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The White Hall Plantation House Ruins and Oak Avenue, remnants of a significant eighteenth century plantation house and grounds which has gained additional significance as a component of an early-to-mid- twentieth century hunting plantation incorporating historic resources such as the ruins of a brick house with tabby wings and twin tabby flankers; evidence of a formal garden as demonstrated by a tabby retaining wall; and a massive double avenue of oaks planted in the late eighteenth or very early nineteenth century.

The White Hall Plantation House was a substantial house of at least two stories, built between 1771 and 1776, then enlarged between 1786 and 1791. The house was built in three major parts, consisting of a brick central block 44' wide and 35' 6" deep, with entrances on the north (facade) and south (water) elevations and at least two brick chimneys, and two tabby wings attached the main block to the east and west, each 33' 9" wide and 29' 9" deep, with the main block projecting slightly beyond each wing on the facade (north) elevation. The house and wings together measured about 112' wide and there is some evidence that the ground levels of each wing had three openings on the south (water) elevation and two openings on the north (facade) elevation.

The house at White Hall burned ca. 1870, and was not renovated or occupied afterward, as the main block and wings gradually collapsed during the first few years of the twentieth century. In 1900 the wings were still essentially complete except for roofing and framing members; by the late 1920s the main block's brick exterior had disappeared and the upper levels of the tabby wings had crumbled.

The extant ruins of White Hall, which contribute to the significance of this historic property, include the brick foundation courses of the main house and substantial sections of its tabby wings, as well as sections of the east and west tabby flankers. The tabby wall sections, 2' thick with an interior plaster finish and an exterior stucco finish, have eroded irregularly through the years, some down to ground level and others to a height of 5' to 6'. Patches of scored stucco are also visible on the exterior walls. At two outer walls of the east wing the tabby has held fast at two window openings, despite the loss of lintels.

---


The east and west flankers at White Hall stood slightly separate from and north of the main house, a location appropriate to their function as service buildings. At 155' apart, their walls define an entry court or yard on the north (facade) elevation. The east flanker, thought to have been a kitchen, was heavily damaged by the ca. 1870 fire and collapsed before 1964; sections of the tabby wall are still extant, with built-up soil and ground vegetation within the footprint of the flanker. Based on similar photographs taken before the east flanker was entirely lost, the two flankers were almost identical and similar to the extant tabby slave house at the Spring Island complex a few miles away.³

The east flanker is thought to have been a slave house. This tentative identification is based on photographic evidence of three entries at the south elevation, visible from the main block. The north elevation featured four windows at each level and a centered interior chimney against the wall, and a single window at each level of the east and west elevations. A 1920s photograph shows the building with a hipped roof, but without window sash or doors; it is not known when the building was last occupied. After the roof and window frames disappeared, the unsupported window and door openings eventually gave way and the north and south elevations eventually collapsed.⁴

The east flanker retains its west and east walls, now free-standing. In this flanker—unlike the brick fragments mixed in with the tabby at the main house foundation—brick is visible here in two or more courses between the two floor levels. Some portions of the original scoring of the exterior stucco and interior plaster are extant.

The residential complex at White Hall was enhanced by the garden or lawn to its south. The only extant visible elements are portions of the tabby retaining wall defining an outdoor space along the . The wall, which contributes to the significance of the property, is at least eighteen inches wide, but the original height cannot be determined without excavation and further examination. The southeast corner of the wall is easily visible. It extends northward, substantially intact, for 33' along the east side of the garden, then as tabby rubble for an undetermined distance. From the southeast corner, the front line of the wall, which is 165' south of the White Hall Plantation House, runs straight for 11'. After a gap of 47' the wall is visible again, curving in an arc in a 53' section. Its closure at the west side of the garden is not visible. Within the lawn is a single massive live oak.

⁴ Brooker, "Conservation and Preservation of Historic Structures located at White Hall."
In 1994 Good Hope Corporation engaged architectural consultant and tabby expert Colin H. Brooker, of Brooker Architectural Design Consultants, of Beaufort, S.C., to stabilize the east and west tabby wings of the main house by patching the walls, filling cracks, and capping the horizontal surfaces of the standing walls with a lime-based mortar. Wood lintels and frames were fitted into the remaining window openings of the east wing to help support the weight of the tabby above and to help brace the abutting walls.

The new mortar is easily distinguishable from the old, but incorporates oyster shell and is expected to acquire a patina of its own over time. The west flanker was also stabilized, with wood lintels and frames fitted into the remaining window openings, and mortar filled the gaps between the new wood members and the historic tabby. The wooden lintels and frames for the remaining window openings of both wings were based on measured drawings executed in 1964.  

avenue on each side. Most of the oaks are in excellent to good condition, though young trees have periodically been planted to replace a few that have died. These trees were most likely planted between ca. 1771, when White Hall was built, and Thomas Heyward Jr.'s death in 1809.

The ornamental gate at the head of the avenue, built in 1932, also contributes to the significance of this property as an example of the improvements made to the property as an early-to-mid- twentieth century hunting plantation. The 28' wide assembly consists of paired brick posts and three gates. A double-leaf central gate of square wood pickets, 11' 2" wide, hangs on two common bond brick posts, 8' high and 2' 6" square, with cast-stone caps and cast-stone ball finials. The single-leaf outer gates, also of square wood pickets, hang on two smaller common bond brick posts, 7' high and 1' 9" square, with cast-stone caps.

---

The White Hall Plantation House Ruins and Oak Avenue are significant at the statewide level under National Register Criterion A in the area of Social History and under Criteria C and D in the area of Architecture.

**Criterion A: Social History**

The White Hall Plantation Ruins and Oak Avenue are significant in the area of Social History for their ability to illustrate the rise and fall of an inland rice plantation—and, to a lesser extent, the Heyward family, one of the most prominent families in early South Carolina—from 1771 to ca. 1860, and the later consolidation of White Hall and several other abandoned plantations into a large hunting preserve from ca. 1890 to the 1940s to meet the changing needs and tastes of its subsequent owners.

The plantation house at White Hall, built between 1771 and 1776, then enlarged between 1786 and 1791, burned ca. 1870 and was in ruins by the mid-twentieth century. It and the magnificent double avenue of live oaks leading to the house illustrate the growing wealth and influence of South Carolina rice planters during the Revolutionary and Early National periods, particularly those owning long-established inland plantations in the hinterlands of Beaufort, Charleston, and other coastal towns.

This plantation, however, fell into decline early in the nineteenth century, and most planters in the same situation sold or abandoned their inland rice plantations in favor of the larger, more productive, and more lucrative tidal rice plantations that made South Carolina the leading producer of rice in the United States for most of the century. By the eve of the Civil War, White Hall was much less valuable than tidal rice plantations established on the Combahee and Savannah rivers, and while a few of those continued to produce rice for decades after 1865, it and many other old inland plantations were almost worthless, and were among the first to be sold as hunting plantations rather than for their agricultural potential.

White Hall is an excellent example of the conversion of South Carolina's unprofitable and often abandoned plantations into hunting preserves in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It was one of many tracts consolidated into Good Hope Plantation, created in the 1890s as a winter hunting retreat. Good Hope Corporation, owner of the White Hall Plantation property since 1932, has conserved the land for game while also introducing timber management as a compatible activity that further supports the continuation of the property's historic use as a hunting plantation.
Criteria C and D: Architecture

The White Hall Plantation House Ruins are particularly significant in the area of Architecture not only as an excellent example of residential and secondary buildings of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries but also as a large extant example of tabby, a significant building material common to the South Atlantic coastal region from ca. 1580 to ca. 1920 and an important feature in the Beaufort area from ca. 1735 to 1862. They are of statewide significance under Criterion C as embodying the distinctive characteristics of a method of construction, but are also of statewide significance under Criterion D for their potential to yield valuable information about the history of tabby buildings and structures in the Beaufort area, in South Carolina, and in the entire South Atlantic coastal region from the colonial period to the Civil War. Tabby buildings and structures, typically in ruins, are relatively rare, so that even the smallest amounts of extant historic material may provide valuable clues about the nature of tabby construction.

Tabby, described as "the first concrete material made and utilized in the United States," was used from 1580 to 1920 along the North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, north Florida, and south Texas coasts, with most construction located on the South Atlantic coast and centered around primary centers at Saint Augustine, Florida, and Beaufort, South Carolina. One authority has described tabby as "an early cast-in place construction material consisting of sand, lime (from shells and wood ash), and water. Tabby can be considered a lime-based concrete, unreinforced, with shell and shell fragments serving as the coarse aggregate. . . . The recipe, based on an oral tradition, usually varied from the Spanish-, Portuguese-, or Dutch-speaking Caribbean region to the English colonies and was influenced by African traditions." Tabby construction in Beaufort District—which included the site of White Hall until Jasper County was created in 1912—dates from ca. 1735 until 1862, after the city of Beaufort (approximately

---


were occupied by Federal troops during the Civil War.

Just after the war Julius James Sams (b. 1826), whose father, Dr. Berners Barnwell Sams (1787-1855) built an enormous plantation complex on Datha (now Dathaw) Island, near Beaufort, described the wide variety of uses in tabby construction along this part of the South Carolina coast:

Tabby or tappy is an artificial stone or concrete used extensively at one time, on the Sea Islands as a substitute for brick and stone, in the construction of houses, foundations, indigo-vats and cisterns of all kinds, as well as sea-walls, fortifications, etc. ⁹

Tabby walls were constructed in layers about 1' to 2' high by pouring the mixture between wooden forms, tamping it extensively and allowing it to set for several days. It was most often finished on building interiors by plaster directly applied to the tabby, and on exteriors by two coats of stucco, with the second coat often scored to resemble stone blocks.

Colin H. Brooker, an expert on tabby construction in this area, points out that Beaufort-area tabby was typically poured into 2' forms instead of the 1' forms favored in coastal Georgia and Florida, and that the White Hall Plantation House Ruins are themselves an intriguing variant of the typical tabby recipe of "oyster shell, shell lime, and sand mixed in roughly equal proportions with water":

On some sites variants are seen, [such as] clay having been substituted for sand or possibly added to an oyster shell, lime, and sand mix at Whitehall Plantation." ¹⁰

The ruins at White Hall, then, have the potential to yield significant site-specific information about tabby construction not only in Beaufort County but also in South Carolina and the South Atlantic coastal region as well.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Thomas Heyward, Jr. (1746-1809)

White Hall Plantation was for many years the principal residence of Thomas Heyward Jr. (1746-1809), a delegate to the Second Continental Congress and one of four South Carolina signers of the Declaration of Independence; an officer during the American Revolution; a circuit judge; and a

⁹ James Julius Sams (b. 1826), "Dathaw," undated typescript [perhaps published in the Beaufort Republican in 1873], Sams Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.
delegate to the South Carolina Commons House of Assembly 1772-75, Provincial Congress and General Assembly 1776, and General Assembly 1779-1780, 1783-84, 1789-1790; a member of South Carolina's ratifying convention for the United States Constitution 1788, and a member of the state Constitutional Convention 1790.

Born at Old House, the plantation of his father, Daniel Heyward (1720-1777), Thomas Jr. (named "Jr." to distinguish him from his uncle Thomas Heyward) was the first of his parents' children to live to adulthood. A career in the law must have been planned for him from the beginning, for he clerked in a Charleston law office in his teens before being sent to London in 1765 to complete his education. Returning to South Carolina in 1771, Heyward was admitted to the bar of the Province of South Carolina and began practicing law in Charleston.

Heyward’s political career began soon afterward. From 1772 to 1775, although living in Charleston, he served for St. Helena’s Parish in the Commons House of Assembly. He represented St. Philip’s and St. Michael’s Parish in the First and Second Provincial Congresses and the First General Assembly (1776). As a delegate to the Second Continental Congress at Philadelphia, he was one of four South Carolinians who signed the Declaration of Independence in 1776. In 1778 he was elected a circuit judge for South Carolina. Heyward was elected to the Second General Assembly (1779-1780) from both St. Helena’s Parish and St. Philip’s and St. Michael’s Parish, and served for the latter. St. Philip’s and St. Michael’s Parish reelected him to the Third General Assembly (1779-1780).  

Daniel Heyward gave Thomas Jr. a lot on Church Street in Charleston in 1770, and the younger Heyward built a house there in 1771. The house, which still stands at 87 Church Street, and has long been known as the Heyward-Washington House (President George Washington stayed there on his Southern tour of 1791), was the first historic house museum in Charleston and was designated a National Historic Landmark on 15 April 1970. 12 Thomas and Elizabeth Mathews Heyward’s first son Daniel (1774-1796) was born in Charleston; they had four more children, none of whom lived to maturity. 13 Like most of the men in his family, Thomas Heyward Jr. also invested in real estate. In 1775 he acquired at least 1,000 acres in two St. Bartholomew’s Parish plantations, one adjacent to

---

13 Edgar and Bailey, pp. 323-25; Charleston County Deed Book B4, pp. 56-60, Charleston County Register of Mesne Conveyance, Charleston, S.C.; Sallie Doscher, "Draft of the Thomas Heyward Biography," undated manuscript, Heyward Papers, Charleston Museum, Charleston, S.C.
Amsterdam Plantation and Rotterdam Plantation, and the other on Cuckolds Creek, which he still owned as late as 1801. In November 1776 Heyward sold a 100-acre Prince William's Parish plantation to Joseph Ainger.  

Politics and planting were interrupted by military service during the American Revolution. Thomas Heyward Jr., commissioned as a captain, commanded a detachment of the Charleston Artillery defending Beaufort, and was wounded at the Battle of Port Royal Island on 3 February 1779. He commanded the Charles Towne Battalion of Volunteers, and was one of about 6700 American prisoners of war captured by the British when Charleston fell on 12 May 1780. Heyward, along with thirty-six other prominent prisoners and twenty-six slaves, were sent to St. Augustine in September of that year. There they were paroled, and had some freedom of mobility; they also corresponded with their families in Charleston. More South Carolinians arrived in November, and by Christmas 1780 there were sixty-four American prisoners in St. Augustine.

In July 1781 word came that the families of any prisoners who refused to swear an oath of allegiance to Great Britain must leave South Carolina by August 1st and that none of the St. Augustine prisoners, even if exchanged for British prisoners of similar grade, would be allowed to return to South Carolina. That summer Thomas Heyward Jr. was exchanged and along with Elizabeth and their son Daniel (who had joined him from Charleston) joined twenty-seven men, one woman, and twenty-eight slaves aboard the schooner East Florida, leaving St. Augustine for Philadelphia. A few of the exchanged prisoners would not accept their exile. Almost immediately after his arrival, for example, Christopher Gadsden hurried home to South Carolina to continue the fight against the British. Edward Rutledge also "embraced the first opportunity of returning to Carolina," but took refuge in the country since he was unable to enter British-occupied Charleston.

The exchanged prisoners in Philadelphia were a close-knit group. They kept in touch with South Carolina's other revolutionaries, and were aware that many of their number, including Thomas Heyward Jr., were chosen for the Fourth General Assembly in an election held mid-December 1781. Since Charleston was still in British hands, the assembly was held from January 8th to February 26th, 1782 at Jacksonborough, thirty miles away. Though 194 men were elected to the House of Representatives, only seventeen members—too few for a quorum—were present at the first meeting, and they met each day and adjourned until seventy-six members arrived in Jacksonborough on January 17th. Before the session adjourned at the end of February, fourteen more late arrivals had

14 Charleston County Deed Books C7, p. 366; G6, p. 259, and R5, p. 88, Charleston County Register of Mesne Conveyance, Charleston, S.C.
joined the Fourth General Assembly, though almost a third of the elected members—including Thomas Heyward Jr.—were absent for the entire session.\(^{16}\)

In August 1782, at the request of the new United States Congress, three British vessels transported some of the exiled South Carolinians home from Pennsylvania. Thomas Heyward Jr., and his wife Elizabeth remained in Philadelphia, where their son Thomas was born that month. Elizabeth Heyward died three days later, and the baby a few months afterward.\(^{17}\) Family histories do not indicate where the Heyward baby died, or when Thomas finally returned to South Carolina. He was probably among the 430 people, white and black, from South Carolina and Georgia still in Pennsylvania in September 1782. Some of the paroled prisoners hired their own transportation home; in December the British sent a ship large enough to return 120 whites and 30 blacks south.\(^{18}\)

When he did arrive in Charleston during the late fall or winter of 1782, Thomas Heyward Jr. could for the first time attend to his responsibilities as executor of his father’s estate (Daniel Heyward had died during the war, in 1777). The elder Heyward had left most of his property in trust for his seven younger children, a trust to be managed by Thomas either alone or with his brother William. There were substantial tracts bequeathed to Thomas’s son Daniel, but none to Thomas Jr. himself. Thomas, like his other grown brothers Daniel Jr., and William, had already been given land, and probably slaves, by his father.\(^{19}\)

When Heyward began to put the family plantations back in order in the aftermath of the war, he found that the destruction caused by British troops during the summer of 1779 had yet to be repaired. He visited his son Daniel’s 2,000-acre Savannah River plantation and his own Combahee River plantations, finding them badly damaged. The 1783 crops were "scanty and indifferent," and Heyward needed to locate runaway slaves, rebuild slave houses and barns, and repair drainage systems to get the Heyward plantations back into production.\(^{20}\)

There were also estate and other legal matters to be settled. Daniel Heyward Jr., the middle of Daniel Heyward’s children with his first wife, had died five years earlier. He was married, but


\(^{17}\) James B. Heyward, "The Heyward Family of South Carolina," South Carolina Historical Magazine 59:3 (July 1958), 153.


\(^{19}\) "Will of Daniel Heyward," in Works Progress Administration, Charleston County Wills, Volume 17, pp. 690-96; various Charleston County Deed Books, Charleston Register of Mesne Conveyance, Charleston, S.C.

because he had no children, his trust properties were entailed for division among the heirs of his brothers Thomas Jr. and William. No will has been found for Daniel Jr., so it is not known how property he owned outright was distributed after his death.21

Thomas Heyward Jr. was active in Charleston's post-Revolutionary civic life. He was a warden of the city's Sixth Ward 1783-86 and vice-president of the Charleston Library Society 1783-84. Heyward was also elected to the Fifth General Assembly (1782-84), again from both St. Helena's Parish and St. Philip's and St. Michael's Parish, but serving for St. Helena's Parish; he was then elected to the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth General Assemblies (1789-90) by St. Philip's and St. Michael's Parish. In 1788 he was a delegate to South Carolina's ratifying convention for the United States Constitution, and in 1780 he was a delegate to the South Carolina state constitutional convention.22

During this period, Heyward took up his country residence at White Hall, in St. Luke's Parish, Beaufort District, near his father's Old House Plantation, and made it his primary home. Heyward's transition from town to country is reflected in real estate records. In 1776 and 1784 he refers to his residence at Charleston; then in 1790 and 1792 at St. Luke's Parish; in 1794 he was "Thomas Heyward of the State of South Carolina;" and in 1801, "of South Carolina." In 1790 the First United States Census enumerated two Thomas Heywards in Beaufort District: Thomas Jr. and his uncle Thomas.23

In 1785 the Agricultural Society of South Carolina was founded in Charleston with Thomas Heyward Jr. as its first president, an office he held until 1798. In his first speech as president of the Society, he announced that "the blessings of peace . . . cannot be effected by any means more interesting and advantageous than by turning our attention to the cultivation and improvement of our fields." Heyward particularly emphasized experimentation and innovation. He was evidently planting rice at White Hall by 1785, and that year he acquired several nearby tracts. These included 1,000 acres on Hazzards Creek (Chelsea Plantation and Pultney Plantation), and an adjacent 500 acres near Chechessee Creek.24 William Heyward, the heir to Old House Plantation, died in 1786. With their young children, his widow Hannah remained in St. Luke's Parish as head of the household and an independent rice planter.25 Close by at White Hall, Thomas Heyward Jr. could keep his eye on the heirs and overseers of Old House.

21 "Will of Daniel Heyward."
23 Heads of Families at the First Census of the United States, Taken in the Year 1790. South Carolina (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1972); references in various recorded deeds, Charleston County Deed Books, Charleston County Register of Mesne Conveyance, Charleston, S.C.
24 C. Irvine Walker, History of the Agricultural Society of South Carolina, Founded Aug. 24th, 1785 at Charles Town, S.C. (Charleston: Agricultural Society of South Carolina, 1919), pp. 3-8; Charleston County Deed Book T5, p. 122, Charleston County Register of Mesne Conveyance, Charleston, S.C.
In 1786 Thomas Heyward Jr. remarried at the age of forty; his second wife, Elizabeth Savage, was seventeen; her family had been among the Philadelphia exiles during the Revolution. Three of their children lived to adulthood. Thomas (1789-1829) was born in Charleston; James Hamilton (1792-1828) and Elizabeth (1794-1852) were born at White Hall. Elizabeth (later Mrs. Henry M. Parker) became the last survivor of Thomas Heyward Jr. and is buried beside him at Old House.\textsuperscript{26}

Elizabeth Savage Heyward was remembered by some family members as having "revolutionized the stately mansion [White Hall] ... to suit her extravagant tastes," and for her "costly open-house hospitality."\textsuperscript{27} The house at White Hall was enlarged between 1786 and 1791, and by the spring of that year was fine enough to house President George Washington on his southern tour. After a week's stay at Heyward's Charleston House, Washington proceeded to White Hall, where he spent the night with the Heywards before continuing on to Savannah.\textsuperscript{28}

Thomas Heyward Jr. died at White Hall in 1809, and was buried in the family cemetery at Old House Plantation. His grave is marked by a fine contemporary monument, and by a twentieth century bust erected by the State of South Carolina.

**White Hall Plantation**

White Hall Plantation House was built by Daniel Heyward Sr. or Jr., probably between 1771 and 1776, and was the home of Daniel Heyward Jr. and his wife Margaret. It is uncertain whether the Heywards occupied the house during the American Revolution or if Daniel Jr.'s widow occupied it after his death in 1778.

In November 1782, four years after Daniel Heyward Jr.'s death, an appraisal was made of his personal property, listing "negroes, stock, furniture, etc." There were thirty-three slaves (valued at £10,350) at White Hall and twenty-two slaves (valued at £7,850) at Springfield. The livestock at White Hall (forty cattle, five hogs, and two horses) was appraised at £675, and the livestock at Springfield (123 cattle, thirty hogs, sixty-one sheep, and four horses) was appraised at £1855. Only at White Hall was household furniture listed in the inventory. Valued at £1.090, it included a "Drawing Room" with two dining tables, two small tables with tea china, and fourteen mahogany chairs;


\textsuperscript{27} Family notes cited in Doscher, "Draft of the Thomas Heyward Biography."

\textsuperscript{28} Terry W. Lipscomb, *South Carolina in 1791: George Washington's Southern Tour* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1993).
a "Parlor" with twenty-four "common" chairs, a dining table, a tea table, and a "Lott of books" valued at £80; also included were a chest of drawers and three bedsteads with featherbeds.29

Details on the occupancy and use of White Hall Plantation immediately after the death of Thomas Heyward Jr. in 1809 are uncertain, but between 1810 and 1830 his widow Elizabeth Savage Heyward (d. 1833) was reported in the United States Census as the head of a separate household consisting of herself and several slaves. Heyward's eldest son Daniel died before him, so that Thomas, the first son of his second marriage, probably inherited White Hall. In 1820 "Captain" Thomas Heyward was in St. Luke's Parish with his wife Ann Elizabeth Cuthbert and their children, living in a separate household from that of his mother.30

Thomas Heyward (the younger) died in 1829, and after his mother Elizabeth died in 1833 White Hall Plantation must have been managed by a trustee for an estate or for a minor child for some time. Though the precise ownership of the property after 1840 is unclear, it is said to have remained in the Heyward family until the early twentieth century. If the practice of male primogeniture was followed, White Hall would have been inherited by Thomas Savage Heyward (1815-1899) son of Thomas Heyward and the grandson of Thomas Heyward Jr.31

In 1840 and 1850 Thomas Savage Heyward (most often known as Savage Heyward) and his family lived in St. Luke's Parish, where he produced both rice and cotton in moderate amounts. Several of his relatives, such as John Webb, John H. Howard, and William C. Howard, produced similar amounts of rice and cotton in 1850 and may have been planting near Heyward.32

The only St. Luke's Parish rice planters to compete with those on the Combahee River or Savannah River in 1850 were A. Alfred Huger and the Estate of John Heyward. Their lands in upper St. Luke's Parish were much more suitable for rice than the fields of lower St. Luke's, and neither planted any cotton. Huger was on the Coosawatchie River. The Heyward plantations, also along the Pocotaligo River or Coosawatchie River, had been the property of the late son of William Miles Heyward and were being managed for Constantia Pritchard (Mrs. John) Heyward and her children.33

It was inevitable that ricefields on the Broad River/Euhaw Creek system, including those at White Hall and Old House, would eventually be abandoned as planters' attentions (and huge gangs of slave labor) were moved to rice plantations with more potential. By 1860, thirty-five planters in St. Luke's

29 Works Progress Administration, Charleston County Inventories, Volume 100, p. 467.
31 Population Schedules, St. Luke's Parish, Beaufort District, 1830 and 1840; Heyward, "The Heyward Family."
33 Agricultural Schedules, St. Luke's Parish, Beaufort District, 1850; Rowland, et al, History of Beaufort County, pp. 374-75; Heyward, "The Heyward Family."
Parish produced at least some rice, but none held as many as one hundred slaves in the parish. The only Heyward planting in St. Luke's Parish in 1860 was William Heyward Jr., listed in the census as "agent." William, the son of John Heyward Jr., may have been managing his father's estate; he produced a fair quantity of rice and no cotton.  

Neither Charleston County deeds nor census data provide any clues to the occupancy of White Hall on the eve of the Civil War. Sometime before 1858 a William Heyward died there; by 1860 Thomas Savage Heyward, presumed to have been heir to the property, had left St. Luke's Parish and was apparently living in Charleston or perhaps Aiken. White Hall must have been occupied and managed for some absentee owner among the Heywards, or owned by some relation with another surname.

White Hall Plantation House was one of the rare plantation houses in Beaufort District to survive the Civil War and the Union occupation of the area from November 1861 through the end of the war and into Reconstruction. The residence—most notably, the brick main block—burned ca. 1870; the west flunker did not burn and was occupied into the twentieth century, possibly by an owner or tenant of the adjacent farmlands. A photograph taken in the 1920s shows the flanker with gaping window and door openings, evidently having been vacant for some time by then.

Good Hope Plantation

South Carolina's earliest hunting plantations—more specifically, quail clubs—were organized before the turn of the twentieth century. Pineland Club (founded 1887); Okeetee (1894), and Palachucola (1897) bought or leased vast tracts in Beaufort County, including areas in what are now Jasper and Hampton Counties. Members of these clubs, many of them Northerners who were seasonal visitors or residents in the area, also acquired land for private hunting plantations, and were soon followed by others. For the first time in decades, there was now a viable market for previously unprofitable land that had been planted—if not in many years—in rice and cotton.

36 Brooker, "Conservation and Preservation of Historic Structures located at White Hall."
The present Good Hope Plantation has its origins in the late nineteenth century as "Camp Good Hope." New York banker Harry B. Hollins, who obtained an interest in the Central of Georgia Railroad in 1887, began hunting in Beaufort County with railroad officials John K. Garnett and Edward Porter Alexander and helped found the Pineland Club in Garnett's lodge. In 1891, soon after he acquired his own land in the area, Hollins and his guests began hunting quail and ducks on his new property at Camp Good Hope.  

Beaufort and Jasper County land records are woefully incomplete, and title abstracts are scanty for the various land parcels within the boundaries of Good Hope Plantation as it stands today. The extant deeds to White Hall Plantation refer to it as an 800-acre tract conveyed by a Mr. Buckner to a Mr. Howard in 1869, leased to Harry B. Hollins from 1905-1910, deeded to Hollins in 1909, and sold to Herbert L. Pratt in 1910, becoming part of Good Hope Plantation as early as 1905.

Pratt, also a New Yorker, used Good Hope as a hunting retreat for his large family. He constructed a lodge and several cabins to replace the rough camp used by Hollins. White Hall Plantation, three miles from the lodge and park, became a favorite spot for picnics and cookouts. In 1932 Pratt marked the highway entrance to Good Hope with a large gate on stuccoed posts and also built an ornamental gate with brick posts and paired wooden gates at the lodge.

Since the early 1940s Good Hope Plantation has been managed for timber and wildlife. It was one of five South Carolina hunting plantations where Walter Rosene studied quail habitat and production between 1947 and 1958. As at other successful pineland hunting plantations, the quail population here is maintained in conjunction with timber production.

Archaeological Potential

Although subsurface archaeological testing and excavations have not been conducted at White Hall Plantation, the site retains its archaeological integrity since it was in the hands of only two owners for the entire twentieth century, both of whom maintained the plantation house site and oak avenue without disturbing the plowzone or timbering in the immediate vicinity of the site. The site continues to have the potential to yield significant scientific data relative to both high and low status plantation lifeways in Beaufort District from the late eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth centuries.

38 "Pineland, Mother of Hunting Plantations."
39 Deed Index, White Hall Plantation Papers, Good Hope Corporation, New York City.
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Additional potential research questions include information relative to the architecture of the main house and its dependencies, the layout of the White Hall plantation complex, including significant landscape features, and plantation activities of both the Heyward family and their slave workforce.
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