

# CHERAW GAZETTE

AND

## PEE DEE FARMER.

VOLUME IV.

CHERAW, SOUTH-CAROLINA, FRIDAY EVENING, JULY 26, 1839.

NUMBER XXXVII.

W. J. JACOBY,  
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

### TERMS:

If paid within three months, . . . \$3 00  
If paid within three months after the  
close of the year, . . . . . 3 50  
If paid within twelve months after the  
close of the year, . . . . . 4 00  
If not paid within that time, . . . 5 00

A company of ten persons taking the paper at the same Post Office, shall be entitled to it at \$25 provided the names be forwarded together, and accompanied by the money.

The paper is discontinued but at the option of the subscriber, if arrangements are paid.

Advertisements not exceeding sixteen lines, inserted for one dollar the first time, and fifty cents, each subsequent insertion.

Persons sending in advertisements are requested to specify the number of times they are to be inserted; otherwise they will be continued till ordered out, and charged accordingly.

The Postage must be paid on all communications.

### Hint in Transplanting.

The common error in transplanting trees, is not making the holes, or pits, for their reception sufficiently broad and deep. The roots require a mellow soil to strike down and horizontally in; and if the earth under and around them is left undisturbed and hard, they can not extend themselves for food, or but very slowly; the plant consequently grows but slowly, if it survives.—The following experiment, made by M. Chalmer, illustrates the importance of this hint. The hole should not be proportioned to the extent of the roots as they are, but to their extent as they may be and should be.

"Four peach trees, resembling each other as to size and vigor of growth, as much as possible, were planted. No. 1 in a hole three feet square; No. 2 in a hole two feet square, and Nos. 3 and 4 in holes eighteen inches square. The soil and exposition similar. No. 1 has every year given the most abundant crops, and the relative sizes of the trees are now as follows: the stem of No. 1, 18 feet high and 8 inches in circumference; that of No. 2, 9 feet high and 5 1-2 inches in circumference; No. 3, 6 feet high and 3 inches 6 lines in circumference; and No. 4, 5 1-2 feet high and 3 inches in circumference."

Showing a difference between No. 1 and No. 4—between large holes and small holes—of five inches in circumference, and 12 1-2 feet in height. Apple, pear and forest trees generally having a larger spread of roots than the peach, require proportionally larger holes.

From the South Carolinian.  
Old Field Cotton, &c.

Mr. Editor.—It is a common practice with most of our planters to put their fresh or best lands in cotton, for that very obvious reason, that that staple requires good land to make it produce profitably, while by planting their poor or worn-out lands in cotton, which may be easily manured, they may cause it to produce in a proportionate degree. It is not my purpose to condemn this system, but rather to suggest a mode that in some instances may supersede it, and be of equal or greater advantage to the farmer, at least so far as to reserve more of his good land for corn. Travelling some years ago through the middle part of Georgia, I had occasion to stop a few days at the house of a thriving and hospitable planter, residing on the Ogeechee river. During my stay, he took occasion to show me his plantation, which consisted of pine land, lying very well, and a small portion of hammock on the river. In many of his fields, not a tree and very few stumps even, were to be seen. But the cotton was growing very luxuriantly on one of them, of pine land. I of course concluded that it had been manured, and that well, though at a loss to conjecture the means he had used to manure so large a space for cotton. Judge my surprise, when he informed me he had not put a particle of manure on it for many years—not since he commenced planting it in cotton. He then stated that he had pursued the following system in planting cotton upon his old lands: He had previously listed his field for cotton during the winter, whenever opportunities offered by throwing three furrows together—the rows being laid off three or three feet and a half apart. The first year, of course, he opened and planted his seed in the centre of the ridge, and tended the crop accordingly; which, he observed to me, was a very poor one: the stalks not growing generally, more than "half-leg high," as he expressed it, or about twelve or fourteen inches; and the best not more than knee high. The next spring, when ready to plant again, instead of listing his ground in the "step," or between the rows, as is usual, where land is successively planted in the same kind of produce, he merely ran a furrow on the old ridge, along side of the former row of cotton, after beating down the old stalks—and without tearing up any more of them than can be avoided. The experiment, in due season began to promise very fair. The cotton all over the field that year averaged knee high, or more. He pursued the same plan the next year, running perhaps the furrow on the side opposite to the one where he had run it the year previous, but on the same ridge. The result was an increase in the growth of the cotton plant, as well as in the product—and he continued the same process each succeeding year, and when I saw the field, which was

in the latter part of the summer, the stalks were nearly three feet high, and very well formed. It was perhaps the fifth or sixth year he had been planting in that manner.

I have never had an opportunity of testing, myself the virtue of this system, but do not doubt that it is a very good one. It is evident that there is much matter in the roots of the cotton stalks to produce manure—and it may be that the soil of the bed being unexposed to the sun, may improve, and retain nutriment much longer. I have merely made this suggestion with the hope that it may be improved, as there are many farmers who plant very poor and old lands in cotton, without manure, and a trial of it can be of no injury. The labor is nothing more, and if any thing less, as it saves at least half the ploughing, necessary before planting. It may be proper to add, that the greatest and I may say the only inconvenience attending the cultivation of a crop in this manner, is the thinning of it out—the stems of the old stalks being in the way of the hoe; but with a little more than common care, this may be obviated.

I will state as a corroborating fact, in support of this system, and an experiment which suggested itself to me, after hearing what I have stated. I planted in corn, an old field, which had lain out many years. It produced but a very ordinary crop, though well tended, and experiencing good seasons. The following year, when ready to plant the same field, I run a furrow through the same hills, without even tilling, and dropped the corn in the old hills. I gathered that year upwards of one third more from the same field. The field was planted four feet square, one stalk in each hill.

From the Southern Agriculturist.  
Emigration.

Mr. Editor.—There are few of us who have not relatives or friends that have emigrated to the West, and whose flattering accounts of that region do not render us uneasy, not to say unhappy at our situation here. Many of us have been there ourselves, and their deep rich soil, their luxuriant fields, their boundless discourses of hundreds of thousands and of millions, have seldom failed to make us look back with absolute contempt upon our barren and spiritless land. With imaginations fired by the glow which rests and shines on every thing around, many purchase at once, and return home to pull up stakes and abandon all the endearing associations of infancy, youth and manhood, for the glorious prospect of unbounded wealth in more favored climes. If any come back to look once more upon his own fields before he determines to give them up forever, and the lapse of time, the change of scene, the comforts of home and friends, wear away his first vivid impression, and deprive him of the resolution to go—still, in most instances, the thorn rankles in his bosom, and he feels that he has made an immense sacrifice to his unfortunate attachment to the spot where an unkind destiny has cast his lot. Most probably he yet hopes, at some future period, to break away, and look upon the soil and situations of his father scarcely as his own—certainly as not his children's. I invite all such, and all who from the accounts of others may be troubled with this fell spirit of emigration to follow me in the calculation I am about to make, by which I hope to convince them that the difference is not so great as perhaps they imagine. But first, in the light pine lands, two acres more of let them look around and scan more narrowly the circumstances of those whom they so much envy. I do not ask them to look at men who left us with reputations impaired or broken fortunes. To such men, almost any change is for the better, because it gives new habits, new energies, and above all, new hopes. Their gain is not to be easily estimated—it is moral rather than physical. But look at those who left here "well to do at home," to better their condition. Count their slaves, count their acres, count their children—the noblest portion of their wealth. I do not ask you to count their friends, or to trace the connections which these children may have formed, or to enumerate those sad hours which bear them back to their native land. But ask them how much clear money they have on hand each year after all is paid, and then inquire how much property they can purchase with it. If you can perceive no great accession to their visible wealth or comforts; if your number no more slaves, and have no broader lands bought and paid for, what avails any high imaginary value, which in conformity with the fashion of that country, they may place on what they have; and how much sweeter are the bought and barren luxuries of a foreign land, because purchased with more money. Let me ask them to do one thing more if it is in their power, to go and inquire of their friends or relatives, if laying aside all affection, and speaking in the honest sincerity of their hearts, they do not wish they had never left their native State—nay, if they do not yet indulge the hope, vague perhaps, but very comforting of one day returning thither.

But to my calculations. I do not desire to appeal to feelings, but to the interest, and to show that the course which the heart so naturally dictates, the understanding may justly sanction.

I will assume that every ordinary cotton planter in this State can plant to each full task hand, ten acres of cotton and eight acres of corn, potatoes, &c. The quantity and the proportions vary I know. In the stiff up-country soil they may plant less;

each are frequently planted. In fact most of the middle country planters cultivate eleven or twelve acres of cotton, make provisions, and in the corresponding region in Georgia, fifteen acres of cotton, besides corn, is not extraordinary. If there is any one who can not cultivate ten acres of cotton and raise an ample supply of provisions, he does not understand his business or does not give it his attention, without which no business can prosper, and he should change his occupation or his habits, or—emigrate.

I will assume that each acre will produce 125 lbs. of ginned cotton. If it will not do this, under the system of resting, I shall recommend and base my calculations on, it is not worth cultivating, and while there is as much land in this State, in almost every section of it, to be had on such moderate terms, which will produce this much, he has no excuse for cultivating it. I say ginned cotton, because the moment you begin to estimate the product in cotton in the seed, you are in the skies. As our cotton is usually weighed wet and dry, basket and trash, by overseers and drivers, with all sorts of steel yards, no planter can tell what amount he is to sell, even if he keeps a statement of his pickings, much less can he form any idea from seeing the cotton in the field. I always inquire how much ginned cotton an acre will produce?—how much ginned cotton a hand will make? It would be nearly as satisfactory to know how many piles of rails he can split, as how many bags he makes. According to this estimate, a full task hand will bring into the market 1250 lbs. of cotton. He is not, however, a first rate planter who does not make 1,500 lbs. on land that will produce 125 lbs. per acre. I know many planters in this State who make more—and he who does not make at least 1,250 lbs. may be sure that there is something radically wrong about his business, which, if he cannot correct, he is not suited to the occupation. To plant, however, with success, and make this product moderate as it is, perfectly sure, every one planting in light and thin lands should have twice as much open land, as he can cultivate, so that he can rest every other year, or plant two and rest two, which perhaps is preferable. He should therefore have thirty-six acres of open land for every hand, to which I will add, say fourteen acres of woodland, which will be amply sufficient for every purpose, and will make the aggregate quantity of land per hand, fifty acres. No planter should have more. I know that many do, not only here but at the West and every where else. One wants an outlet here or there—another is avaricious of all the privileges of his neighborhood—others think "land is safe property," and others again are ambitious of owning large landed estates. This is bad economy, and paying a heavy tribute to pride. There is nothing so expensive as dead real estate, and numbers who dabber themselves of many of the comforts of life, seem never to reflect on the thousands which they annually lose in interest on idle lands. It is vain for us here to purchase and hold lands, expecting their value to appreciate. The spirit of that sort of speculation has long since flown over us, never to return. Local causes may produce rises, and I believe there has been a steady, though slow one on pine lands for some years—but taking the aggregate value of the real estate of the whole State, I doubt if it is so great at present as it was forty years ago, inflated as prices are just now. At this moment, however, land such as will produce 125 lbs. of cotton, cannot be estimated higher than \$5 per acre. If

in some sections it is higher, it is low in others, and probably that which costs more will produce more in like proportion. I could point out lands through the pine region, below the Ridge, broad enough to settle colonies, which will produce as much or more than my estimate, that can be had at from \$1 to \$5 per acre—the price depending more on the neighborhood than the quality—and, in all probability, these lands may not be much higher for generations, awaiting the slow process of increasing population to advance their value. The value of a full task hand may be estimated here at about \$900—and his expenses on the plantation per annum, including his share of the overseer's wages, doctor's bill, clothing, iron, salt, bagging, mules, wagons, gear and meat, (if the planter cannot raise his meat, which in general may easily be done) and all other consumable plantation necessaries, I will put down at \$50. Long experience and strict accounts have taught me that this is a fair average, though I imagine most planters will think it is too much—especially if they do not keep a full memorandum of expenses.

Now let us turn to the Western country. According to the opinions of the most accurate and judicious Western planters, I have seen, it may be assumed, that 2000 lbs. of ginned cotton per hand is a very good average crop—probably far above the average. We hear of immense productions of seed cotton per acre, and of bags per hand, which cannot be properly tested or estimated. I have no doubt 2,500 or 3000 lbs. are sometimes made, but I think I might say, without much fear of contradiction, that there are few planters who cannot compromise at 2000 lbs., one year with another. Assuming that ten acres of cotton and only six of corn are planted per hand, and that from the quality of the soil, it requires less rest, the best of lands require some, I will only allow for that purpose, and for small grain, &c. four acres more of open land, and ten instead of fourteen of woodland, which will give an aggregate of thirty acres per hand. I dare say, as among ourselves, most planters there have more; and certainly this cannot be considered a large estimate, compared with that allowed our own planters. For this land, in almost any part of the West, with a tolerable settlement on it, and a small portion of it cleared, at least \$20 per acre must be paid—often much more—seldom less. I mean of course such land as will year after year make an average of 200 lbs. cotton to the acre. A good hand in the West may be set down as worth \$1200—perhaps at this moment, on account of the extraordinary state of things, he will not bring it in cash, but I am told much more can be obtained for him even now on credit. I think therefore, I am justified in valuing him at that sum. The annual expenses of a hand in the West, including all the items included in expenses here, may be fairly rated at \$50 per man. Men with us at \$75. Those who have tried it will hardly accuse me of exaggerating this item. If any planter is startled by the estimate I make of the plantation expenses, let him for five years keep an exact account of every cent expended for articles not raised, but consumed on his plantation, by no means excluding mules and wagon, which are usually worn out there, and his doubts will vanish.

Now, from all these data, or perhaps I ought to say assumptions, let us make the following tables, the more clearly to exhibit the difference between planting here and in the West.\*

*Plantation in this State.	
Product per hand of ginned cotton 1250 lbs. say 12 cents per lb.	\$150 00
Expenses of hand,	50 00
Nett profit,	\$100 00
Value of land, . . . . . \$900	
Ditto of 50 acres of land at \$5 per acre, . . . . . 250	
\$1150—Interest on this sum at 7 per cent. . . . .	80 50
Surplus,	\$19 50
Plantation in the West.	
Product per hand of ginned cotton, 2000 lbs. say 12 cents,	\$240 00
Expenses of hand,	75 00
Nett profit,	\$165 00
Value of land, . . . . . \$1,200	
Ditto of 30 acres of land at \$20 per acre, . . . . . 600	
\$1,800—Interest on this sum at 7 per cent, . . . . .	126 00
Surplus,	\$39 00
Now from \$39 00	
Take . . . . . 19 50	
Leaves . . . . . \$19 50 as the difference per hand of planting in the West and here, which is equal to one and not quite one-tenth of one per cent. per annum in favor of the West, and in a plantation of 50 hands, will amount to the sum of 975 dollars per annum.	
Another and perhaps a fairer way to make the calculation would be thus—	
Capital in the West per hand, 1,800 dollars: nett profit 165 dollars: rate of interest per ann. 9 16	
Ditto here ditto 1,150 do. ditto 100 do. ditto	8 69
Showing a difference of	0 47
Or not quite one half of one per cent. per annum, in favor of the Western planter; which, on an investment of 90,000 dollars, or 50 hands, would amount to about 450 dollars, done on the same data. They would say, for instance,—	
A plantation in the West and 50 hands at 165 dollars nett income per hand, will make . . . . . \$8250	
Ditto here ditto at 100 do. ditto ditto	5000
Making an apparent difference of 65 per cent. per annum in favor of the Western planter, which would be enormous, and justify every thing that has been said in favor of emigration. But this is a delusive view of the matter as can be clearly shown by a very simple statement. As for example—	
Plantation and 50 hands in the West will cost at 1800 dollars per hand, . . . . . \$90,000 and make a nett income of \$8250 per annum. . . . .	
Ditto ditto here, . . . . . 57,500 and make a nett income of 5000 do. . . . .	
Now, 32,500 dollars will purchase at 1150 per hand another plantation and 28 hands here; which, at 100 dollars nett income each, will make . . . . . \$3250	
Making, in reality, on a difference of . . . . . \$450 ditto.	
The precise sum before shown to constitute the amount in favor of the planter in the West.	

If these calculations are, as I believe correct, I might well ask if any one could be induced to break up here and emigrate to the West for such a prospect of bettering his fortunes? It may be said that if the value of a hand is, by the simple fact, of removal to the West, enhanced 25 per cent., it is not proper to charge that enhanced value to the aggregate of capital there, and require interest on it, when compared with capital here. When a planter remains here and expends here the produce of his capital there, it would appear as though there were some reason in the objection. I grant that if an owner can remain stationary, and by simply removing his capital, can increase it largely and make it produce as safely and as certainly there the same interest upon its increased that it did here on its original value, he would be a gainer. But there are many difficulties in the way of this view of the matter. First, the expense of getting the capital there. Secondly, the large expenditure in provisions, mules and utensils, necessary to put his plantation in operation—all of which I have embraced under the head of annual expenses, and not added to the capital by my calculation above. Thirdly, the great loss of time that must occur before land can be opened so as to make a full crop, even when a fair settlement has been purchased in the first instance; and fourthly, the great risk, not only in removing, but in keeping negroes in a climate notoriously unfavorable to their health, and where the mortality among them exceeds what it is with us, probably the full amount of 25 per cent. These difficulties are great drawbacks on the gain by the mere transfer of property, and I think would entitle me to pass over that point altogether; but let me add that I shall by no means allow a nett profit of \$165 per hand for an average of years at 12 cents for cotton to a planter residing here, and trusting his hand to mere overseers in the west. I would neither give them 2000 lbs. a year, nor would I pay their expenses for \$75 per annum. In short, I believe all will agree with me, that the idea of living here and planting there with no other dependence than a hiring manager, is a perfect fallacy. If the planter removes with his hands, then the true measure of his profits is the rate of interest they produce him on his capital estimated at its value there, where its proceeds are to be laid out either in increasing his property or administering to his comforts. And here let me say, that the increase of one half of one per cent. will bear no proportion to the increase of his family expenditures, and that with even a plantation of fifty hands, his additional income of \$450, or at most \$975, will fall short of his additional wants. Not only will he find every thing much dearer, but the style of living, so far as mere show and style are concerned, is far above ours. There is another drawback that I have not estimated, which subtracts largely from the profits of the Western planter. I allude to the inconvenience and heavy expense of getting his produce to market, and the enormous charges of all kinds upon it. This is a heavy item—but one which I admit is disappearing with the advance of improvements—at least so far as the facilities of getting to market are concerned, but not, I believe, as regards the charges in the market.

In answer to all this, however, we are pointed to persons who are said to have made immense fortunes by emigrating to the West. How easy it would be to point in reply to the numbers who have done the same by remaining here? But have these fortunes been made by plucking alone? In few or no instances I think I may freely say, almost all the nabobs of the West have dipped into land speculations, stock-jobbed, or shaved paper. A more searching question, perhaps, would be,—Have these fortunes been really made at all? Or do they exist only in imagination, or at least on paper? Is the money realized? Is it safely locked up in the Sub-treasury—even in bank bills, bad as they are in the West? Or is it still afloat in the credit currency of other shavers, jobbers and speculators like themselves. There are few, I fear, who would like to give a sincere answer to this question.

In short, Mr. Editor, every thing considered, I cannot but regard the whole scheme of Western fortune-hunting as a splendid delusion, and I trust that I may have convinced some others of the same opinion. Many a worthy and industrious citizen emigrates thither, encounters all the dangers and difficulties of the pioneer, tills the forests, opens the fields, tills the rich soil with unwearied care, and sends its ample products to the markets. His fortune grows apace—yet, looking around and comparing himself with others, he does not find that he approaches that immense wealth which he anticipated when he left home, friends, and the charms of civilization for the Western wilds. Nay, returning to his native country, he finds many who have increased their stores as rapidly as himself, and some even who appear to have outstripped him in the race. He is surprised, if not mortified, and regrets the happiness he has thrown away, in the vain expectation of realizing a brilliant fortune. Others who emigrate, finding that in a new country credit is boundless, soon get into their hands a large property. They open new plantations, build fine houses, set up in magnificent style; half the world regards them as magnificently wealthy, and they are firmly convinced of it themselves—until at last the bubble bursts—lands, negroes, houses, furniture and equipage, all vanish, and they have the glory of being some millions yet in arrears. Such splen-

did effigies of wealth like these delude the credulous and enterprising, and allure them too often to give up the sober certainties of competency and comfort here, to meet, ultimately, the same miserable fate.

Let all those who are looking toward the West reflect maturely on what they do. If they are not satisfied with these views, (if they should chance to see them) let them inquire for themselves, and obtain their own data—but reduce every thing to the minute calculations which I have suggested.

Let no planters in this State, whatever may have been his success heretofore, despair of making at least 1250 lbs. of clean cotton to the hand. It can be done on almost any land in the State—he has only to look into this business himself, and know that it is properly managed. Let him open at once a double quantity of land so as to shift every year, or every other year, as suits it best. Let him plant at least ten acres to the hand, besides provisions—let him, in order to tend it, get half as many mules as he has hands, so as to run that many ploughs, when necessary, and if he has open lands and will put in small grain, he need scarcely feed his mules on corn when idle—let him plant in rows from 1-2 to 3 1-2 feet wide, according to the strength of the soil and if his land is light, tend it with a scraper; if stiff, with the side harrows now in successful operation in the neighborhood of Augusta, Georgia, and other parts of this State, either of which will generally plough out a row at two furrows. Let him do these things, and plant early, and push his cotton from the start, and I will insure him that he can not only tend ten, but twelve to fourteen acres of cotton, and make not only 1250 lbs. but 15 and 1800 lbs. of ginned cotton to the hand, on a large portion of the lands in our State, which may now be had at the rates I have specified above.

I have written you, Mr. Editor, a much longer article than I had any idea of doing, and yet there are some parts that I have not touched, and others merely glanced at, while perhaps I may be accused of some digressions which have consumed valuable space. I send you, however, the article, such as it is, and if my remarks shall induce any one of your readers to believe that our own land, if it is not (as I sincerely believe it is) "of every land the pride," it is, at all events, not very much less favored than some others; and that if neither the ties of birth, of kindred, nor of friends, nor of country, can fix him here, it is, to say the least, doubtful whether his interest will be much advanced by leaving us, my pains will be fully compensated.

A PINE LAND PLANTER.

### Portable Manures.

This is a term given in England to what we call contracted manures, that is, bone dust, horn shavings, and poultice, urette, &c. They are probably there called portable, for the reason, that they may be transported a distance of one-tenth or 1-20th of the expense that their equivalent of stable manure could be transported. Hence they are in great demand, in Great Britain; and the quantity used may be judged of from the fact, that that country is now paying annually, £200,000 to foreign countries, equal to \$898,000 for bones to fertilize her lands; while the high price of the article has led to the most careful collection of them in every part of the United Kingdom. In 1827, Mr. Huskinson gave it as his opinion, in the House of Commons, that the use of bone dust, in British husbandry, occasioned an additional produce of 500,000 quarters of corn, (four millions of bushels), and the writer in the Irish Farmers' Magazine, who states the facts we are narrating, adds, "it is not too much to suppose, that the quantity has since been increased four fold; that is, that the use of bone dust in British husbandry is now annually adding sixteen millions of bushels of grain to her agricultural products! What a lesson this for our farmers, who are exhausting the patrimony which Providence gave for coming generations!

"The most active ingredients in bone dust," says the writer to whom we refer, "are phosphoric acid and ammonia, combined with lime and carbon; and it is to the action of these upon each other, and the influences of the changes of the atmosphere, and of sun shine and rain, in producing and maintaining that action, both above and in the ground, that is to be attributed the extraordinary results attending the application of bone dust."

The writer then proceeds to say, that portable manure may be prepared, very easily, and at little expense, in every farm yard, which shall contain the elements which enrich and stimulate the soil to the highest pitch of fertility. The ingredients he recommends, and the proportions of each, are as follows:—1 ton of turf or peat dust, (if ashes the better,) 1 cwt. 8 lbs. of common salt, 1 cwt. quicklime reduced to powder, 14 lbs. East India salt-petre, (ditto rate of potash.) The ashes, soot and lime to be well mixed together. The salt and salt petre to be dissolved in urine, as it may be required to saturate and keep moist the heap. After the salts are expended, the urine to be continued—and new ashes to be spread on the top to intercept the vapors. Such a composition, he says, can be formed for 20s. a ton, which would be more efficacious than 40 bushels of bone dust, costing 60s. or fifteen cords of yard dung, and might be transported at a single load. The ingredients in the mass supply all the elements for which decayed vegetable and animal substances are used, such as alkali and