

## Chapter 6

### A "Sporting Fraternity"

#### *Northern Hunters and the Transformation of Southern Game Law in the Red Hills Region, 1880–1920*

Julia Brock

Northerners who came to southern states to build or buy winter hunting estates did so at a particular historical moment. They moved to the South after the ouster of federal rule and during the hardening of stringent segregation laws, a time when the South's so-called "new men" were swearing allegiance to an order that purported to move away from the grip of agriculture and make way for business and industry.<sup>1</sup> They came southward at the peak of a third-party challenge to the seemingly solid Democratic Party and eventually saw that challenge dismantled and defeated. At first glance, northerners remained distant from these events. By all appearances, they built insular communities that lay outside the contours of southern life. Yet sportsmen could not have established their estates without assistance from white and black southerners. Close relationships with both groups proved crucial to the development of northern hunting colonies. African Americans supplied agricultural and domestic labor, served as hunting guides, and performed vital roles in supporting northerners' preferred forms of recreation. White southerners aided northerners' efforts to buy and lease land, secure labor, and manage their estates. By virtue of the relationships they developed with white and black southerners, northerners became embroiled in conflicts over land, wildlife, and social order.

In the Red Hills region of southwest Georgia and northern Florida, development of northern-owned estates coincided with fierce debates over land use, hunting, and emergent ideas about conservation. White farmers protested northerners' acquisition of the region's best lands and hunting practices, which limited the availability of game for subsistence. Northern hunters and their southern allies also supported changes in state game laws.

Debates were couched rhetorically in competing versions of masculinity. Many of the small farmers who contested the northern hunting colony were still reeling from the defeat of Populism and clinging to ideas about mastery borne by small producerism and property ownership. These smallholders rhetorically linked manhood to white, productive labor, an independence that could only be found as head of a household of dependents (that included women and children).<sup>2</sup> Northern hunters and their southern allies, on the other hand, claimed identity as sportsmen—gentlemen who practiced manly restraint, exercised skill in the field, and championed new ideas about conservation at the expense of smallholders and customary hunting practices.

Instead of remaining isolated from southern society, northern hunters benefited from the lines of class and race they encountered in the South. The alliance between northern and southern sportsmen was paramount in the former's ability to establish and grow a hunting colony in the Red Hills region. Southern sportsmen led the movement for game laws and finally the establishment of the Georgia Department of Game and Fish. Non-elite hunters allied with sportsmen in formulating laws that curtailed the mobility of African Americans. But smallholders were less sanguine about the ways in which the laws protected elite sportsmen at the expense of their ability to trap, raise, and sell game. The divisions caused by new laws point to the fissures in class among white men in the Jim Crow South. Although controlling black mobility united white hunters to some extent, the battle over mastery of game played out along class lines in the statehouse and in the field.

Ultimately, opposition from small farmers did not derail the elite vision for a winter sporting colony. But, despite the seeming solidity of the political order and the welcome provided to northern men, the South still saw challenges to the new order and to the presence of northerners. This essay details those challenges in Georgia, where a northern hunting colony in the southwestern corner of the state had implications for statewide policy shifts and fueled a rhetoric of resistance. To gain insight into the impact of northern hunters on southern communities, this essay will examine Thomas County, in the northern part of the Red Hills region, and the role of one of its notable citizens, H. W. Hopkins, in championing the creation of a local northern hunting colony.

The Red Hills region encompasses Leon and Jefferson counties, Florida, and Thomas and Grady counties, Georgia. The landscape is characterized by rolling hills, lime sinks, longleaf pine stands and oak hammocks, wiregrass, and winding streams.<sup>3</sup> Historically, Tallahassee, Florida, and Thomasville, Georgia, have been the main centers of cultural life in the region. After the Civil War, Thomasville became a favored destination for northerners seeking

escape from the chill of winter.<sup>4</sup> Over time, tourism and large sporting estates owned by wealthy outsiders shaped Thomasville's economic and social landscape. Northerners patronized small businesses, employed local citizens, and started a number of small enterprises. By the 1890s, they had established the area as a premier destination for bird hunting and hound and horse trials. Northern and Midwestern families supported local schools, churches, and hospitals and eventually established a small historical society.

Thomasville first began attracting travelers in the 1870s. The promise of curative pine forests brought sufferers of respiratory ailments to the town to convalesce. Unlike places such as Asheville, North Carolina, which remained popular with health-seekers for decades, tourism in the Red Hills faded by the 1890s. Connections forged early on provided the foundation for a winter hunting colony, however.<sup>5</sup> By the 1890s, wealthy industrialists from the North and Midwest owned land throughout the Red Hills. Inexpensive land prices facilitated development of large estates, and a ready supply of local workers gave northerners access to cheap labor. Land purchases and estate development continued well into the twentieth century. By the 1950s, northerners owned fifty hunting plantations in the Red Hills.<sup>6</sup> As late as 1976 these estates encompassed a total of 350,000 acres.<sup>7</sup>

During Thomasville's stint as a health resort, the surrounding area became known for a seemingly limitless supply of wild game, particularly quail. Hunting, a male-dominated pursuit in the nineteenth century, was popular among men of all races and classes in the South. Many men pursued game for family or individual sustenance, some hunted for the fur and meat markets, and others for leisure. As Nicolas Proctor has shown, hunting came to constitute an important part of southern manhood; the woods and field became the backdrop for testing and proving prowess; self-control, or the ability of the hunter to remain self-possessed in the excitement of the hunt, the feat of mind over physicality; and mastery, what Proctor calls a "multifaceted concept" that "represented control over other people, animals, nature, and even death."<sup>8</sup> These "distinctively southern" qualities of hunting were reserved for white men, who used hunting to reaffirm caste privilege and dominion over women and slaves. But, enslaved men also drew meaning from hunting; they were also passionate about hunting and wild game served to supplement their food supply. Some enslaved men served as mentors to white male adolescents learning woodsmanship. But, because African and African American men were severely circumscribed in their mobility and access to firearms, the ability to hunt and draw from the tropes of manhood that hunting offered whites was extremely limited.<sup>9</sup>

All white southern men claimed stake in the affirmation of manhood that hunting provided, and this bond leveled the class dimensions of shooting game by a good measure. Any white man could acquire a gun and a dog,

and, at least until the later nineteenth century, hunting laws favored the open range and not the individual property owner. After the Civil War, a distinction grew between those who hunted for leisure and those who hunted for necessity. This divide was visible in hunting practice. More men with means began to consider themselves “sportsmen,” a specific type of hunter. These men were, thanks to advocates such as George Bird Grinnell, taking part in the creation of a national language forming around themes of sport and conservation. Grinnell’s publication, *Forest and Stream*, among others like it, was central in propagating this language to a wide circulation of readers, North and South. The magazine codified the sportsman’s ethos in articles that dwelt on the manliness of hunting and fishing and the values of sporting—sport as purely a pursuit of leisure (as opposed to those who hunted for money or subsistence), as a skill of marksmanship, and as an example of fair play. Baiting fields and poisoning streams, both still common in the South, stood at odds with the code of the true sportsman, who allowed game a fighting chance. An identity only available to elite, white men who had leisure time and capital for guns and dogs, the moniker of sportsman was reserved for a certain class, but described men from across the country. The subscribers of magazines like *Field and Stream* considered themselves a kind of fraternity and, in the late nineteenth century, shared a bond not limited by old war wounds and sectional division. A masculinity bound in elite sporting practice increasingly connected men across sectional lines.

In the 1870s, thanks to *Field and Stream* and other publications, a growing, cross-regional movement of sportsmen took up the cause of conservation. H. W. Hopkins, the mayor of Thomasville, participated in this movement, as did northerners who owned land in the Red Hills. Hopkins exemplified the hunter-as-sportsman ideal. One writer from a national hunting magazine declared emphatically that Hopkins was a sportsman “I wish all sportsmen could know.” It is no small coincidence that he did much to attract northern hunters to Thomasville and helped to build the winter hunting colony.<sup>10</sup> In promoting the region, he followed his uncle’s lead. Dr. T. S. Hopkins had promoted the region as a destination for tuberculosis patients, largely on the basis of his belief in the healthful benefits of pine resin.<sup>11</sup> The younger Hopkins favored shooting and dogs and invested time and money into these pursuits. In 1882, the *Atlanta Weekly-Constitution* reported that Hopkins had a large kennel under construction in downtown Thomasville—one local called it the “dog hotel.” The “hotel” had room for one hundred dogs, a kitchen, a trainer’s house, and an exercise ground. Hopkins used it for breeding and training setters, pointers, and hounds. The newspaper called Hopkins an “authority” on dogs and hunting and noted that he had introduced beagles to hunters in the area. His reputation for breeding and training the best dogs was already cemented in the early 1880s among northern hunters in Thomasville;



**Figure 6.1** H. W. Hopkins (left) and A. H. Mason after a Red Hills quail hunt, 1917. Hopkins was an avid bird hunter and dog breeder and, through his efforts to help build a northern hunting colony, formed lifelong friendships with northern hunters such as Mason. *Source:* Courtesy Thomas County Historical Society, Thomasville, Ga.

a local told the reporter that, "Hopkins's dogs work like clocks, and no yan-kee [*sic*] ever shoots over one without wanting to buy him."<sup>12</sup>

Hopkins also kept up with the latest in the sporting press and actively engaged with other hunters through the pages of national periodicals. He sent, for example, the wing, tail, head, and foot of a bird to the editors of *Forest and Stream* for identification (their response: "The bird is a king rail, or fresh water marsh hen").<sup>13</sup> Hopkins connected to a national network of sportsmen through journals such as *Forest and Stream*, and he cemented relationships with northern hunters who came to Thomasville as tourists by hosting foxhunts and shooting parties and by loaning and selling his hunting dogs. Hopkins' enthusiasm for sport paved the way for a winter hunting colony.

The kind of hunting that Hopkins promoted required capital. His dogs cost between \$100 and \$500, which put them out of the reach of most local

hunters.<sup>14</sup> As Thomasville gained a reputation for abundant game, the area increasingly drew northerners who sought the quarry of its fields and woods instead of a healthful resort town. These sportsmen transformed hunting into a spectacle, replete with the best dogs, guns, wagons, and an entourage of other hunters, wagon drivers, and dog trainers. Northerners found a southern counterpart in Hopkins and, like him, participated in the national culture of sporting that grew in the nineteenth century. They too subscribed to hunting periodicals and sought the best guns and dogs, and they increasingly pursued game in places outside of the northeast and, eventually, outside of the United States. Serious sportsmen had been coming South since antebellum times as their own lands were depleted of game.<sup>15</sup> Northern and southern hunters had shared the field before they formed networks in Thomasville and a code of sportsmanship that came of age after the Civil War.<sup>16</sup>

But these northern hunters were products of the Gilded Age. Many of them made fortunes from the new industries that dominated American business enterprise in the late nineteenth century: oil, railroads, and steel. For these men, hunting was more than just a pastime; it was charged with an ethos of wealth and domination. Historians have argued that hunting by wealthy sportsmen was directly tied to the age of empire in the late nineteenth century in Britain. Hunting, for example, often preceded or went hand-in-hand with territorial domination; the mastery of another territory and its fauna was congruent with the control of its people and institutions. In the United States, sportsmen “served empire in another way,” as Daniel Justin Herman argues, by continuing to associate hunting and white American manhood and casting it in the light of late nineteenth-century ideas about scientific organization and racial hierarchy.<sup>17</sup> Theodore Roosevelt perhaps best personifies these themes; he idealized the western hunting adventure and later, traveling for the Smithsonian, the big game safari. Other wealthy hunters followed his lead onto western lands and eventually to faraway places to pursue sport. These sportsmen, like those who built the winter hunting colony in the Red Hills region, took part in a social drama that reaffirmed the power of wealth and racial hierarchy. Their capital bought adventure, a chance to prove manliness, and, by using a cadre of subordinates as helpmates, the opportunity to be a paternal master of the hunt. These men traversed the country in plush, private Pullman cars (they might have even owned the railroad itself) in search of prey and adventure. When they first came to southwest Georgia, they found not only abundant game, but a place where political and economic systems had been shaken, where farmers were impoverished, and where there existed a labor supply that was large and cheap. The South offered opportunities for wealthy sportsmen with visions for a genteel but rugged life. There already existed a hunting tradition that privileged white manhood; sportsmen found in the South and in its local elite, men like Hopkins, the perfect backdrop with

which to create an idealized leisure community with a stable social hierarchy that blended a mythologized past with the modern.

Like hunting colonies in South Carolina, northerners bought the lands and homes of people who were once scions in the area's planter class. To acquire or increase landholdings, sportsmen relied upon their friendship with the local grandee, H. W. Hopkins. Hopkins combined extensive knowledge of local land and people with a business savvy that resulted in the formation of the winter hunting colony. He was an influential man who had the ability both to secure land at good prices and to inform northerners of local and state laws that would affect their property and hunting customs. By 1879, Hopkins had established a real estate company that formalized his role as a local agent. With his assistance, wealthy sportsmen acquired private hunting preserves and also leased shooting land into the 1930s.

Most of Hopkins' business began from social connections made in Thomasville and continued through word of mouth. In many cases, interested investors sought him out rather than vice versa. In 1901, for example, D. L. Shepard of St. Paul, Minnesota, wrote Hopkins about a potential buyer in "an old and esteemed friend Mr. Marvin Hughitt Paes of C. + N.W.R.R. [Chicago and Northwestern Railroad]." Shepard "told him about Thomasville and the Keifer place and he was impressed very favorably. . . . He is decidedly such a man as you would like to add to your Northern Colony."<sup>18</sup> If interested buyers secured an introduction to Hopkins and made a trip to the Red Hills region to survey available property, Hopkins put himself at their disposal. Charles S. Hebard of New Jersey, owner of Ty-Ty plantation near Thomasville, wrote Hopkins in 1903 thanking him for his careful attention to the interests of buyer J. H. Wade of New York. Wade, wrote Hebard, "seems pleased with [the property] and with the way you treated him—he is a very fine man and will be a great acquisition to the place."<sup>19</sup> The correspondence suggests that before a land sale took place, buyers such as Paes and Wade had to be satisfied with Thomasville and what it had to offer, and to win Hopkins's tacit approval.

Like the hunting enclaves that formed in the lowcountry, northerners reveled in the mythology of the Old South and exploited their opportunity to own a piece of it. Sketching the genealogy of several purchases illustrates this point. Dr. J. T. Metcalfe, a doctor and native New Yorker, spent his winters in Thomasville and, as historian William Rogers notes, "was a tireless promoter of the area's advantages."<sup>20</sup> Metcalfe's first land purchases in 1883 were in the southeastern portion of Thomas County; he bought the old plantation lands of James L. Seward, a prominent state congressman.<sup>21</sup> Though he sold these lands to David McCartney of Wisconsin in 1886, Metcalfe

once more purchased land in 1887, the 1,600-acre Cedar Grove Plantation, from the Blackshears, one of the oldest and largest planter families in the area. Metcalfe's purchase included the original plantation home, which he renamed Susina, for his wife Susan. He did not remain long at Susina—he sold the property in 1891 to A. H. Mason, the heir to a shoe blacking business in Philadelphia—but Metcalfe had garnered enough influence in the area to become the namesake of a railroad stop created in 1889, Metcalf (the town later dropped its final 'e').<sup>22</sup>

Another early buyer was John W. Masury, a wealthy paint manufacturer from New York who had also built a hotel in Thomasville to cater to tourists. In 1887 he purchased a 1,500-acre property that he named Cleveland Park, where he often hosted picnics and parties for wealthy northern and southern whites.<sup>23</sup> The land had once belonged to another branch of the Blackshear family.<sup>24</sup> In 1889, S. R. Van Duzer, also from New York and a “millionaire,” according to the local press, bought a 1,300-acre plantation, Greenwood, owned by the Jones family, another prominent planting family.<sup>25</sup>

The Hanna family, wealthy oil refiners from Cleveland (who sold out to Standard Oil in 1876), and their associates (partners in business and family



**Figure 6.2 Greenwood Plantation, Thomas County, Georgia, circa 1930.** English architect John Wind designed the Greek Revival home in the late 1830s for Thomas and Lavinia Jones, a prominent planting family in Thomas County. The Jones family sold the home to a New Yorker, S. R. Van Duzer, in the late nineteenth century. *Source:* Courtesy Thomas County Historical Society, Thomasville, Ga.

friends) came to dominate landholding in the Red Hills region. "By 1976," notes geographer William Brueckheimer, "the descendants of the Hannas, Hanna Company executives, and Cleveland friends owned forty-one plantations containing over 150,000 acres."<sup>26</sup> Salome Hanna, the sister of Howard Melville (H. M.) and Mark Hanna, made early purchases. She and her husband, J. Wyman Jones (who developed Glen Arven Country Club in Thomasville), bought a plantation in 1891 that they named Elsoma. The same year, Salome's son by her first marriage, Charles M. Chapin, purchased Melrose Plantation from a prominent local family. He later acquired Elsoma for himself. H. M. Hanna, a Standard Oil director who also ran the M.A. Hanna Company (a coal, iron ore mining, and shipping conglomerate) with his brother Mark, purchased Pebble Hill Plantation, an antebellum estate once owned by Thomas Jefferson Johnson, a founder of Thomas County.<sup>27</sup> During the 1880s and 1890s, then, lands in Thomas County and the Red Hills transferred from southern to northern ownership. Local families such as the Jones, Blackshears, and Johnsons—who had built their fortunes on cotton and slaves—sold to northern families whose wealth came from the booming industrial economy.

This lineage of former owners appealed to northerners captivated by the romance of the Old South. For sportsmen, antebellum homes symbolized a bygone aristocracy and fast-disappearing gentility. According to a former director of the Georgia Historic Sites Survey, the classical revival homes in Thomas County that became winter hunting estates "fit the dream ideal of the antebellum South better than those from any other part of Georgia."<sup>28</sup> Greenwood, the Van Duzer estate, later owned by the Whitney family, is perhaps the most famous. With its massive ionic columns, a two-story portico, and a hand-carved pediment, it stands as a temple to the agrarian social order. Many of the homes on northern hunting estates—Susina (Metcalf's home until he sold it to the Mason family); Pebble Hill (owned by H. M. Hanna); Elsoma and Melrose—were antebellum in origin. Though they would install modern amenities, the northern owners largely left the facades of the homes unchanged (though a few of the homes, such as original house at Pebble Hill, later burned).<sup>29</sup> Now the resident gentlemen of these country estates, northern hunters were kings of leisure, not cotton.

Northerners purchased contiguous lands in order to expand their shooting domains. J. H. Wade provides a good example of the process. In 1904, Wade wrote to Hopkins agreeing to purchase the "Girtman place," a farm next to his Mill Pond lands.<sup>30</sup> In 1907, he purchased another parcel of contiguous land from a Miss McCartney of Green Bay, Wisconsin.<sup>31</sup> Three years later, he acquired two parcels owned by the McIntyres (known as the Futch lands), a prominent local family.<sup>32</sup> In 1916, Wade again wrote to Hopkins wishing to enlarge his holdings: "I would like buy the South ½ of lot 91 owned by

Mrs. Lillie if she will sell it at \$15 per acre. This would connect my Futch land with the Hammond place I recently bought. Please see what you can do.”<sup>33</sup> Lula Mae Hamilton, the Wade family governess, informed her mother that Wade loved “to buy the land and then go through laying out roads where he sees fit.” She also noted that not all small farmers were willing to sell. Although Wade had successfully bought land from a few African American families and “let them live on” to farm shares, “There is one little place near here that two darkies own and won’t give up some beautiful woods too.”<sup>34</sup> Hamilton’s offhanded slur belies the empowered stance of the smallholders who refused to sell out to the wealthy sportsman.

Elite hunting customs and business relationships cemented friendships between Hopkins and the northern sportsmen. Hopkins joined northerners on their own hunting grounds, on fishing expeditions in Florida, and sometimes even visited them in their home states. He also maintained hunting camps in the Red Hills region where he and northerners spent time hunting, eating and drinking, and telling tall tales. “Judge,” as he was known affectionately, created lifelong friendships with men who served as the backbone of the winter colony.

Largely through Hopkins’s efforts, consolidation of lands in the Red Hills proceeded swiftly. Clifton Paisley notes that by 1950, northern owners together held 109,700 acres in Leon County, a consolidation that reduced available agricultural land by eighty percent.<sup>35</sup> Because landholdings grew so large, only wealthy northern hunters could afford them when they went up for sale. In 1915, Hopkins conceded to northerner Edward Crozer that a “property like yours is beyond the average villager for a home at anything like it’s value.”<sup>36</sup>

Land consolidation angered locals. Not all farmers in Thomas County and the Red Hills region wished to sell out to wealthy northerners, and voices of dissent peppered local newspapers. In 1904, efforts to form a new county from parts of Thomas and Decatur Counties, for example, provided a vehicle for airing grievances against the Yankees.

Cairo was an emerging market town and railroad stop that served as a trading center for farmers in western Thomas County and eastern Decatur County. A former Populist stronghold, it retained a sizeable number of third-party sympathizers.<sup>37</sup> Logistical considerations sparked the initial push for a new county. As the editor of the *Cairo Messenger* explained, a new county “would be a great convenience for the people in this neighborhood, as this is another instance where the people have to go from 15 to 25 miles to reach the county site.”<sup>38</sup> Traveling the fourteen miles to Thomasville or the twenty-two miles to Bainbridge (county seat of Decatur), the editor argued, was inconvenient and costly for farmers. Creating a new county would allow for new, more accessible municipal buildings and, at least in theory, would spur Cairo’s growth.

A cadre of locals opposed the new county and its supporters. The editors of the *Thomasville Times-Enterprise and South Georgia Progress* led the charge. They used their columns to attack the movement and raise concerns about the dangers of breaking up two large counties. They argued that the measure would decrease revenue and thus lead to tax increases in Thomas County. They questioned the need for a new county seat and wondered if support for the initiative was a power grab by would-be politicians.<sup>39</sup> In more emotional terms, the faction also raised the issue of race and politics. At a public debate held in Thomasville in 1905, for example, a resolution created by opponents of the new county argued that because blacks made up a majority of the citizenry in Thomas County, a new county "would subordinate again their former associates and neighbors" to "this overwhelming mass of ignorance and idleness." Appealing to the new county supporters, the resolution entreated them to "have a human regard for the safety and well-being of their neighbors, who were their comrades in the long and bitter struggle [during Reconstruction] for white supremacy in Thomas County." Piggy-backing on fears of whites becoming a racial minority, the anti-county movement referenced the presidential election of 1896, when Thomas had become the only county to vote a majority for McKinley, the Republican candidate. When H. W. Hopkins came to the defense of the new county with arguments of popular sovereignty, the editors in Thomasville accused him of "endeavoring to bring about a coalition of affairs by which Thomas county [*sic*] might become black Republican." Though 'black Republican' was a common epithet in the one-party system of southern politics, attacking Hopkins—whom all knew was an ally of the northern sportsmen, including the Hanna family, who had invited McKinley to Thomasville to meet with southern Republicans in 1896—was symbolic. Questioning Hopkins' appeal to republican principles, the editors complained of his "sophomoric . . . repetition of trite catch phrases 'vital principles of republics, essence of Democracy freedom and independence.'" They asked Hopkins, "Do you want to square your actions by a definition? Are you willing for white and black to vote? Did Webster know about the color line?"<sup>40</sup> Raising the specter of black political autonomy and subtly connecting it to wealthy northerners' influence on county politics, opponents of the new county relied upon bravado and fear to rail against the movement and its supporters.

Supporters of the new county counterattacked, going beyond arguments for convenience to pit the new county and its prospective population of small farmers against the landed interests in Thomasville. The attacks went to the heart of Thomas County's reputation as a hunting destination and its seasonal northern population. Countering the claim that a new county would raise taxes in Thomas, Grady County supporters wondered why they should "any longer help to pay taxes to keep up Thomasville and to work the Thomasville

roads so their ‘distinguished winter visitors’ can air themselves luxuriously around in rubber tire carriages and four horse tallyho’s?” The editor continued that, “If Thomasville has let her winter birds roost, and set, on all the land around there, driving out home people from their little farms . . . who is responsible for it?” Proponents of the new county pit the “foreign and privileged millionaire class” who had “gobble[d] up . . . lands” against the “home people” who were shut out of the “rich soil . . . which surrounded” the town.<sup>41</sup> In the rhetoric of heated argument, Grady County supporters cast themselves as the heirs of a Jeffersonian republic of small farmers and the “distinguished winter visitors” as a land-hungry elite who earned their wealth from “favored trusts.”

Residents of Leon County, Florida, echoed concerns about northern land consolidation. In the Tallahassee *Weekly True Democrat*, one writer compared the game preserves of the Red Hills to those of England and noted that both had forced out small farmers. A 1914 editorial in the paper argued that,

As much as the *True Democrat* appreciates the good judgment of wealthy men buying up large landed interest in Leon County for game preserves, it prevents the prosperity we are so anxious to see. Small farms are the true source of dependence, and the policy that prevents an increase of population is wrong and damaging.<sup>42</sup>

The editor also expressed a desire to see “the adoption of some plan whereby the large landed interests of Leon County could be converted into small, profitable farms.”<sup>43</sup> By 1920, this vision had gone unfulfilled, prompting the editor to lodge another complaint: “Leon County is suffering much because large landlords are not bringing their immense acreage into production of needed crops.”<sup>44</sup>

The editor pointed to a growing trend among northern landowners to reduce crop cultivation in favor of game conservation. This change was largely due to the decrease in the quail population, which became acute in the second decade of the twentieth century. Concerned about the lack of game, a group of hunters (including Charles Chapin, L. S. Thompson, owner of Sunny Hill Plantation, and Arthur B. Lapsley, owner of Meridian Plantation) hired the services of naturalist Herbert L. Stoddard to study the quail population and offer remedies to its decline.<sup>45</sup> Stoddard published his results in *The Bobwhite Quail*, which became the preeminent guidebook for protection of the bird. Stoddard’s management techniques dismissed commercial agriculture, particularly cotton cultivation strategies. Large-scale agriculture depleted the soil, deteriorating the food supply for quail and leaving them with no cover for a habitat. Instead, less-intensive “patch-style” agriculture (small plots of cultivated land separated by brush or tree stands) was the best environment

for the bird to thrive.<sup>46</sup> This directive was an incentive for northern hunters to maintain the sharecropping system, which employed patch-style farming, but to allow for less intensive agricultural production. The result of the move toward conservation was, as the *True Democrat* editor put it, less land for smaller farms and less cotton cultivation.

Conservation-minded sportsmen also turned their attention to hunting laws to protect access to hunting lands and wildlife. Before examining the role of Hopkins in supporting policy change, an exploration of Red Hills hunting culture—particularly quail hunting—is of use. Coming to Thomas County and the Red Hills region from November to April (when the hunting season ended), sportsmen took advantage of the area's famed shooting. Turkeys, doves, waterfowl, and deer (sometimes even the elusive wildcat) were all prime targets, but the preferred game was the bobwhite quail. The bobwhite quail is a ground-dwelling bird that gathers in coveys of five to thirty birds in the fall and winter months. The Red Hills region is an ideal environment for the bird, which thrives in the brushy edges of cultivated fields, abandoned fields, and long-leaf grassland forests.<sup>47</sup> The pine forests that surrounded Thomasville and the tenant system of labor that scattered farms across the countryside created ideal habitats. One writer to *Forest and Stream* noted the abundance of the bobwhite in Thomas County and the zeal with which "everybody hunts them, both natives and Yankees."<sup>48</sup> He observed that "sometimes one will see a dozen wagons full of men and dogs starting out every morning," to shoot quail.<sup>49</sup> The formal hunting party, with wagons, dogs, and drivers, was the province of wealthy northerners, and quail plantations gave them ample room with which to pursue the practice.

Quail hunting was nothing new to northern or southern hunters, though only during the Gilded Age did it become a formal spectacle. As Nicholas Proctor has argued, small game like quail was often overlooked in the antebellum South among elite hunters in favor of "trophy" animals such as deer and bear that served as symbols of mastery and manhood.<sup>50</sup> Early sporting periodicals, however, attest to the popularity of the bird, at least among northern sportsmen; writers gave much attention, for example, to the natural history, habitat, and behavior of quail. One northern writer considered it a "bird of value" because of its intelligence and the skill, firearms, and dogs required to bag the bird.<sup>51</sup> Hunters in mid-nineteenth-century Illinois, according to one historian, "agreed that quail was the most desirable game and the most difficult to kill on the wing."<sup>52</sup>

Gilded Age quail hunts bore little resemblance to their antebellum predecessors. By the century's end, quail shooting had acquired a pageantry that involved thoroughbred dogs and horses, wagons, and a cast of servants. Sociologist Stuart A. Marks, in writing about hunting in North Carolina,

has attributed this transformation specifically to Thomasville, arguing that “the purchase of Southern plantations by Northerners and their use as retreats . . . perpetuated the image of quail hunting as a recreation for the leisured and privileged classes.”<sup>53</sup>

Quail hunting, in its elite form, centered on the Georgia hunting wagon and formal hunting parties. Developed in Thomasville, the Georgia wagons (still used for hunting today) have high wheels to enable smooth running through tall grass and brush in the open field and, as Hopkins described to hunter D. L. Hebard, “have to be of extra long bodies” to accommodate the “boxes on sides for guns” and “dog crates in rear” (that hold from four to ten dogs and a water tank).<sup>54</sup> These wagons, pulled by mules, made wainwrighting a lucrative enterprise in Thomasville; Hopkins informed Hebard that in 1930, when wagons were still in demand, they cost around \$350. The wagon’s accouterments allowed for the socializing that came with formal hunts; Hopkins noted that “lunches, ice, liquid refreshments, etc.” were kept in a dash compartment for the midday meal.<sup>55</sup> At that point, the driver(s) would unpack lunch for the hunters, who would linger at the picnic for an hour or so before returning to the hunt or heading home. Hunters, who might ride atop the wagon and or follow on horseback, were accompanied by the wagon drivers and dog handlers, who were also sometimes on horseback.

This type of hunting party differed markedly from most local hunters who pursued game on foot with a single dog and years-worn gun. The observations of Grady C. Cromartie, whom Clifton Paisley interviewed for his work on the Red Hills in 1970, illustrate the kind of spectacle northern hunters created in rural Georgia and Florida. In 1908, Cromartie was clerk at a store that served the farming community surrounding Lake Iamonia in Leon County, Florida, the southern end of the Red Hills region. When asked if he remembered the northern hunter Edward Beadel, who owned a quail plantation on the north side of the lake, Cromartie remarked on Beadel’s hunting wagons that were “almost always painted yellow,” including the wagon wheels. Cromartie also remembered that Beadel’s wagon driver, a black man, “had to be dressed like they wanted him to be dressed,” with “leather lines” and formal livery—the driver “had to go neat, don’t you know.” With day-glo wagons and uniformed drivers, Cromartie noted wryly that northern hunters “were kind of particular . . . about how everything looked.”<sup>56</sup>

Conspicuous consumption had a presence in other hunting rituals. Northern hunters also used their lands to host foxhunts, formal affairs that William Rogers notes, “were replicas of similar events in the North and in England.”<sup>57</sup> Plantation-based foxhunts featured large packs of dogs, riders in formal habits, and a crowd of spectators. Hunts took place each season, often on the plantations of J. Wyman Jones and Charles Chapin.<sup>58</sup> These sportsmen had acquired so much acreage that riders could follow the baying hounds

without leaving their own property. The plantation lands, perfect for quail shooting and large fox chases, served as a backdrop upon which northerners acted as would-be gentry.

The consolidation of lands in the Red Hills region gave elite northern hunters access to the best hunting grounds while simultaneously changing traditional southern hunting practices in important ways. Sportsmen built their estates just as game laws became more stringent and, as some argued, reflective of the interests of elite hunters. Indeed, concerns about game depletion and overhunting spurred northern landowners to begin conservation initiatives on their own plantations. H. W. Hopkins, who occupied the statehouse intermittently from the 1890s to second decade of the twentieth century, used his influence to change state game laws to reflect the growing concern for conservation. Hopkins and others followed national trends in calling attention to the problem of declining game populations. Not the cause of the "true sportsman," who followed bag limits on principle, the culprits of overshooting were "pot-hunters," or those who hunted game for the market, and "game hogs," those men whose kill knew no boundary. It was against these two groups that *Forest and Stream* railed—the rhetoric of Grinnell and others in this regard became common among conservation-minded hunters and anglers and influenced the creation of the Georgia Department of Game and Fish in 1911.

Hopkins became such an important advocate for conservation that in 1915 the commissioner of the Department of Game and Fish called him "one of the best friends of game protection in Georgia" and invited him to use the Department's offices as headquarters for his senate term.<sup>59</sup> In fact, Hopkins' voting record in the Georgia Assembly suggests he was part of a wave of reform that swept through Georgia and the South in the first and second decades of the twentieth century.<sup>60</sup> Some of the reform measures followed Progressive agendas enacted elsewhere in the country.<sup>61</sup> As a state congressman in 1911 he voted to limit working hours for factory laborers, for example, and to allow women to enter the Georgia bar (the latter bill did not pass).<sup>62</sup> He focused on municipal reform in Thomas County and led a statewide effort to tighten prohibition laws in a 1917 special session of the House.<sup>63</sup> And as an avid sportsman and representative of a district that benefitted mightily from northern game hunters, he focused on the creation of more stringent game law.

Hopkins' first run as a statesman was in 1894 and 1895 when he was elected to the House, then again in 1896 when he became a senator. During that time he did not create legislation regarding hunting,<sup>64</sup> though he led the effort to amend a state game and fish law that had come to the Senate from the House (statewide laws began to appear sporadically in the late 1870s).<sup>65</sup> In his later term as a senator between 1902 and 1904, he created restrictions in Thomas County that made it illegal to hunt or fish on another's property

without written consent.<sup>66</sup> In doing so, Hopkins was following the lead of other state lawmakers who had passed similar regulations in their own districts. The timing of the measure coincided with Thomas County's rise as a hunting destination for northerners.

Hopkins' efforts figured in a burst of regional game legislation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, though hunting and fishing law in the South well predates the onrush. In Georgia, for example, game regulation of a kind went as far back as the colonial era, when in 1790 the statutes outlawed hunting deer at night by firelight. In the mid-nineteenth century, lawmakers from individual counties established a hunting season for deer and outlawed the poisoning of fish by dumping walnut hulls or buckeyes into streams.<sup>67</sup> Representatives also passed laws that protected terrapins and oyster beds—particularly beds of the individual property holder—and outlawed camp hunting in coastal Georgia counties.<sup>68</sup> Richmond County set a season for quail, turkey, snipe, ducks, and other wild birds between October 1 and April 10.<sup>69</sup> These piecemeal efforts reflected concern for diminishing game populations and efforts to protect the property rights of landowners. Because these laws remained largely unenforced, however, customary hunting practices, which gave hunters access to unfenced lands, still held sway.

In the first decade of the twentieth century, as suggested by Hopkins' measure, the passage of hunting law remained piecemeal and local. Although state laws regulated seasons for certain types of game and outlawed certain hunting practices, no official body existed to enforce them. Supporters of game law, mostly sportsmen from across the state, argued that haphazard codes and puny enforcement made regulations ineffective. Sportsmen advocated for creation of an agency dedicated to protection of game and fish. In a 1908 letter to the *Columbus Enquirer-Sun*, writer R. Andrews called the warden system in the state "worse than a farce" and compared Georgia's "unique and unenviable" position of being without a game commission with other southern states (except Florida and Mississippi) that did.<sup>70</sup> The next year, the *Atlanta Constitution* issued another call for a game and fish commission. "Constant complaints of the ineffectiveness of Georgia's game law and the known scarcity of wild animals, birds, and fish," the editor argued, "sufficiently evidence the need in this state for a statute which will adequately protect this one of our rapidly diminishing natural resources." He lamented that, because of overshooting, there remained "few spots in the state to which the true sportsmen can go and enjoy a reasonably satisfactory day's outing." "True sportsmen," he noted, were rallying by way of petition and lobby to influence the state legislature to pass a comprehensive game bill, which had been attempted in the 1908 legislative session but had failed.<sup>71</sup>

The swell of support for a game law broke ground when, in 1911, the assembly codified hunting law in the state. In that year, H. W. Hopkins

rejoined the House of Representatives and took an active role in efforts to create a department for game and fish regulation. Hopkins and two other congressmen introduced a bill to create a Department of State Conservation. Though it is not clear what the measure entailed or how it differed in substance from other acts to create a unified department, the effort was tabled. Instead, a bill was passed to create the Department of Game and Fish.<sup>72</sup> The Department had powers to appoint a state Game and Fish Commissioner, to select wardens and deputy wardens, to create a licensing structure for in-season hunting, as well as to criminalize violations of game and fish law.

By 1911, those state laws went beyond the establishment of seasons, the outlawing of trapping, and bag limits (which, for quail, were twenty-five birds per diem), all restrictions that were in place by the 1890s. New laws, in effect August 21, 1911, and given "teeth" by the creation of the Department of Game and Fish, made licenses necessary, for example. To hunt in one's own county cost one dollar, in the entire state, three dollars, and, for a non-resident, fifteen dollars. The law did allow that, "a person may hunt and fish in the open season in his own militia district or on his own land without a license," and made it legal for tenants to hunt without a license on "leased and rented" land with the owner's permission. New laws also made it illegal to transport game to another state or county unless accompanied by the game hunter, an amendment squarely aimed at criminalizing market hunting and subsequent sale of game.<sup>73</sup> These laws, informed as they were by men such as Hopkins, followed the statutes of sporting culture elsewhere in the United States.<sup>74</sup> Ostensibly for the conservation of game, new laws privileged hunting for leisure and made operation more difficult for those who hunted for sustenance or additional income. Hopkins, as an avid sportsman and ally to northern hunters in Thomas County and the Red Hills region, and others infused state game laws with the priorities of elite interests. The laws protected property owners and encouraged landholders to post their land, unless the huntsman was following a pack of hounds in chase of a fox or deer and then could trespass freely. The exception to the rule of posted lands privileged those men who had the means to keep hounds for sport. License fees also made hunting accessible only to those who could afford the cost. All of these laws—outlawing the sale of game, posting property, and license fees—went against traditional hunting practices and would ultimately upset small farmers who claimed mastery not only of their lands but also the game therein.

If elite hunters benefited from the new laws, the inverse was true for some whites and most blacks. New legislation not only circumscribed the movement of "pot hunters" and "game hogs" but also black men. Just as the vagrancy and so-called anti-enticement laws of the late nineteenth century had sought to reestablish control over the labor of black men, the new laws restricted activities outside of working for white men and sought to keep

firearms out of black hands. After emancipation, no laws barred freedmen from owning guns outright but conservation laws could, if enforced, perform that task.

Farmers and sportsmen saw the potential of game laws to restrict black mobility. Although the code allowed that anyone could hunt in their own militia district without license and that tenants could hunt and fish on land they farmed, permission of the owner permitting, some smallholders, such as Thomas County local R. R. Redfearn, supported the curtailing of even these rights. He wrote to Judge Hopkins concerned about the need for shooting and fishing restrictions because of “triflen [*sic*] negroes” who fished anywhere they pleased.<sup>75</sup> Though Redfearn may not have known it, the State of Georgia was on his side.

Only two months after the assembly created the Department of Game and Fish, the *Atlanta Constitution* reported that the new laws were being used as a “club” against black laborers. Jesse Mercer, the first game commissioner, told the paper that white farmers in Dekalb County reported falsely that “negroes had quit work in the fields and had gone to hunting birds and other game without license and that a ruthless slaughter of all kinds of was being carried on. . . .” Game wardens responded and found no such slaughter had taken place. Farmers used their presence, however, to “spread the report that the game wardens were after the negroes in order to get them back on the farms, where their labor is needed.”<sup>76</sup>

Sportsmen also argued for the need to control “indolence” among blacks by curtailing hunting privileges. One common critique of the new game code concerned its allowance of hunting without a license in one’s own militia district. This provision frustrated wardens. Militia districts tended to be poorly defined and violations could be easily challenged in courts. Game commissioners consistently advised the Georgia Assembly to change this statute in the code and require a license to hunt anywhere outside of personally owned property. Some commissioners attempted to be more persuasive than others in their reports. Charles Arnow, the Commissioner of the Department of Game and Fish in 1917, wrote in his annual report that “many irresponsible persons” took advantage of the militia district exception and disregarded “other rights of neighbors” who might have posted their land. He singled out “large numbers of negroes” for these types of transgressions, “who are glad of an excuse to prowl through the woods, with dog and gun, when they had far better devote their time and energies to pursuits more in line with their temperaments and necessities.” Arnow considered the mobility of black hunters, who had legal right to hunt without a license, dangerous. To keep black farmers “in line” and at work, he recommended amending the game law to make hunting without a license legal only for property holders.<sup>77</sup> Sam Slate, the Commissioner in 1918, echoed Arnow’s recommendation in his report the

next year.<sup>78</sup> Game laws enacted in the Progressive Era in Georgia served as a form of social control.

The move to limit black access to hunting also suggests that the Department of Game and Fish, sportsmen, and white farmers equated hunting with a certain kind of manhood; the control over land and game was at the heart of their constructions of elite white manhood or of the independent small farmer. If black men were allowed to possess guns (privileges that had been curtailed while enslaved) and have access to hunting grounds, the mastery and manhood of white men stood to be challenged. The many complaints about black hunters after the Civil War stood as a common "trope of lost control" over a racial hierarchy.<sup>79</sup>

Northern hunters took advantage of the new laws to support and further changes that they had put into practice already in Thomas County and the Red Hills region. Charlie Young, a black man from the area who spent his life working as a dog handler and gardener for northern hunters, was an apt observer of changing hunting practices brought by northern sportsmen. He noted, for example, the premium on quail after the northern hunting colony was formed. When he was a boy in the late 1880s, "Quails was every Whair [*sic*] no one ceard [*sic*] about them" and locals could buy the birds at the market for fifteen cents. Black hunters, Young remembered, could not afford the commonly used shells to hunt quail and certainly couldn't afford the smokeless shells that northern sportsmen introduced to the area. But, they could "set a trap eny Whair [*sic*]" and sometimes bag a whole covey of quail (often fifteen birds). Trapping was outlawed in Thomas County by the state legislature in 1876; the observations of Young suggest that these laws were ignored.<sup>80</sup> But, as land was increasingly privatized and laws enforced by newly empowered game wardens after 1911, the trapping and hunting of local blacks and whites was curtailed in a major way.

Northern hunters also wasted no time posting their lands. Young recounted that signs began to dot the rural landscape, warning trespassers of the consequences if caught poaching. Young recalled, "the first sign put up in this country was by a northern man Dr. Metcalfe," the early proponent of Thomasville who owned a 1,200-acre estate near the town.<sup>81</sup> Northerners also fenced their property. In 1904, just as he purchased land in the area, J. H. Wade wrote to Hopkins that, "I am going to fence my entire property at once. The two ten acres [*sic*] pieces on the Boulevard I would like in order to avoid fencing around them. What can you get them for? I will fence around the Girtman place west of the road and run the present road around it also."<sup>82</sup> A. H. Mason, owner of Susina Plantation, took similar action. In 1910 he purchased 1,000 posts from a local man in order to fence in his lands.<sup>83</sup>

Sportsmen often hired their own wardens to ward off illegal hunters. Efforts to employ a warden sometimes took collective form or benefited from

information by multiple landowners in the hiring process. Sometimes a group of plantation owners shared a warden, as was the case with the Lake Iamonia Hunting Club. The club, like its predecessor the Cracker Gun Club, was a collective of wealthy northern hunters and a few of the southern elite, including Hopkins (as president), who shared shooting access to exclusive lands. The club's bylaws provide a clause to employ a game warden that would protect lands from trespassers.<sup>84</sup> In later years, the game warden became a position appointed by the Department of Game and Fish, but Hopkins and the northerners continued to hold sway over appointments in the area. In 1933, C. D. Jordan, from nearby Monticello, Georgia, wrote to Hopkins seeking the position of game warden in Thomas County, and asked that he "write Mr. Lou [sic] Thompson and the other millionaire owners of estates down there and ask them to endorse me [to?] Governor Talmadge."<sup>85</sup> Hopkins, who was well connected in the Department of Game and Fish, likely had no problem securing the appointment if he favored Jordan.

The game laws of 1911 and early conservation advocacy did not go unchallenged. Small farmers, who likely approved the effects on African American hunters, had no time for the challenges that new laws gave to their assumed mastery. Farmers from across the state took notice of the state's nod to sportsmen. Some wrote to *The Jeffersonian*, the magazine of famed Populist Tom Watson, to air their grievances. Even before the Department of Game and Fish was in place, W. L. Dorris cast the interests of sportsmen and farmers as being at odds. While sportsmen, he argued, came during hunting season "to the different railroad towns" to shoot indiscriminately, even on posted lands, farmers and tenants who had spent the year raising the birds for meat and for the eradication of insects had to stand by "indignant." Dorris opposed a state licensing program; he argued that "under a State license the State is their domain, and the farmers must stand by and see their birds shot down and their crops trod down, without recourse." Dorris' descriptions of sportsmen, with their "imported setters and pointers and brand new guns that glistened in the November sunshine like so many mirrors," emphatically stressed the moneyed aspect of sport hunting. He warned that Georgia would be without a truly protective game law as long as the "sporting fraternity" had influence over game policy and the "Legislature enact[ed] laws to meet their hearty approval."<sup>86</sup> Dorris foreshadowed the later criticism of new game laws after 1911.

Another landowner, for example, called for the repeal of all extant game laws in 1916, and took particular issue with the illegality of trapping and marketing game. Citing a property owner's right to kill and sell game on his own land, the writer lamented that only "evils" resulted from the law: that the farmer was "deprived of making money legitimately; those not sportsmen are deprived of the privilege of occasionally eating a little game." Ridiculing

concerns about conservation as merely lip service, the writer wondered why "conservation" meant sacrifice by the farmers (when it was they who could raise, trap, and transport birds to other lands, for example) while no one stopped the "'sportsman' killing twenty-five birds" per day, "during the open season for 'sport.'" The writer argued that, "the law operates against the land owner and farmer, and prevents real conservation, and likewise against everybody other than the 'sportsman.'" <sup>87</sup> Three years earlier, when the laws were still new, Francis H. Harris of Brunswick, Georgia, a coastal destination popular with hunters and anglers, lambasted the state laws as protective only of sportsmen. Like the writer in 1916, Harris found the outlawing of killing and selling game found on one's own property to be an egregious violation; he reasoned that if farmers could raise and sell their own stock, they could raise and sell wild game. After Harris' lengthy critique and call for farmers to cry out in protest, Watson agreed that "no man could be deprived of the legal right to protect his crops, at all times," from wild game and birds by trapping and shooting outside of hunting season. "Legislative enactments to the contrary," Watson concluded, "are pluperfect hog-wash." <sup>88</sup>

Local hunters contested the new laws by simply ignoring them. State commissioner reports consistently decried blatant transgressions of game law across the state. Commissioners pleaded with the General Assembly to create more stringent laws to protect wildlife and to establish more equitable compensation for game wardens. In the Red Hills region, new laws and private efforts by northerners did not keep out poachers, which suggests that hunting practices remained largely unchanged. Charles Chapin asked H. W. Hopkins, for example, if he had "heard of any shooting or poaching out around my T.C. Mitchell lands and if so is there anything you could do or I, to stop it." He ventured to Hopkins that, "maybe something could be done to avoid finding birds shot up as I did last year." <sup>89</sup> To mitigate poaching, northern hunters employed game wardens to patrol their properties and remain on the lookout for trespassers. C. A. Griscom, who owned land in Leon County, Florida, wrote to A. H. Mason that he was anxious to find a warden for his lands:

As far as I know we have no Game-warden yet and I consider the situation precarious. Mr. R.G. Johnson, who is my Agent and lives on Horseshoe Plantation, is trying now to find a man for reasonable wages who has the ability and the nerve. It is no easy position to fill. I will seek your advice if we succeed in securing a suitable man. <sup>90</sup>

Griscom's letter suggests that northern hunters took poaching and trespassing seriously, and his anxiousness indicates that some locals continued hunting as they did before, regardless of posts or fences.

Northerners maintained their close connection with men like Hopkins, who continued to promote their interests locally and statewide, well into the 1930s. Hopkins acted as agent for many northerners up to that point, including L. S. Thompson, John F. Archbold, and George F. Baker of New York.<sup>91</sup> The main purpose of the winter colony—hunting—remained in place during those years and Hopkins and the northerners continued to identify as sportsmen. The leisure economy had, beginning in the late nineteenth century, only deepened the social divides that characterized the South: the continuation of the land tenure system, overwhelmingly populated by black farmers; the struggle by small farmers against the privatization of hunting grounds and consolidation of the area's most fertile lands; and the representation of elite interests in state law, in this case with the creation of the Department of Game and Fish and the game laws codified therein.

Historian Albert Way has chronicled the growth of conservation initiatives in the Red Hills region in the 1920s and 1930s. With the help of naturalist Herbert Stoddard, northerners transformed their hunting plantations into laboratories to study and propagate quail and to develop methods of land management congruent with emerging ideas about conservation. Way argues that Stoddard, in his work on the quail preserves of the Red Hills region, is an important and often overlooked figure in the American conservation movement. Stoddard's ability to bring together the emerging professional and scientific priorities of land resource management and local environmental knowledge and practice—particularly controlled burning—developed a model of “biocentric” management that persists today (several of the game plantations, including Tall Timbers, once home to Edward Beadel's yellow wagons, remain intact as preserves dedicated to research and conservation). But Way concedes that the southern conservation movement headed by Stoddard and the northern estate owners was essentially conservative in nature. Quail plantations always remained in private hands, as opposed to state and federal land trusts, and the movement was founded as “less an oppositional reaction to the growth of industrial and corporate America than a concomitant to it.” Ultimately, northern owners “did as they pleased under the property rights structure of the post-open range New South.”<sup>92</sup>

Northerners certainly did as they pleased, but relied upon their southern allies to support and further their initiatives. A common identity as sportsmen, one that was cross-regional but class-specific, bound these men together. In the Red Hills region, northerners found an ally in H. W. Hopkins, who did much to construct the northern hunting colony and to see that sportsmen's interests influenced changing game laws. Though sportsmen were successful in realizing their colony and could, by 1911, rely upon a set of laws to enforce their particular hunting culture, they met challenges by local farmers who cast their opposition against a monied elite. Competing versions of manhood

lay at the heart of these debates, and though sportsmen were successful in changing policy, small farmers and other non-elite locals were successful in ignoring it, at least until the 1930s. The legacy of northern sportsmen in the Red Hills region is an important one—land preserves founded by them are still in place today—but the history of their seasonal settlement was rife with local challenge. Those challenges must be acknowledged to understand the impact of northern hunting colonies across the region.

## NOTES

1. Donald H. Doyle, *New Men, New Cities, New South: Atlanta, Nashville, Charleston, Mobile, 1860–1910* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990). Doyle identifies "new men" as urban elites who were invested in the growth of southern cities after the Civil War. These men were lobbyists for railroad expansion, which they linked to economic development, and saw opportunities for a growing urban network linked to industrial development.

2. For more detail about small farmers' conception of manhood, see Stephen Kantrowitz, *Ben Tillman and the Reconstruction of White Supremacy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), esp. chap. 4.

3. Albert G. Way, *Conserving Southern Longleaf: Herbert Stoddard and the Rise of Ecological Land Management* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011), p. 12.

4. Clifford Paisley, *From Cotton to Quail: An Agricultural Chronicle of Leon County, Florida, 1860–1967* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1968), p. 77.

5. A vast literature on the anthropology of tourism seeks to define tourism and the tourist. This literature is useful for historical studies of tourism. I use a broad definition that does not distinguish between different subsets of tourism for business, health, recreation, and so on. Consequently, I am less concerned with discerning the motivations of early tourists to Thomasville than assessing their influence. For classic studies of the anthropology of tourism, see Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976); Victor Turner and Edith Turner, *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978); John Urry, *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Society* (London: Sage Publications, 1990).

6. Paisley, *From Cotton to Quail*, p. 77.

7. William R. Brueckheimer, "The Quail Plantations of the Thomasville-Tallahassee-Albany Regions," *Journal of Southwest Georgia History* 3 (fall 1965): p. 44.

8. Nicolas Proctor, *Bathed in Blood: Hunting and Mastery in the Old South* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002), p. 61.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 145. See chap. 7 for a more thorough look at the hunting experiences of enslaved men.

10. "With Gun and Dog in Georgia," *Forest and Stream* 60, no. 2 (Jan. 10, 1903): p. 29.

11. E. L. Youmans, "Thomasville as a Winter Resort," *Popular Science Monthly* 28 (Dec. 1885): p. 190.

12. "Beagles and Bulls and Other Attractions of Thomasville," *Atlanta Weekly-Constitution* (Atlanta, Ga.), May 2, 1882, p. 7.
13. *Forest and Stream* 18, no. 18 (June 18, 1882): p. 376.
14. "Beagles and Bulls and Other Attractions of Thomasville."
15. Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, p. 31.
16. Daniel Justin Herman, *Hunting and the American Imagination* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001), p. 139.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
18. D. L. Shepard to H. W. Hopkins, Apr. 26, 1901, fol. 1978.010.188, box 3010A, Hopkins Collection (hereafter HC), Thomas County Historical Society (hereafter TCHS).
19. C. S. Hebard to H. W. Hopkins, July 14, 1903, fol. 1978.010.269, box 3019A, HC, TCHS.
20. William Warren Rogers, *Thomas County 1865–1900* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press), p. 116.
21. Brueckheimer, "The Quail Plantations of the Thomasville-Tallahassee-Albany Regions," p. 53; William Warren Rogers, *Antebellum Thomas County 1825–1861* (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1963), pp. 67, 115.
22. Brueckheimer, "The Quail Plantations of the Thomasville-Tallahassee-Albany Regions," p. 54; Rogers, *Thomas County*, p. 116. Susina remained in the Mason family until 1980; today it is still a private residence.
23. Paisley, *From Cotton to Quail*, p. 78; "On the River," *Thomasville Times-Enterprise* (Thomasville, Ga.), Mar. 4, 1893.
24. Brueckheimer, "The Quail Plantations of the Thomasville-Tallahassee-Albany Regions," p. 54.
25. "What a Visitor Says," *Thomasville Times-Enterprise*, Feb. 2, 1893; Paisley, *From Cotton to Quail*, p. 78.
26. Brueckheimer, "The Quail Plantations of the Thomasville-Tallahassee-Albany Regions," pp. 55–56.
27. *Ibid.* For a full history of Pebble Hill Plantation, see William Warren Rogers, *Pebble Hill: The Story of a Plantation* (Tallahassee: Sentry Press, 1979).
28. William R. Mitchell, Jr., *Landmarks: The Architecture of Thomasville and Thomas County, Georgia, 1820–1980* (Thomasville, Ga.: Thomasville Landmarks, 1980), p. 32.
29. Rogers, *Pebble Hill*, pp. 130–131.
30. J. H. Wade to H. W. Hopkins, Aug. 2, 1904, fol. 1978.010.269, box 3019A, HC, TCHS.
31. J. H. Tayler to H. W. Hopkins, May 6, 1907, fol. 1978.010.269, box 3019A, HC, TCHS. Tayler acted as McCartney's agent.
32. Abstract of Title, "South half of lot number 94 in the 13th District of Thomas County, State of Georgia," H. J. and A. T. McIntyre to J. H. Wade, 1910, fol. 1978.010.269, box 3019A, HC, TCHS; Abstract of Title, "Lot 93 in the 13th District of Thomas County, Georgia," H. J. and A. T. McIntyre to J. H. Wade, 1910, fol. 1978.010.269, box 3019A, HC, TCHS.

33. J. H. Wade to H. W. Hopkins, Oct. 26, 1916, fol. 1978.010.269, box 3019A, HC, TCHS.
34. Journal entry for Mar. 27, 1919, fol. 1:11, Lula Mae Hamilton Harding Collection, Hargrett Library, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
35. Paisley, *From Cotton to Quail*, p. 94.
36. H. W. Hopkins to Edward Crozer, Oct. 8, 1915, fol. 1978.010.330-9, box 3020A, HC, TCHS.
37. William Warren Rogers, *Transition to the Twentieth Century: Thomas County, Georgia, 1900-1920* (Tallahassee: Sentry Press, 2002), p. 71.
38. *Cairo Messenger* (Cairo, Ga.), June 24, 1904.
39. Rogers, *Transition to the Twentieth Century*, pp. 69, 72-73.
40. "An Open Letter to Mr. Hopkins," *Thomasville Times-Enterprise*, Feb. 14, 1905, fol. 1978.010.538, box 3012A, HC, TCHS.
41. *Cairo Messenger*, June 3, 1904.
42. *Weekly True Democrat* (Tallahassee, Fla.), July 3, 1914, quoted in Paisley, *From Cotton to Quail*, p. 84.
43. *Weekly True Democrat*, Sept. 24, 1909, quoted in William Warren Rogers, *Foshalee: Quail Country Plantation* (Tallahassee: Sentry Press, 1989), p. 80.
44. *Weekly True Democrat*, Jan. 30, 1920, quoted in Paisley, *From Cotton to Quail*, p. 84.
45. Charlie Young, "Reminiscences of Charlie Young for Bill Rogers," vertical files, accession number 2001.99.104, TCHS, p. 28; Rogers, *Foshalee*, pp. 112-117.
46. Herbert L. Stoddard, *The Bobwhite Quail: Its Habits, Preservation, and Increase* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931), pp. 350-351.
47. Way, *Conserving Southern Longleaf*, p. 39.
48. H. C. S., "A Georgia Quail Country," *Forest and Stream*, Feb. 24, 1893, p. 161.
49. *Ibid.*
50. Proctor, *Bathed in Blood*, p. 58.
51. Samuel B. Smith, "Interesting Particular in the Natural History of the Quail," *American Turf Register and Sporting Magazine*, Dec. 1829, p. 205. See also, "The Quail or Partridge," *American Turf Register and Sporting Magazine*, Jan. 1830, p. 247.
52. John T. Flanagan, "Hunting in Early Illinois," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 72, no. 1 (Feb. 1979): p. 6.
53. Stuart A. Marks, *Hunting in Black and White: Nature, History, and Ritual in a Carolina Community* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), p. 71.
54. H. W. Hopkins to D. L. Hebard, Oct. 10, 1930, fol. 1978.010.326-7, HC, TCHS; Paisley, *From Cotton to Quail*, p. 85.
55. H. W. Hopkins to D. L. Hebard, Oct. 10, 1930, fol. 1978.010.326-7, HC, TCHS.
56. Grady C. Cromartie, interview by Clifton Paisley, Jan. 23, 1970, Clifton Paisley Collection, 1915-1968, Special Collections, Archives, and Manuscripts, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.
57. Rogers, *Transition to the Twentieth Century*, p. 215.

58. Ibid.

59. Hopkins served in the state legislator in 1902–1904, 1911–12, 1913–1914, 1915–1916, 1917–1918. “Offices Held by H. W. Hopkins,” fol. 1978.010.600, box 3020A, HC, TCHS; Charles H. Arnow to H.W. Hopkins, Oct. 1, 1915, fol. 1978.010.516B, box 3025A, HC, TCHS.

60. For an overview of Progressive law in Georgia, see Numan V. Bartley, *The Creation of Modern Georgia*, 2nd ed. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990).

61. For more on southern Progressivism, see William A. Link, *The Paradox of Southern Progressivism, 1880–1930* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

62. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, at the Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 29, 1911* (Atlanta: Charles P. Byrd, State Printer, 1911), pp. 706, 803.

63. See *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, Extraordinary Session at Atlanta Tuesday, March 20, 1917* (Atlanta: Byrd Printing, 1917).

64. He amended dates on the hunting season and took out snipe as a protected game bird. See *Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, at the Regular Session of the General Assembly, At Atlanta, Wednesday, October 28, 1896* (Atlanta: George W. Harrison, 1896), pp. 355–356.

65. Lawmakers passed bills in 1878, for example, that allowed landowners to post their lands to stop trespassing hunters and that outlawed trapping fish in creeks and rivers. See *Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, 1878–1879* (Atlanta: James P. Harrison & Co., 1880), p. 52.

66. *Journal, the Senate of the State of Georgia, at the Regular Session of the General Assembly, At Atlanta, Wednesday, June 24, 1903* (Atlanta: Franklin Printing Publishing Co., 1903), p. 233.

67. John Rutherford, comp., *Acts of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia Passed in Milledgeville at a Biennial Session, in November, December, January, and February, 1853–54* (Savannah: Samuel T. Chapman, 1854), pp. 336–340.

68. John W. Duncan, comp., *Acts of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, Passed in Milledgeville at a Biennial Session, in November, December, January February, and March, 1855–56* (Milledgeville: Boughton, Nisbet and Barnes, 1856), p. 12.

69. *Acts of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, Passed in Milledgeville, at an Annual Session in November and December, 1859* (Milledgeville: Boughton, Nisbet, and Barnes, 1860), p. 9.

70. R. Andrews, “State Without Game Law—Georgia’s Unique and Unenviable Distinction,” *Columbus Enquirer-Sun* (Columbus, Ga.), reprinted in *Atlanta Constitution* (Atlanta, Ga.), June 29, 1908, p. 4.

71. “Georgia Needs an Effective Game Law,” *Atlanta Constitution*, Feb. 22, 1909, p. 4.

72. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia at the Regular Session of the General Assembly* (Atlanta: Charles P. Byrd, 1911), July 10, 1911, p. 284; July 14, 1911, p. 427; and *Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, 1911* (Atlanta: Charles P. Byrd, 1911), Part 1, Title 5, pp. 137–146.

73. Charles B. Reynolds, *The Game Laws in Brief: A Digest of the Statutes of the United States and Canada Governing the Taking of Game and Fish* (New York: Forest and Stream Publishing Co., 1911), p. 89, accessed Aug. 20, 2011, <http://www.archive.org/stream/gamelawsinbrief00canagoog#page/n5/mode/2up>.

74. Scott Giltner, *Hunting and Fishing in the New South: Black Labor and White Leisure After the Civil War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), pp. 150–158.

75. R. R. Redfearn to H. W. Hopkins, June 20, 1903, fol. 1978.010.515–5, HC, TCHS.

76. "State Game Law is Used as Club: Farmers Take Advantage of Law to Frighten Negroes," *Atlanta Constitution*, Nov. 30, 1911, p. 6.

77. Charles Sterling Arnow, *Sixth Annual Report of the Department of Game and Fish of Georgia, July 1st 1916 to June 30th, 1917, State Game and Fish Commissioner* (Atlanta: Johnson-Dallis Co., 1917), p. 5.

78. Sam J. Slate, *Seventh Annual Report of the Department of Game and Fish of Georgia, July 1st, 1917 to June 30th, 1918, State Game and Fish Commissioner* (Atlanta: Johnson and Dallis Co., 1918), p. 5.

79. Giltner, *Hunting and Fishing in the New South*, p. 51.

80. Rogers, *Thomas County*, p. 259.

81. Young, "Reminiscences," p. 26.

82. J. H. Wade to H. W. Hopkins, Aug. 2, 1904, fol. 1978.010.269, box 3019A, HC, TCHS.

83. "Memorandum of Accounts Paid by H. W. Hopkins for Account, A. H. Mason, From Sept., 25th, 1909 to May, 1910," fol. 1978.010.320–11, box 3020A, HC, TCHS.

84. Lease for the Iamonia Lake Club, n.d., fol. 1978.010.611, box 3010A, HC, TCHS.

85. C. D. Jordan to H. W. Hopkins, Aug. 2, 1933, fol. 1978.010.518, box 3025A, HC, TCHS.

86. W. L. Dorris, "Discussing the Game Laws," *The Jeffersonian*, Apr. 19, 1909, pp. 6–7, Thomas E. Watson Papers Digital Collection, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, accessed Aug. 19, 2011, [http://www.lib.unc.edu/dc/watson/index.html/container/digitem\\_142?id=006](http://www.lib.unc.edu/dc/watson/index.html/container/digitem_142?id=006).

87. A Georgia Citizen, "Interesting Facts About the Game Laws," *The Jeffersonian*, Feb. 3, 1916, accessed Aug. 19, 2011, [http://www.lib.unc.edu/dc/watson/index.html/container/digitem\\_405?id=003](http://www.lib.unc.edu/dc/watson/index.html/container/digitem_405?id=003).

88. Frances H. Harris, "Criticizes the Georgia Game – Law," *The Jeffersonian*, Mar. 6, 1913, p. 9, accessed Aug. 19, 2011, [http://www.lib.unc.edu/dc/watson/index.html/container/digitem\\_288?id=009](http://www.lib.unc.edu/dc/watson/index.html/container/digitem_288?id=009).

89. Charles M. Chapin to H. W. Hopkins, n.d., fol. 1978.010.317, box 3020A, HC, TCHS.

90. C. A. Griscom to A. H. Wade, Nov. 8, 1905, fol. "Hunting Rights, Sale of Plantations," box 3005A, HC, TCHS.

91. H. W. Hopkins to C. M. Chapin, Jr., July 6, 1933, fol. 1978.010.416–4, box 3020A, HC, TCHS.

92. Way, *Conserving Southern Longleaf*, p. 226.