Republic: A Revolution Against Politics* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994).
- Raboteau, Albert J., *Slave Religion: The "Invisible Institution" in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978).
- Ransom, Roger L., *Conflict and Compromise: The Political Economy of Slavery, Emancipation, and the American Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Reilly, Ciarán, *The Irish Land Agent, 1830-60: The Case of King's County* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2014).
- Remini, Robert V., *The Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988).
- Richards, Eric, *Britannia's Children: Emigration from England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland Since 1600* (London: Hambledon Press, 2004).
- Richards, Leonard L., *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1790-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000).
- Roark, James L., *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1977).
- Roberts, David, *Paternalism in Early Victorian England* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979).
- Roberts, Justin, *Slavery and the Enlightenment in the British Atlantic, 1750-1807* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- Robinson, Armstead L., *Bitter Fruits of Bondage: The Demise of Slavery and the Collapse of the Confederacy, 1861-1865* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004).
- Robinson, Donald L., *Slavery and the Structure of American Politics, 1765-1820* (New York: Norton, 1979).
- Robinson, Philip, *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-*

- 1670 (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1984).
- Rodgers, Nini, *Ireland, Slavery and Anti-Slavery, 1612-1865* (London: Palgrave, 2007).
- Rose, Anne C., *Victorian America and the Civil War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Rothman, Adam, *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).
- Rothman, Joshua D., *Flush Times and Fever Dreams: A Story of Capitalism and Slavery in the Age of Jackson* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012).
- Rozbicki, Michal J., *The Complete Colonial Gentleman: Cultural Legitimacy in Plantation America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1998).
- Rubin, Anne Sarah, *Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).
- Savitt, Todd Lee, *Medicine and Slavery: The Diseases and Health Care of Blacks in Antebellum Virginia* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002 [1978]).
- Sawyer, Roger, *We Are But Women: Women in Ireland's History* (London: Routledge, 2002 [1993]).
- Scally, Robert James, *The End of Hidden Ireland: Rebellion, Famine and Emigration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Scarborough, William Kaufman, *Masters of the Big House: Elite Slaveholders of the Mid-Nineteenth-Century South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003).
- Scarborough, William Kauffman, *The Overseer: Plantation Management in the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984).
- Schoen, Brian, *The Fragile Fabric of Union: Cotton, Federal Politics, and the Global Origins of the Civil War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).
- Schroeder, John H., *Mr. Polk's War: American Opposition and Dissent, 1846-1848* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1973).
- Scott, Anne Firor, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).
- Scott, James C., *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Scott, James C., *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Subsistence and Rebellion in Southeast Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976).
- Scott, James C., *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
- Shepherd, Ernest W., *The Midland Great Western Railroad of Ireland: An Illustrated History*

- (Leicester: Midland Publishing, 1994).
- Shields, Andrew, *The Irish Conservative Party, 1852-1868: Land, Politics, and Religion* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2007).
- Shoemaker, R.B., *Gender in English Society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (London: Longman, 1998).
- Shore, Laurence, *Southern Capitalists: The Ideological Leadership of an Elite, 1832-1885* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986).
- Simms, John G., *Colonial Nationalism, 1698-1776: Molyneux's The Case of Ireland Stated* (Cork: Mercier Press, 1976).
- Sidbury, James, *Ploughshares Into Swords: Race, Rebellion and Identity in Gabriel's Virginia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Silbey, Joel H., *Storm Over Texas: The Annexation Controversy and the Road to Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Sinha, Manisha, *The Counterrevolution of Slavery: Politics and Ideology in Antebellum South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).
- Smith, Elbert, *The Presidency of James Buchanan* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1975).
- Smith, Mark M., *Debating Slavery: Economy and Society in the Antebellum American South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Smith, Mark M., *Mastered By The Clock: Time, Slavery, and Freedom in the American South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).
- Smyth, Jim, *The Making of the United Kingdom, 1660-1800: State, Religion and Identity in Britain and Ireland* (Harlow: Longman, 2001).
- Snay, Mitchell, *Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997 [1993]).
- Solow, Barbara L., *The Land Question and the Irish Economy, 1870-1903* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971).
- Spring, David, *The English Landed Estate in the Nineteenth Century: Its Administration* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1963).
- Stamp, Kenneth M., *The Peculiar Institution: Negro Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South* (New York: Vintage, 1956).
- Starobin, Robert S., *Industrial Slavery in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970).
- Steinfeld, Robert J., *Coercion, Contract, and Free Labor in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

- Stewart, James B., *Holy Warriors: The Abolitionists and American Slavery* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997 [1976]).
- Stone, Lawrence, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (New York: Penguin, 1977).
- Stowe, Steven M., *Intimacy and Power in the Old South: Ritual in the Lives of the Planters* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).
- Sweeney, Fionnghuala, *Frederick Douglass and the Atlantic World* (Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 2007).
- Sydnor, Charles S., *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L.C. Wailes* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1938).
- Sydnor, Charles S., *Slavery in Mississippi* (Gloucester: P. Smith, 1965 [1933]).
- Tarlow, Sarah, *The Archaeology of Improvement in Britain, 1750-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Thirsk, Joan, *The Rural Economy of England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984).
- Thomas, William G., *The Iron Way: Railroads, the Civil War, and the Making of Modern America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).
- Thompson, Edgar T., *Plantation Societies, Race Relations, and the South: The Regimentation of Societies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1975).
- Thornton, A.P., *The Habit of Authority: Paternalism in British History* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1965).
- Tillyard, Stella, *Aristocrats: Caroline, Emily, Louisa and Sarah Lennox, 1750-1832* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1994).
- Tise, Larry E., *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987).
- Tomich, Dale W., *Slavery in the Circuit of Sugar: Martinique in the World Economy, 1830-1848* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).
- Tomich, Dale W., *Through the Prism of Slavery: Labor, Capital, and World Economy* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004).
- Truxes, Thomas M., *Irish-American Trade, 1660-1783* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Van Cleve, George William, *A Slaveholders' Union: Slavery, Politics, and the Constitution in the Early American Republic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010).
- Valch, John Michael, *Back of the Big House: The Architecture of Plantation Slavery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
- Varon, Elizabeth, *Disunion!: The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859* (Chapel

- Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).
- Vaughan, W.E., *Landlords and Tenants in Ireland, 1848-1904* (Dublin: Economic and Social History Society of Ireland, 1984).
- Vaughan, W.E., *Landlords and Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- Vesey, Padraig, *The Murder of Major Mahon, Strokestown, County Roscommon, 1847* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008).
- Waldstreicher, David, *Slavery's Constitution: From Revolution to Ratification* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2009).
- Wall, Maureen, *The Penal Laws, 1691-1760* (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press, 1976).
- Wallace, Anthony F.C., *The Long, Bitter Trail: Andrew Jackson and the Indians* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Capitalist World-Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World-System, Vol. 1: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World-System, Vol. 2: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World Economy, 1600-1750* (New York: Academic Press, 1980).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World-System, Vol. 3: The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy, 1730s-1840s* (New York: Academic Press, 1989).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World-System, Vol. 4: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789-1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).
- Walsh, Lorena S., *Motives of Honor, Pleasure, and Profit: Plantation Management in the Colonial Chesapeake, 1607-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010).
- Waterhouse, Richard, *A New World Gentry: The Making of a Merchant and Planter Class in South Carolina, 1670-1770* (Charleston: The History Press, 2005 [1989]).
- Watson, Harry L., *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 1990).
- Watson, Ritchie Devon, *Normans and Saxons: Southern Race Mythology and the Intellectual*

- History of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008).
- Whelan, Irene, *The Bible War in Ireland: The 'Second Reformation' and the Polarization of Protestant-Catholic Relations* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005).
- Weiner, Marli F., *Mistresses and Slaves: Plantation Women in South Carolina, 1830-80* (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1998).
- Wilentz, Sean, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005).
- Williams, Eric, *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944).
- Wilmot, Sarah, "*The Business of Improvement*": *Agriculture and Scientific Culture in Britain, c. 1770-c. 1870* (Bristol: Historical Geography Research Group, 1990).
- Wilson, Deborah, *Women, Marriage, and Property in Wealthy Landed Families in Ireland, 1750-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008).
- Wolf, Eric, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).
- Wolffe, John, *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland, 1843-1945* (London: Routledge, 1994).
- Wood, Betty, *The Origins of American Slavery: Freedom and Bondage in the English Colonies* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997).
- Wood, Betty, *Slavery in Colonial America, 1619-1776* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005).
- Wood, Betty, *Slavery in Colonial Georgia, 1730-1775* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984).
- Wood, Peter H., *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 Through the Stono Rebellion* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974).
- Woodman, Harold D., *King Cotton and His Retainers: Financing and Marketing the Cotton Crop of the South, 1800-1925* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1990 [1968]).
- Wooster, Ralph A., *The People in Power: Courthouse and Statehouse in the Lower South* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1969).
- Wooster, Ralph A., *Politicians, Planters, and Plain Folk: Courthouse and Statehouse in the Upper South, 1850-1860* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975).
- Wright, Gavin, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 1986).

- Wright, Gavin, *The Political Economy of the Cotton South: Households, Markets, and Wealth in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978).
- Wyatt, Lee T., *The Industrial Revolution* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2009).
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).
- Young, Jeffrey Robert, *Domesticating Slavery: The Master Class in South Carolina and Georgia, 1670-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999).
- Zakim, Michael and Kornblith, Gary J. (eds.), *Capitalism Takes Command: The Social Transformation of Nineteenth-Century America* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2012).

Journal Articles and Chapters in Edited Collections

- Alter, Peter, "Symbols of Irish Nationalism," in O'Day, Alan (ed.), *Reactions to Irish Nationalism, 1865-1914* (London: Hambledon Press, 1987), pp. 1-20.
- Armitage, David and Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, "Introduction: The Age of Revolutions, c. 1760-1840: Global Causation, Connection, and Comparison," in Armitage, David and Subrahmanyam, Sanjay (eds.), *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760-1840* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. xii-xxxii.
- Barnard, Toby, "The Gentrification of Eighteenth-Century Ireland," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, Vol. 12 (1997), pp. 137-155.
- Barnard, Toby, "Planters and Policies in Cromwellian Ireland," *Past and Present*, Vol. 61 (1973), pp. 31-69.
- Barnard, Toby, "Protestantism, Ethnicity and Irish Identities, 1660-1760," in Claydon, Tony and McBride, Ian (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c. 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 206-235.
- Bartlett, Thomas, "'A People Made Rather for Copies than Originals': The Anglo-Irish, 1760-1800," *International History Review*, Vol. 12 (1990), pp. 11-25.
- Bartlett, Thomas, "Britishness, Irishness and the Act of Union," in Keogh, Dáire and Whelan, Kevin (eds.), *Acts of Union: The Causes, Contexts and Consequences of the Act of Union* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), pp. 243-258.
- Bartlett, Thomas, "The Emergence of the Irish Catholic Nation, 1750-1850," in Jackson, Alvin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 517-543.
- Bartlett, Thomas, "The Rise and Fall of the Protestant Nation, 1690-1800," *Éire-Ireland*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (1991), pp. 7-18.

- Beames, Michael R., "Rural Conflict in Pre-Famine Ireland: Peasant Assassinations in Tipperary, 1837-1847," in Philpin, C.H.E. (ed.), *Nationalism and Popular Protest in Ireland* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 264-283.
- Bevilacqua, Piero, "Peter Kolchin's 'American South' and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Some Questions about Comparative History," in Dal Lago, Enrico and Halpern, Rick (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 60-69.
- Bloch, Marc, "A Contribution Towards a Comparative History of European Societies," in Bloch, Marc, *Land and Work in Medieval Europe: Selected Papers* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967 [1928]), pp. 44-81.
- Bottigheimer, Karl S., "The Restoration Land Settlement in Ireland: A Structural View," *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 69 (1972), pp. 1-21.
- Bottigheimer, Karl S., "Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Westward Enterprise, 1536-1660," in Andrews, Kenneth, Canny, Nicholas, Hair, P.E.H. (eds.), *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America, 1480-1650* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1978), pp. 45-65.
- Bourke, P.M.A., "The Use of the Potato in Pre-Famine Ireland," *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, Vol. 21 (1967/1968), pp. 72-96.
- Bowman, Shearer Davis, "Conditional Unionism and Slavery in Virginia, 1860-1861: The Case of Dr. Richard Eppes," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 96, No. 1 (Jan., 1988), pp. 31-54.
- Bowman, Shearer Davis, "Industrialization and Economic Development in the Nineteenth-Century U.S. South: Some Interregional and Intercontinental Comparative Perspectives," in Delfino, Susanna and Gillespie, Michele (eds.), *Global Perspectives on Industrial Transformation in the American South* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005), pp. 76-104.
- Boyce, D. George, "The Marginal Britons: The Irish," in Colls, Robert and Dodd, Philip (eds.), *Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880-1920* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014 [1986]), pp. 255-278.
- Boyce, D. George, "Trembling Solicitude: Irish Conservatism, Nationality and Public Opinion, 1833-86," in Boyce, D. George, Eccleshall, Robert, and Geoghegan, Vincent (eds.), *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 124-145.
- Boyce, D. George, "Weary Patriots: Ireland and the Making of Unionism," in Boyce, D. George and O'Day, Alan (eds.), *Defenders of the Union: A Survey of British and Irish*

- Unionism Since 1801* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 13-38.
- Breen, T.H., "A Changing Labor Force and Race Relations in Virginia 1660-1710," *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Fall, 1973), pp. 3-25.
- Breen, T.H., "An Empire of Goods: The Anglicization of Colonial America, 1690-1776," *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 25 (1986), pp. 468-499.
- Brenner, Robert, "The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism," *New Left Review*, Vol. 104 (July/August, 1977), pp. 25-92.
- Brenner, Robert, "The Rises and Declines of Serfdom in Medieval and Early Modern Europe," in Bush, Michael L. (ed.), *Serfdom and Slavery: Studies in Legal Bondage* (London: Longman, 1996), pp. 247-276.
- Bric, Maurice J., "Daniel O'Connell and the Debate on Anti-Slavery, 1820-1850," in Dunne, Tom and Geary, Laurence M. (eds.), *History and the Public Sphere: Essays in Honour of John A. Murphy* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2005), pp. 69-82.
- Bridgforth, Lucie Robertson, "Mississippi's Response to Nullification, 1833," *Journal of Mississippi History*, Vol. 45 (1983), pp. 1-21.
- Broussard, Joyce L., "Naked Before the Law: Married Women and the Servant Ideal in Antebellum Natchez," in Swain, Martha H., Payne, Elizabeth Anne, and Spruill, Marjorie Julian (eds.), *Mississippi Women: Their Lives, Their Histories* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010), pp. 57-76.
- Broussard, Ray, "Governor John A. Quitman and the Compromise of 1850 in Mississippi," *Journal of Mississippi History*, Vol. 28 (1966), pp. 103-120.
- Buchanan, R.H., "Field Systems of Ireland," in Baker, Alan R.H. and Butlin, Robin A. (eds.), *Studies of Field Systems in the British Isles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), pp. 580-618.
- Burnard, Trevor, "The Atlantic Slave Trade," in Heuman, Gad and Burnard, Trevor (eds.), *The Routledge History of Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 2011), pp. 80-97.
- Burnard, Trevor, "The Planter Class," in Heuman, Gad and Burnard, Trevor (eds.), *The Routledge History of Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 2011), pp. 187-203.
- Canny, Nicholas P., "Identity Formation in Ireland: The Emergence of an Anglo-Irish Identity," in Canny, Nicholas and Pagden, Anthony (eds.), *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 159-212.
- Canny, Nicholas P., "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Oct., 1973), pp. 575-598.
- Canny, Nicholas P., "The Irish Background to Penn's Experiment," in Dunn, Richard S. and Dunn, Mary M. (eds.), *The World of William Penn* (Philadelphia: University of

- Pennsylvania Press, 1986), pp. 139-156.
- Canny, Nicholas P., "The Origins of Empire: An Introduction," in Canny, Nicholas (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol. 1, The Origins of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 1-33.
- Cashin, Joan E., "Introduction: Culture of Resignation," in Cashin, Joan E. (ed.), *Our Common Affairs: Texts from Women in the Old South* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), pp. 1-42.
- Cavanagh, Edward, "Kingdom or Colony? English or British? Early Modern Ireland and the Colonialism Question," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (2013).
- Chaplin, Joyce E., "Creating a Cotton South in Georgia and South Carolina, 1760-1815," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 57 (1991), pp. 171-200.
- Chaplin, Joyce E., "Creoles in British America: From Denial to Acceptance," in Stewart, Charles (ed.), *Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory* (Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, 2006), pp. 46-65.
- Chaplin, Joyce E., "Indian Slavery in Early America: Captivity Without the Narrative," in Mancke, Elizabeth and Shammas, Carole (eds.), *The Creation of the British Atlantic World: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), pp. 45-70.
- Christianson, G.E., "Landlords and Land Tenure in Ireland, 1790-1830," *Éire-Ireland*, Vol. 9 (1974), pp. 25-58.
- Christianson, G.E., "Secret Societies and Agrarian Violence in Ireland, 1790-1840," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 46, No. 4 (1972), pp. 369-384.
- Clarke, Aidan, "The Irish Economy, 1600-60," in Moody, T.W., Martin, F.X. and Byrne, F.J. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 3, Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 168-186.
- Clarke, Aidan and Edwards, R. Dudley, "Pacification, Plantation, and the Catholic Question, 1603-23," in Moody, T.W., Martin, F.X. and Byrne, F.J. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 3, Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 187-232.
- Claydon, Tony and McBride, Ian, "The Trials of the Chosen Peoples: Recent Interpretations of Protestantism and National Identity in Britain and Ireland," in Claydon, Tony and McBride, Ian (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c. 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 3-29.
- Coclanis, Peter A., "How the Low Country Was Taken to Task: Slave-Labor Organization in

- Coastal South Carolina and Georgia,” in Paquette, Robert L. and Ferleger, Louis A. (eds.), *Slavery, Secession, and Southern History* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000), pp. 59-78.
- Cohen, Deborah and O’Connor, Maura, “Introduction: Comparative History, Cross-National History, Transnational History—Definitions,” in Cohen, Deborah and O’Connor, Maura (eds.), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. ix-xxiv.
- Collins, Steven G., “System, Organization, and Agricultural Reform in the Antebellum South, 1840-1860,” *Agricultural History*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (2001), pp. 1-27.
- Connolly, Sean J., “Family, Love and Marriage: Some Evidence from the Early Eighteenth Century,” in MacCurtain, Margaret and O’Dowd, Mary (eds.), *Women in Early Modern Ireland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1991), pp. 276-290.
- Connolly, Sean J., “Marriage in Pre-Famine Ireland,” in Cosgrove, Art (ed.), *Marriage in Ireland* (Dublin: College Press, 1985), pp. 78-98.
- Connolly, Sean J., “Mass Politics and Sectarian Conflict, 1823-30,” in Vaughan, W.E., *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 5, Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 74-107.
- Craton, Michael, “Reluctant Creoles: The Planters’ World in the British West Indies,” in Bailyn, Bernard and Morgan, Philip (eds.), *Strangers Within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), pp. 314-362.
- Cullen, L.M., “Economic Development, 1691-1750,” in Moody, T.W. and Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 4, The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 123-158.
- Cullen, L.M., “Economic Development, 1750-1800,” in Moody, T.W. and Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 4, The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 159-195.
- Cullen, L.M., “Population Trends in Seventeenth-Century Ireland,” *Economic and Social Review*, Vol. 6 (Jan., 1975), pp. 249-265.
- Cullop, Charles P., “An Unequal Duel: Union Recruiting in Ireland, 1863-1864,” *Civil War History*, Vol. 13 (June 1967), pp. 101-113.
- Curtis, L.P., “Demonising the Irish Landlords Since the Famine,” in Casey, Brian (ed.), *Defying the Law of the Land: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin: History Press Ireland, 2013), pp. 20-43.
- Curtis, L.P., “Incumbered Wealth: Landed Indebtedness in Post-Famine Ireland,” *American*

- Historical Review*, Vol. 85, No. 11 (Apr., 1980), pp. 332-67.
- Curtis, L.P., "Landlord Responses to the Irish Land War, 1879-87," *Éire-Ireland*, Vol. 38 (2003), pp. 169-186.
- Dal Lago, Enrico, "Comparative Slavery," in Paquette, Robert L. and Smith, Mark M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 664-684.
- Dal Lago, Enrico, "Count Cavour's 1844 *Thoughts on Ireland: Liberal Politics and Agrarian Reform Through Anglo-Italian Eyes*," in Whelehan, Niall (ed.), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (London: Routledge, 2015), pp. 88-105.
- Dal Lago, Enrico, "The End of the 'Second Slavery' in the Confederate South and the 'Great Brigandage' in Southern Italy: A Comparative Study," in Laviña, Javier and Zeuske, Michael (eds.), *The Second Slavery: Mass Slaveries and Modernity in the Americas and in the Atlantic Basin* (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2013), pp. 73-92.
- Dal Lago, Enrico, "Second Slavery, Second Serfdom, and Beyond: The Atlantic Plantation System and the Eastern and Southern European Landed Estate System in Comparative Perspective, 1800-60," *Review*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (2009), pp. 391-420.
- Dal Lago, Enrico and Halpern, Rick, "Two Case-Studies in Comparative History: The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno," in Dal Lago, Enrico and Halpern, Rick (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 3-25.
- Dal Lago, Enrico, "World-Systems Theory," in Miller, Joseph C. (ed.), *The Princeton Companion to Atlantic History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), pp. 498-501.
- Davis, Richard, "William Smith O'Brien and the American Civil War," *Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Dec., 1993), pp. 45-53.
- Devine, T.M., "Unrest and Stability in Rural Ireland and Scotland, 1760-1840," in Devine, T.M., *Exploring the Scottish Past: Themes in the History of Scottish Society* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1995), pp. 182-196.
- Dickson, David, "Middlemen," in Bartlett, Thomas and Hayton, D.W. (eds.), *Penal Era and Golden Age: Essays in Irish History, 1690-1800* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1979), pp. 162-185.
- Dillon, Gerald, "Cnoc Diolún: A Genealogical Survey of the Dillon family in Ireland," *The Irish Genealogist*, Vol. 2 (1955), pp. 361-367.
- Doan, James E., "An Island in the Virginian Sea: Native Americans and Irish in English Discourse, 1585-1640," *New Hibernia Review*, Vol 1, No. 1 (Spring, 1997), pp. 79-99.

- Domar, Evsey D., "The Causes of Slavery or Serfdom: A Hypothesis," *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (1970), pp. 18-32.
- Donnelly, James S., "Irish Property Must Pay For Irish Poverty: British Public Opinion and the Great Irish Famine," in Morash, Chris and Hayes, Richard (eds.), *Fearful Realities: New Perspectives on the Irish Famine* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1996), pp. 60-76.
- Donnelly, James S., "Landlords and Tenants," in Vaughan, W.E. (ed.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 5: Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 334-349.
- Donnelly, James S., "Mass Eviction and the Great Famine: The Clearances Revisited," in Póirtéir, Cathal (ed.), *The Great Irish Famine* (Dublin: Mercier Press, 1995), pp. 155-173.
- Donnelly, James S., "The Terry Alt Movement of 1829-31," *History Ireland*, Vol. 2 (1994), pp. 30-35.
- Donnelly, James S., "The Whiteboy Movement, 1761-5," *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 81 (Mar., 1978), pp. 20-54.
- Down, Kevin, "Colonial Society and Economy," in Cosgrove, Art (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. II, Medieval Ireland, 1169-1534* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993 [1987]), pp. 439-491.
- Dubois, Laurent, "Slavery in the Age of Revolutions," in Heuman, Gad and Burnard, Trevor (eds.), *The Routledge History of Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 2011), pp. 267-280.
- Duffy, Patrick J., "'Disencumbering Our Crowded Place': Theory and Practice of Estate Emigration Schemes in Mid-Nineteenth Century Ireland," in Duffy, Patrick J. (ed.), *To and from Ireland: Planned Migration Schemes, c. 1600-2000* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 2004), pp. 79-104.
- Dugger, Julie M., "Black Ireland's Race: Thomas Carlyle and the Young Ireland Movement," *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 3 (Spring 2006), pp. 461-485.
- Dunn, Tom, "A Gentleman's Estate Should Be a Moral School: Edgeworthstown in Fact and Fiction, 1760-1840," in Gillespie, Raymond and Moran, Gerard (eds.), *Longford: Essays in County History* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1991), pp. 95-122.
- Egerton, Douglas R., "Markets Without a Market Revolution: Southern Planters and Capitalism," *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Summer, 1996), pp. 207-221.
- Egerton, Douglas R., "Rethinking Atlantic Historiography in a Postcolonial Era: The Civil War in a Global Perspective," *Journal of the Civil War Era*, Vol. 1, No. 1, (March,

- 2011), pp. 79-95.
- Egerton, Douglas R., "Slave Resistance," in Paquette, Robert L. and Smith, Mark M., *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 447-464.
- Eisenstadt, S.N., "Multiple Modernities," *Daedalus*, Vol. 129, No. 1 (Winter 2000), pp. 1-29.
- Engerman, Stanley L., "Introduction," in Engerman, Stanley L. (ed.), *Terms of Labor: Slavery, Serfdom, and Free Labor* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), pp. 1-23.
- Engerman, Stanley L., "Slavery, Serfdom, and Other Forms of Coerced Labour: Similarities and Differences," in Bush, Michael L. (ed.), *Serfdom and Slavery: Studies in Legal Bondage* (London: Longman, 1996), pp. 18-41.
- Everett, C.S., "They Shall be Slaves for their Lives: Indian Slavery in Colonial Virginia," in Gally, Alan (ed.), *Indian Slavery in Colonial America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), pp. 67-108.
- Fagin Yellin, Jean, "Texts and Contexts of Harriet Jacobs' *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl Written by Herself*," in David, Charles and Gates, Henry Louis (eds.), *The Slave's Narrative* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 262-282.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin, "Introduction: The Proslavery Argument in History," in Faust, Drew Gilpin (ed.), *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), pp. 1-20.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin, "The Peculiar South Revisited: White Society, Culture, and Politics in the Antebellum Period, 1800-1860," in Boles, John B. and Nolen, Edward T. (eds.), *Interpreting Southern History: Historiographical Essays in Honor of Sanford W. Higginbotham* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), pp. 78-119.
- Finkelman, Paul, "Slavery and the Constitutional Convention: Making a Covenant with Death," in Beeman, Richard, Botein, Stephen, and Carter, Edward C. (eds.), *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), pp. 188-225.
- Follett, Richard, "On the Edge of Modernity: Louisiana's Landed Elites in the Nineteenth-Century Sugar Country," in Dal Lago, Enrico and Halpern, Rick (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 73-94.
- Follett, Richard, "Slavery and Technology in Louisiana's Sugar Bowl," in Delfino, Susanna and Gillespie, Michele (eds.), *Technology, Innovation, and Southern Industrialization: From the Antebellum Era to the Computer Age* (Columbia: University of Missouri

- Press, 2008), pp. 78-96.
- Foner, Eric, "The Wilmot Proviso Revisited," *Journal of American History*, Vol. 56 (1969), pp. 262-279.
- Fredrickson, George, "From Exceptionalism to Variability: Recent Developments in Cross-National Comparative History," *Journal of American History*, Vol. 82, No. 2 (1995), pp. 587-604.
- Freeman, T.W., "Land and People, c. 1841," in Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 5: Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 242-271.
- Garst, Daniel, "Wallerstein and His Critics," *Theory and Society*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (July 1985), pp. 469-495.
- Geary, Laurence M., "Anticipating Memory: Landlordism, Agrarianism and Deference in Late-Nineteenth-Century Ireland," in Dunne, Tom and Geary, Laurence M. (eds.), *History and the Public Sphere: Essays in Honour of John A. Murphy* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2005), pp. 127-139.
- Genovese, Eugene D., "'Our Family, White and Black': Family and Household in the Southern Slaveholders' Worldview," in Bleser, Carol (ed.), *In Joy and Sorrow: Women, Family, and Marriage in the Victorian South, 1830-1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 69-87.
- Genovese, Eugene D. and Ambrose, Douglas, "Masters," in Paquette, Robert L. and Smith, Mark M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 535-555.
- Gillespie, Raymond, "The Problems of Plantations: Material Culture and Social Change in Early Modern Ireland," in Lyttleton, James and Rynne, Colin (eds.), *Plantation Ireland: Settlement and Material Culture, c. 1550-c. 1700* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 43-60.
- Goddard, Nicholas, "The Development and Influence of Agricultural Periodicals and Newspapers, 1780-1880," *Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (1983), pp. 116-132.
- Gonzales, John Edmond, "John Anthony Quitman in the United States House of Representatives, 1855-58," *Southern Quarterly*, Vol. 4 (1966), pp. 276-288.
- Graham, B.J., "Anglo-Norman Manorial Settlement in Ireland: An Assessment," *Irish Geography*, Vol. 18 (1985), pp. 4-15.
- Gray, Peter, "The Peculiarities of Irish Land Tenure, 1800-1914: From Agent of Impoverishment to Agent of Pacification," in Winch, Donald and O'Brien, Patrick

- Karl (eds.), *The Political Economy of British Historical Experience, 1688-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 139-162.
- Greene, Jack P., "Colonial South Carolina and the Caribbean Connection," in Greene, Jack P. (ed.), *Imperatives, Behaviors, and Identities in Early American Cultural History* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992), pp. 68-86.
- Greene, Jack P., "Identity and Independence," in Greene, Jack P. and Pole, J.R. (eds.), *A Companion to the American Revolution* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), pp. 230-234.
- Greene, Jack P. and Pole, J.R., "Reconstructing British-American Colonial History: An Introduction," in Greene, Jack P. and Pole, J.R. (eds.), *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), pp. 1-17.
- Grew, Raymond, "The Case for Comparing Histories," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 58, No. 4 (Oct., 1980), pp. 763-778.
- Hadfield, Andrew, "Irish Colonies and America," in Appelbaum, Robert and Sweet, John Wood (eds.), *Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), pp. 172-193.
- Hahn, Steven, "Class and State in Postemancipation Societies: Southern Planters in Comparative Perspective," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 95 (Feb., 1990), pp. 75-98.
- Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard and Kocka, Jürgen, "Comparative History: Methods, Aims, Problems," in Cohen, Deborah and O'Connor, Maura (eds.), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 23-39.
- Hayton, David W., "Anglo-Irish Attitudes: Changing Perceptions of National Identity Among the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland, c. 1690-1740," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, Vol. 17, (1987), pp. 145-157.
- Hayes-McCoy, Gerard Anthony, "The Completion of the Tudor Conquest and the Advance of the Counter-Reformation, 1571-1603," in Moody, T.W., Martin, F.X. and Byrne, F.J. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 3: Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991 [1976]), pp. 94-142.
- Hearon, Cleo Carson, "Mississippi and the Compromise of 1850," *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, Vol. 14 (1914), pp. 7-229.
- Hearon, Cleo Carson, "Nullification in Mississippi," *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, Vol. 12 (1912), pp. 37-71.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," in Hobsbawm, Eric J. and Ranger,

- Terrence (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 1-14.
- Hoppen, K. Theodore, "Landlords, Society, and Electoral Politics in Mid-Nineteenth Century Ireland," *Past and Present*, Vol. 75 (1977), pp. 62-93.
- Hoppen, K. Theodore, "Landownership and Power in Nineteenth-Century Ireland: The Decline of an Elite," in Gibson, Ralph and Blinkhorn, Martin (eds.), *Landownership and Power in Modern Europe* (London: HarperCollins Academic, 1991), pp. 164-180.
- Hull, Katherine L., "To Drain and to Cultivate: Agriculture and 'Improvement' at Ballykilcline," in Orser, Jr., Charles E. (ed.), *Unearthing Hidden Ireland: Historical Archaeology at Ballykillcline, County Roscommon* (Bray: Wordwell, 2006).
- Jackson, Alvin, "Irish Unionism, 1870-1922," in Boyce, D. George and O'Day, Alan (eds.), *Defenders of the Union: A Survey of British and Irish Unionism Since 1801* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 115-136.
- Jackson, Alvin, "Loyalists and Unionists," in Jackson, Alvin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 45-64.
- James, Francis G., "Irish Colonial Trade in the Eighteenth Century," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (1963), pp. 574-584.
- Jenkins, Brian, "William Gregory: Champion of the Confederacy," *History Today*, Vol. 28 (1978), pp. 322-330.
- Johnson, Walter, "On Agency," *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2003), pp. 113-124.
- Joyner, Charles, "Elizabeth Allston Pringle: A Woman Rice Planter," in Spruill, Marjorie Julian, Littlefield, Valinda W., and Johnson, Joan Marjorie (eds.), *South Carolina Women: Their Lives and Times, Vol. 1* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009), pp. 184-213.
- Kaye, Anthony E., "The Second Slavery: Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century South and the Atlantic World," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 75, No. 3 (Aug., 2009), pp. 627-650.
- Kelly, James, "'Era of Liberty': The Politics of Civil and Political Rights in Eighteenth-Century Ireland," in Greene, Jack P. (ed.), *Exclusionary Empire: English Liberty Overseas, 1600-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 77-111.
- Kelly, James, "Parliamentary Reform in Irish Politics, 1760-90," in Dickson, David, Keogh, Dáire, and Whelan, Kevin (ed.), *The United Irishmen: Republicanism, Radicalism and Rebellion* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1993), pp. 74-87.
- Kelly, James, "We Were All to Have Been Massacred: Irish Protestants and the Experience of Rebellion," in Bartlett, Thomas, Dickson, David, Keogh, Dáire, and Whelan, Kevin

- (eds.), *1798: A Bicentenary Perspective* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), pp. 312-330.
- Kelly, Matthew, "Home Rule and Its Enemies," in Jackson, Alvin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 582-602.
- Kerber, Linda, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Women's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," in Kerber, Linda K. (ed.), *Toward an Intellectual History of Women: Essays* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), pp. 159-199.
- Kinealy, Christine and O'Riordan, Tomás, "Private Responses to the Great Famine: Documents," in Ó'Corráin, Donnchadh and O'Riordan, Tomás (eds.), *Ireland, 1815-70: Emancipation, Famine and Religion* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), pp. 95-128.
- Kolchin, Peter, "The American South in Comparative Perspective," in Dal Lago, Enrico and Halpern, Rick (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 26-59.
- Kolchin, Peter, "The South and the World," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 75, No. 3 (Aug., 2009), pp. 565-579.
- Kulikoff, Allan, "A 'Prolifick' People: Black Population Growth in the Chesapeake Colonies, 1700-1790," *Southern Studies*, Vol. 16 (1977), pp. 391-428.
- Lammey, David, "The Growth of the "Patriot Opposition" in Ireland during the 1770s," *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 7 (1988), pp. 257-281.
- Large, David, "The House of Lords and Ireland in the Age of Peel, 1832-50," in Jones, Clyve and Jones, David Lewis (eds.), *Peers, Politics and Power: The House of Lords, 1603-1911* (London: Hambledon Press, 1986), pp. 373-406.
- Large, David, "The Wealth of the Greater Irish Landowners, 1750-1815," *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 15 (Mar., 1966), pp. 21-47.
- Lee, Joseph, "Patterns of Rural Unrest in Nineteenth-Century Ireland: A Preliminary Survey," in Cullen, L.M. and Furet, Francois (eds.), *Ireland and France, 17th-20th Centuries: Towards a Comparative Study of Rural History* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1980), pp. 223-237.
- Lee, Joseph, "The Provision of Capital for Early Irish Railways, 1830-53," *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 61 (Mar., 1968), pp. 33-63.
- Lee, Joseph, "The Ribbonmen," in Williams, T. Desmond (ed.), *Secret Societies in Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1973), pp. 26-35.
- Levine, Bruce, "Modernity, Backwardness, and Capitalism in the Two Souths," Dal Lago,

- Enrico and Halpern, Rick (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 233-240.
- Lichtenstein, Alex, "That Disposition to Theft, With Which They Have Been Branded: Moral Economy, Slave Management, and the Law," *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 21 (Spring 1988), pp. 413-440.
- Littlefield, Daniel C., "Colonial and Revolutionary United States," in Paquette, Robert L. and Smith, Mark M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 201-226.
- Livesey, James, "A Kingdom of Cosmopolitan Improvers: The Dublin Society, 1731-1798," in Stapelbroek, Koen and Marjanen, Jani (eds.), *The Rise of Economic Societies in the Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 52-72.
- Luddy, Maria, "Women and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Ireland," in Valiulus, Maryann Gialanella and O'Dowd, Mary (eds.), *Women and Irish History: Essays in Honour of Margaret MacCurtain* (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1997), pp. 89-108.
- MacDonagh, Oliver, "Economy and Society, 1830-45," in Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 5: Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 218-241.
- Maginn, Christopher, "'Surrender and Regrant' in the Historiography of Sixteenth-Century Ireland," *Sixteenth-Century Journal*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (2007), pp. 955-974.
- Malcomson, A.P.W., "Absenteeism in Eighteenth-Century Ireland," *Irish Economic and Social History*, Vol. 1 (1974), pp. 15-35.
- Martin, F.X., "Diarmait Mac Murchada and the Coming of the Anglo-Normans," in Cosgrove, Art (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. II, Medieval Ireland, 1169-1534* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993 [1987]), pp. 43-66.
- May, Robert E., "John A. Quitman and His Slaves: Reconciling Slave Resistance with the Proslavery Defense," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 46, No. 4 (Nov., 1980), pp. 551-570.
- May, Robert E., "John A. Quitman and the Southern Martial Spirit," *Journal of Mississippi History*, Vol. 49 (May 1979), pp. 155-181.
- May, Robert E., "Psychobiography and Secession: The Southern Radical as Maladjusted 'Outsider,'" *Civil War History*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (March 1988), pp. 46-69.
- May, Robert E., "Southern Elite Women, Sectional Extremism, and the Male Political Sphere: The Case of John A. Quitman's Wife and Female Descendants, 1847-1931," *Journal of Mississippi History*, Vol. 50 (November, 1988), pp. 251-285.
- McBride, Ian, "The Common Name of Irishman: Protestantism and Patriotism in Eighteenth-

- Century Ireland,” in Claydon, Tony and McBride, Ian (eds.), *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-c. 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 236-263.
- McCardell, John, “John A. Quitman and the Compromise of 1850 in Mississippi,” *Journal of Mississippi History*, Vol. 37 (August 1975), pp. 239-266.
- McDaniel, W. Caleb, “Repealing Unions: American Abolitionists, Irish Repeal, and the Origins of Garrisonian Disunionism,” *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Summer, 2008), pp. 243-269.
- McDonald, Roderick A., “Independent Economic Production by Slaves on Antebellum Louisiana Sugar Plantations,” in Berlin, Ira and Morgan, Philip D. (eds.), *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993), pp. 275-299.
- McDonough, Terrence and Slater, Eamonn, “Colonialism, Feudalism and the Mode of Production in Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” in McDonough, Terrence (ed.), *Was Ireland A Colony? Economics, Politics and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2005), pp. 27-45.
- McDowell, R.B., “The Age of the United Irishmen: Reform and Reaction, 1789-94,” in Moody, T.W. and Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 4, The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 289-338.
- McDowell, R.B., “The Age of the United Irishmen: Revolution and the Union, 1794-1800,” in Moody, T.W. and Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 4, The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 339-373.
- McDowell, R.B., “Colonial Nationalism and the Winning of Parliamentary Independence, 1760-82,” in Moody, T.W. and Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 4, The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 196-235.
- McDowell, Robert B., “Parliamentary Independence, 1782-9,” in Moody, T.W. and Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 4, The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 265-288.
- McEntee, Joanne, “Pecuniary Assistance for Poverty and Emigration: The Politics of Irish Landed Estate Management and Philanthropy in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” in Geary, Laurence M. and Walsh, Oonagh (eds.), *Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015), pp. 115-132.
- McGrath, Charles Ivar, “Securing the Protestant Interest: The Origins and Purpose of the Penal Laws of 1695,” *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 117 (May, 1996), pp. 25-46.

- McKenna, Kevin, "Charity, Paternalism and Power on the Clonbrock Estates, County Galway, 1834-44," in Geary, Laurence M. and Walsh, Oonagh (eds.), *Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015), pp. 97-114.
- McKenna, Kevin, "Elites, Ritual, and the Legitimation of Power on an Irish Landed Estate, 1855-90," in O'Neill, Ciaran (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), pp. 68-82.
- McLendon, James H., "Ancestry, Early Life, and Education of John A. Quitman," *Journal of Mississippi History*, Vol. 10 (1948), pp. 271-89.
- McLendon, James H., "John A. Quitman, Fire-Eating Governor," *Journal of Mississippi History*, Vol. 15 (Apr., 1953), pp. 73-89.
- McMichael, Philip, "Incorporating Comparison Within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 55, No. 3 (Jun., 1990), pp. 385-397.
- McNally, Patrick, "Ireland: The Making of the 'Protestant Ascendancy,' 1690-1760," in Dickinson, H.T. (ed.), *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), pp. 403-413.
- McNamara, Conor, "'The Monster Misery of Ireland': Landlord Paternalism and the 1822 Famine in the West," in Geary, Laurence M. and Walsh, Oonagh (eds.), *Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015), pp. 82-96.
- McNamara, Conor, "This Wretched People: The Famine of 1822 in the West of Ireland," in King, Carla and McNamara, Conor (eds.), *The West of Ireland: New Perspectives on the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: History Press Ireland, 2011), pp. 1-34.
- Melton, Edgar, "Manorialism and Rural Subjection in East Central Europe, 1500-1800," in Eltis, David and Engerman, Stanley L. (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Vol. 3: AD 1420-AD 1804* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 297-322.
- Menard, Russell R., "From Servants to Slaves: The Transformation of the Chesapeake Labor System," *Southern Studies*, Vol. 16 (1977), pp. 355-390.
- Menard, Russell R., "The Africanization of the Lowcountry Labor Force, 1670-1730," in Jordan, Winthrop D. and Skemp, Sheila L. (eds.), *Race and Family in the Colonial South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1987), pp. 81-108.
- Metzer, Jacob, "Rational Management, Modern Business Practices, and Economies of Scale in Antebellum Southern Plantations," in Fogel, Robert W. and Engerman, Stanley L. (eds.), *Without Consent or Contract: Technical Papers, Vol. 1, Markets and Production* (New York: Norton, 1992), pp. 191-215.

- Miller, Michael, "Comparative and Cross-National History: Approaches, Differences, Problems," in Cohen, Deborah and O'Connor, Maura (eds.), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 115-132.
- Miller, Steven F., "Plantation Labor Organization and Slave Life on the Cotton Frontier: The Alabama-Mississippi Black Belt, 1815-1840," in Berlin, Ira and Morgan, Philip D. (eds.), *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993), pp. 155-169.
- Mintz, Sidney W., "The So-Called World System: Local Initiative and Local Response," *Dialectical Anthropology*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (November 1977), pp. 253-270.
- Mokyr, Joel, "Uncertainty and Pre-Famine Irish Agriculture," in Devine, T.M. And Dickson, David (eds.), *Ireland and Scotland, 1600-1850: Parallels and Contrasts in Economic and Social Development* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1983), pp. 89-101.
- Moody, T.W., "The Treatment of the Native Populations Under the Scheme for the Plantation in Ulster," *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 1 (1938), pp. 59-63.
- Moore, Jason W., "Sugar and the Expansion of the Early Modern World-Economy: Commodity Frontiers, Ecological Transformation, and Industrialization," *Review*, Vol. 23, No. 3, (2000), pp. 409-33.
- Moore, John Hebron, "Cotton Breeding in the Old South," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Jul., 1956), pp. 95-104.
- Morgan, Edmund S., "The Labor Problem at Jamestown, 1607-18," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 76, No. 3 (Jun., 1971), pp. 595-611.
- Morgan, Philip D., "Two Infant Slave Societies in the Chesapeake and the Lowcountry," in Halpern, Rick and Dal Lago, Enrico (eds.), *Slavery and Emancipation* (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), pp. 18-34.
- Morris, Christopher, "An Event in Community Organization: The Mississippi Slave Insurrection Scare of 1835," *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 22 (Fall, 1988), pp. 93-111.
- Muldoon, James, "The Indian as Irishman," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, Vol. 3 (Oct., 1975), pp. 267-89.
- Nash, R.C., "Irish Atlantic Trade in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (Jul., 1985), pp. 329-356.
- Nelson, Scott Reynolds, "Who Put Their Capitalism in My Slavery?" *Journal of the Civil War Era*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Jun., 2015), pp. 289-310.
- Newby, Howard, "The Deferential Dialectic," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Apr., 1975), pp. 139-164.

- Newby, Howard, "Paternalism and Capitalism," in Scase, Richard (ed.), *Industrial Society: Class, Cleavage, and Control* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977), pp. 59-73.
- Oakes, James, "The Peculiar Fate of the Bourgeois Critique of Slavery," in Jordan, Winthrop D. and Gordon-Reed, Annette (eds.), *Slavery and the American South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2003), pp. 29-48.
- Ó'Gráda, Cormac, "Industry and Communications, 1801-45," in Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 5: Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 137-157.
- Ó'Gráda, Cormac, "The Investment Behaviour of Irish Landlords, 1850-75: Some Preliminary Findings," *Agricultural History Review*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (1975), pp. 139-155.
- Ó'Gráda, Cormac, "Poverty, Population, and Agriculture, 1801-45," in Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland, Vol. 5: Ireland Under the Union, 1801-70* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 108-133.
- Ó'Hanracháin, Tadhg, "Plantation, 1580-1641," in Jackson, Alvin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 291-314.
- Ohlmeyer, Jane H., "Making Ireland English: The Seventeenth-Century Irish Peerage," in MacCuarta (ed.), *Reshaping Ireland, 1590-1700: Colonization and Its Consequences: Essays Presented to Nicholas Canny* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), pp. 131-146.
- Olmstead, Alan L. and Rhode, Paul, "Biological Innovation and Productivity Growth in the Antebellum Cotton Economy," *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 68 (2008), pp. 1123-1171.
- Olwell, Robert, "'Domestik Enemies': Slavery and Political Independence in South Carolina, May 1775-March 1776," *Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 55 (1989), pp. 21-48.
- O'Neill, Timothy P., "Minor Famines and Famine Relief in County Galway, 1815-25," in Moran, Gerard (ed.), *Galway History and Society: Interdisciplinary Essays on the History of an Irish County* (Dublin: Geography Publications, 1996), pp. 445-485.
- Onuf, Peter S., "Antebellum Southerners and the National Idea," in Barnes, L. Diane, Schoen, Brian, and Towers, Frank (eds.), *The Old South's Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 25-46.
- O'Riordan, Maeve, "Assuming Control: Elite Women as Household Managers in Late Nineteenth-Century Ireland," in O'Neill, Ciaran (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), pp. 83-98.

- Petrusewicz, Marta, "Ex-Centric Europe: Visions and Practices of Harmonious Modernization in the 19th-Century European Peripheries (Ireland, Norway, Poland and Two Sicilies)," in Giuliani, Luca and Grimm, Dieter (eds.), *Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin Jahrbuch 2006/07* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008), pp. 278-293.
- Petrusewicz, Marta, "Land-Based Modernization and the Culture of Nineteenth-Century Landed Elites," in Dal Lago, Enrico and Halpern, Rick (eds.), *The American South and the Italian Mezzogiorno: Essays in Comparative History* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 95-111.
- Petrusewicz, Marta, "The Modernity of the European Periphery; Ireland, Poland and the Two Sicilies, 1820-1870: Parallel and Connected, Distinct and Comparable," in Cohen, Deborah and O'Connor, Maura (eds.), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 145-164.
- Potter, David M., "The Historian's Use of Nationalism and Vice Versa," in Potter, David M., *The South and the Sectional Conflict* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968), pp. 34-83.
- Quigley, Paul, "Secessionists in an Age of Secession: The Slave South in Transatlantic Perspective," in Doyle, Don H. (ed.), *Secession as an International Phenomenon: From America's Civil War to Contemporary Separatist Movements* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010), pp. 151-173.
- Quinn, David Beers, "Ireland and Sixteenth-Century European Expansion," *Historical Studies*, Vol. 1 (1958), pp. 20-32.
- Quinn, David Beers, "The Munster Plantation: Problems and Opportunities," *Journal of the Cork Archaeological and Historical Society*, Vol. 71 (1966), pp. 19-40.
- Ranger, Terrence O., "Richard Boyle and the Making of an Irish Fortune," *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 10 (1957), pp. 257-297.
- Riach, Douglas C., "Daniel O'Connell and American Anti-Slavery," *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 77 (Mar., 1976), pp. 3-25.
- Richards, Eric, "The Land Agent," in Mingay, G.E. (ed.), *The Victorian Countryside, Vol. 2* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), pp. 439-456.
- Ridden, Jennifer, "Britishness as an Imperial and Diasporic Identity: Irish Elite Perspectives, c. 1820s-1870s," in Gray, Peter (ed.), *Victoria's Ireland? Irishness and Britishness, 1837-1901* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), pp. 88-105.
- Robinson, William I., "Globalization and the Sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A Critical Appraisal," *International Sociology*, Vol. 26 (2011), pp. 1-23.
- Roebuck, Peter, "The Economic Situation and Functions of Substantial Landowners, 1600-

- 1815: Ulster and Lowland Scotland Compared,” in Mitchison, Rosalind and Roebuck, Peter (eds.), *Economy and Society in Scotland and Ireland, 1500-1939* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988), pp. 81-92.
- Rose, Willie Lee, “The Domestication of Domestic Slavery,” in Freehling, William W. (ed.), *Slavery and Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 18-36.
- Rosengarten, Theodore, “The *Southern Agriculturalist* in an Age of Reform,” in O’Brien, Michael and Moltke-Hansen, David (eds.), *Intellectual Life in Antebellum Charleston* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1986), pp. 279-294.
- Rothstein, Morton, “The Changing Social Networks and Investment Behavior of a Slaveholding Elite in the Antebellum South: Some Natchez Nabobs, 1800-1860,” in Greenfield, Sidney M., Stricken, Arnold, and Aubey, Robert T. (eds.), *Entrepreneurs in Cultural Context* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979), pp. 65-84.
- Rothstein, Morton, “The Natchez Nabobs: Kinship and Friendship in an Economic Elite,” in Trefousse, Hans L. (ed.), *Toward a New View of America: Essays in Honor of Arthur C. Cole* (New York: Ayer Publishing, 1977), pp. 97-111.
- Ryan, David, “Ribbonism and Agrarian Violence in County Galway, 1819-1820,” *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, Vol. 52 (2000), pp. 120-134.
- Schoen, Brian, “The Burdens and Opportunities of Interdependence: The Political Economies of the Planter Class,” in Barnes, L. Diane, Schoen, Brian, and Towers, Frank (eds.), *The Old South’s Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 66-84.
- Scott, Pauline, “Rural Radicals or Mercenary Men? Resistance to Evictions on the Glinsk/Creggs Estate of Allan Pollock,” in Casey, Brian (ed.), *Defying the Law of the Land: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin: History Press Ireland, 2013), pp. 65-79.
- Shammas, Carole, “English-Born and Creole Elites in Turn-of-the-Century Virginia,” in Tate, Thad W. and Ammerman, David L., *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), pp. 274-296.
- Simms, J.G., “The Establishment of Protestant Ascendancy, 1691-1714,” in Moody, T.W. and Vaughan, W.E. (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Vol. 4, The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 1-30.
- Skocpol, Theda and Somers, Margaret, “The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial

- Inquiry,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Apr., 1980), pp. 174-197.
- Slater, Eamonn and McDonough, Terrence, “Bulwark of Landlordism and Capitalism: The Dynamics of Feudalism in Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” *Research in Political Economy*, Vol. 14 (1994), pp. 63-119.
- Sidbury, James, “Resistance to Slavery,” in Heuman, Gad and Burnard, Trevor (eds.), *The Routledge History of Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 2011), pp. 204-219.
- Small, Stephen, “The Twisted Roots of Irish Patriotism: Anglo-Irish Political Thought in the Late Eighteenth Century,” *Eire-Ireland*, Vol. 35 (2001), pp. 187-216.
- Smith, Cathal, “Apostles of Agricultural Reform: The Ballinasloe Agricultural Improvement Society in an Era of High Farming and Famine, 1840-1850,” *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, Vol. 64 (2012), pp. 128-145.
- Smith, Cathal, “Second Slavery, Second Landlordism, and Modernity: A Comparison of Antebellum Mississippi and Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” *Journal of the Civil War Era*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Jun., 2015), pp. 204-230.
- Smith, Mark M., “Old South Time in Comparative Perspective,” *American Historical Review*, Vol. 101, No. 5 (1996), pp. 1432-1469.
- Smyth, William J., “The Western Isle of Ireland and the English Seaboard of America: England’s First Frontiers,” *Irish Geography*, Vol. 11 (1978), pp. 1-22.
- Snell, K.D.M., “Deferential Bitterness: The Social Outlook of the Rural Proletariat in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century England and Wales,” in Bush, Michael L. (ed.), *Social Orders and Social Classes in Europe Since 1500: Studies in Social Stratification* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 158-184.
- Solar, Peter, “Shipping and Economic Development in Nineteenth-Century Ireland,” *Economic History Review*, Vol. 59 (2006), pp. 717-742.
- Solow, Barbara L., “Slavery and Colonization,” in Solow, Barbara L. (ed.), *Slavery and the Rise of the Atlantic System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 21-42.
- Spence, Joseph, “Isaac Butt, Irish Nationality and the Conditional Defense of the Union, 1833-70,” in Boyce, D. George and O’Day, Alan (eds.), *Defenders of the Union: A Survey of British and Irish Unionism Since 1801* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 65-89.
- Steinfeld, Robert J., “Changing Legal Conceptions of Free Labor,” in Engerman, Stanley L. (ed.), *Terms of Labor: Slavery, Serfdom, and Free Labor* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), pp. 137-167.

- Steinfeld, Robert J. and Engerman, Stanley L., "Labor, Free or Coerced? A Historical Reassessment of Differences and Similarities," in Brass, Tom and Van Der Linden, Marcel (eds.), *Free and Unfree Labor: The Debate Continues* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), pp. 107-126.
- Stowe, Steven M., "Rhetoric of Authority: The Making of Social Values in Planter Family Correspondence," *Journal of Family History*, Vol. 73 (Mar., 1987), pp. 916-933.
- Tadman, Michael, "The Persistent Myth of Paternalism: Historians and the Nature of Master-Slave Relations in the American South," *Sage Race Relations*, Vol. 23 (1998), pp. 7-23.
- Thomas, Brinley, "Food Supply in the United Kingdom During the Industrial Revolution," in Mokyr, Joel (ed.), *The Economics of the Industrial Revolution* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1985), pp. 137-150.
- Thomas, William G., "'Swerve Me?': The South, Railroads, and the Rush to Modernity," in Barnes, L. Diane, Schoen, Brian, and Towers, Frank (eds.), *The Old South's Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 166-188.
- Thompson, E.P., "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present*, No. 50 (Feb., 1971), pp. 76-136.
- Tomich, Dale W., "The 'Second Slavery': Bonded Labour and the Transformation of the Nineteenth-Century World Economy," in Raimrez, Francisco O. (ed.), *Rethinking the Nineteenth Century: Contradictions and Movements* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), pp. 103-117.
- Tomich, Dale W. and Zeuske, Michael, "Introduction, The Second Slavery: Mass Slavery, World Economy, and Comparative Microhistories," *Review*, Vol. 31, No.2 (2008), pp. 91-100.
- Touchstone, Blake, "Planters and Slave Religion in the Deep South," in Boles, John B. (ed.), *Masters and Slaves in the House of the Lord: Race and Religion in the American South, 1740-1870* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988), pp. 99-126.
- Tyrrell, Ian, "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 96, No. 4 (Oct., 1991), pp. 1031-1055.
- Tyrrell, Ian, "Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History," in Bender, Thomas (ed.), *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), pp. 168-192.
- Vaughan, W.E., "An Assessment of the Economic Performance of Irish Landlords, 1851-81,"

- in Lyons, F.S.L. and Hawkins, R.A.J. (eds.), *Ireland Under The Union: Varieties of Tension, Essays in Honour of T.W. Moody* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), pp. 173-199.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, "American Slavery and the Capitalist World-Economy," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 81, No. 5 (Mar., 1976), pp. 1199-1213.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (1974), pp. 387-415.
- Walsh, Lorena S., "Slave Work, Slave Life, and Tobacco Production in the Tidewater Chesapeake, 1620-1820," in Berlin, Ira and Morgan, Philip (eds.), *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993), pp. 170-200.
- Walsh, Lorena S., "Slavery in the North American Mainland Colonies," in Eltis, David and Engerman, Stanley L. (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery, Vol. 3: AD 1420-AD 1804* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 407-430.
- Walther, Eric H., "Honorable and Useful Ambition: John A. Quitman," in Walther, Eric H., *The Fire-Eaters* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992), pp. 83-111.
- Wood, Betty, "The Origins of Slavery in the Americas, 1500-1700," in Heuman, Gad and Burnard, Trevor (eds.), *The Routledge History of Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 2011), pp. 64-79.
- Wood, Peter H., "'More Like a Negro Country': Demographic Patterns in Colonial South Carolina, 1700-1740," in Engerman, Stanley L. and Genovese, Eugene D. (eds.), *Race and Slavery in the Western Hemisphere: Quantitative Studies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 131-169.
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram, "The Mask of Obedience: Male Slave Psychology in the Old South," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 93 (1988), pp. 1228-1252.
- York, Neil Longley, "The Impact of the American Revolution in Ireland," in Dickinson, Harry T. (ed.), *Britain and the American Revolution* (New York: Longman, 1998), pp. 205-232.
- Young, Jeffrey Robert, "Proslavery Ideology," in Paquette, Robert L. and Smith, Mark M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Slavery in the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 399-423.
- Zeuske, Michael, "Comparing or Interlinking? Economic Comparisons of the Early Nineteenth-Century Slave Systems in the Americas in Historical Perspective," in Dal Lago, Enrico and Katsari, Constantina (eds.), *Slave Systems: Ancient and Modern*

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 148-183.

Zuckerman, Michael, "Identity in British America: Unease in Eden," in Canny, Nicholas and Pagden, Anthony (eds.), *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 115-159.

Unpublished Dissertations, Theses, and Manuscripts

Casey, Brian, "Land, Politics and Religion on the Clancarty Estate, East Galway, 1851-1914," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011).

Cunningham, Johanna, "An Idle and Deeply Fashionable Life? A Catholic Gentry Family and their World, 1820-1923," (M.A. thesis, National University of Ireland, Galway, 2008).

Dillon-Mahon, Edith, "The Dillons of Clonbrock," (Unpublished Manuscript, National Library of Ireland, Dublin, 1957).

McEntee, Joanne, "The State and the Landed Estate: Order and Shifting Power Relations in Ireland, 1815-1891," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Galway, 2012).

McKenna, Kevin, "Power, Resistance and Ritual: Paternalism on the Clonbrock Estates, 1826-1908," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 2011).

McLendon, James H., "John A. Quitman," (PhD diss., University of Texas, 1949).

O'Riordan, Maeve, "Home, Family and Society: Women of the Irish Landed Class, 1860-1914. A Munster Case Study," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Cork, 2014).

O'Sullivan, John, "Landlord-Tenant Relations on the Clonbrock Estate in Galway, 1849-93," (M.A. thesis, National University of Ireland, Maynooth, 1997).

Pole, Adam, "Landlord Responses to the Irish Land War, 1879-82," (PhD diss., Trinity College Dublin, 2006).

Regan, Joe, "Irish Immigrants in the Rural U.S. Slave South," (PhD diss., National University of Ireland, Galway, 2015).

Ridden, Jennifer, "'Making Good Citizens': National Identity, Religion, and Liberalism Among the Irish Elite, c. 1800-1850," (PhD diss., King's College London, 1998).

Smith, Cathal, "A Tale of Two Estates: A Comparison of Thomas Redington's and Major Denis Mahon's Elite Ideologies and their Estate Management Practices in the Mid-Nineteenth Century," (M.A. thesis, National University of Ireland, Galway, 2009).

Snow, Eric V., "Who Was Better Off? A Comparison of American Slaves and English Agricultural Workers, 1750-1875," (M.A. thesis, Michigan State University, 1997).

White, Dean Gunter, "The Tudor Plantations in Ireland Before 1571," (PhD diss., Trinity College Dublin, 1968).