

### MISSISSIPPI'S RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT.

To the Honorable R. B. Fulton, LL.D.,  
Chancellor of the University of Mississippi:

MY DEAR SIR:

It is with sincere and great regret that I am forced to forego the honor of accepting your flattering invitation to address the University of Mississippi. Pray make my excuses and accept this letter as being all that, in view of other engagements which keep me here, I can do at this time, for "The Development of the Material Resources of Mississippi."

You will, perhaps, pardon some prefatory words of personal explanation touching my relations to the university over which you preside, and the state by which it was endowed.

The first Mississippians whom I ever met, were members of the university, and also members of a college fraternity which still flourishes in your midst. They had come to New York, shortly after the close of the civil war, to make the acquaintance of and to show their brotherly love toward us of the North, while yet the losses and sorrows of war were fresh in all our minds, and bore with such peculiar severity upon them and their families in the South. I was but a boy just out of school, and yet this first offer to "clasp hands across the bloody chasm" has not been, and cannot by me, be forgotten.

The published letters of Justice Lamar show that long before he, in 1874, made the speedy restoration of order at the South possible, through his magnanimous and eloquent eulogy on Senator Sumner, he had thought out and written out the peace-be-getting plea with which he closed that memorable address, "My countrymen, know one another, and you will love one another." Is it not fair to assume that his teachings in the university, as professor of ethics and metaphysics, must have had somewhat to do with your undergraduates bringing to us in New York the divine message of healing, so many years earlier?

Not only did the clergyman who had married my father and mother—the gifted, eloquent and charming Dr. Francis L. Hawks—become one of the board of trustees named in the act of 1844 to incorporate the university, but my whole course at Columbia college was passed under the presidency of one of your predecessors as chancellor; I refer, of course, to the late Dr. F. A. P. Barnard, of honored memory.

My first visit to the state was in the autumn of 1877, in connection with the organization of the Chicago, St. Louis and New Orleans railroad company. This gave me the privilege of making the acquaintance of Judge R. A. Hill,

who then presided over the federal court, and was for so many years chairman of the board of trustees of the university.

It has since been my good fortune to know many of the alumni, among whom may be counted so large a number of those who have represented, and now represent, the state in congress, and are, or have been, administering justice on the bench and practicing at the bar.

I also am, and have been for many years, a freeholder, a taxpayer, and, in a sense, a farmer in Mississippi; and having devoted nearly a quarter of a century of hard work to the material development of the state, I may claim to speak thereon from experience, if not with authority.

If all that I have to say shall not, in every particular, coincide with your views, and those of other citizens of the state, let us hope that this will be set down to an honest difference of opinion on the part of one who is a well-wisher and a co-worker.

#### Mississippi and Iowa.

The resources of Mississippi are essentially agricultural. Alone of all the southern states, it lacks mineral resources. For, after all, Florida and South Carolina export phosphate rock, Louisiana furnishes both salt and sulphur, and Texas has of late begun to produce petroleum.

To contrast Mississippi with the equally agricultural northern state of Iowa is natural and may prove instructive.

Mississippi was admitted into the union in 1817, as the twentieth state, and Iowa in 1846, as the twenty-ninth.

The next census, that of 1850, showed that Mississippi had more than three times the population of Iowa. (606,526 against 192,214.)

Although Iowa has long been more populous than Mississippi, the census of 1900 shows that in density of population there is no very great difference, Iowa having 40.2 and Mississippi 33.5 inhabitants to the square mile.

But, on looking further, we find that Iowa contains one city of over 60,000 inhabitants, three of from 30,000 to 40,000, four of from 20,000 to 30,000 and one of from 15,000 to 20,000. Those nine cities have in the aggregate a population of 282,355. In them dwell more than one-eighth of all the people of that state.

In Mississippi, on the contrary, there is not a single city of 15,000.

Furthermore, the eighty-eight villages, towns and cities in Iowa, having a population of over 2,000, contain 612,203 persons, while the thirty similar municipalities in Mississippi contain only 138,086. That is to say, the urban population of Iowa is more than four-fold that of Mississippi.

Without claiming any special virtue for an urban population, it must be ad-

mitted that in the mere matter of wealth urban communities excel the rural.

On the other hand, during the decade from 1890 to 1900, the total population of Mississippi increased in a greater ratio (20.3 per cent.) than did that of Iowa (16.7); or for that matter than did that of any one of twenty states, including Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas, Missouri, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Nebraska and Kansas.

Like Iowa, Mississippi is without any great commercial markets, or manufacturing and distributing centers, within her own borders.

The marked differences noted above must be traceable to the character of the people, the way in which these states were settled, and the habits thereby engendered. The development of the Northern and of the Southern states has proceeded on radically different lines. From the beginning all works of public utility were, in the North, created through joint action, and, very generally, by means of joint stock companies. From the earliest days the little saw-mill or grist-mill, the small manufacturing plant, the turnpike road and the toll bridge, were, at the North, built and operated, if not by corporations, at least by joint effort. In the South, on the contrary, each plantation was a thing by itself, with its own store, its own mill, its own roads and bridges. To be entirely candid, it seems to me that the North has prospered through combination and unity of effort, while the South has lagged behind by reason of isolation and the absence of a community of interest. That this should have been the case so long as slavery endured was a necessity; that it continues to this day is a misfortune, which we, as educated men, should set ourselves to correct.

Another marked characteristic of the state lies in the vast preponderance of the native-born population. The census of 1890 showed only 7,952 foreign-born residents in Mississippi, as against 14,264 in Arkansas, 14,777 in Alabama, 20,029 in Tennessee, and 49,747 in Louisiana.

From the beginning the state was blessed with a seacoast affording natural harbors, available for small craft, as well as with a vast system of navigable rivers, which not only gave access to her whole western border, but also extended far into the interior in many directions. No state, certainly none west of the Allegheny mountains, earlier appreciated the value of railroads and its need of them. More than one railroad was in operation in Mississippi before a mile of track had been laid in Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, or any of the states lying west thereof.

#### The First Inter-State Railroad.

In spite of all its traditions in favor of state's rights and the strict interpretation of the constitution, Mississippi,