

BOWA-026
CRBIB# 401762
404/130523

LIBRARY,
PLANNING AND RESOURCE PRESERVATION
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, NABO

STUDIES IN THE LOCAL HISTORY OF SLAVERY

Essays Prepared for

The Booker T. Washington National Monument

by Roy Talbert, Jr., Gary Lee Cardwell, and Andrew L. Baskin

Ferrum College
Ferrum, Virginia

1978

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
1 INTRODUCTION	i - vii
by Roy Talbert, Jr., General Editor Director of Curriculum and Programs, Ferrum College	
2 SLAVERY AND SOCIETY IN THE TOBACCO KINGDOM: Franklin and Bedford Counties, Virginia, 1850-1865.	
Part I: The Microcosm: Hales Ford Community	1 - 13
Part II: The Macrocosm: Society and Politics in the 1850's Franklin and Bedford Counties	
Master and Slave	14 - 35
Non-Slaveholders in the Rural Community: The Whites Slaveholders Dominated	36 - 49
Culture and Politics in a Rural Southern Community: The 1850's	50 - 76
Part III: Aftermath: Glimpses of the Civil War Ordeal	77 - 87
by Gary L. Cardwell, Associate Professor of History Ferrum College	
3 PEOPLE OF COLOR IN BEDFORD COUNTY AND FRANKLIN COUNTY, 1850-1865	88 - 127
by Andrew L. Baskin, Assistant Professor of History, Ferrum College	

INTRODUCTION

There are a number of unique features about this work which, one hopes, will serve to make it a model for similar studies in the future. Without any doubt, this manuscript owes its origins and present status to the enthusiasm and dedication of the staff of the Booker T. Washington National Monument, located in Franklin County near Smith Mountain Lake. In particular, Superintendent John T. Hutzky and his staff historian, William T. Wilcox, convinced not only the National Park Service that the project was worthy of support, but also the history department of Ferrum College that they could accomplish such a task. The cooperation reflected in this paper between a large government agency and a small liberal arts college is certainly a healthy sign of vitality, both for the Monument and the College.

As historians at Ferrum College we are deeply grateful for the opportunity to pursue our trade in a manner which allowed us at once to live up to the standards of our profession and to serve the needs of our local community. Such a combination, indeed, seems entirely fitting for a College which began as a training school in these remote hills. In these present times of retrenchment in funds allowing for the professional development of faculty, this task was even more welcome. We hope that one of the demonstrated facts from this effort is that a professional faculty can turn its attention directly to its local area with gratifying results.

The mission given us by the Booker T. Washington National Monument was to provide sufficient information on the general conditions of the surrounding area so as to allow the Monument staff to interpret it to their visitors.

In the 1850's Booker T. Washington was born a slave on the farm of James Burroughs. His subsequent rise to national fame as a leader of black Americans is clearly reason enough for the nation to have enshrined his birth place, and it is reason enough as well to investigate closely the local conditions of the area of his birth. Because the Burroughs' "plantation" was located on the northeast edge of Franklin County, very near the Bedford County line, the team of historians, under my direction, decided very early that a proper focus could only come through an investigation of conditions and events in both counties. We believe that our decision has been well justified, enabling us to make valuable comparisons which would not have been available had we limited our study to Franklin County.

I believe that the following essays are impressive and are a credit to the professionalism of professors Gary L. Cardwell and Andrew L. Baskin. Professor Baskin came to this study already having deeply immersed himself in the black history for this region. This latest work clearly establishes him as the authority on the black experience in Virginia's western Piedmont and eastern slope of the Blue Ridge in the decades immediately before and directly after the Civil War.

Professor Baskin's study contains, in addition to a wealth of documented material from courthouse and census records, all the pathos of a young black man studying the history of his people in this area. One can literally see Mr. Baskin grappling with the long term impact of a paternalistic slave system which, on the one hand, was perhaps more lax than in the Deep South, but, on the other, may presently act as a restraining factor as contemporary blacks seek to deal with public policy issues such as affirmative action, school integration, and the more subtle vestiges of Jim Crowism. It will become clear to the reader that Mr. Baskin has a great deal of interest in

these contemporary problems, serving as he currently does as president of the Franklin County chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Some purists may claim that such a present involvement in such issues must inevitably destroy Mr. Baskin's objectivity. This editor, however, believes that, once we have established Mr. Baskin's frame of reference, his work adds, more than anything else, a note of realism, perhaps even of continuity, to the story of blacks, slave and free, in this area. It is the judgment of this editor that Mr. Baskin, a bright, young, energetic leader of his people today, has raised a number of questions which would have remained entirely overlooked by the traditional historical approach. More importantly, the inclusion of his essay clearly incorporates into this work the process of a contemporary black examining black history.

As such, then, Mr. Baskin's essay can be seen as a proper counterweight to the longer study by Dr. Gary Cardwell who has attempted to survey the general social, economic, and political scene in Franklin and Bedford counties on the eve of the Civil War. Dr. Cardwell is to be congratulated for the wealth of material he discovered and the skillful techniques he used to exploit the so often dull records of courthouse and census. Given the back-country nature of this region until well into the present century, one must also be impressed with the amount of other primary sources uncovered by Dr. Cardwell and the research team under his direction.

We believe, at this point, that we have located every existing issue of any newspaper concerned with this region in our timeframe. Dr. Cardwell would be the first to be delighted were that statement subsequently proved incorrect, for the truth is that few issues are extant. For manuscript material we have been pleased that the anticipated paucity of records

dissipated when we discovered the extremely valuable Saunders papers.

Dr. Cardwell has proved especially skillful at quantitative methodology, generating a statistical study which places the Burroughs' "plantation" precisely in relation to its neighbors in the Hales Ford community, but also extends this comparison to include the larger areas of both Franklin and Bedford counties. We have little doubt now as to where Burroughs stood, in terms of real estate, personal property (including slaves), and to a lesser extent social status, in relation to the nearby neighbors and those as many as twenty miles in any direction.

More importantly, however, in terms of the historian's task of telling the human story, Dr. Cardwell has done a masterful job of revealing the social contours of this society. One has only to consider the case of the young Meadors whose story is unraveled in successive treatments of his life as a son of a poor farmer, hiring himself out in a tobacco factory, joining his wealthier neighbors in slave patrol duty, fighting and dying for a slave system in which he was not a participant (but to which he was inextricably tied, as Dr. Cardwell so successfully demonstrates), and lastly the story of his widow as a recipient of county aid. The same story can be told for overseer Starkey, the wealthy Saunders family, and the local personages who have come alive through Dr. Cardwell's work.

There are other areas of investigation in which we have been less successful. For the poor white and the blacks, slave and free, some fundamental aspects of their lives will always be excluded from history because we lack absolutely any evidence upon which to recreate them. These essays, nevertheless, include so much of the human drama, across a fairly large spectrum, that will be invaluable to the staff of the Booker T. Washington National Monument since it will necessarily increase substantially the

resources they have for interpretation to the public.

This work is, then, unique because of its origins, the differing techniques used by the two investigators which in the end work toward the enhancement of the dimensions covered, and the very specificity of the project which targeted itself at a relatively small area for a fairly brief period of time. There are only a few other such studies which have so attempted to limit the scope and deepen the depth, and the authors have noted these and compared their findings.

Beyond our hope that we have served the needs of the Monument staff, always our first concern, it is also our belief that we have been faithful to our profession, and that this work represents a substantial contribution to the study of the slave community of this region. We further believe that we have created a model which can successfully be applied to that long narrow belt running from Virginia to Georgia where the Piedmont rolls up to the Blue Ridge. In the course of our work we uncovered additional material which we felt was extraneous to the present discussion, and it is my hope that professors Baskin and Cardwell will continue their investigations and will eventually produce an important and definitive study of this region as it emerged from its tobacco and slave domination.

For this work, the editor has served as something between office manager and rigorous director of research. Certainly the uniqueness of the material and the quality of its presentation must be credited to professors Baskin and Cardwell. Whatever limitations of scope, lapses of interpretation, and inaccuracies of presentation exist are the responsibility of the General Editor. Official and personal records from a period of considerable illiteracy generate a perplexing array of inconsistent spellings of personal nouns. We have attempted, after ascertaining that the different spellings in fact

referred to the same person, place, or thing, to maintain one consistent spelling for clarity.

The participants have become so involved in the questions of how this wealth of material can be effectively interpreted for the public that they have spent hours dreaming of displays which will show the Burroughs' "plantation" in its proper setting, including the reproduction of representative documents which we have in our files. We are prepared, at any time, to offer our services as consultants to the Monument to assist in this technical aspect of interpretation.

It will be clear from a reading of the following essays that we have provided this material solely for the use of the Monument staff. We have made no effort to introduce the personalities of the Burroughs' household, white and black. The Burroughs family, and Booker, Monroe, and the other slaves arrive on the scene unannounced because we felt that the Monument staff were already sufficiently informed concerning them. For others, without that background, these sudden appearances may be disconcerting, but we had no desire to waste effort and resources repeating what our specific audience already knew.

Our primary purpose has been to place the origins of Booker T. Washington in their larger setting, hoping to learn by inference a great deal more about the larger environment in which he developed. We hope that the material presented here accomplishes that task.

A number of people have become involved in this work, without which it could not have been completed in the manner it has. Virginia Senator Virgil Goode gave us valuable support by securing copies of state statutes on slavery. Virginia Goodwin and Ann Devenish-Cassell, of the Stanley Library at Ferrum College, proved once again how valuable they are for scholarly

work here. Two local historians, Ann Carter Lee and Gertrude Mann, once again demonstrated their willingness to assist in this matter which is of so great an interest to them. A fortunate discovery was Darlene Krueger, whose on-going work of indexing Franklin County courthouse records considerably enhanced our efforts.

Heading the field research teams was Janet Foard, aided by Richard Bigler and Denise Mitchell. The long hours spent over inscrutable records and blinding microfilm readers testify to their tenacity and scholarly interest. Administratively the project was helped considerably by the interest of Dr. Douglas Foard who traveled with a number of field teams in their search for material and who has been of great help in the final editing. In many ways it has been because of the encouragement of men like Douglas Foard, and James Davis, Dean of the College, that the history department was ready for such a mission. A joint effort such as this one presents unusual typing problems, but they were admirably overcome by the hard work of three excellent typists: Joy McConnell, Linda White and Carolyn Quinn. Their willingness to work long hours, typing from copy sometimes even worse than that our researchers found in the manuscript census returns, is deeply appreciated. There are others I have not named, the list would be too long, in libraries in Washington, D. C., Virginia, and North Carolina, in the courthouses of Bedford and Franklin, and there are many others who reside in this area who have expressed their encouragement and their interest in our work. We ask that all these accept our grateful appreciation.

Roy Talbert, Jr.
General Editor

SLAVERY AND SOCIETY IN THE TOBACCO KINGDOM:
Franklin and Bedford Counties, Virginia, 1850-1865

GARY L. CARDWELL
Associate Professor of History
Ferrum College, Ferrum, Virginia

PART I: THE MICROCOSM: HALES FORD COMMUNITY

Booker T. Washington recalled above all, the remoteness of the "plantation" upon which he was raised as a slave. The Burroughs farm "was about as near to nowhere as any locality gets to be," he recorded.¹ Hales Ford was but one house and a post office. The community served by that post office stretched from the ford at the Roanoke River (since dammed up to create Smith Mountain Lake) nearly eighteen miles south and west towards the county seat, along the Rocky Mount-Lynchburg Turnpike. Ninety-five households populated an area which extended from that pike several miles northwest toward the Roanoke River, several miles southeast beyond Gills Creek and west in the direction of the Taylor's Store and the Glade Hill-Union Hall communities.

The Burroughs neighborhood was Piedmont tobacco country. Geographically it lay between the larger plantation economy of the Lynchburg and James River estates and the mountainous regions of Franklin and Floyd counties, where large scale slaveholding and the cash-crop farming were less typical.

James Burroughs and his slaveowning neighbors did not fit the stereotype of the Southern aristocrat. They were rugged farmers. Their estates were mostly unimproved land, and the portion under till was usually worked by both free white and black slave labor. Their economy was primarily based upon credit, and the cash raised from tobacco, and occasionally grain, provided money for necessities at neighborhood stores but few luxuries.

Yet in most every respect, the Hales Ford community faithfully reflected the sociology of the pre-war South. It was distinctly rural and primarily

non-slaveholding, with only a few large-scale slaveholders among a population of masters who owned only a handful of slaves. For the "tobacco kingdom," which included most of Tidewater and Southside Virginia as well as the North Carolina farmers, Burroughs' neighborhood and his own farm were a microcosm.

Large slaveholding estates of legend and lore, in fact, were atypical for the South as a whole in 1860. A few more than 2,000 slaveholders in 1860 owned more than 100 slaves among a slaveholding population of more than 380,000 people. These largest estates, moreover, were concentrated in the rice producing districts of South Carolina, the sugar cane country of Louisiana, and the black belt cotton kingdom of the lower South. In Virginia in 1860 one hundred and fourteen masters of 52,128 slaveholders owned more than one hundred slaves. Slaveholding in the Old Dominion was more diffuse; there were more slaveholders but fewer large plantations.² Contrary to legend, Kenneth Stampp observed of the South, nearly three-fourths of the population neither owned slaves nor were connected with slavery through family ties: "The 'typical' Southerner was not only a small farmer but also a nonslaveholder." In Virginia about one in four white families owned slaves.³

In the Hales Ford community the tobacco crop, more than geography, determined both the small size of the producing units and the relatively meager size of the slaveholding units. Tobacco needed smaller acreage than other crops, required closer supervision throughout the year, and yielded more produce per acre per hand: typically from 1,500 to 2,000 pounds.⁴ In 1860, James Burroughs raised 2,000 pounds of tobacco.⁵ Historian Joseph Robert's analysis of seven tobacco counties in Virginia (including neighboring Bedford and Henry counties) revealed the average yield of the area's plantations at 3,558 pounds grown on some 5 or 6 acres; for 55 percent of the plantations the yield for 1859 was less than 4,000 pounds.⁶ James Burroughs'

production was, perhaps, less than average but hardly atypical for the region.

Tobacco farms were customarily smaller than rice, sugar, or cotton plantations. According to Robert most tobacco producers were middle class farmers, "substantial but with limited acres and a moderate number of slaves." Their typical acreage ranged from 129 acres (47 improved, 82 unimproved) in Henry County to 478 (207 improved, 271 unimproved) in Nottoway County.⁷ James Burroughs owned 207 acres in 1860, most of it probably unimproved. A small proportion of the land under the plow was in tobacco; the remainder was in corn, hay, and vegetables which provided food for the family and slaves and feed for the livestock. Small farmers typically raised most of their food and raised some hogs, cattle, and sometimes sheep for meat and wool. Perhaps a portion of the tobacco crop was sold directly by the farmer at the warehouses in Lynchburg and Richmond, but in most of the small towns and country districts tobacco was more often sold to a country merchant to settle an account or to wagoners or local tobacco manufacturers who would transport and sell the crop or process it into plug chewing tobacco.⁸

In Hales Ford a large majority (64%) of the male population, including 69 farmers and 11 farm laborers, were involved in the pattern of farming found on the Burroughs estate. Occupations in the community were diverse, including tobacco manufacturers and tobacco factory laborers, merchants, and wagoners, teachers and students, and a variety of skilled artisans ranging from carpenter, miller and blacksmith to shoemaker and one overseer. They were all involved in an economic web of interdependence which included the raising of the "sotweed," its processing, the provision of tools and necessities for the maintenance of small scale farming and, to a lesser extent, slavery.

Slaveholding in Hales Ford was in most respects typical of this part of

the South. Among 77 males eligible to own slaves (employed or 21 years of age) 35, or 45% of the community, were members of the "master class," a figure higher than the Virginia average (25%). The majority of these (71%), however, owned 10 or fewer slaves (compared to 72% in the South as a whole). James Burroughs, who owned 10 in 1860, was upper-middle class by comparison to his neighbors; only eight owned more slaves than he, 16 owned fewer (see Chart I and 57 households (or about 60% of those in the community) were nonslaveholding.⁹

CHART I: The Pattern of Slaveholding in Hales Ford Community
Among Adult Males - 1860

Number of Slaves Owned	Number of Slaveholders Owning This Number of Slaves	Percentage of Slaveholders in this Bracket (rounded off to nearest whole)
50 or more	0	0%
41 - 50	0	0%
31 - 40	0	0%
21 - 30	2	6%
11 - 20	6	17%
5 - 10	16	45%
1 - 4	11	32%
Totals	35	100%

Computed from the Franklin County 1860 Slave Census

NOTE: Among 77 males who were of eligible age to own slaves 35 (or 45%) were recorded as slaveholders.

Typically for the tobacco region the "large" slaveholders, defined here as those owning more than 20 slaves, were few. Accumulation of property and Negro chattel took years of work or the luck of inheritance, and only six in Burroughs' community were so fortunate. Abram Childress, a 65 year old farmer, was the wealthiest in Hales Ford. His household contained four

relatives, none of whom could have assisted in working the estate. Most probably, he employed the only man who claimed "overseer" as his occupation on the 1860 census, John Starkey. Starkey supervised 32 slaves (6 were owned by daughter-in-law Jane Turner) on Childress' 822 acre estate. The elderly man's personal property was valued at \$32,900 (compared with Burroughs' 207 acres and \$8,200 personal property).¹⁰

Childress and five others constituted what there was of an "aristocracy" in Hales Ford; together they owned 141 slaves (or 38% of those in the community); averaged nearly \$20,000 in personal property and owned more than twice the acreage of Burroughs. Lewellin H. Powell, for instance, employed 21 slaves and a 15 year old white farm laborer. Records do not reveal the size of Powell's farm. Two other leading families of the immediate neighborhood, the Cragheads and the Hollands, owned considerable wealth. Catherine and Sarah Craghead (ages 50 and 83 respectively) had most likely inherited their slaves by dower. Catherine's two sons, John and Thomas (ages 27 and 22), worked 22 slaves on their mother's 627 acre farm; they owned 6 slaves each, she 10. Their immediate neighbor Sarah, most likely Catherine's mother-in-law, owned 20 slaves; since there was neither farm hand nor overseer nearby, the grandsons most likely managed her chattel as well. Asa Holland (age 50), whose land adjoined Burroughs on the east, owned 26 slaves and probably others hired out at the Kanawha Salines in West Virginia; he was assisted by a 23 year old farm laborer. A. G. Holland worked 20 slaves on 211 acres several miles north of Burroughs near the river.

Ten of the thirty-eight slaveholding households in the community were more typical of the region, owning from eight to eighteen slaves and property evaluated near that of Burroughs. Joel Meador (age 49), Peter Hancock (age 38), and James Wright (age 64) were all farmers who owned greater acreage,

more personal property and more slaves (14, 12, and 20 respectively) than Burroughs but belong in the category of middle-class slaveholders. Josiah Ferguson, who held 405 acres and 18 slaves immediately across the turnpike from Burroughs was exceptional; he supplemented his farming with some interest in the Benjamin Hatcher-Ferguson Tobacco manufactory. Others did something similar: Milerd R. Hurt, 35 year old farmer with 8 slaves, ran the saw mill or grist mill which Booker and Monroe visited; and Joseph Meador (see above) was not only a farmer but part-time tanner with C. C. Cundiff.

A good number of his neighbors, nevertheless, were what Joseph Robert described as typical farmers -- with "limited acres" and a "moderate" number of slaves. In addition to those above there were four other households less wealthy than Burroughs. Two who were evidently widows, Mary Meador (age 87) and Sarah Holland (85), were distant neighbors owning less real estate and 9 and 12 slaves respectively. Edward Powell, a 79 year old farmer owned six more acres than Burroughs on distant Gills Creek, with 10 slaves and \$7,470 personal property. Joseph Rucker was unique for Hales Ford (but not necessarily the South) in that he worked 386 acres on Merriman's Run which belonged to his brother (Anthony) in Bedford; but because he owned 6 slaves and personal property amounting to \$3,712, he belonged nevertheless among the "middlin" slaveholders.

A complete inventory of slaveowners would be meaningless, but the social contours of Hales Ford reveal something quite apparent and quite typical of the rural, small-farming South--Southern mythology notwithstanding. A handful of the wealthy provided the social and economic example for the community; beneath them were moderate-size slaveholding farmers like James Burroughs and the others mentioned above. At the base of the slaveholding community were a surprising number who owned a handful of slaves; and outside

the slaveholding class were even more Southern whites with less property, in fact often propertyless. While apparently excluded from relative wealth and power, these last were locked into a mutually interdependent economy, a web of kinship in the neighborhood and county, and a set of social ideals shared by agrarian communities.

At first glance the almost 20 slaveholders who owned 5 or fewer slaves in Burroughs' neighborhood may appear a starting aberration for the Southern economic system, but the prevalence of such a small unit of slaveholding is explicable. At least seven were women who lived in with relatives and whose slaves were managed by father, son, or son-in-law. These numbers slant the statistics unrepresentatively. Elizabeth Sample (age 77), for example, lived in with L. H. Powell (probably her son-in-law) and added one slave to his force of twenty; Mary Powell (age 61) owned 3 slaves but lived with her son, Wyth, who supplemented this slave labor with his own and, no doubt, expected to inherit them upon Mary's death. Ann Holland (age 23) represented the other trend; she owned 1 slave but lived with her father Asa, whose 25 slaves and estate have been mentioned.

Eleven white, male heads of household in Hales Ford represented, perhaps, a more curious aspect of the slave regime. Independent farmers, they owned four slaves or less, a small amount of real estate (averaging around \$1,000, a third less than Burroughs), and an insignificant amount of personal property (ranging from \$470 to \$2,600, a significant distance from Burroughs' \$8,700). Small unit slaveholding, however, was common to a rural economy in which the accumulation of slaves and property was gradual, and one static portrait ignores the youthful farmer who likely someday owned a more considerable estate. Six of these eleven farmers were less than 30 years of age and their family names prominent in the county: James English, Peter Booth,

James and Henry Kasey, Samuel and Thomas Turner. Only two, William Divers (owner of 4 slaves at age 75) and James Meador (owner of 1 at age 63), had reached, perhaps, the height of their wealth. Just as most of the wealthy masters were elderly, those who owned the fewest slaves were youthful.

As Frank Owsley and the Vanderbilt school of historians have insisted, Southern society was a rich mosaic rather than a monolithic pyramid of "master, slave and poor white." Fifty-seven of the ninety-five households along the turnpike in Hales Ford did not contain slaves and a considerable number of these, 26 (or about 27% of the whole), were headed by white males who chose to call themselves farmers. Only eleven of these owned more than \$1,500 in real estate, which might have admitted them to the middle class (this same group's personal property ranged from \$150 to \$5,500). None were as wealthy as Burroughs, and most were, of course, older (in their 30's, 40's or elderly). A surprising number, an even dozen, were without any real estate at all, yet family breadwinners; while many of these were young, others were not. J.D.B. Swain, age 81, lived on the Rocky Mount Pike with his wife Nancy, owned a meager personal estate of \$130, and rented his home. Neither did William Hutts (age 50, who lived with his wife Emily nearby) own any land; his personal property amounted to \$50.

A good portion of those who chose to call themselves "farmers," then, were counted among the poor in that society. None in the neighborhood were technically "paupers," under the care of the elected overseer of the poor in Franklin County, but were comparable to tenant farmers, better known in the post-war South. In fact, their economic status mirrored the latter: they worked someone else's land and, very likely, may have paid "in kind" for the use of the land.

The economic status of the poorest farmers shaded nearly imperceptively

into that of the "farm laborers." These were "hired hands" in the neighborhood. Nearly always young (the average age in Hales Ford was 23) they were usually propertyless and served an apprenticeship, all but two under slaveholders. Littleton Meadors (age 18) who served with Burroughs' sons in the Civil War, worked for M.R. Hurt; James Dickenson (age 19) for L. H. Powell; William English (age 23) for Asa Holland; and Thomas Watson (age 18) for a lesser slaveholder, Edward Powell (10 slaves). They were all young bachelors, entirely propertyless, residing with their employers, and very likely working the fields with slaves. Two others, John Pagan and William Drewry (both 23), worked for family, brother and father respectively. Only two who were "farm laborers" according to the neighborhood census were heads of households; Thomas Steger (33) and William Wilkerson (29) had family, owned no real estate and \$300 and \$500 personal property respectively.

The disparity in wealth between the poorest farmers and farm laborers, on the one hand, and those who owned as many or more slaves than Burroughs, on the other, was only one dimension of the gulf between the relatively rich and the nearly poor. Artisans were an important part of that rural economy and, no doubt, accorded some respect for their skills. If personal wealth were the only measure, they would have suffered a low social status. Robert Payne (age 23), who cared for a wife and son and was the only resident to claim carpentry as a trade, owned no land and \$50 worth of personal property. Cabinetmaker Abram Betz (age 68), certainly no novice in his trade, fared no better. Among four millers in the neighborhood, three owned no real estate and meager property, while the eldest and wealthiest, Thomas Payne (age 55), recorded \$200 real estate and \$1,400 personal property. Andrew Drewry (31 years old) was the sole wagoner, with no real estate and \$530 personal property. John Thurman (age 48), the neighborhood's only blacksmith,

supported a wife and seven children but owned only \$500 worth of real estate and \$450 in personal property. He hired out sometimes to the Ferguson and Hatcher Tobacco manufactory, while his eldest son cared for his small farm.

Thurman's family was not an exception. Without benefit of inherited wealth, the near poor in the community encouraged every family member who was eligible to seek some livelihood to provide eventual independence or additional income in the meantime. Miller William Read's son, age 20, worked in a factory, one of 20 factory laborers in the neighborhood.

Ferguson's and Hatcher's manufactory employed (in addition to Read) three Clingenpeel sons (ages 21, 19 and 16), two Meadors (23 and 22), one Divers (23; kin to William Divers) and one Newman (24; most probably the son of Caleb Newman, cabinetmaker). The list of employees reads like a neighborhood militia roll, without officers; they worked twisting or dipping tobacco along with slave labor.

The important economic functions served by the family were characteristic of the entire neighborhood and region. Peter Chambers (28) worked a small farm (\$150 real estate) with two brothers, Calvin and John (26 and 21). Walter Chewing owned a larger estate (\$2,500 in real estate) but at age 64 needed the assistance provided by his son Charles (35), half owner in the land, and farm laborer James Burnett, 23 and propertyless. Burroughs worked his own larger holdings with his three sons, two prime field hands (Monroe and Lee) and whatever help the younger slaves could give. What is significant is that only Abram Childress hired a professional overseer; his employee, John Starkey (age 38) provided for his wife Catherine and 10 children; he owned no land and \$75 worth of property. Land was worked by family members in Hales Ford, and such day laborers or resident hands as neighbors could

provide. Should a slaveholder have need of assistance, a younger son of a neighbor provided it at cost.

This obvious interdependence in such rural economies must have had a mitigating effect upon the class resentment that such a gulf between the propertied and nearly propertyless might have generated. Small farmer and large farmer grew tobacco and were mutually concerned about the prices of their cash crops; the going exchange price offered at Ferguson and Hatcher's by Kyle Clingenpeel (merchant/clerk) or by B. G. Garret at Josiah Ferguson's, just across the road from Burroughs, concerned all alike just as much as the state of the Lynchburg market. They went to M. R. Hurt's grist mill, to John Thurman for a blacksmith, and to a neighbor for supplemental labor or a meaningful trade.

Bare statistics obscure what such a small, rural community shared in terms of human relationship. Most whites around Hales Ford were Baptists or Methodists and, even without a list of church members, one may presume that those who went to "Asa Holland's" Baptist church two or three miles down the pike from the Burroughs represented some sort of cross section of this multifaceted neighborhood. The county was a hunter's paradise; bounties were still offered in the 1850's for foxes, wolves and crow; and slaveholder and non-slaveholder hunted.

In many respects Southerners shared a life-style without regard to class, wealth, or pedigree. The sons and daughters of slaveholder and non-slaveholder attended local common schools; but there were only two teachers in Hales Ford: A. G. Holland's son Thomas (24) and Angeline Turner (20) who lived at Abram Childress'; both were relatives of large slaveholders. Neighbors, no doubt, gathered at the post office and Ferguson's store to make a social occasion of conversation. Living otherwise a rather monotonous

existence in a relatively provincial culture, they all shared together those events which enlivened matters: the excitement of political speeches, the horse trading and brawls on court day, and the social occasion provided by religious revivals.

Neither diaries, family letters, nor local newspapers are available with which the historian can recreate that very human dimension of life in Hales Ford itself. To understand more about the economy and society we must turn our attention to the macrocosm of the Franklin-Bedford County areas. To borrow from the insights of journalist-historian Wilbur Cash, if Hales Ford indeed was a microcosm of small farming communities of the old South, not only the tradition of paternalism but shared values and a common perspective helped overcome social and economic distances among whites. There was an identity created not only by the significant forces of economic interdependence, kinship, slavery and race, but by the historical tragedies of sectional conflict and civil war as well. There could be no stronger social cement, and to these we turn our attention.

FOOTNOTES

1. From Booker T. Washington's, The Story of My Life and Work, quoted in Louis R. Harlan (edited), The Booker T. Washington Papers, Vol. I: The Autobiographical Writings (Urbana, 1972), p. 10.
2. William Scarborough, The Overseer: Plantation Management in the Old South (Baton Rouge, 1966), p. 11.
3. Kenneth Stampp, The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South (Baton Rouge, 1966), p. 30.
4. Louis R. Harland, Booker T. Washington, The Making of a Black Leader, 1856-1901 (New York, 1972), p. 7. Hereafter cited as Harland, Making of a Black Leader. His Chapter 1, "In the Bullrushes," is an excellent rendition of his early life in slavery; our focus is the community.
5. Joseph Robert, The Tobacco Kingdom: Plantation, Market, and Factory in Virginia and North Carolina, 1800-1860 (Durham, 1938), p. 19.
6. Robert, Tobacco Kingdom, p. 7.
7. Robert, Tobacco Kingdom, p. 108.
8. Comparison to South and Virginia as a whole drawn from Stampp, Peculiar Institution, p. 30. All census data are from Franklin County Slave Census, 1860, Hales Ford Community.
9. Stampp suggests a "large plantation was one of 20 or more slaves"; and 22% of the slaveholders owned that many in the South as a whole; see Peculiar Institution, p. 30. Childress' estate on Franklin County White and Free census, p. 514. The census records are only so accurate. Slaveowners may have owned other slaves "hired out" to employers in neighboring counties or states.
10. These and all statistical census information hereafter are taken from the Franklin County White and Free Black Census for 1860, Northeast Division, Hales Ford area, and the same area in the Franklin County Slave Census. Page numbers would be too numerous to cite.

PART II. THE MACROCOSM: SOCIETY AND POLITICS IN THE 1850'S,
FRANKLIN AND BEDFORD COUNTIES

Master and Slave

Slaveholding in Franklin and Bedford Counties was restricted to a relatively small percentage of the population. Among 2,884 males who were of eligible age to own slaves in Bedford County, 1,103 were recorded as slaveholders, or 35%. In Franklin County 624 of 3,144 males, or 20% of those eligible, were among the "master class." Few of these individuals resembled the stereotypical planter of legend. They, like James Burroughs (owner of 10 slaves), were mostly farmers on a moderate scale; three of every four slaveowners in Franklin County, for example, owned ten slaves or less.¹ Slavery on this scale was distinctive; it was probably physically less harsh upon the slave and left more room for paternalism to develop.

Yet the "peculiar institution," whatever the distribution of slave ownership, had a more pervasive influence than sheer statistics reflect. By the 1850's slavery had proven its profitability, and slaveownership was an obvious economic objective for any enterprising tobacco farmer. More importantly the ownership also conferred status. The formula for success in the pre-Civil War South was apparent: wealth in slaves and land brought social prestige, and with such prestige came power. However many there were of the "master class," they carried an influence in that society disproportionate to their numbers. For Southerners, in the tobacco as well as the cotton kingdom, slaveholders were a social model; one aspired to be a "gentleman" and a "planter" and those labels best suited one who owned Negroes.

CHART II The Pattern of Slaveholding in Bedford County, Virginia
Among Adult Males - 1860

Number of Slaves Owned	Number of Slaveholders Owning This Number of Slaves	Percentage of Slaveholders in this Bracket (rounded off to nearest whole)
50 or more	2	0%
41-50	13	1%
31-40	23	2%
21-30	47	5%
11-20	148	15%
5-10	261	26%
1-4	519	51%
Totals	1,013	100%

Computed from the Bedford County 1860 Slave Census

NOTE: Among 2,884 males who were of eligible age to own slaves 1,013 (or 35%) were recorded as slaveholders

CHART III The Pattern of Slaveholding in Franklin County, Virginia
Among Adult Males - 1860

Number of Slaves Owned	Number of Slaveholders Owning This Number of Slaves	Percentage of Slaveholders in this Bracket (rounded off to nearest whole)
50 or more	5	1%
41-50	6	1%
31-40	9	2%
21-30	18	3%
11-20	115	18%
5-10	169	27%
1-4	302	48%
Totals	624	100%

Computed from the Franklin County 1860 Slave Census

NOTE: Among 3,144 males who were of eligible age to own slaves, 624 (or 20%) were recorded as slaveholders.

Slaveholding was diffuse in this region. Even among the largest plantation owners (20 or more slaves), there appear one hundred twenty-eight family names in the two counties. That fact in itself reveals the stake which these communities had in the "peculiar institution." Just as striking, however, is the obvious cluster of family names which must have carried social and political weight: for example, the Browns (five in the two counties owned 147 slaves among them); the Callaways (four in Franklin owned 167 among them); the Hales (two in Franklin owned 125 between them); the Leftwiches (four in Bedford owned 148); and the Saunders (six in Franklin owned 285). Many prominent slaveholding families appear in both counties -- the Armisteads, the Arringtons, the Burfords, the Hurts, the Poindexters, the Turpins and others.³

These were the propertied class in an economy where land and slaves, obviously, were not only the measure of wealth but also the producers of income. In a figurative, as well as literal sense, slaves begot slaves. The wealthiest owners were usually older and had accumulated their property gradually. In 1860 the major slaveholders (20 or more slaves) in Franklin County owned usually from \$20,000 to \$80,000 in personal property and from \$15,000 to \$40,000 in real estate.⁴

The actual value the figures reflect can only be appreciated by comparing them with James Burroughs' estate assessed in 1860 at \$8,200 worth of real estate (207 acres) and \$3,105 in personal property. Burroughs' wealthy neighbor, Abram Childress (26 slaves, \$14,000 in personal property, \$7,200 in real estate: more than 800 acres), was actually one of the "less well-to-do" planters compared to the large slaveholders of the region. Among 38 masters of more than 20 slaves in Franklin County (for which information is available), only one had less personal property and three less real estate

than Abram Childress; most had considerably more wealth. The largest estates in Franklin County were concentrated not in Hales Ford, but Retreat to the southwest. A glance at the same "class" in Bedford County reveals that every one of the nearly 70 masters owned personal estates valued much higher than that of neighbor Childress. In Bedford the largest estates were geographically concentrated in the Davis Mills and Forest Depot areas.

A full appreciation of the economic and social importance of slaveholding can be discerned by considering the proportionate value of slaves to one's total estate. In a slave market which valued prime field hands (a young male) from \$600 to \$1,200 (Burroughs' Monroe was valued at \$600, very low, but Lee at \$1,000, according to the inventory) slaves were usually a Southerner's single most important asset. James Burroughs' land, for example, was valued at \$3,105 (207 acres), according to the 1860 census. When his property was appraised for the inventory of the estate, his ten slaves were valued at \$5,550 and the remainder of his personal property at \$1,573. His slaves, in short, were more valuable than the rest of his entire worldly goods. This situation was particularly true for the small or middleclass slaveholder. Samuel Robinson, a wheat farmer in Bedford County who owned considerable furniture, three horses, twenty-six hogs and other worldly goods left, as well, eleven slaves for his relatives. They were valued at \$5,750; the entire estate at \$6,773.⁶ For the largest of the slaveowners the proportionate value of slaves versus other wealth was less. When emancipation arrived small slaveholders lost most of their personal wealth, but before the war wealth in slaves distinguished them clearly from the nonslaveholding population.

A greater number of the largest slaveholders lived in Bedford County: eight-five owners of 20 slaves or more (8% of slaveowning population). Those who best approximated the legendary wealth of the Old South from this county

were Alex Leftwich of Davis Mills and Mumford Radford of Forest Depot, both Bedford County citizens owning 77 slaves. In Franklin County, where only one in every five males were slaveholders, there were only thirty-eight slave masters of sizeable estates. The four largest were Jno. Hale, James Callaway, and Peter Saunders, Jr., all of Retreat, owning 87, 54, and 52 slaves respectively, and Peter Guerrant whose estate on the Pigg River included 46 slaves.

The estate of Peter Saunders, Jr., a near legendary figure among local historians, will serve as our example. Saunders was the son of Judge Fleming Saunders, a resident of Franklin County until he moved to Flat Creek near Evington in neighboring Campbell County in the 1840's. Peter inherited the family property which lay between present day Callaway and Ferrum, Virginia, in 1842. In the 1850's he lived on that property, first in a small cabin and then in a handsome home constructed during the 1850's. "Bleak Hill," which still stands, was a large Italiniate brick home (which reminds one of the old South legends) complete with Doric columns, a brick office and kitchen nearby, and surrounded by assorted outbuildings.⁷ What is significant about this particular master is that Peter Saunders, Jr., left a rich collection of correspondence while he lived upon and farmed the estate, served as an attorney in the Rocky Mount Courthouse, and participated in local politics.

Saunders exemplified the local "aristocracy." He inherited wealth, owned vast acres, married well (his wife Elizabeth was a Campbell County Dabney), and accumulated 52 slaves by 1860. The Saunders were eventually related to the Watts, Early (Jubal's) and Hairston families. In the 1850's his correspondence includes mention of Dr. Hairston, Robert Hairston, James Callaway and other local slaveowning celebrities, while in Rocky Mount he served in the same courtroom with Jubal Early. Family connections and wealth in land

conferred power: during the Civil War Peter Saunders, Jr., was elected to the Virginia House of Delegates.

Saunders' letters from Bleak Hill reveal a great deal about farming in the 1850's. Like James Burroughs he raised tobacco, a variety of vegetables (potatoes, cabbage, turnips), and hay. He also raised wheat and took pride in the apples and cherries he sent relatives. He raised hogs, like Burroughs, and sheep and cattle as well. Whatever the size of the farm, the crops, the husbandry, the challenge, and the routine were similar.

Most land in this region in the 1850's was unimproved and breaking the land was a task all farmers faced. One correspondent remarked that "there is now too little open land in this section to admit of grazing to any extent -- and it takes a long time to clean up such forests as you know we have."⁸ (County bounties on wolves and foxes in the 1850's testified to the wilderness nature of this backcountry.) His brother Edward, Peter wrote, took weeks planting his corn crop because "a large portion of the ground that he has now to plant has never been broken for the first time."⁹

Farming in the mid-nineteenth century presented a formidable calendar of tasks, all of which help explain the utility of slave labor. Tobacco, in particular, was an exacting crop that required delicate attention throughout the year: burning and preparing the plant bed (January-March), making hills (April), sowing (May), transplanting from the beds (June), laying and topping (July), worming and suckering (August), housing and curing (October), stripping and tying in hands (November), and making for market (December). The original crop was not usually marketed before another had been planted.¹⁰

One has only to imagine the multiplicity of tasks on Saunders' estate, where several variety of livestock and crops were raised and domestic chores abounded, to appreciate the value of slavery as an economic system. Peter

Saunders was an exacting capitalist, and when he visited relatives at Flat Creek his letters were there in his stead at "Bleak Hill":

Direct Moses to finish planting potatoes. . . He can plant a good many in the lower garden, and if the overseer will finish leveling the ditch upon which I commenced work in the meadows /it/ will be a fine place to plant a few roses. . . /Tell/ Peter to put up the pigs -- and have the potatoes fed them. . . . Make Moses set out the tomato plants in both gardens and he ought to thin out . . .¹¹

A week later more instructions arrived:

Daniel ought to work the Irish potatoes -- plant cabbage as soon as possible. The bricks should be taken from around the small beds and a good working given the plants.¹²

What emerges from the Saunders correspondence is an awareness among slaveholders that they were planter-capitalists, challenged to exact a profit through the efficient management of slave labor. Saunders' wife, Betty, also acted as manager and frequently worried because ". . . Bob is suffering for employment . . ."; another servant, Betsy, entrusted with a single task of housekeeping worked little, but ". . . assured me with a tone of injured innocence that she has been working like a dog and that it peared /sic/ like I bore down on her harder than anybody else on the place."¹³ Obviously, upon occasion, what masters required some slaves resisted.

Yet in spite of such commonplace complaints, slavery proved itself profitable as long as there was careful management. Anxieties about its economic soundness were exceptional and were created mostly by fears of Northern intention. Richard Cardle, a nephew of Judge Saunders, for instance, was so shocked by the debates over the Compromise of 1850 to admit that in the future "slave labor . . . as things are going /sectional controversy/ is alike unprofitable and precarious." He toyed with turning to cattle raising, which required "less of slave labor."¹⁴ The rapid increase in the price of slaves in the 1850's, however, was evidence enough to indicate the

good health of this economic institution. Fleming Saunders, Jr., (Peter's brother) remarked in October of 1856 that:

" . . . Negroes sell . . . very high and every thing [sic] raised by their labor is higher -- negro men ought to bring without doubt \$1,000 and likely women the same. I think negroes will sell better in the country. I hear of likely negro men selling for \$1,100 and odd dollars. I am like you I do not think dishonest slaves are worth anything.¹⁵

That there were tasks enough on tobacco farms to make slave labor economically viable for large and small owners alike is rather apparent. A more convincing argument for the same conclusion existed in the widespread practice of hiring slaves out in these counties. Hiring out one's slaves involved a legal contract by which a master leased his slave to an employer who profitted from but was charged with maintaining that slave: providing housing, clothes, and food. Contracts differed, but their specifications were taken seriously because masters could sue in court for breach of contract or for maltreatment. I.A.G. Simms, for example, sued the employers of his slaves, Henry and Perry (leased for one year at \$240.00), because the employer did not live up to the terms: ". . . to treat them well and not work them in the rain or usual bad weather. . . ." Because the employers worked them in such weather and did not "furnish the boys with good yarn clothes, shoes, hats or blankets," Simms was awarded \$500.00 by the court. Several such cases occurred in Franklin County alone.¹⁶

The frequency of hiring out demonstrated the profitability of slave labor to all slave owners. Louis Harlan's biography of Booker T. Washington points out that Booker's stepfather was hired out in the salt works in West Virginia. Harlan also suggested that the discrepancy between the census tabulation of seven slaves for Burroughs in 1860 and the settlement of the estate where he owned 10 "may" have been due to the fact three were hired out.¹⁷

These were hired out in Bedford County, doing agricultural labor. Burroughs' objective, obviously, was to make a profit, and he was among as many as 132 Franklin County masters who engaged in the practice of hiring out in 1860.¹⁸ Some families shared slaves at no cost or left them with others to be marketed, which may account for as many as 53 slaves residing elsewhere than their master's residence, but 79 slaves are listed as hired out in 1860 within the county and the figure is likely higher. Slaves hired outside the county, a most common practice, are not included in the statistic. In 1860 alone, within Franklin County, 98 employers were hiring slaves, mostly one or two.

The demand for slave labor in the 1850's was obviously greater than the supply, and, according to William Scarborough, ". . . the rates of slave hire advanced appreciably during the nineteenth century as slave prices increased."¹⁹ Though Scarborough suggests those rates advanced more rapidly in the lower South where demand was even greater than in tobacco country, nevertheless, the profit involved in these counties was impressive. Judge Saunders, for example, remarked with satisfaction in January of 1856: "Mr. Preston's agent hired forty-five Negroes, he goes very high prices, one hundred thirty to \$160."²⁰

Some historians once assumed that slaves were allowed to keep a portion of their hire and that, subsequently, hiring out was an "escape valve" by which a Negro might buy his freedom. Little evidence exists for this region, in the 1850's, to bear out this thesis. Only once might such an instance have occurred in the Saunders family, which hired out frequently; in January of 1863 Peter Saunders wrote his wife that slaves Bob and Patrick, "are counting the balance of their hire of service with more anxiety than schoolboys ever did."²¹ Whether the two slaves received a percentage of their hire depends upon how one interprets the remarks.

The chief significance of hiring slaves was obviously in its profit; for the slaveowner hiring out was simply sound management of property. A perusal of the Will and Deed books in Bedford County revealed, for instance, dozens of cases of the hiring out of slaves by guardians of the estates of minors. E. M. Poindexter served as guardian of Mary Poindexter's estate, hired out her slaves ("Venus and Child") annually, and charged their owner five percent for providing clothing and maintenance. Mary received \$103 for hire in 1851, \$120 in 1852, \$131 in 1853, \$125 in 1854, \$160 in 1855, \$155 in 1856 and \$195 in 1857. Her steadily increasing income (except for 1854) appears to have been applied to Mary's college tuition.²²

The practice of hiring out also provides important insights into the black experience. The frequency of hiring and the variety of functions in which hired slaves served indicates, as Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman have persuasively argued in Time on the Cross, that slave labor was very productive, skilled labor. Correspondence, wills, and court cases provide additional collaborative information on this point. Fleming Saunders, for instance, begged to brother Peter to "spare Jack . . . I should be very glad to put him to make some brick."²³ In the will of John Callaway of Bedford the deceased prepared guardianship for his sons and daughters and carefully specified that when slaves were allotted, Rose received 7, including Jim, a blacksmith; Emma's lot was to include a carpenter, Robert's a carpenter, and Mary Linda's a blacksmith.²⁴

Slaves were hired as smiths, carpenters, bricklayers, boatmen (on the Kanawha Canal in West Virginia), factory workers, laborers (on the Virginia and Tennessee Railroad), and in the Salines of West Virginia. The flexibility of slave labor insured its economic vitality in regions of small scale agriculture units, but it also unwittingly served as an apprenticeship for

blacks whom history would emancipate. Washington carried young Booker to West Virginia after the Civil War because he was familiar with the area and its salt works. Hiring out broadened the slave experience beyond the confines of neighborhood, county, or even state.

Considerable evidence, in fact, suggests that from the standpoint of controlling the slaves (and slavery was a system of social control) that hiring out was problematic. Court cases reveal that some masters chose to lease slaves who were quite independent or often unmanageable. William Lee, for example, trustee for the estate of James Robinson (Bedford County) complained to his attorney about slave Ann: ". . . 13 or 14 years old and will not stay anywhere I put her; last year she was run away for two or three months and at this writing is in the woods or somewhere else. . . ." The more quickly sold the better, he urged, "as she will soon become notorious and she would not sell well."²⁵ Eliza Dudley of Franklin County testified that she wished a Negro man Lewis of her estate "hired out because I can't manage him."²⁶ The single most outstanding instance of slave rebellion in Franklin County was probably the work of a slave hired out. Fragmentary evidence suggests that Mary Brooks' slave, Silas, refused to stay where he was "hired out" and "threatened to run away"; Silas, one witness testified, was of "such bad temper and character," that the employer "has the right and power to correct and punish him." Held in custody for his owner at the County jail, he attempted, nearly successfully, to burn it down.²⁷

The danger of the slave's capitalizing on the modicum of mobility hiring out allowed was ever present. Joseph Robert found for hired slaves in Lynchburg and Richmond tobacco factories a "liberalizing" practice of allowing them to find their own employers and bargain for personal privileges and concessions. He concludes that this practice was common "in the Virginia

/tobacco/ district by the 1850's"28 Bedford courthouse records, with accounts of slaves hired out by guardians, show the costs of transportation to Lynchburg, on occasions, without indicating the cost of an agent there to aid in contracting the hire. Apparently some slaves were sent to find their own employment in Lynchburg.

Evidently the same liberality was shown slave "favorites" in rural Franklin County. Peter Saunders informed his father (the Judge) in December of 1856 that he had hired George and Jim to a Mr. Claiborne's factory for \$140, but added: "Gentry says he does not wish to hire Joe for the next year and unless Joe can find some satisfactory place /emphasis added/ I don't know what to do with him unless I let Mr. Preston have him."29 Despite the fact that the General Assembly had passed an act in 1808 explicitly prohibiting masters allowing "his or her slaves, or any slave hired out by him or her to go at large, or hire himself out . . .," the practice was obviously resorted to for convenience.30 In one 1865 case, for example, Wiley Woody was indicted for allowing a slave to "trade as a freeman and hire himself out for the benefit of others, all against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia." Woody was found guilty in a jury trial and fined \$1,000.31

The prohibition against a slave's hiring himself out was but one of several comprising Virginia's "slave code." These statutes had accumulated since colonial times as the state assembly saw fit to legislate control over the black population, free and slave. The enforcement of the law varied regionally and locally and was tempered with some understanding that slaveholders sometimes had to compromise them. In Franklin and Bedford Counties there appear to have been a relative laxness in enforcement, especially in the former, more rural, county. Considerably more cases involving trials

of white and black who ignored the policing system occurred in Bedford courthouse. The larger slave population (10,276 to Franklin's 6,351 in 1860), the concentration of free Negroes (504 to Franklin's 105), and the more urban nature of the county (in Bedford and near Lynchburg) help explain the disparity.

According to the codes, slaves were not allowed to leave the plantation without a pass, to drink liquor, to carry firearms, to assemble for religious purposes (other than in white churches), or to learn to read or write. Yet, judging by Peter Saunders' correspondence, slaves were sometimes carelessly guarded. They were sent on errands between Flat Creek (in Campbell County) and Rocky Mount frequently, with mail, supplies, wagons, and goods. No letter mentioned a pass, but curious comments occurred: "The boy who ran away from Franklin," Saunders' wife wrote from Flat Creek in 1862, "returned last night bringing a letter from Jr. Henderson overseer." ³² Judge Saunders certainly knew the prohibition against firearms, but in 1856 he wrote his son: "The dogs are killing my sheep, and I wish to put a gun in the hands of some of my servants. I prefer a flint gun. . . ." ³³

As in the Judge's case, slave codes were most probably compromised simply for convenience's sake. In a Franklin County trial B. F. Belcher, the manager of the estate of Frank Belcher, indicated the Belcher slaves had been given the permission (recorded with a local merchant) to buy liquor: "I give you liberty to sell ardent spirits to any of the slaves under my control." The practice, evidently, was quite common. In a similar case the firm of Dickenson and White explained that they kept "written permission of a number of persons giving us the privilege of selling liquor to their slaves, filed among our papers." ³⁵

The Codes, nevertheless, were policed by slave patrols, and blacks off

plantations had to present either a pass or freedom papers (a court certification that one was a "registered" free Negro) to the patrol or undergo arrest and trial before a Justice of the Peace. Negroes, slave and free, were tried only in these lower county courts (rather than circuit courts). The Court Order Books of the county justices present historians not only with a record of patrols but also with considerable information about related trials. In Franklin County, trials for criminal offenses by slaves and free blacks occurred less frequently than in Bedford, where the police system appears to have been more stringent.

In Franklin, for instance, a handful of cases appear in which slaves convicted of larceny received lashes, thirty-nine in the case of West (slave of Nicolas and Henry Carper), given by a special constable.³⁵ Not until 1866, after the War, was a free Negro tried on criminal charges; but in Franklin trials became more numerous at the War's end. Throughout the 1850's in Bedford, however, crimes by blacks were numerous and serious punishment appeared more harsh. In the county seat convicted slaves were sentenced to lashes (as was Henry, slave of Samuel Fuqua, who had assaulted a free black) "on the bare back at the Public Whipping Post of this County and the Sheriff [emphasis added] to carry this judgment into immediate execution."³⁶ In Franklin there appeared no indication of a whipping post, and typically, local constables executed court punishments.

Punishments, of course, varied according to crimes, but there was hardly a uniform system of justice. Even judgments in violent crimes differed. A slave William was convicted in November, 1860 (Bedford County), of shooting two other slaves of his master, John Callaway; his sentence read: "30 lashes immediately; 10 lashes applied 10 days later; and 20 more lashes layed on when released from a months jail sentence." James, slave of one William

Jones, was convicted of first degree murder of a neighbor's slave and was hanged by the neck.³⁸ Hangings were public executions conducted at Bedford Courthouse between 10:00 A.M. and 4:00 P.M.; none occurred in Franklin County in the 1850's.

The slave codes, patrol system, and related trials, in short, were all a part of a social imperative of slave society: the necessity to control the behavior of human chattel. There was, however, an obvious moral ambivalence in both the laws and their execution: slaves were property, yet human; laws were strict, yet laxly enforced where codes might interrupt the smooth working of plantation operations. It is as a system of social control that the "peculiar institution" still provokes important debate: how paternalistic was the master class, which after all justified slavery upon the grounds that it exercised a benevolent and civilizing influence upon the slave? Any answer must be complex because historical evidence is often inadequate and must be subject to interpretation.

Court records reveal a concern for the protection of slaves as property, seldom as humans. The case of Indiana Choice, and of wills which sought manumissions for favorites (see Andrew Baskin's companion study), are significant as exceptions to a legal system in which a Negro slave appeared most often as an "animate thing." Slaves, for example, could be "levied" upon by the Sheriff to compel the payment of debt by one who was delinquent.

Most court orders levied upon some other property of a debtor's estate, but in several instances, the court forced the sale of a slave to satisfy a debt. In 1856, for example, the Franklin County courts "levied on" and sold "a Negro boy" for \$310. The county took part as a cost for boarding the slave in the jail, settled the debt, and returned a \$181.93 balance to the owner.³⁹ Levying upon slaves was very infrequent, but it exemplified the fact that,

before the law, blacks who were human chattel were property, first and foremost.

By far the most numerous cases before courts involved division of estates among heirs. Most wills divided slaves into "lots," according to value, and with no mention of "slave families" in the vast majority of instances. Where the owner died intestate a committee "viewed the property" and divided it fairly; in most instances it appeared a widow was assigned one-third for life as her dower share and the remaining estate was divided among the other various heirs. The division of the estate of William Radford, probated in Bedford County Court in 1861, was typical. Except for a specific bequest to the grandson who held in trust "Julian and her children," the slaves were divided and assigned according to value alone. The total value was \$10,175 for 39 slaves and "each lot \$3,235.00 in slaves"; each of three sons received 11, 12, and 12 slaves respectively and each an older one who was a debit to the estate.⁴⁰

Death, in short, and the division of property it brought, meant a tragedy to most slave communities which was unavoidable. Some masters spoke of dividing slave families casually, as did William Hairston in 1863 who complained that his chattel were undervalued:

Emma and Bob were valued at \$1,500 each which was the only valuation that in any way approached market value. Emma fell to my share, Bob to Ruth. John Hairston got a long ways the most valuable women, and five children from four months to nine years of age. He also got the choice part of the land.

Yet correspondence and court cases also reveal many human attachments between master and slave. As a social institution, Eugene Genovese has argued so well, slavery was a series of compromises between black and white which allowed the slave community some meager but meaningful psychological independence.⁴² Booker Washington's reminiscences of his childhood indicate

it: his private criticism of slavery as an institution which made master reliant upon black labor, or Burroughs' provision for Christmas festivities for his slaves as long as the "yule log" burned.

The Saunders correspondence reveals a solicitude for slaves which (though not necessarily typical) was quite humane. Most letters commented, particularly, on the health of slaves, and some on their families. In July 1861 Peter Saunders was concerned about the health of some 15 "negroes," but particularly a "grandson of Daniel's" (a domestic favorite).⁴³ When away in Richmond during the war he sent words to his slaves through letters to his wife. "Vexed" at their stealing he urged: "You may say to the Negroes that if I find that any of them are engaged in it I shall deal with them in a most exemplary way. They must not allow other neighboring negroes to visit them and I want them to stay closely at home."⁴⁹

Deaths among families, white and black, and divisions of estate, of course, brought about the greatest concern. In Abingdon, Virginia, in 1859 Saunders attended an estate sale necessary to satisfy outstanding debts of some slaveholding friends. "I think it a great relief to Ann and Mr. Preston that the Negroes were sold," he wrote his brother Fleming. Saunders himself purchased sixteen:

. . . and the others were purchased by unexceptionable masters and families. The traders did not get any of them. emphasis added James and his family were not sold . . . the other negroes and all the personal property will he could have said "must be" sold on the 4th Monday in next month.⁴⁵

The sensitivity of masters about slave sales was not uniformly expressed. Three years earlier Saunders sold six slaves to a trader named Hunter who offered a "disappointing" \$3,900. "I thought it better to sell," he wrote his father, "than to send them off and take the chance of a sale in Richmond."⁴⁶ Southern apologists, John Wise (son of the Governor, Henry)

for instance, assured later generations that the "negro-buyer" was a social pariah, and Southerners were "taught to regard them as an inferior class of humanity." Masters "seldom referred to them, and they received no sort of social recognition." Ostracism of the "buyer," perhaps, reflected some guilt Southerners would disassociate from the "seller."⁴⁷

Slaves were usually sold because of legal or economic necessity, and most were sold within the counties to local citizens on court day. Both counties, however, occasionally trafficked in larger markets. Patrick Ferguson of Franklin County sold his slaves through "an agent in Lynchburg," obviously a principal market.⁴⁸ In another county court suit a trader in Negroes identified Richmond as "the principal market in this State" and for this area's farmers; in this instance Richmond's Dickinson and Hill firm provided auctioneers.⁴⁹

The frequency of and the reaction to sales, the mutual respect between slave and master, or the psychological or physical harshness of the institution upon black (and also white) Southerners present important historical issues which elude easy generalizations -- whatever the wealth of the evidence. In the Piedmont tobacco regions, however, the smaller scale of slaveowning units, the relative number of instances in which white and blacks shared the farm tasks, the laxness of enforcement of the slave codes in remote rural districts, and the instances of professed paternalism all suggest slavery in these counties was less brutal an institution than some scholars (such as Stanley Elkins) have asserted.

The morality of slavery, however, is no longer a hotly debated issue. More important is the influence which the "masters" as a class exercised over an entire society: their social, political, and psychological influence upon a majority of nonslaveholders in the region. Small farmers left few observa-

tions and few diaries (none have been discovered for these counties), but some evidence is available which demonstrates what Wilbur Cash called the "proto-Dorian Bond" (or what psychologists argue about the psychological function of race). Slavery was defended as a positive good by a variety of arguments (Biblical, organic, and pseudo-scientific) but the central contention was that whites, whether slaveowners or not, were a superior race. Pigmentation of the skin, in short, conferred instant status.

Jubal Early's autobiography provides, perhaps, an example of the extent to which all local whites identified with the "peculiar institution" in this social and psychological sense. According to his biographer, Early was no friend to slavery. In 1860, as a Franklin County resident, he owned no slaves and before the war he had established, in fact, a reputation as an attorney who served the less well to do. After the war he became an apologist for the South; the Confederacy, he insisted, had not fought "for slavery." Yet he insisted that the "peculiar institution" had "civilized and christianized" blacks. About the slaves he wrote:

The Creator of the universe had stamped them, indelibly, with a different color and an inferior physical and mental organization. He had not done this from mere caprice or whim . . . an amalgamation of races was in contravention of His designs or He would not have made them so different.⁵⁰

Slavery's pervasive influence molded white culture in the back country tobacco districts. Slavery ownership was the most successful ingredient of the farm economy; the masters were exemplary men with social standing. The slave system also created social distinctions other than that of master and slave -- those of black versus white and slaveholder versus nonslaveholder. To the white nonslaveholder, the majority of the population which remains historically neglected, we now turn our attention.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Chart II. These figures were computed on the basis of the white, male population either 21 years of age or for whom the census indicated an occupation. These adult males were "eligible" to own slaves in that society.
2. Kenneth Stampp and most other historians of slavery agree that one who owned 20 slaves usually hired an overseer and should be counted as a large slaveholder.
3. These names and accompanying data were drawn from both the slave and "white and free colored" census records for 1860.
4. These are estimates not mean or median figures. The value of slaves is included in the personal property statistics.
5. Will and Deed Book (for 1860's), p. 121, Franklin County Courthouse.
6. Will and Deed Book, R 17, p. 374, Bedford Courthouse.
7. For a complete description of "Bleak Hill" see Ann Carter Lee, "Bleak Hill, A Handsome Farm House," Journal of the Roanoke Valley Historical Society, IX, pp. 50-58.
8. R. K. Carolle to Judge Fleming Saunders, March 30, 1850; in the Irving-Watts-Saunders Papers, Alderman Library, University of Virginia. Hereafter cited as Saunders Papers, U.Va.
9. Peter Saunders, Jr. to Dear Mother, May 4, 1850, Saunders Papers, U.Va.
10. See the frontispiece to Joseph Robert, The Tobacco Kingdom; it depicts and names the tasks and gives the months. Some similar display might be provided the tourists.
11. Peter Saunders to his wife, May 11, 1858; the Saunders Family Papers, Virginia State Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia. Hereafter cited as Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
12. Peter Saunders to his wife, May 17, 1858, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
13. Elizabeth Saunders to Peter Saunders, July 13, 1857; Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S. See also Saunders to his wife, January 25, 1858, ibid.
14. R. K. Carolle to Judge Fleming Saunders, March 30, 1850; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
15. Fleming Saunders (the younger brother, not the Judge) to Peter Saunders, October 31, 1856; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
16. Simms vs Turner and Davis (1852), Franklin County Chancery Papers.
17. Harlan, Making of a Black Leader, pp. 18, 32.

18. Slaves "hired" are indicated in the census. In some instances, however, the owner is not indicated and the word "employed" is not indicated. Though some of these may have been "left" with a relative, the likelihood is they were "hired out." The West Virginia Census might indicate a large number hired out of these counties.
19. Scarborough, The Overseer, pp. 34-35.
20. Judge Fleming Saunders to Peter Saunders, June 4, 1856; Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S. Peter evidently managed hiring out contracts for his father and brother. They often exchanged skilled slaves.
21. Peter Saunders to his wife, January 31, 1863; Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
22. Will and Deed Book R 7, p. 30, Bedford County Courthouse.
23. Fleming Saunders to Dear Brother (Peter), July 18, 1859; Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
24. Will and Deed Book 18, p. 454, Bedford County Courthouse.
25. James Robinson Estate Papers (1857), on file in Court Papers, 1856-1860, Bedford County Courthouse.
26. Franklin County "Determined Papers," 1850-51, Franklin County Courthouse (Reel 126). These particular papers have been microfilmed and at this writing are being indexed. References will be made to reels only.
27. Filed under Mary Brooks' name; Franklin County Chancery Papers, 1861-1862; Box 78.
28. Joseph Robert, Tobacco Kingdom, pp. 198, 203. Robert devotes an excellent chapter to hired slaves in the factories of larger cities. The Lynchburg Virginian refers sometimes to Bedford slaves brought before municipal court.
29. Peter Saunders to Dear Father, December 4, 1855; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
30. An Act passed January 29, 1808, Virginia Statues.
31. Franklin County "Determined Papers" (1856 case), Reel 135. For example, in Bedford County see the John Callaway and Anderson Everett Trial for April, 1862, Court Order Book, p. 541.
32. Elizabeth Saunders to Peter Saunders, March 19, 1852; Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
33. Judge Fleming Saunders to Peter Saunders, June 4, 1856; Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
34. Both trials in Franklin County "Determined Papers," Reel 131.

35. Commonwealth vs Nicolas and Carper (1856), Franklin County "Determined Papers."
36. Bedford County Court Order Book, 1850-55, p. 307.
37. Ibid., p. 479.
38. Ibid., pp. 103, 131.
39. Webb vs. Fice (1856), in Chancery Papers, Box 63 Franklin County Courthouse.
40. William Radford Estate Papers (1861), Bedford County Court Cases.
41. William Hairston to Peter Saunders, February 5, 1863; Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
42. In contradistinction to Stanley Elkins, Eugene Genovese stressed the mutual influence black and white communities had upon each other. Without accepting entirely his characterization of the South as a pre-capitalist society (or Marxist assumptions) his critique of Elkins is enlightening; see his Roll Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made (New York, 1974). Herbert Gutman's The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom (New York, 1976) also suggests a black culture survived and was molded by the experience.
43. Peter Saunders to Dear Mother, July 20, 1856; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
44. Peter Saunders to Elizabeth Saunders, December 19, 1861; Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
45. Peter Saunders to Dear Brother (Fleming), July 28, 1859; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
46. Peter Saunders to Judge Fleming Saunders, November 13, 1856; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
47. John Sargeant Wise, The End of an Era (New York, 1965).
48. Issac Jones vs Patrick Ferguson (May, 1858), Franklin County "Determined Papers," Reel 137.
49. Patteson vs Cundiff (1858?), Franklin County "Determined Papers," Reel 139; see depositions of L. L. Wood and Dr. R. H. Hill.
50. Jubal Anderson Early, War Memoir's: Autobiographical Sketch and Narrative of the War Between the States (Bloomington, 1960), XXXV and XXXVI.

Non-Slaveholders in the Rural Community:
The Whites Slaveholders Dominated

The attention that American literature has focused upon Southern slaveholders is a testimony to their dominant influence in that region before the Civil War. The portrait which emerged from the pens of abolitionist critics, pro-slavery apologists, and post Civil War novels and movies has, however, distorted the social realities of the old South.¹

The obscurity to which the non-slaveholding whites and the relatively poor were once assigned by historians is understandable. They left little literature, and travel accounts gave them scant attention. Fortunately since Franklin Owsley's Plain Folk of the Old South appeared, land and census records have been investigated in detail.² What has emerged is a richer understanding of Southern society, together with an enduring debate about the extent to which that region was an "economic democracy."

Professor Owsley argued that there was a numerically sizeable, non-slaveholding, middleclass in the old South which shared significantly in the best lands of the region and the wealth of its economy. He successfully laid to rest that mythological notion of a tripartite South of slave, master, and poor white. Subsequently Fabian Linden, among others, contested Owsley's emphasis and insisted he had exaggerated and idealized the non-slaveholding "yeomanry." Although these classes may have been substantial numerically," he wrote, "they shared, in the areas studied [lower South], a relatively small proportion of the South's property, while conversely an almost negligible segment of the population owned a very significant proportion of the productive lands and slave labor."³

The status which James Burroughs and his family held in Franklin County society can not be appreciated without considering the majority of his neighbors, who owned no slaves and considerably less property. There were some 1,637 slaveowners in the two counties studied, but the population of the farming community, adult males alone, exceeded 4,650.⁴ Among those whites who chose to call themselves "farmers" in the 1860 Hales Ford community more than seven in ten owned less real estate and less personal property than Burroughs.

Hales Ford appears, in this instance, to have been a true microcosm of the regional society. Among the more than 2,000 white males who were Franklin County farmers in 1860, 88% owned less real estate and 73% less property than James Burroughs. The area was obviously populated primarily by small non-slaveholding farmers. But more surprising is the fact that 35% of the white males in Hales Ford owned no real estate; and 38% of the white males who farmed in the county were propertyless.

These statistics can be placed in a larger perspective. Dr. Linden's critique of the Vanderbilt historians found that half of the rural families in Louisiana were landless. During the same decade he discovered a "striking similarity of the socio-economic pattern of ownership" in the lower South regions (Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi) he studied.⁵ James C. Bonner's excellent portrait of Hancock County, Georgia, also revealed that a third of the population was relatively poor: farm laborers, factory hands, and overseers, for instance. Farm tenantry and perhaps sharecropping, usually associated with the impoverished post-war South, he suggested, originated before the War of the Rebellion.⁶ Bonner and Linden concurred: the South was not an economic democracy. In the 1850's, they hypothesized, more affluent planters were buying up the land of small farmers, buying more slaves,

and closing the avenues by which others acquired small holdings. The slave system was becoming increasingly exclusive.⁷

The rapid increase in the price of slaves and the exodus of blacks from these counties in the 1850's (see Andrew Baskin's study) are phenomena which may indicate just the economic stringency Bonner hypothesized.⁸ In every other respect, our investigations bear out the Bonner-Linden thesis: property and slaves in the tobacco district were held by a numerically small number of white males in 1860.

The result was that the contours of this region's society in the 1850's was pyramidal. Consider the base: the large number of farm laborers in the two counties in 1860. There were well over 1,100 white males who were laboring on the property of others in the 1850's, in a farm community of 4,650. In Franklin County the number was considerably less (381, less than 15%); in Bedford County nearly 800 males, 28% of the white male population and 38% of those engaged in farming, gave this occupation in 1860.⁹

CHART IV Distribution of Wealth Among Farmers
(Slaveholders and Non-Slaveholders)

Franklin County, Virginia - 1860

REAL ESTATE			PERSONAL PROPERTY		
None	Less Than \$3,105*	More Than \$3,105*	None	Less Than \$8,200*	More Than \$8,200*
38%	50%	12%	11%	81%	8%

Computed from the 1860 White and Free Inhabitants Census, Franklin County.
*This figure represents the total value of the real estate and personal property recorded for James Burroughs on the 1860 census.

CHART V Distribution of Wealth Among Farmers
(Slaveholders and Non-Slaveholders)

Hales Ford Community, Virginia - 1860

REAL ESTATE			PERSONAL PROPERTY		
None	Less Than \$3,105*	More Than \$3,105*	None	Less Than \$8,200*	More Than \$8,200*
38%	40%	22%	8%	65%	27%

Computed from the 1860 White and Free Inhabitants Census, Franklin County.
*This figure represents the total value of the real estate and personal property recorded for James Burroughs on the 1860 census.

These were the working poor of the tobacco and grain producing South. In Bedford only nine males who claimed this occupation reported owning any real estate. Farm laborers either resided with parents (or relatives), lived in and worked for a family needing additional labor, or rented a household and worked on the land of a more wealthy neighbor. The picture is one of nearly total dependency on wage earnings, and accumulation of worldly goods was a slow process. In Bedford County in 1860, for instance, 71% of farm laborers owned neither real estate nor personal property.

Statistics alone, however, may exaggerate poverty without explaining it. In slave society in the foothills and back country wealth in land and property fell to the sons of well established families by inheritance, and the greatest proportion of both were held by the more elderly, ages forty to seventy. A large proportion of the youthful population worked the land of others. The family farm was dominant, and the farm economy required hard labor of all males. Some as early as age 10 worked the fields with their father and brothers, and some like the Burroughs along side of slaves.

The tendency in the 1850's was for sons to linger about the family farm perpetuating their economic dependency. Eighty-four farm laborers in

Bedford, for instance, were between the ages of 21 and 30 and still lived with parents; only 45 of these owned any personal property (which ranged from 50 to 500 dollars). These, together with those in their late teens, account for the largest part of the propertyless among farm laborers: more than 6 of every 10 in Bedford; 115 or one in three farm laborers in Franklin lived with parents.

There was a large demand for white, as well as black, agricultural labor in the tobacco district. Frequently more wealthy families, with sons too young to work the fields or whose sons had left to establish themselves on their own, hired their younger neighbors. In Bedford County 104 and in Franklin 102 white males hired themselves out as farm hands and lived in the households of their employers. Most were in their twenties. Their's was hardly an apprenticeship; they were wage earners, hopeful to save enough to purchase land. In 1860 they were poor; 78% of them owned no property or real estate.

A significant number of farm laborers in the two counties were "heads of households." More than one in four (213 in Bedford, 119 in Franklin) who claimed this occupation rented a home and provided for a family, typically a wife and two or three children, on wages. Only four in Bedford owned real estate, and only thirteen held \$500 or more in personal property (these tended to be older); typically in that county personal property ranged from \$100 to \$200 (true for 50% of those who were heads of households with dependents). In Franklin they were considerably poorer; 84% of the laboring heads of households owned less than \$100 in personal property (32% owned none).

The vast majority of the farming population of these counties enjoyed an existence, then, even less luxurious than that of the Burroughs family. John Motley's family, for example, lived in the Davis Mills area of Bedford

among large slaveholders. By age 46 he had accumulated \$1,800 in real estate, a little more than half that of Burroughs and much more typical of Franklin County non-slaveholding farmers. He had a wife and nine children. Though he was listed as a "farmer" his five eldest sons were "farm laborers" employed by their father; their ages were 16, 18, 20, 23, and 25, and none owned property. Such a family farm situation was more typical of those 3,000 white males in the two counties. Either, like John Motley, they owned a modest tobacco farm, or they were wage earning agricultural laborers.¹⁰ Others were even poorer. Jonas Ferguson of the same neighborhood was 45 but owned no real estate and only \$15 worth of personal property; he was a day laborer who supported his wife and one child with his wages, while his four sons (ages 21, 23, 25, and 28) who lived in his home worked for more wealthy neighbors.¹¹ Ferguson had not earned his way into the propertied class, much less the slaveholding class. In Franklin County there were 26 farm laborers who were 45 or older (nearly 25% of those laborers with an independent household) who, like Jonas Ferguson, had never made it into the economic mainstream.

There were several occupations, other than farm laborer, dependent for wages upon their neighbors. Twenty-two men ranging from ages 22 to 45, chose to call themselves "farm managers." Most lived in with employers and performed farm tasks as well, some the management of slaves. Only five owned real estate, however, and their personal property ranged typically from \$1,000 to \$4,000 (five owned more than Burroughs). Only by virtue of a greater accumulation of personal property did they differ from farm laborers who "lived in."

The most famous example of dependent labor in the Old South was, perhaps, the overseer. According to legend he was "uncouth," "drunken,"

"dissolute," "neglectful": a prototype for degraded labor, and a social outcast. Harriet Beecher Stowe, ironically, in Uncle Tom's Cabin chose to make Simon Legree a "Yankee come South." William Scarborough's detailed study on overseers provided a needed corrective. The vast majority of overseers were not Yankees; nor were they, by comparison to poor farmers or farm hands, degraded labor. They were hard working laborers in an "anomalous position" with a great deal of "responsibility and a minimum of authority." Relentlessly castigated by their employer (who limited their authority variously), they withstood low wages and a job security limited to a seasonal contract, usually for one year.¹²

Virginia's tobacco region had more overseers than any other state Scarborough studied.¹³ Typically a master of 20 slaves or more hired a manager for his slaves. Most probably the existence in Virginia of a large number of tobacco plantations using 20 or more slaves on acreage which was less impressive than rice, sugar, or large cotton plantations further south, explained the pervasiveness of the occupation in this state. In Franklin County 38 slaveowners owned 20 or more slaves and 37 white males gave the Census Taker the occupation of overseer. In Bedford there were 85 large slave plantations (20 or more slaves) and 78 who were overseers in 1860.¹⁴ Scarborough's "statistical view of the overseer" provides a typical portrait for tobacco country (see statistics for Stokes County, North Carolina) in 1860: he was 36 years of age, married, a non-slaveholder (only 8% owned slaves), and an owner of but a meager amount of property and no real estate (only 15% owned real property).¹⁵

Franklin and Bedford County overseers fit Scarborough's description nicely. Most were in their 30's and a considerable number were over 40 (21 of 115). Most were married men, though there were 25 bachelors in the two

counties (slightly less than 80% of the overseers here were married; Scarborough finds 92% in his North Carolina county). Their wealth was certainly meager. Eight in Franklin and ten in Bedford owned real estate (a little less than the 15% in Stokes County). Personal property holdings varied widely, but, if we exclude owners of real estate, they ranged from \$20 among the youngest in the occupation to \$5,000 among the oldest. Typically those in their thirties owned from \$200 to \$1,500 in personal property. Established overseers, in short, ranked near the top of dependent farm labor in terms of wealth but squarely within the base of the social pyramid.

John Starkey, the 38 year old overseer for Abram Childress in the Burroughs neighborhood, was, in one respect, atypical. In 1860 he owned no real estate, and only \$75 worth of personal property. On probably a meager salary, he supported his wife and ten children. Obviously he was poorer (in terms of property) than most in his profession. Scarborough suggests that the usual annual salary was between \$150 to \$250. In Franklin County wages were probably lower. In 1858 Elkanah T. McGhee, overseer for his uncle for five years, sued in court for back pay: \$90 for 1853; \$115 for 1854; and \$115 each for 1855-1857. One court deposition claimed the average salary "in this neighborhood for the last five years" was \$125.¹⁶

The pay, of course, varied with the size of the estate, the number of slaves and the duties to be managed. Jacob Sink, a Franklin County overseer for Owen Price, received \$150, but his tasks were quite numerous. His employer charged Sink to:

. . . superintend my plantation and the said slaves and stock on it, and to keep private entertainment for me on said plantation, and to sell grain and other provisions to wagoners and other travellers, all subject to and in obedience to my authority and instructions.¹⁷

Perhaps the oft-criticized overseer was expected to do too much. E. T.

McGhee (see above) not only managed Haley Andrews' slaves and farm land but contracted, as well, for the hire of slaves.

One fact is particularly meaningful about this occupation. Overseers were typically poorer neighbors (as were farm laborers) who were hired by the more wealthy slaveholders on short term contracts, usually a yearly one. Every overseer in the two counties was Virginia-born and most were from the same county as their employer. Peter Saunders was looking for an overseer in 1856. Typically (according to Scarborough) he contacted friends rather than advertising in a newspaper:

Say to Robert I wish he would send me a good overseer if he can hear of one. I prefer one of the county who will never have occasion to leave the plantation and will not even be entitled to the privilege of a vote.¹⁸

A year later Saunders was still searching and considering William Ballard who was "living this year [emphasis added] with John Buford. If he [Robert] knows anything of him I wish he would inform me."¹⁹

The overseer, in short, was one among many laborers in that rural society dependent upon hire by neighbors, and the prospective employer was typically a slaveowner. "I want to employ a miller for next year," Saunders wrote in a similar vein. "It would suit some man very well who could shoemake, cooper, or carry one [sic] some other work not inconsistent with . . . milling."²⁰ There were 46 millers in Franklin County in 1860; 25 owned no real estate, while 21 owned from \$200 to \$1,000 in real property. Personal property ownership ranged typically less than \$200 (for 27 of the 46; 15 owned more than \$500).²¹

All major artisans of the two counties were among the relatively property-less, as was the case in Hales Ford. Among practitioners of 25 trades in Franklin County (involving 293 skilled and semi-skilled laborers), 69%

owned no real estate and 28% owned no personal property. Carpenters, who received \$60 a month in Louisiana (Scarborough's estimate) may have made less in Franklin County.²² Fifty-five of sixty-six in the county were without real estate, and forty-one of these owned less than \$100 in personal property. Among 51 blacksmiths 28 owned no real estate, and 28 owned less than \$100 personal property. None of the county's 9 coopers (paid 75¢ to \$1 a hogshead, according to Scarborough) owned real estate and none held over \$200 worth of personal property. These four occupations account for more than half of the artisan population. The same meager property holding was true for 16 wheelwrights, 7 masons, 9 saddlers, 14 cabinetmakers, 30 shoemakers, 9 millwrights and other trades, including a "ditcher" and a "coachmaker" (both with no property, personal or real).

All these rural laborers -- artisans, overseers and agricultural workers -- were a part of the tobacco economy. They were all involved in raising, processing, or transporting tobacco, or tangentially employed by providing services for tobacco growers. One other category, that of factory workers, must be added to a portrait of the rural community because in these counties the tobacco factory predominated.

Joseph Robert's study describes a small county factory. The building might appear but an immense shed. The "large rooms were designed so that a single overseer could direct the maximum number of slave hands." There was space for loading and hauling near the rear or on the side. Inside, almost exclusively in this region, they made plug tobacco. One would find a stove in a sweathouse where tobacco was first steamed and then dried, a kitchen at the rear, and a large "twist room." In this latter, main room tobacco was spun into twist by a tobacco wheel and then cut to appropriate lengths and rolled or twisted by hand at a series of benches (employees

sometimes listed their occupation as "tobacco roller"). There were large boilers (cauldrons) in which the tobacco was dipped to provide a flavor like "licoriced" (though Robert claims Northerners, rather than Southerners, preferred their chewing tobacco "well scented"). Tobacco was then pressed by a hand operated press or a crude open-air press operated by a long wind-lever to which a horse or mule was attached. Cutting knives, scales, balances and other apparati would abound.²³

The people who worked in these factories were slave and free, black and white. J. C. Ferguson and B. N. Hatcher were partners in the Ferguson-Hatcher tobacco factory at Hales Ford. Their ownership of the combination tobacco factory and blacksmith shop placed them in the social category with the master class. In addition to the value of the factory and shop, J. C. Ferguson owned 8 slaves (\$10,000 total personal property). He employed a total of 40 slave men and 4 slave women, likely the chattel of his immediate neighbors. Eight young white men also worked in the factory (see Chapter One). The Meadors, J. A. (23) and E. J. (22), were typical. They owned no real estate; the older owned \$600 in personal property, and the younger none. Joel Meador, a 49 year old farmer (14 slaves), on the turnpike was probably their father.²⁴

The tobacco factory not only meant healthy profit for the owner but employment for white neighbors (usually young) and for hired slaves; in short, it brought profit and income to the community. One of the largest slaveholders in Franklin County, Jno. S. Hale, though he was nicknamed "Pad," must have carried considerable social weight. He owned 87 slaves, \$80,070 in personal property, and \$20,000 in real estate. His factory in Rocky Mount (located at the site of the old Rocky Mount Hotel, now burned down) employed 34 hired slaves thus providing a profit for neighbors.

More typical, perhaps, was Wesley Peters of Davis Mills in Bedford, owner of a tobacco factory which employed slave and free laborers. The number of slaves hired each year must have varied, but "living in" were three white factory workers (18, 23 and 25), the oldest an overseer, and three free blacks (16, 12 and 7).²⁶ If larger factories in Richmond or Lynchburg used slave labor almost exclusively, the smaller country factory was a community enterprise. Most profit went to owners of the slaves and the factories; factory wages were not discovered.

The traditional professions will be discussed elsewhere, but those occupations above constituted, obviously, the base of an economic and social ladder in an economy where one was wealthy only when he or she accumulated considerable land and/or slaves. Without sufficient evidence to comment on social mobility, suffice it to say that any study of the white Southern community would be incomplete without consideration of the small non-slaveholding farmers like John Motley, the farm laborers like Jonas Ferguson and his sons, the overseer like John Starkey, the artisans like John Thurman (blacksmith at Ferguson and Hatcher's, \$500 real estate and \$450 personal property), and factory workers like the young Meadors. They and people like them were a majority of nearly 70% in the region, but they lived in a society dominated by slaveholders.

FOOTNOTES

1. The literary phenomenon is analyzed in Paul Buck, The Road to Reunion, 1865-1900 (Boston, 1937). Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman in Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery (Boston, 1974) comment upon derogatory assumptions of abolitionists about slave labor versus free labor; so does Eric Foner's chapter on the Northern critique of Southern society in Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: Republican Ideology Before the Civil War (New York, 1970). The best corrective to (and analysis of) the "Old South legend" is Francis Pendelton Gaines, The Southern Plantation.
2. See Frank Owsley, Plain Folk of the Old South (Baton Rouge, 1949).
3. Fabian Linden, "Economic Democracy in the Slave South: An Appraisal of Some Recent Views" Journal of Negro History, XXXI (1946), p. 186. Hereafter cited as Linden, "Economic Democracy."
4. The "farming community" here is defined solely as those who indicated farmer, farm laborer, day laborer, farm manager on the census. Artisans were included in this section (but excluded from the 4,650 statistic); they, nevertheless, were primarily neighbors of farmers, employed by them or serving that clientele.
5. Linden, "Economic Democracy," pp. 158, 164.
6. James C. Bonner, "Profile of a Late Ante-Bellum Community," American Historical Review, XLIX (1944), p. 663.
7. Bonner, "Profile," p. 666 and Linden, "Economic Democracy," p. 145.
8. See Andrew Baskin's companion study.
9. These statistics and those for six subsequent paragraphs are drawn from census data on file at Ferrum College. "Farm laborer," "day laborer" are interchangeable, and both appear frequently in the census (second only to farmer). Note the fact that Bedford contained more slaveowners and also more farm laborers; the one must have helped create a demand for the other. Subsequent statistics not footnoted also on file and drawn from the two 1860 census of both counties.
10. Bedford White and Free Colored Census, p. 204.
11. Ibid., p. 113.
12. See Scarborough's first chapter, The Overseer, particularly, p. 6.
13. Scarborough, The Overseer, pp. 6, 10.
14. See file on "overseers" at Ferrum College from the manuscript census: includes name, family, age and income for all claiming the occupation.

15. Scarborough, The Overseer, p. 55. See the chart; Stokes County, North Carolina was his example of a tobacco and grain region most comparable to our counties. Overseers here were older with a more stable employment and family life than in other regions.
16. McGhee vs. Cooper (1859), Franklin County "Determined Papers", Reel 139.
17. Sink vs. Price (1859), Franklin County "Determined Papers," Reel 193. Scarborough wrote that in the tobacco region overseers enjoyed a longer tenure of employment; see p. 39.
18. Peter Saunders to Dear Mother, July 17, 1856; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
19. Peter Saunders to Fleming (his brother), October 1, 1857; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
20. Peter Saunders to Dear Mother, November 21, 1856; Saunders Papers, U.Va.
21. The statistics here and that in the few subsequent paragraphs on artisans drawn from Franklin and Bedford County White and Free Colored census and on file at Ferrum College.
22. Scarborough, The Overseer, p. 36, contains all salaries mentioned; these were in Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana and probably higher than local or Virginia salaries.
23. Robert, The Tobacco Kingdom, gives a lengthy portrait of tobacco factories in one chapter. The government might consider an appropriate display, even model, for tourists.
24. Harlan, Making of a Black Leader, p. 12. Also Hales Ford census (Meadors mentioned above, Part I, the Microcosm).
25. Hales statistics from Franklin County White and Free Colored Census, 1860; the factory and location described in Marshall Wingfield, Franklin County, Virginia: A History (Berryville, 1964), p. 20.
26. Bedford County White and Free Colored Census, 1860, p. 453.

Culture and Politics in a Rural
Southern Community: The 1850's

Property and the social status conferred by wealth did not entirely define the southern community. Aside from these were equally important ingredients which determined an individual's relationship with the larger neighborhood. Common values, a rural lifestyle, similar economic interests, and a lively participation in politics helped create out of the social and cultural diversity of this region a collective identity. Though inadequate historical evidence exists for the historian to recreate it with any exactness, certain shared experiences defined the sense of community enjoyed by Franklin County farmers like James Burroughs.

Their daily existence was devoted to the hard labor of the farm homestead. Whatever their holdings in land or slaves, Burroughs and his neighbors shared a harsh routine necessary to grow the grain, vegetables, livestock, and tobacco by which they sustained their families. The fact that some employed the sons of others, or that some owned slaves while others did not, helped create rather than destroy a sense of community. Slaveholding was the enviable route to success, and the employment offered to the young Meadors at Ferguson and Hatchers or to a farm laborer by a wealthier neighbor was most likely considered an opportunity for the employee rather than a matter of impersonal exploitation by an employer.

Whether small or large scale tobacco farmers, most all residents were directly interested in the price of tobacco, its transportation to market, and the commercial exchange of commodities which were not cash crops. The petitions of Franklin County citizens to the state legislature reveal that

community of interest: in 1850 and again in 1850 they complained that "ungraded roads" made it impossible for wagons fully loaded with hogsheads of tobacco to move. "They being a farming and planting people who produce a great deal of tobacco and surplus grain," one petition read, Franklin County citizens requested a state road from Meadows Goose Creek across the Staunton River at Shallow Ford to Union Hall and Glade Hill -- and in an earlier request a connection of the Danville and Big Lick (later Roanoke) road with the Lynchburg and Rocky Mount Turnpike.¹

Because Franklin County in the 1850's was a quite underdeveloped, rural community, there was urgency about improving transportation. On October 3, 1859, a town meeting at the courthouse made plans for a railway convention which would meet the eighth of November to encourage an extension of the Orange and Alexandria railroad from Lynchburg to Rocky Mount (a proposal which failed). A seventy year old physician (and owner of 18 slaves), R. M. Taliaferro, chaired the meeting, and Peter Saunders was present (both were active courthouse politicians). Whatever the number of citizens attending, they chose as their thirty-man delegation persons of wealth and smaller farmers: Saunders, Peter Guerrant, and John and Samuel Hale were among the largest slaveowners of the area; Wiley Woods and Issac Cannaday were smaller farmers; Jacob G. Macherbeinier may have been representative of the German Dunkards who conscientiously objected to slavery. All, nevertheless, had an interest in promoting the commerce of the region: physician and farmer, Whig and Democrat.²

Farmers from this region marketed tobacco in Lynchburg, more often than Richmond, and most likely James Burroughs sent tobacco north on the turnpike for sale. Jonas Callaway was a vice president of Lynchburg's Agricultural Society, and some county names appear in tobacco competition at fairs held

there in the fall each year. Most smaller farmers like Burroughs probably sold tobacco to local waggoners, or to local manufacturers of chewing tobacco. In the northeast part of the county, neighbors went (other than to Ferguson and Hatchers) to Smithson G. Holley's (who employed ten laborers, living in) in Hales Ford; to A. T. Hollands large factory in Taylor's Store (he worked 36 slaves; John Street, a 24 year old overseer most probably, lived in) or to the smaller factories of William Burwell (a youthful manufacturer without property and two white laborers) and F. B. Ferguson's (called Ferguson's and Powells; it employed one white and two free black laborers). Benjamin T. Preston, with the labor of six slaves, processed tobacco in Glade Hill. There were eighteen manufactories in the Franklin area, ten of which used slave labor. If Joseph Robert is correct, they purchased the largest share of the locally grown weed.³

Though Franklin farmers were obviously engaged in commercialized farming, except the cash crops of grain and tobacco, most all other farm productions were marketed among neighbors. If one fell short of grain or had need of pork, he purchased it from a neighbor or, perhaps, at a local store. Court records reveal that to a large extent the economy of the region was based upon credit; because the vast majority of wealth was land and slaves (non-liquid assets) local merchants extended considerable credit for tobacco.

The thirty-one merchants in the county were not concentrated in Rocky Mount (where there were but a handful) but throughout the county area, where they served neighbors. In Hales Ford, one took tobacco or cash to Kyle Clingenpeel, merchant-clerk for Ferguson and Hatcher or to G. Garret, whose meager property holdings of \$1,000 (no real estate) suggest he was just beginning. In Glade Hill farmers did business with Peter Davis, William Pannill or Thomas Holland. These people were all an integral part of the

farm community. Many claiming a mercantile occupation were like the local Clingenpeel, propertyless clerks rather than store owners. Five others claimed to be farmer/merchants, professions often combined in the rural areas. Fourteen merchants (and one clerk) were slaveowners, some indication that many merchants farmed as well.⁴

Merchants who were wealthy enough to have become a part of the local slaveowning aristocracy were not numerous. Seven only in Franklin County owned more property than Burroughs and held slaves as well. Lewis H. Turnbull, Griffin Bush and William D. Young (ages 35, 48 and 54) were merchant/farmers; they all owned at least \$7,000 in real estate and \$1,100 in personal property, while Bush owned 11, Young 8, and Turnbull 13 slaves. Jno. Horn (5 slaves), William Pannill (3 slaves), M. R. Allen (20 slaves) and Seth McGuire (6 slaves), were also among county storeowners more wealthy than the majority of their neighbors. Only two merchants, however, compared with large slaveholders in terms of property. Griffin Bush owned \$31,295 in personal property and \$10,000 in real estate and M. R. Allen \$35,850 in personal property and \$14,150 in real estate. Slaves also entitled them to prestige; Bush held 8 and Allen 20 slaves.

Most merchants, however, were less well to do and must have dealt with neighbors on familiar terms. Stephen D. English, a forty-one year old merchant at Union Hall was more representative. An owner of 2 slaves (included in his \$3,500 of personal property) and a modicum of real estate, \$1,800, he appears to have employed a brother (age 34), W. F. English, and a local neighbor's 19-year old son, William G. Mattox, as clerks. Judging from personal property statistics, English's stock must have been meager. Some twenty merchants in the county fell into this category; they owned less property than Burroughs; seventeen others were merchant/clerks without any

property holdings.

Farmers in those rural areas mixed social occasions with business whenever possible. The local store and post office were meeting places for neighbors who exchanged information, gossip, and news. A slave like Monroe might return from an errand to the store with news; such eavesdropping provided "grapevine communication" for the blacks at home. For the whites, a trip to these localities provided an escape from toil and isolation of their daily existence to some broader social contact.

A glimpse at just how remote this area was is provided by John Wise, who visited the region in 1862. Traveling from Big Lick toward Rocky Mount, the pike carried him, he write, into a "new class of population:"

Instead of stately brick houses standing in groves on handsome knolls, all that we saw of human habitations were log-houses far apart upon the mountain sides, or in the hollows far below us. No longer were pastures visible, with well-bred cattle standing in pooly places, shaded by sugar maples, bathing their flanks at noontide. No more did we meet smart equippages drawn by blooded horses.⁵

Wise was as impressed by the quaintness of the rural folk as he was by the bad roads. Near a roadside cabin with "patch" of arable ground he saw a woman "smoking a pipe," with "innumerable tow-headed children" hanging about her; a teamster (or waggoner) in shirt sleeves, "trousers stuck into cowhide boots," who had drawn his team to the side of the narrow road to let him pass. And:

here a bearded man, clad in homespun and a broad slouched hat, riding leisurely along on his broad-backed, quiet horse, carrying the saddle-bags of the mountaineer; here a woman on horseback, with long sunbonnet, and coarse, cotton riding-skirt, and a bag slung at the saddle-bow, and a small boy, with dangling bare feet, riding behind her. . . .⁶

John Wise, son of the Governor Henry Wise who served Virginia in the late 1850's, was more accustomed to the James River plantations and Richmond society. Franklin County farmers, by contrast, visited the city infrequently

and then most likely Lynchburg, Martinsville, or Big Lick. The most exciting travel for many must have been to court day in Rocky Mount. At "court day," held monthly, cases were litigated, slaves were sold (at the Court House), necessary commodities purchased, horses traded, and considerable conversation shared.

Present at court day in 1862, Wise recalled the "main street" of the "village" of Rocky Mount as a rather narrow slice of civilization, "a rocky lane upon a sharp decline, with stores and houses scattered on either side, terminating at an inclosure /sic/ where stood the court house, clerk's office and county jail." Halfway down this street was the "rallying point of the town," the tavern. Here news arrived by mail and stagecoach and was quickly disseminated by villagers and "country folk" who sat on the cane bottom chairs or benches on the porch, or stood there to watch new arrivals at the hotel. In 1860 Hay Turnbull, considerably wealthy at age 43 (more than \$20,000 in property including 14 slaves), was hotel proprietor; his seven guests included a merchant, two salesmen, a coachmaker, and three local lawyers (among them the bachelor, Jubal Early). In 1862 hostellers were more plentiful, wounded veterans quite in evidence, and news of the war dominated conversation.⁷

Whatever the month or year, by mid-day farmers began to populate the village, arriving on "saddle horses," usually "broad-backed" and "short on the leg." According to Wise's account, women, who wore the "long-slattered poke bonnet" and riding skirts, visited "the stores, or the tavern kitchen, or the private houses, with chickens or butter, or other farmyard produce, seldom speaking further than asking one to buy, and when their sales were effected . . . went away as silently as they had come." Men, too, engaged in trading, particularly horse trading. Wise was struck by the expertise

of the Dunkards ("solemn," "ascetic," temperance men opposed to slavery), who brought such an enthusiasm to the art of horse trading that it led him to believe, "It must have been a part of their religious faith."⁸

Customarily, for all but the most sincere of temperance man, such society meant considerable drinking which gave to the atmosphere and conversations a festive character. Local storytellers and newsbearers held out on the porch or in the tavern. In 1862 Jubal Early was entertaining; "conversation grew louder and agitation greater" Occasional fist fights likely punctuated the evening. To John Wise the scene appeared curious but understandable:

Each day opened and passed and closed, with its excitements. It was all very narrow and primitive, the out-of-the-way world of the obscure village in an unknown region. Yet in it were all the same hopes and fears, and joys and tears, hearteases and heartaches, loves and hates, and all the mood and tenses of human nature to be found in the most populous and cosmopolitan lives of humanity.⁹

In some instances there was considerable distance between the social worlds of wealthy slaveholder and small farmer. If the Saunders family was representative, the wealthy travelled to Richmond upon occasion, and to Lynchburg quite often; those at the base of the social pyramid must have travelled less widely and less often. A visit to the "watering places" definitely indicated membership in the social elite of the state. Peter Saunders travelled to White Sulphur Springs in Greenbrier County often. In August of 1851 he reported seven to eight thousand at the spring, including President Franklin Pierce who was feted by a delegation of "gentlemen" from Lynchburg. A neighbor, James Callaway, was also vacationing there.¹⁰ Biographer Millard Bushong relates the courtship episode of Jubal Early who met an attractive Philadelphia belle at White Sulphur Springs in 1837: having come to her assistance on a "black charger" (she was being swept upon a

wagon down a swollen stream), Early "monopolized her dancing list" the next evening and became her "constant companion" in subsequent days. Finding weeks later that she had married upon her return to Philadelphia, Bushong suggests Early vowed to remain a bachelor forever!¹¹ However much legend here, there was definitely more glitter to the higher social life.

The preponderant influence of the aristocracy also helped determine the educational system, and for the worse, if we believe John Wise. "It is true that every enterprise dependent upon what is known as public spirit, or originated in the demand or desire of common use," he wrote, was sadly lacking in the Old South.¹² Hotels, public liveries, and public education were poor. One obvious reason that there was no public education system in Virginia before the Civil War was that the

wealth of the upper classes enabled them to have private tutors. The paucity of numbers of the lower classes of whites /here he perpetuates myth/, and the distances at which they lived apart, rendered public schools impracticable . . . Education for the blacks was, of course, contrary to all ideas of slavery.¹³

Not only was the requirement that blacks remain illiterate necessary to slavery, but the maldistribution of wealth which was also a consequence of the system precluded any public educational system. Sons and daughters of the wealthy were tutored or attended academies, then went to the state's colleges. For example, the Redford Sentinel ran advertisements for Piedmont Institute (a male academy with a military corps) and Bedford Female Institute, a finishing school "to expand, strengthen the intellect, refine the taste and cultivate the heart." Board at the latter was \$120.00 for ten months and tuition varied with the course.¹⁴ Such fees were prohibitive for the average farmer. In the Franklin County census of 1850 a female academy listed twenty-two students; prominent family names abounded: Taliaferro, Carter, Claiborne, Saunders, Burwell, Callaway.¹⁵

Some children of the wealthy attended colleges for a classical education. In 1856 J.D.B. DeBow's Statistics listed nine institutions of higher learning in the state. William and Mary (130 students), Union Theological Seminary (175 students), Randolph Macon (145 students), Rector College (a theological school of 55 in Printy town) and Bethany College (100 theological students, Fairfax Co.) were probably too distant from this region for most to attend.¹⁶ The exclusiveness of these institutions is reflected in their limited enrollment. The University of Virginia, for instance, chose one "state student" (given monetary assistance) from forty-nine regions of the state; region #13 encompassed Henry, Patrick, and Franklin counties; #14 was Bedford County. Most probably, few of the 200 students at "Mr. Jefferson's University" were from these counties.¹⁷ Peter Saunder's younger brother Fleming (Campbell Co.) was exceptionally fortunate.

Some area students may have attended institutions closer at home. Emory and Henry taught 125 students with a faculty of three professors and one tutor. Washington College enrolled 80 students and Virginia Military Institute 120 cadets.¹⁸ Unlisted in DeBow's Statistics were probably considerable numbers of other small private institutions. Lynchburg College advertised for young men in 1856 who, at the parents' desire, "will be organized into military corps. . . with proper uniform, manual and drilling."¹⁹ An interesting letter from Bettie Anthony, whose parents lived in Bedford County near Lynchburg, reveals the impressions of a student at Valley Union Seminary in 1855 ("Hollin's Institute" in another letter). She was anxious to finish grammar, complained about having to read Paradise Lost, and boasted about receiving higher marks in composition than her sister, Sally. Social life, evidently, left something to be desired. She saw few people outside the institution, she remarked, "and we stay here all of the time

except when we go preaching and that is not often." She sent love to the children and her mother and added: "Tell all of the black ones howdy."²⁰

Schooling for the less-well-to-do whites in the county communities was meager. They received only the basic rudiments of an education during a term which averaged eleven and a half weeks a year. Work on the farm no doubt kept some children from attending. Those who could afford it paid annually \$233 tuition; the state paid that of "poor children." (DeBow neglects to mention whether these were "paupers.")²¹

No evidence was discovered by which to discern the curriculum. But the census provides a profile of the typical teacher: a male or female in his or her 20's or thirties, born in the county, living in with relatives or neighbors and owning very little wealth. Twenty-six persons in Franklin County gave their profession as "teacher" to the 1860 census taker. Only five were older than 40 years old; 2 were in their teens. Most striking are that only one teacher in the county owned real estate, only ten owned any personal property at all, and 17 of the 26 lived in with others. That younger teachers might live with parents is to be expected; but those who were in their teens or early twenties and fitted this description accounted for only seven of those who lived in.²²

Meager salaries may have explained the dependency of others. Z. W. DeWitt, a 42 year old school teacher, lived with a neighbor; Anne M. Walker, 37 year old teacher at the Union Hall Common School, lived with her brother; and Susan Hodges, 33 (same school), with her father; Hannah J. Dodd, 28 year old teacher at Bonbrook Common School, resided with her mother; and Robert Ashner, 30, a teacher in the same locale, lived in with a neighbor. Despite the fact they had clearly reached adulthood, none of these teachers owned any property, real or personal.

As a result of a poor educational system, the state was plagued with the problems of illiteracy. In 1853 there were an estimated 166,000 children of school age, between 7 and 16, in the state. About 28,000 poor children received a common school education; twelve thousand more (the wealthy) received, in addition, the classical education provided by colleges, academies and classical schools. "The remaining 126,000," DeBow reported, "attended no school at all, except what can be imparted by poor and ignorant parents."²³

Yet whatever social distinctions wealth allowed or education provided in that society, the rural environment helped mitigate social differences and create a common lifestyle. Most children of slaveowners attended common schools until age 17 with the sons and daughters of the less-well-to-do. Most social events were local ones shared by all, like court day or militia muster. "Our village has been in a state of great confusion and excitement during the last four days," Helen Saunders (sister-in-law to Peter) wrote from Rocky Mount in 1850, "growing out of the training and general muster, I am heartily rejoiced that it is at length all over and that peace is again restored. . . ."²⁴ Though there were captains and privates in the militia, events like the muster helped mold a community identity.

A sincere devotion to the Protestant religion was one of the most effective social bonds in the Franklin County community of the 1850's. Near Hales Ford at Wirtz, at Germantown, and in some other areas of the county were communities of German Dunkards who kept largely to themselves. The vast majority of the white community, however, were mainstream southern Protestants -- Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Christians of the primitive variety. Most had a Calvinist's respect for the diety, no doubt

listened to some "hell fire and brimstone" sermons, and attended church because it provided some social exchange as well as religious instruction.

The clergy of the county give some indication of the religious persuasion of the area's farmers. Sixteen clergymen gave the census taker their denomination in 1860. One-half of these were Baptists (four missionary Baptists and the others a part of the sect who would avoid missionary activities). Methodist clergymen ranked second; there were three in the area, one in Gogginsville and two in Rocky Mount. Two Presbyterian preachers appeared in the census, both perhaps with the Piedmont Church, along with one minister of the Christian Church (or Church of Disciples) and two Dunkard clergy (in Gogginsville and Bonbrook). Census records are often inaccurate; no doubt there were more men of the cloth in 1860 than appear on record.²⁵

What is most apparent about the preaching profession is that its members were representatives of the frontier-like the community which they served. Half owned no real estate; nine owned less than \$500 personal property. All but one were Virginia born (twenty-nine year old Horace Smith, the exception, was a Presbyterian from Massachusetts). Three Baptists were also farmers, and three clergymen owned slaves. Robert Gray, pastor at the Piedmont Presbyterian Church was owner of 9 slaves and among the four wealthiest clergymen in the county (\$12,700 in personal property, though no real estate). Joseph Parker at the Beulah Baptist Church (a "missionary" church) near Sontag ("Gills Creek" was his residence) owned 21 slaves (personal property worth \$23,500) and \$12,000 in real estate. Theodore Webb was both farmer and Baptist clergyman; he owned 25 slaves (\$29,470 in personal property) and \$12,000 worth of real estate. Three of every four among these men, however, were considerably less-well-to-do than James Burroughs. At the opposite

extreme from Theodore Webb was 52 year old Baptist clergyman and farmer William Hankins of Rocky Mount. Hankins had been elected first clerk of the Blue Ridge Baptist Association in 1858 and earned, no doubt for his prosylytizing efforts abroad, the title "walking preacher." He owned no property, real or personal.

Religion in the backcountry was an aggressive force because a large part of the society remained unchurched. Preachers sought to spread the gospel among heathen, and would-be parisioners competed to acquire a settled clergyman for established churches. G. W. Abell, a Christian (Disciple) clergyman admitted with evident frustration in 1861:

For a few days I have been skimmishing here among the hills of Franklin but I can't get the people within the reach of heaven's artillery. They won't stand the divine fire. Their orthodox ears are too hard to be perforated with the bullets of heresy. Yet a few free spirits are here.²⁶

N. R. Arthur, like many others, hoped for a permanent preacher but had to do with a circuit rider: "Old Brother Harris was down Saturday. Small turnout owing to the inclemency of the weather. We begin to have a good deal of preaching down at the cave and schoolhouse just down the river. . ."²⁷ Helen Saunders in Rocky Mount complimented a Dr. Wade in 1850 because, "his preaching is quite popular here, and I hope he will be able to build up a church."²⁸

The "backwoods revival" served proselytizer, anxious Christians and country heathen as well. The "camp meeting" became a social event of first magnitude. Scores of families might arrive, camp under wagons or in tents, and listen to sermons of the uneducated clergy of the "arminian variety" who believed in free will and an appeal to the emotions. These meetings could last for days, even weeks, and a good deal of socializing, not all of it temperate, occurred on the edge of the encampment.²⁹

Newspapers frequently reported these revivals, inside meeting houses and without, and journalist-scribes faithfully chronicled the competitive search for converts. In September of 1859, for example the Lynchburg Virginian reprinted a Bedford Democrat account: meetings at Old Olive Branch Church; a Baptist meeting in progress at Timber Ridge, "into the grove [where there were 3 more preachers] as well as in the house." Methodist Reverend William Blount reported "several fine revivals" on the circuit, with six converted at Union Church, 4 or 5 at Emanus, 20 at Thomas Chapel, 7 at Tabernacle, and 27 at Ebenezer. Franklin County received an inglorious footnote: The Bethel Church (primitive Baptist) held a revival with 7 or 8 persons "said to have been present" and 8 or 10 ministers; "several accessions were made."³⁰

Most all Franklin County whites, then, even if they were not among the propertied elite, shared membership in an interdependent tobacco economy. They were a fraternity of hard working farmers. The vast majority participated in Protestant services and shared the predominant Calvinistic ethic. They also participated in local, state, and national politics. In the nineteenth century, as Walter Burnham has argued, there existed quite a different "political universe" than in the twentieth. Political participation was more widespread, particularly among the rural masses, and politics were a form of entertainment as well as a means of registering the popular will.³¹ As much, perhaps, as race or occupation one's party identification defined one's place in society. As the political debate over slavery grew increasingly intense in the 1850's, politics weighed even more heavily because the southern way of life was being impeached. By the secession crisis in 1860, the community identity was, in effect, determined by the casting of ballots.

In the early part of the decade, however, (the debate over the Compromise

of 1850 excepted) politics at the local "courthouse" level counted more than either state or national matters. The federal government was inactive by comparison to modern times, Democratic, laissez-faire policy dominated the decade, and the central government exercised little power (neither the income tax nor military conscription were policy until the war years). With the possible exception of members of the House of Representatives, nationally elected officials were distant celebrities to be read about in newspapers or seen infrequently during major campaigns and then usually in the major cities. The Richmond government levied a tax on property and provided important services: assisting in the building of canals, railroads, and major highways; it also managed the tobacco inspection system at warehouses. For these reasons the "statehouse" influenced the lives of its local citizens more immediately than Washington.

Local politics, however, had a much greater impact upon the daily lives of farmers like James Burroughs. A percentage (10% usually) of state taxes went to Rocky Mount. The county government, in return, held court monthly, hired a state appointed sheriff, provided for the election of all other local officials, and managed the most important governmental functions of the local society. The lower court, made up of locally elected Justices of the Peace (the circuit court was the higher court) licensed everyone from preachers to tavern keepers, appointed road surveyors and slave patrols, heard civil and criminal cases, and was the only court which heard cases involving blacks. Because the justices presided over matters so diverse, the court order books of Franklin and Bedford counties in the 1850's provide considerable insight into the relationship between local citizens and their government.

Slaveholders owed the court appreciation because it provided the police

system with which to maintain the "peculiar institution." Slave patrols were appointed every three months for several districts in each county, and non-slaveholders as well as masters were conscripted to maintain the plantation slave system. "Captains" were paid \$1.50 a day and "privates" \$1.12 (according to an 1854 Bedford accounting), and a total of 35 men received such compensation for the three month period.³² Patrolling was a social "duty" which helped define the community of interest in slaveholding among all whites. In December of 1858 the Franklin court decreed for Burrough's neighborhood:

--William Bond, Capt. Marsh Holland, C. F. Burroughs /James' son, emphasis added/, James Meador, Booker Holland and Joseph Rucker to patrol the neighborhood of Hales Ford -- 3 mos.³³

The social makeup is meaningful: Bond and Rucker were small slaveholders, the Hollands and C. F. Burroughs sons of slaveholders, and James Meador a propertyless factory worker.

The court also facilitated the management of slave property when an owner died, providing services for master and sometimes slave. The case of Christian vs Christian (1853) was in most respects typical. The indebtedness of this estate required the sale of slaves. Billy, Dabney and Sims were advertised in the Bedford Sentinel and Lynchburg Virginian to be sold at the court house steps on a given date. Atypically, however, the court provided for an infirmed slave; the estate executor was ordered to

make arrangements as may be proper for the future support of the old Negro slave Sims in this bill mentioned in the event he /the executor/ may find it practicable to make sale of him for any valuable consideration.³⁴

The court's order appeared "humane," but, it was also politic. Old slaves were a debit to any estate. Frequently masters petitioned, as did Richard Davis in June of 1854, to be exempted from paying court taxes and parish

levies "for his old and infirmed slaves Dolly, Nancy and Jenny."³⁵

The government's management of the entire black population was necessary for policing the slave system. Free persons of color were required to "register" themselves and obtain a certificate which would be produced for the patrols. After the Nat Turner rebellion one county court considered seriously, as in an October, 1852, case, "the propriety of allowing the said Issac to remain in the Commonwealth of Virginia and to reside in the county of Bedford."³⁶ Free blacks who were "paupers" were indentured by the court, but unlike whites received no education. Sandy Hale, a free black, was bound to Joel D. Mitchell in 1854; at age 21 he was to be compensated with "a horse worth seventy five dollars."³⁷ Some free persons of color were so impecunious as to be unable to pay local taxes. The Bedford court in 1853 decreed that sixteen free blacks be hired out by the sheriff "for such time as will suffice the said free Negros, at not less than ten cents a day, to raise the said taxes and levies, with a commission of five per cent to the sheriff."³⁸ "Free" persons of color, in effect, enjoyed economic rights but few "civil" rights and no political privileges. They were a population well governed.

The local government also provided for the truly destitute in the society. Their numbers were few because the family undertook the primary responsibility for the care of its own in the nineteenth century (those designated "paupers" and living in occurred infrequently in the 1860 census). Others became wards of the court. Whenever possible the justices indentured youthful paupers, providing according to state law for their education and apprenticeship until age 21. Others were entrusted to the Overseers of the Poor, elected local officials who ran the Poor House. In 1850 the Franklin County Poor House contained twenty-six inmates, seventeen of them females,

two blacks and two mulattoes. Only three were elderly (65 or older), and ten were children. A decade later there were twenty residents, an entirely new population. There were two idiots among the residents in 1860, one in 1850.³⁹ The county court customarily housed lunatics in the county jail until they could be sent to a state asylum. Johnathan A. Hick, for example, was fortunate. In September of 1858 he was judged "not of sound mind" and released upon payment of \$100.⁴⁰ Samuel Ferguson's was a tragic case. In July of 1858 he was mentioned as one of three lunatics in Bedford jail awaiting transport to an asylum. In November 1860 it was reported he had "died in jail."⁴¹ The justices passed the cost on to the taxpayers. In 1864 \$4,924.87 was levied upon Bedford County citizens "for the benefit of the poor."⁴²

Considerable effort was made by the justices to provide for the maintenance of the roads in these counties. The court appointed some resident of each neighborhood "surveyor" of the road. In 1852 Bedford County paid \$1,00 a day for such work, and one Silas Dearing \$310 for "making" two roads. Most probably slave labor was also used.⁴³ A typical order in 1856 appointed Edward Bridges (in Franklin County) surveyor to work:

the road from the ford of Blackwater at James M. Leftwiches along the new road across Grassy Hill at the Indian Graves to the Rocky Mount and Floyd Turnpike at the Maple Swamp with the following hands, to wit, Walter C. Callaway and hands, James Leftwich and hands,⁴⁴ Lewis H. Turnbull and hands and the said Bridges and hands.

The justices of the county, court officials, and locally elected representatives were the most important political personages in the county in the 1850's. An analysis of those who held the office of justice of the peace reveal scores of family names. Considerable rotation in office and the appearance of non-slaveholders as elected representatives indicate a

quite democratic political system. The local constable, for example, was elected. In 1860, Burroughs' neighbors chose James R. Hammer, age 26, owner of only \$130 personal property (no real estate). Appointive offices also went to Burroughs' neighbors. Asa Holland was appointed a deputy sheriff by John S. Burwell in the 1850's.. Benjamin Hatcher served as Assistant Commissioner of Revenue for the Northern District. Holland and Hatcher were wealthy, but among those who gave "deputy sheriff" or "constable" or "clerk of court" as an occupation in the 1860 census only two were slaveholders and none as wealthy as James Burroughs.⁴⁵

Lawyers at the county courthouse, however, appeared to dominate Franklin County party politics. Three men appeared particularly influential: Hughes Dillard, Peter Saunders, Jr., and Jubal Early. Dillard, several times Commonwealth's Attorney and a wealthy slaveholder, was spokesman for the Democracy. In 1852 he met Jubal Early, spokesman for the Whigs, in debate at the courthouse, charging the Whigs with abolitionism and identifying Franklin Pierce with the defense of "southern rights." In an 1858 Democratic meeting at the courthouse several identifiable celebrities joined Dillard: William Taliaferro, Dr. William and Robert Hairston (Peter Saunders' friends), Fleming Saunders (Peter's brother) and "A. T. Holland" (Asa). Abram Childress, the wealthiest slaveholder in Hales Ford, was a delegate to the state Democratic convention in 1856.⁴⁶

Jubal Early and Peter Saunders, Jr., were Whig politicians. Early was elected in 1841 to the General Assembly, appointed Commonwealth's Attorney in 1843. He ran unsuccessfully in the 1850's as a delegate to the constitutional convention and was also defeated as a delegate to the lower House.⁴⁷ Peter Saunders was equally unsuccessful: he was defeated in 1850 when he too sought to be a delegate to the convention and again in 1859

when he ran for the House of Delegates. Their lack of success reflected the declining fortunes of the Whig Party, which died a lingering death in the 1850's.

Party competition, nevertheless, was quite strong in Franklin and Bedford counties before the war, and political participation quite widespread. In Bedford County, for example, there were 3,273 males who paid taxes (according to an 1854 accounting).⁴⁸ In 1856, 2,059 males cast votes for either James Buchanan or Millard Fillmore. A greater than 60% participation in the political process is remarkable by comparison to today's turnouts, though more typical for the nineteenth century. Bedford went Whig in the Presidential elections of 1852 and 1856, but by a margin of little more than 200 votes in the former election and by a mere 29 votes in 1856. Franklin County was captured by the Democracy in 1852 (Pierce /D/ 802; Scott /W/ 620) and 1856 (Buchanan /D/ 1,163; Fillmore /W/ 699) by comfortable margins.⁴⁹ In 1859, however, both counties voted for "opposition" (Whig) candidate for Governor of Virginia William Goggin (a Bedford resident). In Franklin Goggin won by 247 votes; 600 votes had switched to the Whig column.⁵⁰

Such close party competition required careful canvassing of the rural districts by political aspirants. Bedford County, for example, had fifteen polling places in addition to the courthouse; "Wade's," "Preston's Store," "Board's Store," "Bigbies Shop" were neighborhood localities where farmers voted their political persuasions, and in close contests a few votes counted mightly.⁵¹ Peter Saunders' correspondence reveals both the drugery of campaigning and the excitement of politics. In 1850, he wrote the Judge that his canvass for delegate to the constitutional convention was "a very active and laborious one." He had been on horseback nearly every day for five

weeks, "riding from ten to thirty miles a day and have during that time made more than twenty speeches."⁵²

In 1855 Saunders wrote of election day at the Franklin County courthouse, where "a large crowd assembled, and the day was principally taken up with public speeches."⁵³ Politicians were quite long-winded in the nineteenth century; oratory was an art because political meetings were a form of entertainment. At Liberty (Bedford County), for example, two visiting political dignitaries spoke two hours.⁵⁴ Saunders, at least privately, was an aristocratic-sounding Whig. In 1850 he complained of "the inferior order of men" among the opposition, and in 1855 that the Democrats had nominated "some rather unacceptable candidates." In 1859, despite the Whig victory for Goggin in Franklin, Saunders lost a seat in the House of Delegates to his Democratic opponent -- by a mere 45 votes.⁵⁵

Because local voting returns were not preserved, James Burroughs' political persuasion was not ascertainable. He may, like Abram Childress, have been a Democrat or like Jubal Early, a Whig. Both Bedford and Franklin County farmers, however, appear to have approached secession haltingly. Both counties supported the "opposition" candidate for governor in 1859, William Goggin, a former Whig less inclined to be a "fire eater" than his opponent. Bedford County, which had been Whig since 1852, also displayed moderation in the 1860 Presidential elections when it gave a majority to John Bell, the compromise constitutional union candidate. Franklin County delivered a Democratic majority for John Breckinridge, the pro-southern Democratic candidate. In the secession convention of 1860, Bedford delegates voted for secession and Franklin against.⁵⁶

The differences between the two counties on secession vote should not obscure the more important fact of their moderate attitude. Virginians in

1861 were, in fact, confronted with a dilemma. South Carolina had succeeded December 20, 1860, and within a few weeks six other states of the lower south joined her to form the Confederacy on January 7, 1861. The 152 delegates elected to the Virginia secession convention met in Richmond February 13, 1861, and as they deliberated a Peace Conference met at Washington. Lincoln's party was hopeful that Virginia and the upper South would remain in the union. The choice was a difficult one.⁵⁷

Peter Saunders, Jr., and Jubal Early were the elected "Unionist" delegates from Franklin County. Early had defeated his "secessionist" opponent by 1,061 votes, a considerable margin. When he gave a speech against secession, he obviously represented most Franklin County farmers. He insisted Lincoln never intended to interfere with slavery in the States, defended the President's inaugural promise that he would execute the laws, and argued (in good Whig fashion) that the tobacco economy was an integral part of a national commercial system in which the North was a major consumer.⁵⁸

Peter Saunders' opinions weren't publicized, but a letter from his brother Fleming at Flat Creek (neighboring Campbell County) reveals the complexity of the dilemma. In March of 1861 (before the shots at Sumter) Fleming reported that most of his neighbors were opposed to the "immediate secession" or "ultra secession party." These ultra people, he reported, were literally moving South: "To hear them talk more than two thirds of the wealth of this country and most of the intelligence and refinement are going south." He added, "leaving out exaggeration, I believe there will be an unusually large emmigration south. . ."⁵⁹ Fleming saw little hope of compromise, but was, representatively, a Virginian reluctant to secede. Secession, Fleming and probably most area citizens believed, was to be

avoided except "in the event of any attempt at coercion sic when we will make common cause with the South."⁶⁰ The firing upon Fort Sumter and Lincoln's call for troops settled the matter for them.

Coercion aligned Virginians with the Confederacy. Jubal Early raised a company and rode back to Richmond to sign the ordinance of secession. This act was symbolic. From the viewpoint of Franklin County citizens the war's purpose was not to perpetuate slavery so much as it was an ultimate decision to defend their society from an armed aggressor. Fleming Saunders expressed the community's consensus even before the call for troops:

I am persuaded that the perpetuity of the union is fine but I hope our convention will succeed in placing the odium upon the shoulders of the people of the North, where it ought to rest.⁶¹

Slaveholder and non-slaveholder, wealthy and poor, bound by ties in the community that were economic, political, and social, volunteered like Jubal Early to go to war with their kin and neighbors. C. F. Burroughs, James' son, joined Troop D, 2nd Virginia Cavalry, "The Franklin Rangers," with 140 other county patriots. Others in Hales Ford joined him. Privates Samuel M. Board, Wythe Perdue, Joseph Rucker and Thomas Stegar were small slaveholding farmers (1-6 slaves among them). Benjamin Hancock and M. D. Holland (Asa's boy) were sons of more wealthy slaveholders as were Mark Holland and Thomas Craghead (both Second Lieutenants). The Meador brothers, factory workers at Ferguson and Hatchers, fought with them also. Charles' unit included neighbors W. G. Wilkinson, farm laborer, and John Starkey, Abram Childress' overseer. It was a democratic cavalry. Littleton T. Meador, an 18 year old farm laborer, was a Second Lieutenant. James H. Meador and K. Clingenpeel were sergeants. Burroughs fought along side of Hales, Booths, Hurts, and Poindexters, sons of the wealthy.

The war cost these soldiers and their relatives dearly. Troop D

suffered 25 wounded and lost 26 in battle. Four others were disabled by disease. E. J. Meador returned wounded. Among the dead were Thomas Craghead (Sarah's son), Samuel Board (23 years old in 1861, owner of one slave), John Starkey (the overseer), and C. F. Burroughs, James' son.⁶² Too often the toll of battle obscures the sacrifice at home. To this community's ordeal we turn our attention.

FOOTNOTES

1. Drawn from Legislative Petitions, 1844-1861, at Virginia State Library. Filed according to county; see petitions of December 13, 1850 and January 21, 1851.
2. Lynchburg Daily Virginian, October [5?], 1855.
3. See "Manufacturers" on file at Ferrum College. Drawn from the Franklin County White and Free Colored Census, 1860.
4. For this and the two succeeding paragraphs see "Mercantile Community" (on file Ferrum College). From 1860 Franklin County White and Free Colored Census.
5. Wise, End of an Era, p. 222. See the chapter "A Trip to the Mountains."
6. Ibid., p. 223
7. Ibid., p. 224-225
8. Ibid., p. 225-226
9. Ibid., p. 228.
10. Peter Saunders, Jr. to Dear Mother, August 17 and 18, 1851, Saunders Papers, U.Va.
11. Millard K. Bushong, Old Jube: A Biography of General Jubal A. Early (Boyce, 1958), pp. 18-19
12. Wise, End of an Era, p. 64-65.
13. Ibid., p. 36.
14. Bedford Sentinel, 1856.
15. Franklin County White and Free Colored Census for 1850, p. 280.
16. J.D.B. DeBow, The Industrial Resources, Statistics, Etc. of the United States and More Particularly of the Southern and Western States (London, 1854), pp. 453-455.
17. Richmond Enquirer, July 5, 1858.
18. DeBow, Statistics, pp. 453-54.
19. Bedford Sentinel, 1856.
20. Bettie Anthony to "My Dear Mother," May 7, 1856, Anthony Family Papers, in the T. J. Bell Collection, Virginia State Library, Richmond, Virginia (Anthony Papers).

21. DeBow, Statistics, p. 455.
22. See "Teachers" (on file, Ferrum); from 1860 Franklin County White and Free Colored Census. For this and next paragraph.
23. DeBow, Statistics, p. 460.
24. Helen Saunders to Dear Mother, May 4, 1850, Saunders Papers, U.Va.
25. See "Clergymen" (on file Ferrum); from 1860 Franklin County White and Free Colored Census, for this and next paragraph.
26. G. W. Abell quoted in Wingfield, Franklin County, A History, p. 110.
27. N. R. Arthur to Almira Anthony, May 17, 1858, Anthony Papers, Virginia State Library.
28. Helen Saunders to "Dear Mother," May 4, 1850, Saunders Papers, U.Va.
29. Wingfield describes the "laying in" season well in his Franklin County, A History, pp. 93-97.
30. Lynchburg Daily Virginian, September 4, 1859.
31. Walter Dean Burnham, "The Changing Shape of the American Political Universe," American Political Science Review, Vol. 59 (March, 1965).
32. See "accounting" for 1854 in Bedford County Court Order Book 31, p. 463.
33. Franklin County Court Order Book for 1855-60, p. 367.
34. Christian vs Christian (1853) Bedford County Court Order Book 31, p. 355.
35. Ibid., p. 55.
36. Ibid., p. 180.
37. Ibid., p. 516.
38. Ibid., p. 300
39. 1850 Franklin County White and Free Colored Census, p. 286. Same for 1860, p. 278.
40. Bedford County Court Order Book, 1855-60, p. 342.
41. Ibid., p. 342; Court Order Book, 1860-65, p. 53
42. Bedford County Court Order Book, 1860-65, p. 404.
43. Bedford County Court Order Book 31, p. 167.

44. Franklin County Court Order Book, 1855-60, p. 34.
45. See "Court Officials" (on file, Ferrum College); from 1860 Franklin County White and Free Colored Census. Holland and Hatcher appointments in Court Order Book for 1850-55, pp. 167, 182.
46. Lynchburg Daily Virginian, August 17, 1852.
47. Bushong, Old Jube, p. 19.
48. See "accounting;" Bedford County Court Order Book 31, p. 463.
49. Returns drawn from Richmond Enquirer. More complete returns for all elections have not yet arrived.
50. Lynchburg Daily Virginian, May 27 and 28, 1859.
51. Richmond Enquirer, November 9, 1852.
52. Peter Saunders to Judge Fleming Saunders, August 22, 1850, Saunders Papers, U.Va.
53. Peter Saunders to Judge Fleming Saunders, April 8, 1855, Saunders Papers, U.Va.
54. Richmond Enquirer, September 3, 1852.
55. Peter Saunders to Judge William Saunders, August 22, 1850 and April 8, 1855, Saunders Papers, U.Va.
56. Henry Thomas Shanks, The Secession Movement in Virginia, 1847-1861. (New York, 1970), pp. 60, 116, 206 (maps).
57. See the chapter "Terrapins from Franklin" in Bushong, Old Jube.
58. Ibid.
59. Fleming Saunders to Peter Saunders, April 7, 1861, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
60. Fleming Saunders to Peter Saunders, March 10, 1861, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
61. Fleming Saunders to Peter Saunders, April 7, 1861, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
62. Troop D members are listed in Wingfield, Franklin County, A History, pp. 164-67, with those wounded, disabled or killed noted.

PART III: AFTERMATH: GLIMPSES OF THE CIVIL WAR ORDEAL

Day after day this horrid war is claiming its victims
As the repeated sad results of this war come under my
knowledge and when in addition to that I see the clouds
still thickening and darkening around, I sometimes give
way to great depression of spirits. God grant that our
day of trial and suffering may be not much longer prolonged.

Peter Saunders, Jr., (from Richmond)
to Betty Saunders, January 17, 1862

The Civil War not only brought an end to the era of slaveholding in the tobacco region, but in most respects also revolutionized that backcountry society. It drained the region of much of its white manhood and called for unparalleled sacrifice for those who were left behind. The war demanded liquid financial assets of an economy based primarily upon land, slaves, and credit and created an inflation unprecedented in American history. It prompted new powers in government which conscripted sons, impressed crops, and requisitioned slaves, drastically altering the citizens' relation to both courthouse and state capitol. Finally, it emancipated slaves, destroying most of the property of small slaveholders like James Burroughs and giving freedom to the black community.

For the Burroughs plantation, the war brought tragedy quickly. On July 24, 1861, James Burroughs died of lung disease. Elizabeth remained on the plantation with her daughters while all but one (Joseph or "Nick") of the Burroughs' sons fought with the Confederacy. Thomas Robertson Burroughs, riding with Company D of the 2nd Virginia Cavalry, was the only son to survive the war unscathed. Brother "Ben" was wounded in Pickett's charge at Gettysburg and "Newt" at Nance's Shop. J. Christopher Burroughs died

in captivity and James William in battle at Kelly's Ford, Virginia, on March 7, 1863. By 1865 the slaves had departed for an uncertain freedom, and by 1870 Elizabeth had left the Franklin County farm to live with a married daughter.¹

The sacrifices of the Burroughs, however, were not uncommon. Whatever historians have said about states rights opposition to the war effort, disaffection and disloyalty in the Confederacy, or errors financial and political on the part of Southern governments, none have denied that the war called upon the general population to achieve nearly the impossible. The Civil War brought an almost unimaginable ordeal to whites in the Franklin and Bedford communities, "a day of trial and suffering," as Peter Saunders said, which molded anew a tragic sense of community.

The war began with an enthusiastic patriotism, White Confederates volunteered by the thousands. Fleming Saunders reported with pride the response of his neighbors. "The county independent of Lynchburg, has raised three infantry companies," he wrote on April 30, 1860. "Besides there is quite a troop in the Forest Depot Bedford County composed of people from Campbell and Bedford."² The raising of a company was a community affair in Franklin County. When the Franklin County "Rangers" (C. Frank Burroughs' unit) were mustered, Peter Saunders reported "Many of them are badly off in the way of money and I have no doubt that they are greatly dissatisfied that no aid has been given them by the county." The justices, however, "quartered them in one of Mr. James Callaway's double tobacco houses." Citizens erected a shed for a kitchen to which neighbors brought bread. They "levied" upon Saunders for a mutton and the use of two wagons. At the Hairston's Saunders wrote, "the family have been exclusively occupied for some time in making uniforms."³ Cloth, arms, horses, and other materials

of war were already in short supply before Manassas. "It is almost with a feeling of dismay," wrote brother Robert Saunders from Flat Creek, "the Revelation of the fact [sic] that the State has not in its bounds enough of powder and bullets to equip 25,000 men."⁴

Lack of supplies boded ill should the conflict be a prolonged one, but the slaveholding community faced the challenge realistically. "I am afraid there is something of a spirit abroad," Robert added in the same letter, "that this is a rich man's quarrel and they must fight it out. If the Rich [sic] don't come forward and give of their means and services to the cause it is lost."⁵ The county governments in Virginia levied a tax on all free males over sixteen years of age to maintain the soldiers in the field and by April 1862 to assist their families at home. The Bedford court levied \$50,000, for example, in May, 1861, floated \$20,000 in bonds in June and created a county currency in denominations from five cents up.⁶ Both counties began a financial commitment which became nearly unbearable as the war dragged on.

Citizens at home kept a most anxious watch upon their troops. When Captain Winston Radford (former court justice) was killed while charging at the head of his troops in the first battle of Manassas, the county cited him for "a bravery and intrepidity alike characteristic of the man." In June, 1862, they memorialized Col. Charles Cotey, "a late member of this body."⁷ By June, 1862, the court established a committee, including physicians, to travel to Richmond to care for the wounded of twenty-one companies who had fought at Seven Pines. Shoes, socks, gloves, and blankets were purchased by the county to clothe its own, and justices empowered to "impress them in their representative districts." Both counties mobilized its citizens on the home front to support those in the field.

By early 1862 Peter Saunders, Jr., and his neighbors in the county, recognized fully the magnitude of their ordeal. Elected a delegate to the House, Saunders was depressed by the news he constantly received when in Richmond. "Our Franklin county suffered severly," he wrote his wife, "and I was sorry to see Davy Mountcastle's name in the list of missing." General Jubal Early was then visiting Saunders and assured him that county boys "killed in the regiment would not exceed 20 or 25 . . . Jack Hairston is undoubtedly killed."⁹ Saunders visited hospitals where the county lost soldiers to disease. "I found at the depot on Thursday five corpses," he wrote, "and I believe that already ten or fifteen of the militia of this county have died and many more are seriously and dangerously sick."¹⁰

The toll of battle was equally apparent back home in Rocky Mount. Among the lasting impressions that village made upon John Wise, then only sixteen, was the community's remorse. "There was young so-and-so, with his empty sleeve," Wise remembered in 1862. "A year ago he had left the place and passed safely through all the earlier battles; but at Malvern Hill a grape-shot mutilated his left arm."¹¹ Wise stayed in the fine homes of the Taylors in Rocky Mount and commented upon "the desolating sorrow which engulfed them. . . ." "The war," he noted, "filled grave after grave in the graveyard of the Taylor family, until, when it ended, the male line was almost extinct."¹²

The county governments by August, 1862, began providing "support and maintenance" for the families of soldiers killed or disabled in battle, usually from \$10 to \$35 every other month. The amount varied according to family size. The names appear in the county's court order books: three pages and sixty-nine names in February, 1863; nineteen pages and six hundred seventy-one names by July, 1863. In magisterial district number four, the Hales Ford community, 96 names appear in 1863. Ann Shaon received \$5,

Mary Meador \$11, Catherine Starkey \$12, and Marian Steger \$12. Ann Shaon had no children, but Mary Meador (widow of the factory worker) had one child. Catherine Starkey, widow of the overseer had five children, and Marian Steger had four children.¹³ By June, 1863, the Franklin County Court was paying \$10,416 a year to indigents and widows.

On the local level, all citizens were called upon to make greater sacrifices. The patrol system, for example, was more than doubled when the war began. In June, 1861, three patrols (Thomas Holland, Joel Meador, and L. H. Powell, Captains) rode the south side of the Rocky Mount Turnpike; three others (Josiah Ferguson, Charles Chewning, and William Bond, Captains) rode the north side. By this time thirty-six patrollers rode, nearly five times the number before the war, and they served without pay.¹⁴

Pursuant to an act of the Assembly on October 3, 1862, the state of Virginia requisitioned slaves to work on the fortifications at Richmond and in other capacities. All male slaves between 18 and 55 and fit for service were enrolled at the Courthouse. Slaveowners were assigned a quota; families with soldiers in the Confederate service, or widows with a son in the military (or widowed by the war) were exempted.

Elizabeth Burroughs would have fallen into this last category, a widow with sons fighting. Franklin County slaveholders provided 534 slaves in response to four drafts. In the 1862 draft there were the names of 237 owners, most of whom provided one or two slaves (40 provided one, 26 two). From five larger owners the government requisitioned three slaves. Peter Saunders was called upon to give six, and Jno. S. Hale (the wealthy tobacco-nist) nine.¹⁵

The exceptions in this instance help explain the rule. Peter Saunders made application to exempt his slaves because they were manufacturing iron

for Confederate guns; the petition was denied. Frequently the Court certified to Richmond those owners who were released from the requisition. In February of 1863 the Justices reported John Brown's slave was "detailed" by the Secretary of War to work in a gun factory; James Ingram, Sr.'s slave had died and Horace Smith's were already in Richmond. Tilgham Cobb's slave in Franklin County was "hired out" and Cobb's quota furnished in Bedford. Thomas Reynolds' only slave was "unsound and utterly unfit for service."¹⁶

Beginning in 1862 the Confederacy conscripted men for military service. The exemptions for professionals (from druggist to teacher of 20 or more students) and particularly the exception for owners of 20 or more slaves created resentment. So did the substitute provision. "There is a great stir among the conscripts," a Lynchburg relative wrote Jubal Early, "it appears difficult to understand the law and also the substitute law and it is causing a good deal [of] excitement. I think the substitute is a bad one. . . and also the exemption law."¹⁷ Even before the law was passed in September, 1862, Peter Saunders' wife reported that:

the people in Franklin are almost in open rebellion at the prospect of the draft and many of them swear they will die at home before they will be forced to fight, that no one has a right to draft them, and they will not submit to it.¹⁸

By 1863, the area contained considerable numbers of deserters. John Wise, for instance, was among those Confederate soldiers who went "deserter-hunting" in the mountainous regions of Western North Carolina, East Tennessee, and Southwest Virginia. He described in End of an Era one such detail ordered to arrest deserters in nearby Floyd County.¹⁹

In 1863, complaints were rampant about disloyalty. Fleming Saunders' unit, so enthusiastic in 1861, was demoralized after Gettysburg. "It is

impossible at this time to procure any leave of absence from the army," he wrote brother Peter. "Our soldiers have deserted very much since we returned from Pennsylvania." He was particularly critical of the North Carolina troops.²⁰ In January of 1863, Peter Saunders had already heard from Asa Holland, neighbor to the Burroughs at Hales Ford, urging the passage of a law to create a militia (of men 45-55) to arrest deserters and to provide protection in any "emergency." "Include in the enrollment all who have furnished substitutes," he insisted, "but not allow them the privilege of holding any office in their respective companies."²¹

Military reverses, an inflationary economy, disease, and class resentment all helped undermine Confederate morale. Dr. William Hairston, for example, complained to Saunders in February of 1863. The requisition had taken some of his slaves and he was with little else "but my own exertions. I have not even a plough boy, and but for having to take care of Ruth's hands, I would be compelled to hire my ploughing." Slave values were skyrocketing, and with them, most likely, the cost of hire. Dr. Hairston, who was overwhelmed by patients, also reported a plague of the smallpox which swept the county and a shoot-out between deserters and the cavalry in the county. Two soldiers were shot and "one very badly wounded by a party of deserters and thieves" at Bob Goodson's house. "Bob himself was wounded in the neck and is now in jail. The others made their escape. . ."²² Hairston was attending to the wounds of the Confederate officers.

Saunders' own overseer, R. L. Henderson, reported the same "shooting frolick" and also complained that "the Germans or rather the Dutch . . . won't respond to the draft." Sugar was rationed (along with salt and eventually wheat), but distilleries abounded: "8 distilleries in operation within 10 miles of this place." He suggested the legislature do something.²³

Impressment agents had visited the Saunders estate on January 17 "to impress our corn." By early February they had not "pestered" Henderson yet but, "the people generally. . .are becoming very tired of them and some of them have been behaving very bad from what I can find out [sic]."24

Impressment of grains and other goods for the army was a Confederate policy disastrous to morale, even in areas like this region, quite removed from battle. Fleming Saunders (Peter's brother) was a Brigadier Quartermaster in the Shenandoah Valley and knew the law well; he executed it, but disliked it. "There is not much grain in the country to spare," he wrote in early 1863, "and then there is such difference between what the government is paying and what private citizens pay for corn" that farmers rushed grain to market to avoid army officials.

In every district the poor people and those who have no corn ought to be taken into account and enough left for them. The present way of impressing takes the corn chiefly from the honest and truthful whilst many by a little . . . deception save their supplies and get a high price for it.²⁵

Impressment was necessary, perhaps, to the war effort, and county governments as well as the Confederate authorities resorted to it. The counties also purchased salt and wheat (both had to be imported before the war ended) to be distributed to households in each justices' district, and the courts covered the cost by levying taxes. By 1863, the war had simply demanded more than the economy could generate. William Hairston complained he lacked "necessaries" for family and livestock. Impressment agents took too much and neighbors had none to sell. "I cannot get even seed oats, neither wheat nor corn, I have not six barrels of corn to save my life and not a grain of wheat. . . . My cattle and sheep have been dying two a day."²⁶

Along with scarcity went rampant inflation. Confederate, state and even county currency circulated. Even in Richmond there were notes, Saunders

wrote, "of a most infamous character. Notes as small as ten cents are circulating and under that sum postage stamps are used."²⁷ In Bedford County the prices fixed by the Court for local impressment agents (probably below market value) registered the inflation: flour at \$200 per barrel, corn at \$20 a bushel, bacon at \$5 a pound, beef at \$2 a pound.²⁸ John Wise reported butter in Virginia at \$8 a pound and eggs at \$3 a dozen.²⁹ Fast days were set in Richmond, and when Betty Saunders requested new shoes of her husband, she was disappointed. He had hoped to find some on the way home, but "there are none in Lynchburg."³⁰

The ordeal lasted for four years without any invasion of Franklin County or Hales Ford. The approach of R. M. Hunter's union forces through Bedford toward Lynchburg in 1864 provided an opportunity for some blacks to seek freedom. That, however, was the beginning of another era which deserves separate investigation. Slaveholders and non-slaveholders during the war did not witness a sudden collapse of the slave society in which they had lived. They fought valiantly to defend it in battle and at home provided every conceivable financial and material support only to watch their economy and will become slowly exhausted long before the Union army compelled a military surrender.

The spirit displayed by those beleagued people who endured that ordeal, whatever the guilt or mistakes historians assign them, is what ennobled their lost cause. "This fast day," Betty Saunders wrote her husband in 1862,

. . . will be solemnly kept by the whole country, for the darkest hour has certainly arrived unless we are destined to be completely subdued, which I cannot bring my mind to believe can ever be the case. I do believe we should humble ourselves as a nation before God, in a way we have never yet done if we expect Him to help with our efforts.³¹

Their efforts were considerable.

FOOTNOTES

1. Barry MacKintosh, The Burroughs Plantation, 1856-65 (1968), pp. 6-14.
2. Fleming Saunders to Peter Saunders, Jr., April 30, 1861. Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
3. Peter Saunders to Dear Wife, July 8, 1861, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
4. Robert C. Saunders to Peter Saunders, Jr., April 18, 1861, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
5. Ibid.
6. Bedford County Court Order Book #31, pp. 3, 104, 124. Franklin raised 50,000; also see Court Order Book for 1860-65, p. 120.
7. Bedford County Court Order Book #34, pp. 35 and 125.
8. Ibid., pp. 123, 205, 323. Franklin County did the same; see Court Order Book for 1860-65, p. 199.
9. Peter Saunders Jr. to Dear Wife, March 13 and 27, 1862, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
10. Peter Saunders to Dear Wife, April 29, 1862, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
11. Wise, End of an Era, p. 229.
12. Ibid., p. 224.
13. Franklin County Court Order Book for 1860-65, pp. 255, 261, 288, 303, 315, 328.
14. Ibid., p. 124.
15. Ibid., p. 243-45, 383, 486.
16. Ibid., p. 258.
17. J. Early to "Dear Jubal," January 7, 1863, The Early Family Papers, Virginia State Historical Society, Richmond.
18. Betty Saunders to Peter Saunders, Jr., "Monday the 17th," 1862, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
19. Wise, End of an Era, p. 391. Most likely that area of Franklin County which borders on Floyd was a haven for deserters.
20. Fleming Saunders to Peter Saunders, Jr., August 16, 1863, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.

21. Asa Holland to Peter Saunders, Jr., January 1, 1863, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
22. William Hairston to Peter Saunders, Jr., February 5, 1863, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
23. R. C. Henderson to Peter Saunders, Jr., January 1, and February 17, 1862, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
24. R. C. Henderson to Peter Saunders, Jr., February 7, 1863, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
25. Fleming Saunders to Peter Saunders, Jr., February 1, 1863, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
26. William Hairston to Peter Saunders, Jr., March 2, 1863, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
27. Peter Saunders, Jr. to "My Dear Wife," December 19, 1861, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
28. Bedford County Court Order Book #34, p. 420
29. Wise, End of an Era, p. 33.
30. Betty Saunders to Peter Saunders, Jr., February 25 and 28, 1862, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.
31. Betty Saunders to Peter Saunders, Jr., February 28, 1862, Saunders Family Papers, V.H.S.

PEOPLE OF COLOR IN BEDFORD COUNTY AND FRANKLIN COUNTY, 1850-1865

ANDREW L. BASKIN
Assistant Professor of History
Ferrum College, Ferrum, Virginia

PEOPLE OF COLOR IN BEDFORD COUNTY AND FRANKLIN COUNTY, 1850-1865

Almost all Americans know that once in our nation's past the institution of slavery was as American as "hot dogs, baseball, apple pie, and Chevrolet." Many Americans, as well, think of slavery in terms of mint juleps, plantations such as Tara in Gone With the Wind, and, of course, white masters like Rhett Butler and Scarlet O'Hara. Such images may be true for portions of the Deep South, but what about areas on the edge of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia like Franklin County and Bedford County?

Most previous studies of the two counties are of little value in dealing with slavery, especially from the perspective of people of color. One need only to examine the studies of Franklin County to verify this argument. A Selected Annotated Bibliography of Resources on the History of Franklin, of Henry, and of Patrick Counties in Virginia, by Oliver Burns Issac, for example, concentrates only on the remaining ruins of plantations still to be found. Social, economic, and political factors are omitted.¹

T. Keister Greer, in "Genesis of a Virginia Frontier: The Origins of Franklin County," attempted to study the individuals who originally settled the county. He made no mention of slavery, although slaves eventually composed 33% of the county's population.²

The most prolific writer about the county's history was Marshall Wingfield, a minister and amateur historian. In one of his works, Franklin County, Virginia, A History, he has a chapter entitled "Some Negroes." In a single paragraph Wingfield states that the tobacco growing section had

a large black population, that there were a few slaves on the Blackwater, and that the Dunkards did not own slaves.³ The rest of the chapter is a narrative about blacks he knew personally, and he made no attempt to re-create the lives of others.

Only recently have there been attempts to look at the antebellum period from the perspective of people of color in Franklin County.⁴ This area should become a major area of study for at least two reasons. First, the location of Bedford and Franklin Counties is unique, with flat sections and parts that are mountainous. This location permits the examination of the old theory that slavery could not survive in the mountains. Second, the border between Franklin and Bedford is close to the birthplace of two famous black Americans: Adam Clayton Powell, Sr., and Booker T. Washington. Any area that can produce two men of their caliber deserves some investigation. This work is a small step towards that goal.

Franklin County came into existence in 1786, carved from the southeastern end of the older Bedford. There are no records of the first persons of color to arrive in the area and, of course, whether or not they were free or slave. For Franklin, at any rate, it can be established that slavery existed when the county was formed. The inventory of the estate of Henry Guthry, one of the first wills to be probated in the new county, lists six slaves at 345L.

Between the years 1850 and 1860, as shown in Chart I, the population in both counties of slaves and free blacks increased. During that decade the black population of Franklin was about 33% of the total population of the county, while in Bedford it was close to 45%. Such percentages might seem relatively small when compared to the heavy black population of the Black Belt of the deep South but, considering the mountainous nature of

the area, the percentages are significant; perhaps significant enough to use as a model to examine the lives of blacks in the eastern Blue Ridge before the Civil War.

CHART I: Population of Bedford County and Franklin County
in 1850 and 1860

Year	Race	Bedford	Percentage	Franklin	Percentage
1850	Whites	13,556	56	11,638	67
	Free Blacks	463	2	66	1
	Slaves	<u>10,061</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>5,726</u>	<u>32</u>
	Total	24,080	100	17,430	100
1860	Whites	14,388	57	13,642	67
	Free Blacks	504	2	105	1
	Slaves	<u>10,276</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>6,351</u>	<u>33</u>
	Total	25,168	100	20,098	100

The average slave was young. Based on census data, the mean age of the average slave in Franklin County was 19.7 in 1850 and 19.8 in 1860. In Bedford the mean age was 22.4 for 1850 and 1860. An interesting mystery arises from a study of the ages of the slaves. Chart II shows 1,530 slaves in Franklin County in 1850 who fell into the 10 to 20 age category. These same slaves should be listed in the 20-30 age group in 1860. The fact is that their number decreases to 969. For Bedford, the slaves 10 to under 20 in 1850 numbered 2,451, but by 1860 their population had decreased to 1,731. For both counties the trend continued with most age groups. The only growth in the slave population was in the age group below ten years old. What happened to the adult slaves between the years 1850 and 1860?

CHART II: Ages of Slaves in 1850 and 1860

Ages	1850		1860	
	Bedford	Franklin	Bedford	Franklin
Under 1	310	147	300	233
1 - under 5	1,381	915	1,347	972
5 - under 10	1,529	998	1,448	1,009
10 - under 15	1,369	919	1,584	983
15 - under 20	1,082	610	1,152	722
20 - under 30	1,731	886	1,638	969
30 - under 40	1,013	498	1,017	604
40 - under 50	730	325	710	384
50 - under 60	460	225	468	214
Over 60	456	202	513	261

Compiled from Population of the United States. For 1850, pp. 252-256 and 242-246; for 1860, pp. 508-509 and 500-501.

One answer might be a high mortality rate because of hard work and brutality. This theory does not seem appropriate when more closely examined. Chart III clearly shows that the mortality rate for slaves was highest for slaves under the age of ten. Once a slave passed the age of ten his or her chances to reach old age increased greatly. The Chart also shows the causes of death, at least as reported to the County Clerk. If these reports have any validity, it seems that the overwhelming majority of slaves in Franklin County died of some type of disease or illness, not brutality.

CHART III: Ages and Causes of Death for Slaves in Franklin County in 1853, 1861, and 1865

Ages	1853	1861	1865
Below 1	21	13	15
1 - 5	36	48	38
6 - 10	10	13	2
11 - 20	16	11	7
21 - 30	9	10	4
41 - 50	9	5	3
51 - 60	5	5	1
61 - 70	5	4	1
71 - 80	4	1	2
Over 80	3	1	0
Age unknown	8	2	0
Still Born	2	3	0
Total	142	120	75

Causes

1853	1861	1865
Unknown 40	Not listed 61	Flux 16
Typhoid Fever 17	Diphtheria 18	Unknown 12
Pneumonia 13	Unknown 9	Hooping Cough 10
Hooping Cough 10	Croup 6	Croup 9
Dropsy 8	Dropsy 3	Typhoid 7
Inflamation of bowels 7	Lungs, smothered, flux, typhoid fever, old age, measles - 2 each	Consumption 6
Croup 5	Casualty, worms, camp fever, consumption - 1 each	Measles 4
Consumption, old age, measles, flu - 4 each		Diphtheria, dropsy, scrofula - 2 each
Child bed fever, Scroffula brain - 3 each		Internal abcess, poisoned, spasms, breast disease, old age - 1 each
Ricketts, Overlaid in bed, cold, scarlet fever - 2 each		
Apoplexy, liver, diarrhea, convulsions, smothered in bed, fever, bronchitis		
Killed by a stone, deformed, strangled, killed by a lick, overheated - 1 each.		

Another factor to bear in mind concerns the increase in the slave population through natural reproduction. Figures for the years 1853, 1861, and 1865 show the following number of slaves born in Franklin County:

1853 - 351	1861 - 246	1865 - 108 ⁶ .
------------	------------	---------------------------

For each of these years, the birth rate was larger than the death rate.⁷ This should produce an increase in slaves, but instead one finds a decrease. The question as to what happened to many of the slaves who survived to become adults remains.

The answer can be found in the value of slaves. Throughout the decade the value of slaves in both counties increased. In Franklin, in 1850, the highest value of a slave was \$800. By 1855, some slave males were worth \$1,000. In 1860, a "Negro man, Sam," was sold to Christopher Hancock for \$1,700.⁸ Prices were similar in Bedford. In 1857, a "negro man, Peter, 22" was valued at \$1,150. Appraisement of the estate of Robert Allen in

March of 1860 resulted in "Abel, Jr., 23 years old" being valued at \$1,400.⁹ The values appear to have increased because of the demand for slaves, especially in the New South to the west.

The movement of slaves southward came about in two ways. First, entire plantations were moved. This is the contention of Fogel and Engerman in Time on the Cross.¹⁰ Most historians, however, have stated that individual slaves of the Old South were sold to the New South to help the growth of the cotton kingdom. This type of transaction occurred in Bedford.

One newspaper advertisement stated:

NEGROES WANTED

This subscriber wishes to purchase any number of likely Negroes suitable for the Richmond and Southern markets. The highest cash prices will be paid.

William S. Myler¹¹
Lynchburg

Another news story reported:

LARGE SHIPMENT OF NEGROES

During the months of November and December 1,386 Negroes were shipped over the Petersburg and Weldon Railroad for the cotton and rice fields of the South. Tuesday 107 were sent upon the same road and 100 more are now¹² in Petersburg in readiness to be forwarded to the same market.

The Tennessee and Virginia Railroad operated in Bedford and provided a ready means of transportation to southern slave markets. High prices for slaves, a ready market, and convenient transportation may very well explain the disappearance of the adult slaves between 1850 and 1860.

The slaves who remained in the area usually were found on a farm, more specifically, a tobacco farm. In both counties the poundage of tobacco produced in 1860 doubled that produced in 1850.¹³ Tobacco manufacturing was also an important local industry. In Franklin, of 85 manufacturing

establishments found in the county in 1860, 17 were involved with tobacco.¹⁴
King Tobacco ruled in Bedford and Franklin.

There seems to have been little relationship between slavery and tobacco manufacturing. White Southerners appear to have had imprinted into their own minds, as did many blacks, that persons of color lacked the necessary intelligence to operate machinery. Furthermore, teaching an intelligent black to operate the machinery represented educating the black. An educated slave would be the one most likely to rebel against the institution. A little freedom, like education, might cause the desire for more freedom, which could only lead to rebellion.

Rebellions like those of Nat Turner's or Gabriel Prosser's did not occur in the Franklin and Bedford area. A few slaves, did, however, express open discontent with the institution of slavery. There are instances in the Register of Deaths of slaves under the age of one being smothered in bed, suggesting the mother did this to keep the child from living as a slave. Running away was another way for a slave to express displeasure. The following is an example:

RUNAWAY

Runaway from subscriber near Oak Mulga, Bedford County, Va., a few days ago, a negro boy named Jerry. He is 5'10" tall had on a suit of "dark colored Jeans" old white wool hat. Took with him a black dog. . . . He was raised on Catawba and probably made his way to that section of county. \$10.00 reward -- apprehension and delivery to me or lodged in jail so I can get him.
William Bush¹⁵

On some occasions the master or mistress might feel physically the displeasure of the slave. Such was the fate of James Poindexter of Bedford who was shot "against the right side of his . . . face" by his slave, Tom. For murder, Tom was sentenced to be "hanged by the neck, Friday, January 6, 1865 between ten and four."¹⁶ Jane, property of Christopher

Musgrove, released her wrath on her mistress, Eliza E. Musgrove. Musgrove died from "four severe bruises and wounds" on the head from "a certain large stick." Jane was hanged on September 10, 1858.¹⁷

Other acts of defiance included beating the animals, breaking the tools, or destroying the crops. Silas of Franklin County attempted unsuccessfully to burn down the jail in which he had been incarcerated for disobedience. Considering the number of slaves in the area, however, the number of acts of defiance was small. Hopelessness of being successful was no doubt one factor for the lack of defiance. A more important reason may have been the nature of the slave system that existed in the area, one which, for lack of a better term, can be characterized as paternalistic.

As Chart IV shows, the average slaveowner in both counties held fewer than 10 slaves. Such a small number of slaves per slaveowner meant that the average slave worked in the fields beside his or her master. In other words, there was a great deal of personal contact between slave and master. This contact, however, did not necessarily enhance the well being of the slave. The two races came to know each other as individuals, even though whites considered themselves superior. Paternalism clearly existed, but without the caste system on the larger plantations of the deep South. Whites would learn that there were "good" and "bad" blacks, instead of lumping all blacks into one category.

CHART IV: Slaveholders and Slaves in 1860

<u>No. of Slaves</u>	<u>No. of Slaveholders-Bedford</u>	<u>No. of Slaveholders-Franklin</u>
1	222	274
2	128	131
3	102	71
4	86	75
5	70	52

Chart IV: Slaveholders and Slaves in 1860 -continued

<u>No. of Slaves</u>	<u>No. of Slaveholders-Bedford</u>	<u>No. of Slaveholders-Franklin</u>
6	48	69
7	57	35
8	53	40
9	34	28
10-15	142	
15-20	77	
20-30	61	
30-40	25	
40-50	14	
50-70	7	3
70-100	3	3

Compiled from Agriculture of the United States in 1860 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1864) p. 243.

The slave system with few slaves being owned per white restricted the slave's movement into a black world. By being around whites to such an extent, the blacks surrendered much of their heritage, especially when compared to slaves on larger plantations. The majority of blacks in Bedford and Franklin worked with whites, ate near whites, and slept near whites. This perverted integration produced docile and submissive individuals who had to accept the situation to survive.¹⁹

One way to examine the level of contact between the races is to deal with miscegenation. There are no listing of blacks and whites legally marrying each other, but apparently in Bedford some interracial couples lived as husbands and wives. If the census data has any validity, miscegenation was more of a phenomenon in Franklin. In Bedford, for 1860, 15% of the slaves and 55% of the free blacks were classified as being mulattoes. Franklin County's percentages were 19.3% for slaves and 65% for free blacks.²⁰ It must be remembered that the statistics only measured the individuals considered to be of mixed blood, not the frequency of sexual intercourse. These numbers seem very high when compared with the research of Fogel and Engerman who stated that "among rural slaves, who constituted 95% of the

population, only 9.9% were mulatto in 1860 . . .,"²¹ Clearly miscegenation was a part of race relations in the Blue Ridge during the antebellum period.

Sexual intercourse could lead to more than physical contact and mulattoes; it could lead to the development of romantic interests. Slaves, especially females, would not likely attempt rebellion against someone for whom they cared. A large mulatto population would as well lead to greater submissiveness. The people of mixed blood were considered Negroes, but they thought of themselves as better than the average Negro, and they would try to enter white society by imitating the values of whites. Overt rebellion might have been unacceptable to the mulattoes; instead they tended to ape the ways of the whites and enforce the slave system.

The role played by this significant group of mulattoes appears to have been in part responsible for the submissiveness of virtually all blacks in the area.

It should be added, on the other hand, that mulattoes could also be the hardest slaves to handle. This might be especially true if the individual could pass for white. They would probably be more successful at running away since they could submerge into the dominant white population. For example:

\$100 Reward

Runaway from the subscriber, . . . a Yellow Boy, (almost white) who answers to the name of Charles He also answers the following description: — about 5 feet 8 inches, has light curly hair, large wide mouth, which he keeps closely shut, and a nose sunken at the bridge, which projects upward at the point. He has a coarse, harsh voice, and his conversation is of a rather familiar style²²

This description suggests that Charles stood a chance at being successful in his escape. Most slaves did not have Charles' "almost white" complexion;

they were black and forced to submit to the system.

Religion may also have been used to make the slaves submissive. In both counties, churches set aside certain sections within the sanctuary to be used by slaves. As stated in A History of Pleasant Hill Church, 1857-1867, "there was a gallery reached by a flight of steps from the front left-hand corner on the inside of the building which served as a place for the slaves of the members; thereby affording an opportunity for the slaves, too, to hear the word of God preached."²³ Other churches, such as Morgan Baptist Church of Moneta and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, of Franklin County allowed blacks to become charter members.²⁴ On occasions preachers were brought to the farms or plantations. For example, a Mr. Mead, apparently a friend of Peter Saunders of Franklin County, "requested for Mr. Wells at Campbell Courthouse." After the sermon was delivered, Saunders stated, "I wish we could have a minister of his zeal and earnestness . . . We would doubtless accomplish much good."²⁵

A slave who had accepted Christianity may have brought a better price at the slave market. As John Watson stated in a letter to Peter Saunders,

It is too common however that their moral and religious instruction is neglected and this subject will present to you the greatest difficulty in effecting a satisfactory disposition of the slaves. . .²⁶

It was no doubt to the slaveowner's physical and financial well being that slaves concentrated on life after death and not their lives of earth. Religion provided that security.

Both counties sought to enforce the system with slave patrols serving on a three month rotation. Their major duty was to ascertain that every black encountered on a highway possessed a pass. Bob, a slave of Mr. Callaway of Bedford, was found March 1, 1859, without a pass. He received 30 lashes as his punishment.²⁷ Even for travel by rail blacks had to have a

pass, as the following advertisement shows:

Slaves traveling by themselves. . . must be furnished with two passes, so that one can be retained in the office and it must be expressly stated on the pass that they are permitted to go on the cars. . .²⁸

That these legal restrictions on the movement of slaves were not always observed is indicated by the fact that some were charged with "going at large and trading as a free man." When a slave was charged with such an offense, the white individual controlling the slave at that time was summoned to court. The summons could result in a fine for the white person. John Irby was fined \$30 plus court costs for allowing his slave Bird to act as a free man. If the fine was not paid, Bird was to be sold.²⁹

Although it seems a harsh penalty for Bird to be sold if Irby did not pay the fine, the legal system did not always go against the black individual. A slave named Guy was charged with assault, a felony, upon John S. Preston. The Court decided he was not guilty of a felony, but a lesser offense for which he ought be be whipped. His punishment was 39 lashes upon his bare back.³⁰ In a harsher slave society he probably would have been executed for assaulting a white man.

Similar punishment was handed out to Green, property of William Dickinson, originally found guilty of murdering James Burch, a white person of Bedford County. New evidence must have been found, because Green was later found guilty "of accompany to the murder after the fact." Another slave, Jim, was convicted of the murder and hanged.³¹ Hanging was also the punishment for a slave killing another slave. Jim, property of William Jones, was charged with murder in the first degree because he killed Woodson by stabbing. Jim was sentenced "to be hanged by the neck."³²

Though these legal controls were stringent, the system sometimes included very human, personal feelings. Hector Harris, in 1863, paid \$1,900

for a "negro boy" to please his "old Negroes" even though the slave was valued at only \$1,200.³³ H. R. Arthur wrote: "Your Pa sends his love to you all, The Negroes sends howdy to you. Tell the negroes howdy for me. . . ." ³⁴ These feelings had the same effect as religion and legal restrictions. The slaves learned the advantages of submission. For many slaves, the methods worked; they were submissive.

Procurement of slaves also reveals something about the relationship between blacks and whites. One way to obtain a slave was to own a female slave who gave birth. By law, the children took on the legal status of the mother; thus, if the mother was a slave, the child was a slave. Based on the ages of slaves, as shown in Chart II, it is obvious that many slaves were obtained this way. Another avenue to slave ownership was to buy a slave.

As stated earlier, slave traders bought many slaves, but local whites also bought slaves at the auction of the estate of a deceased individual. At the sale of the estate of Elizabeth Booth in 1852 "a Negro woman, Mary and child," were sold to "Jas. Ferguson for \$900.00." C. Neighbors bought "1 Negro woman, Patsy, for \$22.00."³⁵ Before an auction could occur, the estate was appraised by the executors. These appraisals reveal some interesting information.

First, real attempts seem to have been made to sell together the mother and her young children. An example comes from the estate of Fountain Hurt where "Nancy 18, and child Virginia 2 years" were valued at \$1,100. Or, "Malinda 31, and child Ellen 9 months," appraised for \$900. Apparently after the age of four the child could be sold apart from the mother. The estate of Fountain Hurt had a girl Amanda, aged 4, appraised individually for \$400.³⁶ The slaveowners attempted to maintain some semblance of a

family structure for slaves. If the women were sold with their children, they would resent the selling less, and the discontentment of slaves would be lessened. Though slaves were property, and inferior, they were also beings with feelings. To some extent whites attempted to recognize those feelings.

Another aspect, based on the appraisals, involves the value of men and women. Men, for what were then obvious reasons, were usually valued for more than women of the same age. The average cost of slaves sold in Richmond verifies this conclusion:

Men 20 - 26 yrs	\$1,450-1,500
Best Plough Boys 17 - 20 yrs	1,350-1,425
Boys 15 - 17	1,250-1,375
Boys 12 - 15	1,100-1,200
Best Grown Girls 17 - 20 yrs	1,275-1,325
Girls 15 - 17	1,150-1,250
Girls 12 - 15	1,000-1,100 ³⁷

The prices indicate slaves were purchased to work and not to breed. Slave breeding, of the type shown in Mandingo, was not a phenomenon of this area. Masters did force themselves upon black females, but that was an individual act and not part of a group pattern. King Tobacco was more important. Tobacco provided immediate profits, while slave children became assets only after 3 or 4 years.

Older slaves often received special treatment. The inventory of Caleb Tate in 1857 shows "Matt 74 valued at \$000.00 and Laviesy, 67 valued at \$000.00."³⁸ In his will Tate stated, "It is my desire that my old servants, Matt and Visy, shall never be sold, but they are to live with my daughter during her life, and her children after her death, rendering such services as they can, and receiving their support in return. . . ." ³⁹ There are many references in the legal records of both counties showing that old slaves were not turned out into the world to die; they received homes until

their death. Even though financial liabilities, their years of loyalty were rewarded. For Matt and Visey, they were to die as members of the Tate household.

Even when sold, some masters allowed their slaves latitude in determining their masters. Ludwick Keslor stated in his will, "I desire my Executor to sell my slaves privately, and as far as possible to masters that they may wish to go to. . ."⁴⁰ Keslor's slaves may have been luckier than most, but his instructions once again show the humane, paternalistic nature of slavery that could exist, and did to a considerable extent.

Everyone who made use of slaves did not have to buy them; they could "hire out" slaves. This process involved leasing or renting slaves. For an individual with a limited amount of money to invest hiring out could save money. The person hiring the slaves usually had to meet certain obligations. For example:

Specification under the following are supposed to be hired. The men and boys are to be furnished each with one good woolen coat and pants one shirt one good pair of shoes and socks one hat and one blanket of the usual qualifications had to hire Negroes. The women and girls are to be furnished each with one coat suitable for winter. Also suitable underclothes shirt. One pair of shoes and stockings. One bonnett or handkerchief and one blanket of good quality. . .⁴¹

How much had to be paid to hire a slave was determined by many factors. Time involved, the job to be done, and the age and condition of the slave were all factors to be considered. For example, those hiring slaves from the estate of Matthew Hall paid different prices for each slave. Henry was hired out for \$9.90. For "Emily, a woman and Tabitha a girl," the one hiring them fed both and clothed the woman only. The estate clothed the girl. The individual hiring Phebe paid nothing and only clothed her.⁴²

The problem with slave hiring was that it required cash and did not

mean a long term investment. Money would be saved over the short run, but not over a lengthy period, similar to renting a home instead of buying one. The person hiring a slave was taking a risk since the slave could get hurt and reduce his or her value. In the estate of Haley Andrews were four slaves, each with only one hand. Their value was merely \$100 apiece.⁴³

In Bedford, many masters leased slaves to the Virginia and Tennessee Railroad. This was especially risky, as verified by what happened to "a valuable Negro man belonging to Dr. Hector Harris." The slave was asleep on the tracks when a train ran over him and "one of his legs was severed from his body." He later died.⁴⁴ No matter the risks, slave hiring continued.

The group of people of color facing the most risks were those classified as "free." Theoretically, they were to have the same rights as a white person, but in reality, free black people were in a position somewhere between slavery and freedom. They were "quasi-free," as John Hope Franklin has stated. Education was an example of their status. If a free Negro left the state to be educated that individual could not return to the state.⁴⁵ In Accomac and Richmond counties, they could not sell or barter corn, wheat, peas, or other agricultural products without a written certificate by two white persons stating the Negroes raised or came by the goods honestly.⁴⁶

Another restriction on free blacks involved the legal documents testifying to their free status. These papers were to be carried at all times so that the individual could verify his or her freedom. These papers were especially necessary when the individual was confronted by the patrol. If the papers were lost, the individual went to court, as Nathaniel Holmes did in 1858, and sought duplicate copies. If he proved the papers were

lost, duplicate copies were made, as the court did for Holmes.⁴⁷

Taxes were also used to control free blacks. In Bedford the tax was "40¢ upon each free male over the age of 16."⁴⁸ For those not able to pay the levy, they were "hired out for such time as will suffice, the said free Negroes, at not less than ten cents a day." For example, James Ruff owed \$9.18 and David Ruff owed \$5.31 in back taxes. Both men had to work for the county for over a month free of charge.⁴⁹ This levy by the county naturally limited their freedom. In all fairness to those who controlled the county, it must be added that they did on occasion show some sympathy. For example, David Barlow, a free Negro, in 1854 proved he was suffering from "old age and infirmities." He was exempted from payment of taxes and levies.⁵⁰

Such restrictions were passed by the Virginia General Assembly and the counties because of the threat free Negroes represented to the institution of slavery. Each successful free Negro showed slaves that, given a chance, their race could survive in a white society. It is also a fact that the major attempts at actual slave rebellion in Virginia were led by free Negroes. They had tasted freedom, and they wanted more. The legal restrictions on their existence were a way of limiting this freedom. For some, the restrictions were so devastating that they sought to be enslaved, instead of being free.⁵¹

Despite the restrictions and voluntary enslavement, the number of free Negroes increased each year. In Franklin County, the total in 1850 was 66, and by 1860 that number had increased to 105. In Bedford, the numbers were 463 in 1850 and 504 in 1860. The growth did not bring happiness to all whites in the area. "Commenting on a new Constitution. . . to be voted by the General Assembly," the Bedford Sentinel stated:

We approve of the provision in regard to slaves and free Negroes. They ought not to be permitted to remain in our midst. They are generally a great annoyance to society and a disadvantage to the slaves. If their owners chose to emancipate them, let them provide for their removal.⁵²

The editors did not get their wish since free blacks remained in the area.

Freedom came in different ways. One way to be free was to be born to a free female because the child took on the status of the mother. Protecting this freedom could be difficult especially if the individual moved to a new area. Witness the case of Indiana Choice. Indiana's story began in Dinwiddie County when she was born to a free woman, Fanny and a slave father, Stephen. Stephen's master was indebted to William Barrow. Barrow hired Stephen as a way to recover his money. Eventually, Barrow moved to Henry County, along with Stephen and "Free Fanny." Although "Free Fanny" lacked papers to verify her freedom, Barrow never claimed her as his slave.

Upon Fanny's death, Indiana was taken in by Barrow's daughter Cassandra. At this time, Indiana was approximately ten. Cassandra was married twice. Her first husband was Armistead Jones. During this marriage Cassandra, Armistead, and Indiana moved to Franklin County. After Jones' death, Cassandra married Gresham Choice, a slaveholder from Franklin County. Indiana's problems began with this marriage because Choice claimed Indiana and her three children, Washington, Ann Elizabeth, and Sandy, as his slaves.

Indiana countered by suing Greshma Choice for assault, battery, and illegal imprisonment. She also asked for damages of \$1,000.00. Jubal A. Early and John Wooten were appointed her attorneys. After numerous continuances, the jury on October 11, 1851, handed down its verdict:

We find that Indiana and her children are free, not slaves, find the defendant guilty and award the plaintiff costs and one cent.⁵³

Though Indiana obtained her freedom, that verdict might not have ended her involvement with the law. Before 1849, after becoming 21, a free Negro had one year to leave the state or lose his or her freedom and be sold as a slave.⁵⁴ In 1849 the law was changed to allow the individual to stay if the local courts agreed.⁵⁵ For example, Spencer and Dick, ex-slaves freed by John Cheatwood, petitioned the Bedford Court to be allowed to stay in the county. There are, unfortunately, no records to show if the petitions were allowed.⁵⁶ Indiana should have had to petition the court as Spencer and Dick did. There are no records to indicate she ever petitioned the court to be allowed to stay in the county, though apparently she did.

In Franklin there are four cases on file where other blacks petitioned the court to be registered as free. All four petitions were approved. An example is the petition of the children of Ruth Catharine Dunnings:

Mary Elizabeth Dunnings aged 16 years and Lucy Ann Frances Dunnings aged 8 years - - - children of Ruth Catharine Dunnings a free woman of color is ordered to be registered as free persons of color.⁵⁷

Another route to freedom was through a stipulation in the master's will.

The will of John Watson of Bedford stated:

Immediately on the death of my wife. . .I hereby direct that all my slaves now owned by me. . .together with the increase of the females from the date of this will be emancipated and set free.⁵⁸

Of course these slaves had to wait until Elizabeth Watson died before they obtained their freedom. Jacob Fishburne, Franklin County, gave his slave, Violet, immediate freedom. Her children were to be freed when they reached the age of 21. Fishburne added "in case they refuse to take freedom shall have the liberty of choosing masters."⁵⁹ Susannah Wright directed her executors to "hire out my said slaves at their discretion until a

sufficient amount of money is raised to bear their expenses to a free state and there buy one years provisions. . . ."60

Timothy Rogers went further. . He instructed his executors, after his wife's death, to emancipate his "servants" and send them "to the African colony of Liberia." The trip was to be paid for in two ways. They were to apply "to the American Colonization Society or other like benevolent and humane institutions for funds and aid," and they were to hire out "to good and kind employers to form a sort of joint stock fund for their common benefit." If funds could not be obtained these ways, Rogers directed that "the needed funds are to be paid out of my estate before any and all other bequests or legacies."

Not all of his slaves wanted to emigrate to Africa. Daniel petitioned the court in 1859 to remain in Bedford, but the petition was denied. The court also ruled the slaves could only receive the profits of their hire once they reached Liberia, even though the slaves were hired out. The men received substantial fees from the railroad. There are no records to indicate whether or not the slaves made it to Liberia or if there was enough money to cover the trip.⁶¹ The records do indicate one slave who did not get the opportunity. Clarissa was charged with a felony, burning the dwelling house of Lindsay Shumaker. After the court determined she was free, and should be tried as such, Clarissa received 5 years in public jail and penitentiary for her crime.⁶²

Another complicated will was the one of Benjamin Price. Price allowed his slaves, Joseph and Peter, to hire themselves out. The proceeds from the hires were to be paid back to the estate to buy their freedom. The executor felt the instructions put "the slaves Joseph and Peter in a condition between freedom and slavery." The court in 1860 agreed with the

executor. It ruled that Benjamin Price died intestate. The executor was allowed to dispose of the slaves as he saw fit. Probably the slaves remained slaves.⁶³ Emancipation by will had specifically to give the slave freedom, or the court could disallow the will.

Meritorious service, such as serving in a war or possibly warning of a planned slave rebellion, might provide freedom. Slaves possessing a skill were sometimes able to buy their freedom if the master hired out or allowed the slave to hire himself out. Considering the free blacks in Bedford who were shoemakers or carpenters, this method must have been used in that county.

Another avenue to freedom in both counties involved miscegenation. The individual could be the offspring of a relationship between a slave woman and the master. Especially if romantic feelings developed, the offspring could receive freedom from the master as an expression of love. Considering that 55% of the free blacks in Bedford and 65% in Franklin County in 1860 were mulattoes, it seems likely that this method of freedom was used in the area.⁶⁴

The problem with the data for both counties is that there is no mention of how the overwhelming majority of the free blacks obtained their freedom. One point is clear, many who were free in 1850 were not cited in the census returns of 1860. Though one can surmise the reasons for the exodus, there are no records. Possibly the free blacks were not viewed as threats and there may have been little government interference or involvement in their lives. Usually restrictions were tightest during periods of tension and fear of slave rebellion. Since there were no slave rebellions in the immediate area, there was probably little fear of free blacks. Most of the dominant white majority accepted their existence,

even though many of the whites, like the editor of the Bedford Sentinel, were opposed to living among free blacks.

Who headed the households that contained free blacks? From the census data, free blacks were usually found in households headed by free blacks. For example, for Franklin in 1850, 3 individuals lived in households headed by whites, while 54 individuals lived in 15 black headed households. For Bedford, the figures were 52 persons in 37 white headed households and 263 in 58 black headed households. Such statistics might lead one to the conclusion that free blacks possessed considerable independence. The figures are misleading. They could possess some independence, but the economic statistics make it obvious that free blacks only survived at the pleasure of whites.

The average free black in both counties was poor. Of the free blacks in Franklin in 1850, only four owned land. Altogether the land was valued at only \$350. By 1860, the total value of real estate owned was \$3,580, but that was owned by only nine individuals. The total personal estate was even less. Nine individuals owned \$2,170 worth of personal property. The overwhelming majority owned nothing of value. Ann Choice, daughter of Indiana mentioned earlier, and her children, Lettidia and William, were in the best financial shape. As a servant of John Somones, she had amassed real estate worth \$1,000 and a personal estate worth \$475. Only one free black owned a more valuable personal estate, and that was John Stewart, a shopkeeper, owning \$500 worth of personal property.

For Bedford, in 1850, of the 315 free blacks used in the sampling, only 10 individuals owned land. The land was valued at \$4,420. Interestingly, if the Bedford census taker was right, the richest free black was a 50 year old male mulatto by the name of Caleb Noell. He was the

head of the household which included a white female and eight children. The census returns leave the impression they were living as husband and wife.

If Caleb Noell was different in one respect, he was normal in another. That involves his occupation, farming. Considering the 92 free blacks in Bedford possessing an occupation, 56 were farm laborers and 21 were farmers. The other occupations listed were blacksmith, shoemaker, carpenter, stonemason, wheelwright, and tobacconist. What the majority of these occupations have in common is that free blacks were forced to work for whites. Of course, a blacksmith or a carpenter would be considered skilled positions, but whites provided the work for these individuals. By controlling the economy, whites controlled all phases of life for free blacks. Perhaps this explains the lack of rebellion as well as the apparent lack of concern about blacks petitioning the courts for freedom. Free blacks in Bedford and Franklin were quasi-free as Franklin stated. They were free in name only; whites were still their masters.

For some free blacks, their economic status was so bad that they became more like indentured servants than free men. For example:

Ordered that the Overseer of the poor of this county bind Eliza Homes, a free girl of colour, child of Ann Homes, to Peter Arrington according to law and that the said Peter Arrington be required to pay the said Eliza Homes twenty dollars at the expiration of her apprenticeship.⁶⁵

Eliza Homes was fortunate, she received pay for her apprenticeship. Daniel Jones received five free black female apprentices in 1852. Because of their ages, he did not have to pay the blacks anything.⁶⁶ Thus, the decision of the court was similar to putting the women into slavery; they were to receive nothing for their labor.

Whites controlled the economic system, and they also controlled the judicial system. Free blacks knew this fact. It is interesting that there were few criminal cases involving free blacks. The reason for the scarcity is simple: the punishment. For example, the grand jury of Bedford County returned a true bill against Daniel, Bob, London, and Phil Rogers. All pled not guilty, but the verdict went against them. As punishment for their crime (which is not stated in the records) they had to forfeit their freedom and be sold as slaves by the sheriff.⁶⁷

It is not entirely true that free blacks stood no chance in court. William Thomas Mason was charged in 1855 with stealing a gold watch valued at \$150. After six months of continuances, the case was nol-prossed.⁶⁸ The issue is not the handling of the case, but instead, the penalty if found guilty. To be sold as a slave means losing all freedom. To free blacks, being half free might be better than no freedom. Thus, they usually did everything necessary to avoid breaking the law and risking their status.

For many free blacks, their quasi-free status may have been too much to bear. Appendices I and II show the free blacks in Franklin County in 1850 and 1860 respectively. The striking fact is that the same names do not appear on the two lists, as they should in a stable situation. Only Eliza Howell and her children, Henry and Alexander, Keziah Smothers or Smithers, and Lucinda Fry and her daughter, Elizabeth, are found in both sets of returns. Of course, there must be some errors in the census data. Some free blacks probably died during the decade, but these explanations can not account for all the individuals missing in 1860.

No doubt many free blacks left the area to seek economic independence and genuine personal freedom in the free states. In Franklin County,

especially if the census takers were right, the majority of free blacks were mulattoes. Many, in areas where they were unknown, could pass as white. Granted, the whites in Franklin County might have treated them less harshly than the Deep South, but if they remained they were tied to a peculiarly paternalistic system nonetheless strict in its insistence on innate inferiority.

Were the free blacks of the area allowed to practice paternalism themselves? Were they able to own slaves? It was not uncommon in the South for a husband or wife to buy their spouse and/or children. Of course, there were stipulations. They had to have the approval of the master, and they had to have the money necessary to complete the deal. Slave ownership by free blacks was in existence in both counties in 1830, but by 1860 this practice had ended.⁶⁹ Ownership of non-relatives by free blacks was dangerous. If slaves saw it, they might dream themselves of becoming slaveholders and become restless with their lowly position. At any rate the Virginia General Assembly in 1860 made it illegal for a free black to acquire any slaves except if the slave was a descendent of the free black.⁷⁰ In Bedford County in 1859, in the case of "Updike vs Updike," Nancy A. Anthony, a free Negro woman, attempted to buy a slave, Henry. The court set aside the sale. Thus, by the beginning of "The War of the Rebellion," there was no slave ownership by free blacks in the area.

The Civil War had an effect on both slaves and free blacks in the area. Even before the first shots at Fort Sumter, war hysteria hit the area. From reading the local newspapers, it becomes obvious how crimes or supposed crimes by blacks were played up. Below is an article from the Lynchburg Republician reprinted in the Bedford Sentinel:

A free negro named William White . . . was arraigned before the Mayor yesterday, charged with attempting . . .rape upon . . .Mrs. Mildred Lawhorn on Saturday evening last. The villain is of the true African type, and appears to have gone about his devilish work with a deep-laid scheme. Having found out that the husband . . .was absent and found out that no one was at home but Mrs. Lawhorn and her two little children . . .he went up to the children, and asked them if they did not want some cakes, and at the same time giving them a copper each, telling them to go to a grocery near by and make their purchase. . . .The black villain immediately went into the house, made known his intentions and commenced his diabolical attempt by throwing Mrs. Lawhorn down upon a box and to stifle the cries of the outraged woman inflicted several severe blows upon her person. Mrs. Lawhorn, however, successfully resisted the rascal and by her cries brought some gentlemen to her rescue . . . White was . . .soon caught and lodged in the cage. The only evidence given yesterday was by Mrs. Lawhorn which if but half true, should convict the black rascal . . ."71

The preceding newspaper article leaves little doubt that White stood no chance of being found innocent. White was not the only black who had his alleged crime sensationalized by the newspapers. Here is another article from the Lynchburg Daily Virginian:

"Insolent Darkey"

Bob, a slave belonging to Mr. Callaway of Bedford, and hired to Mr. McGowen in this city found 1st St. without a pass late last Tuesday. . .Insolent toward officers . . .got 30 lashes.⁷²

After the war began, the whites' fear of blacks was even more obvious. In Franklin County the instructions to patrols became very specific. They were told where to patrol, how often to visit an area, and what to do with slaves found in "unlawful assembly" or "strolling." In general, these fears were not justified since most slaves remained faithful to their masters. In fact, in both counties, blacks, both free and slave, were drafted to help the Confederacy. In Franklin County, on February 13, 1864, the following orders were issued:

You are hereby directed to notify Peachagrew Fry, John Green, Lewis Radford, Jack Walton, John Nelson, Burwell Murphy, George Williams, Henry Foley, Washington Gorin and Addison Davis, free negroes in the said County who have this day been selected by . . . a Board . . . to report in person to Major J. C. Green at Salem in Roanoke County on or before 25th of February, 1864 as laborers in the service of the Confederate States and failing to report they are liable to the penalties of desertion.⁷³

In 1861 all free Negro males between the ages of 18 and 50 were liable to be enrolled in the Confederate Army.⁷⁴ Their only option to reporting was to be shot on sight as deserters. There were at least five calls from the General Assembly for Bedford and Franklin counties to draft slaves "to provide for the public defense." The type of work done by slaves varied from working at the James River and Kanawha Canal to working on the railroads. For Robert, Peter, and Charles, slaves of G. B. Hale, their work was "recruiting government animals." Other slaves worked in the stables.⁷⁵

The quota of slaves to serve was determined by the General Assembly and sent down to the local government to fill. The quota changed with each call. Bedford filled her requirement by ordering slaveholders to report the number of male slaves they possessed. Originally, the slaves requested were between the ages of 18-50, but late in the war the age limit was raised to 55. The court reviewed the lists provided by the slaveholders and determined how many slaves each owner had to send for service of sixty days.

If an owner decided not to send his or her slaves to the assigned meeting place, the owner would be summoned to court. If the slave was sick, he was supposed to be sent as soon as he got better. If the slave was a runaway, the slave was to be sent as soon as he was caught. If the owner lacked a justifiable reason for obeying the law, he faced a fine of

"three dollars for each slave as required to be delivered for every day of failure or refusal."⁷⁶ Charles Scott had not delivered six slaves for 33 days, while William Bowling had refused for 33 days to send one slave. Bowling was fined \$99. Scott must have angered the Court because his fine was raised to \$10 a day resulting in a total fine of \$1,968. If the fine was not paid the sheriff was to seize the slaves.

Owners received "markers" ascertaining the value of the slaves. Should the slaves run away or get killed the Confederate government was to reimburse the owner. The value set by the government seems to have been lower than the fair market value. It is clear, at any rate, that the value of slaves reached astronomical levels during the war.

In 1836, as part of the estate of William Creasy of Bedford, "a Negro man Killis" was \$200. By 1864, three males of Reubin Guthrie were valued at \$3,200. Women were sold for \$2,200.⁷⁸ In 1865, the appraisal of John Turner shows the following:

1 Negro man Caleb \$6,000, 1 Negro man Charles \$4,500,
1 man Bob \$5,000, 1 man Toby \$5,000, 1 boy Pack \$4,000, 1
boy Abe \$4,500, 1 girl Louisa \$4,500, 1 boy John \$2,000,
1 girl Ellen \$1,500, 1 Negro woman Susan and 2 children
\$5,000.⁷⁹

These and similar appraisements may explain why the court of Bedford requested the Commonwealth Attorney to ascertain whether the draft of 1864 could "be suspended or dispensed with."⁸⁰ The slaveowners were taking a huge financial risk. It should also be remembered that each slave who left hurt the economic life of the home county. Fewer workers were at home with no one to replace them.

Many slaves probably knew of their importance in the war effort of the Confederate states. In his work, The Hales Ford Community, Barry MacKintosh relates how slaves knew of the events of the war. Some slaves

heard news through the mail carrier who listened to whites. Others gained their knowledge through slaves who could read. These slaves would sneak and read the paper. Word of mouth transferred the information from slave to slave.⁸¹

By April of 1865 even the slaves knew the war was a lost cause for the Confederacy. They knew it from the news but also from the Federal troops in the area. What was the reaction of the blacks to the troops? It varied from fear to joy. Fear was represented by Catharine Harris, a young black girl. Commenting on the invasion of Yankee soldiers as they searched for Jubal Early:

The horses stomped in the yard, the Yankees broke things up. Swinging their guns, they knocked out the heads of the molasses barrels and stole all of our meat. I just run around behind Miss Margaret crying.⁸²

Probably the best way to sum up the reaction would be through the words of the widow of Frank Burroughs:

The negroes are considered free by military law. Some of them are behaving now as well as they did before and some of them are cutting up on a high horse. Some rejoice in their freedom and some are cut down about it as a general thing they remain with their masters. . . . Some think they will never be free and some think they will. One thing certain the most of them are ruined and the next thing will be to send them off.⁸³

Margaret's last statement was wrong. There was confusion and many blacks were worse off in freedom. Out of the confusion, however, the area sent the nation two great black leaders, Booker T. Washington, born 1856, and Adam Clayton Powell, Sr., born ten days after Lee's surrender. Any area can be proud of the two men, but they belong to the Hale's Ford Community bordering Bedford County and Franklin County, Virginia.

FOOTNOTES

1. Oliver Burns Issac, "A Selected Annotated Bibliography of Franklin, Henry, and Patrick Counties in Virginia." (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University, 1964), pp. 37-39.
2. See T. Keister Greer, "Genesis of a Virginia Frontier: The Origins of Franklin County, Virginia, 1740-1795." (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Virginia, 1946).
3. Marshall Wingfield, Franklin County, Virginia: A History. (Berryville Virginia: Chesapeake Book Co., 1964), p. 10.
4. See Glenna Hawkins, "Free Black Persons of Color" (unpublished M.A. research paper, Virginia Tech, 1976); Andrew Baskin, "The Black Family in 1870: Its Structure and Origins" (unpublished M.A. research paper, Virginia Tech, 1975); Andrew Baskin, "Persons of Color in Franklin County, Virginia, 1850-1860" (unpublished research paper for the Blue Ridge Institute, Ferrum, VA., 1977).
5. Will Book 1, Franklin County, Va., Rocky Mount, VA., p. 2. For more information on 18th century Franklin County see "Virginia's Back Country Inhabitants," Ann Carter Lee, Stanley Library, Ferrum College, Ferrum, Virginia.
6. Franklin County Register of Births, pp. 1-21; 107-120; and 137-144.
7. See John Hope Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom, 4th ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974), pp. 46-55.
8. Franklin County Will Book 7, pp. 464-67; Will Book 9, pp. 112, and Will Book 11, p. 505.
9. Bedford County Will Book 16, p. 373, Will Book 18.
10. Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1974).
11. Bedford Sentinel, 1856. Also see Salem Register, 1858, and Bedford Sentinel, 1859, and 1860, for ads stating interest in buying slaves.
12. Lynchburg Daily Virginian, January 22, 1859.
13. See U. S. Census Office, Agriculture of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, for years 1850 and 1860).
14. U. S. Census Office, Manufacture of the United States in 1860 (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1865), p. 613.
15. Salem Register, June 1855; see also Lynchburg Daily Virginian, August 9, 1859; Bedford Sentinel, 1856.

16. Bedford, Order Book 34, p. 479.
17. Bedford, Order Book 33, p. 87.
18. The case of Silas, the jail burner, is interesting. See Franklin County, Chancery Papers, Boxes 74 and 78.
19. For a study of the psychological effects of slavery see, Stanley M. Elkins, Slavery, 2nd edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).
20. Manuscript Census Returns of Free Inhabitants for Bedford County in 1850 and 1860. Also see returns of Patrick County.
21. Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1974), p. 132.
22. Lynchburg Daily Virginian, August 9, 1859.
23. A History of Pleasant Hill Church, 1857-1967 (Ferrum, Va.; Ferrum College), p. 1; other churches with balconies for slaves were Beaver Dam Baptist and Walnut Grove Baptist Churches. Information from Mr. Woodward, Principal of Staunton River High School.
24. Woodward; Methodist Episcopal Church South, Class Book 1851-1852 (Virginia Annual Conference, Franklin Circuit), found in John W. Lewis Papers, Manuscript Department, Perkins Library, Duke University.
25. Saunders Papers, Virginia Historical Society, May 16, 1858.
26. Ibid., n.d.
27. Lynchburg Daily Virginian, March 31, 1859.
28. Bedford Sentinel, April 15, 1853.
29. Bedford County, Order Book 34, p. 242; Order Book 33, p. 534.
30. Bedford County, Order Book 33, p: 234.
31. Ibid., pp. 349, 352-354.
32. Bedford County, Order Book 32, p. 104, 131.
33. Hargall Papers, Virginia State Historical Library, Richmond, Virginia
34. Anthony Family Papers, J. J. Dell Collection.
35. Franklin County, Will Book 9, p. 10.
36. Bedford County, Will Book 16, p. 373.

37. Richmond Enquirer, July 29, 1859.
38. Franklin County, Will Book 10, p. 233-34.
39. Ibid., p. 220.
40. Ibid., p. 236.
41. Bedford County, Will Book 16, p. 268.
42. Ibid.
43. Franklin County, Will Book 10, pp. 455-56
44. Richmond Enquirer, August 12, 1859.
45. June Guild, Black Laws of Virginia (New York, New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 112. The census return lists one free black who in 1860 was attending school. The individual was in Bedford.
46. Ibid., p. 114.
47. Bedford County, Order Book 33, p. 66.
48. Ibid., Book 31, p. 310
49. Ibid., p. 300.
50. Ibid., p. 447.
51. Guild, p. 119; 120; and p. 121.
52. Bedford Sentinel, August 22, 1851.
53. Franklin County, Determined Papers, 1850-52, Reel 127.
54. Guild, p. 117.
55. Ibid., pp. 117-18.
56. Bedford County, Order Book 30, p. 338; Order Book 31, p. 412.
57. Franklin County, Order Book 11, p. 111; also see p. 111, pp. 134-35, p. 236.
58. Bedford County, Will Book 16, p. 374.
59. Franklin County, Chancery Papers, Box 50, 1850-51.
60. Franklin County, Will Book 10, p. 425; see Order Book 11, p. 134-35.
61. Bedford County, Will Book 13, pp. 395-397; Order Book 33, p. 220.

62. Bedford County, Order Book 32, p. 13.
63. Franklin County, Chancery Papers, Box 75.
64. Although there are no listing in the records for these counties, there is data for other counties where white women had their marriages dissolved because they gave birth to children whose fathers were men of color. Children of these relationships would have been free and a thorn in the side of the institution of slavery. See Guild, p. 31.
65. Bedford County, Order Book 32, p. 306.
66. Ibid., p. 210.
67. Ibid., Book 33, pp. 400, 417, and 480.
68. Ibid., Book 32, pp. 105, 131, 139, 174, 185, 195, and 208
69. Carter G. Woodson, Free Negro Owners of Slaves in the United States in 1830 (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968).
70. Guild, p. 120.
71. Bedford Sentinel, June 24, 1850, p. 2.
72. Lynchburg Daily Virginian, March 31, 1859.
73. Franklin County, Chancery Papers, Box 81, 1864.
74. Bedford County, Order Book 34, p. 23.
75. Franklin County, Chancery Papers, 1864, Box 81.
76. Bedford County, Order Book 34, p. 354-356.
77. Ibid., pp. 413-14.
78. Bedford County, Will Book 19, p. 189-194; p. 536.
79. Ibid., Book 20, p. 210-12.
80. Bedford County, Order Book 34, p. 395.
81. Barry MacKintosh, The Hales Ford Community 1856-1865.
82. Town Tours, Centennial Celebration, October 12, 1973, Rocky Mount Va., pp. 8-9.
83. M.F. Burroughs Letter, July 6, 1865, Franklin County Historical Association, Folder 33, Ferrum College, Ferrum, VA.

APPENDIX I

Free Blacks in Franklin County, Virginia - 1850

Name	Age	Sex	Race	Occupation	Land Value
James Downas	20	M	B	Lived with white family	
John Green	30	M	M	Laborer	
Jacob Katady	45	M	B		
Nancy Brown	52	F	M		
Martha	23	F	M		
Rebecca	22	F	M		
William R	15	M	B		
Eliza	13	F	M		
Mary	6	F	M		
Sarah	7	F	M		
Thomas	5/12 months	M	B		
Edorn Foland	16	M	B		
Taebert Frog	35	M	M		
Sarah	35	F	M		
Emeline	18	F	M		
Howard	16	M	B		
Fleming	14	M	B		
Jane E.	12	F	B		
Catherine	10	F	B		
John	8	M	B		
John Beverly	50	M	B		\$100
John Stewart	35	M	B	Confectioner	
Jane Smothers	48	F	M		\$100
Mary	26	F	M		
William	15	M	M		
James	13	M	M		
Blair	10	M	M		
Keziah	6	F	M		
Emily	4	F	M		
Lewis	8	M	M		
William	6	M	M		
Nancy	3	F	M		
James	9/12 months	M	M		
Charles	35	M	M	Laborer	

Appendix I - continued

Name	Age	Sex	Race	Occupation	Land Value
Lucinda Fry	37	F	B	Farmer	\$ 50
Elizabeth	14	F	M		
Samuel Roe	60	M	B		
Samuel	12	M	M		
Joshua Brown	18	M	B	Lived with white family	
Eliza Howell	30	F	B		
Margaret	13	F	M		
James	6	M	M		
Henry	6	M	M		
Alexander	4	M	M		
Louis	4	M	M		
Mathew	2/12 months	M	M		
Easephus	8	M	B		
Simon Freeman	60	M	B	Lived with white family - laborer	
Sarah Jeter	38	F	B		
Amanda	13	F	B		
James	9	M	B		
Lucinda	8	F	B		
Elizabeth	6	F	B		
Keziah Smothers	75	F	M		\$ 80
Mary	35	F	M		
Martha	27	F	M		
Louisa	16	F	M		

In the Poor House

Sarah	75	F	B		
William	25	M	M		
James	5	M	M		
Rosaline	8/12 months	F	B		

Compiled from the Manuscript Census Returns of Free Inhabitants of Franklin County, Virginia, for 1850.

APPENDIX II

Free Blacks in Franklin County, Virginia - 1860
(Southwest District)

Name	Age	Sex	Race	Occupation	Land Value
Bailey Foley	21	M	M	Lived with white family	
Giles W. Trail	2	M	M	Lived with white family	
Louisa Foley	10	F	M	Lived with white family	
Cinda Foley	45	F	M	Lived with white family	
Wm. Ingram	50	M	M		\$500 real estate 50 personal estate
Rachel	30	F	B		
Sarah	70	F	B		
Jack Foley	6	M	M	Lived with white family	
Henry Foley	22	M	B	Lived with white family	
Milly Foley	25	F	B		
Omab	4	F	M		
Larkin	3/12 months	M	B		
Adeline Foley	4	F	M	Lived with white family	
Kate Foley	36	F	B		
Mary	15	F	B		
Jim	12	M	B		
Tarleton	7	M	B		
Melinda	4	F	B		
Sam	2	M	B		
Billy Foley	9	M	B	Lived with white family	

Appendix II - continued

Name	Age	Sex	Race	Occupation	Land Value
Celia Foley	42	F	M	Born in Patrick Tenant Farmer	\$10 personal estate
Minerva	18	F	M		
Lucy E.	14	F	M		
Louisa	9	F	M		
Caroline	8	F	M		
Daniel	5	M	M		
Milton	1	M	M		
<u>In Hotel</u>					
Eliza Bustle	2	F	M		
Margaret Howell	24	F	M		
Kate Cooley	10	F	M		
Keziah Smithers	84	F	M		\$400 real estate 100 personal estate
Polly	45	F	M		
Fanny Blankenship	27	F	M		
Miranda	8	F	M		
America Newberry	21	F	M	Servant for white family	
David	3	M	M		
Jepe	3	M	M		
Ellen Foley	5	F	B	Lived with white family	
Caroline Foley	7	F	M	Lived with white family	
Daniel	5	M	M		
Danny Vineyard	32	F	M		
John	5	M	M		
Aby C.	3/12 months	F	M		
Martha Vineyard	10	F	M	Lived with white family	
James Hill	19	M	M	Lived with white family	
William Turner	48	M	M	Lived with B. Smith	\$300 real estate 300 personal estate
Buford Smithers	50	M	M	Lived with B. Smith	\$000 real estate 000 personal estate

Appendix II - continued

Name	Age	Sex	Race	Occupation	Land Value
Burwell Murphy	36	M	B	Laborer	\$000 real estate 235 personal estate
Sarah Johnson	25	F	M	Lived with white family	
Fanny	5	F	M		
Jacob Powders	23	M	B	Lived with white family	
Varian Carter	6	F	M	Lived with white family	
Eliza Howell	40	F	B		
Thomas	16	M	B		
Henry	16	M	B		
Lewis	15	M	B		
Alex.	15	M	B		
Fillemore	4	M	B		
Donelson	4	M	B		
Sallie	1	F	B		
Mary Mildrum	38	F	M		
James Hill	21	M	M		
Wm. Mildrum	14	M	M		
Roxa	17	F	M		
Ferdinano	10	M	M		
Nancy Stewart	90	F	B		
Charles Cuff	45	M	M	Lived with white family	
Bluford Rayford	40	M	M		\$200 real estate 000 personal estate
Lewis Rayford	35	M	M		
Louisa	10	F	M		

(Northeast Division)

Ann Choice	20	F	B	Servant-lived with white family	\$1000 real estate 475 personal estate
Lettidia	4	F	B		
Wm.	2	M	B		

Appendix II - continued

Name	Age	Sex	Race	Occupation	Land Value
Lucinda Fry	60	F	B		\$350 real estate 150 personal estate
Stephen Dunning	29	M	M	Carpenter	
Elizabeth	23	F	M		
Lucy A.	7	F	M		
Louisa	5	F	M		
Catharine	3	F	M		
Henry	5/12 months	M	M		
Pitchgrove Fry	26	M	M	Tobacco Roller	\$300 real estate 350 personal estate
Charles Drew	30	M	B	Ostler-lived with white family	
Susan Drew	15	F	M	Lived with white family	
Wash	12	M	B		
Mathew Hix	59	M	B	Carpenter-born in S.Carolina	\$330 real estate
<u>Poor House</u>					
Mary Burchet	7	F	M		
Tamar Parsley	79	F	B		
John Steward	35	M	B	Shopkeeper	\$200 real estate 500 personal estate
Wm. Meldran	12	M	B	Factory worker- lived with white family	
Ferdinam	10	M	M		
Susan Steward	22	F	B	Servant-lived with white family	
Adam Dunning	30	M	M	Farmer	
John	33	M	M		
Mildred	60	F	M		
Hannah	110	F	M		
Mary	55	F	M		
Jane	30	F	M		
Sallie	18	F	M		
George	16	M	M		
Lucetta	8	F	M		
Mildred	6	F	M		
Jas. Hall	25	M	B	Factory laborer- lived with white family	

Appendix II - continued

<u>Name</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Land Value</u>
Jas. Basher	15	M	M	Lived with white family	
Jacob Cathand	65	M	B	Carpenter-lived with white family	

Compiled from the Manuscript Census Returns of Free Inhabitants of Franklin County, Virginia for 1860.