ALBEMARLE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1850-1870
AN ECONOMIC SURVEY BASED ON THE U.S. CENSUS

Approved:
Edward Pessen
Joel J. Burton

Ann Lenore Stauffenberg
Charlottesville, Virginia

B.A., Susquehanna University, 1968
M.L.S., Columbia University, 1969

A Thesis Presented to the Graduate
Faculty of the University of Virginia
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Corcoran Department of History
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

August, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

General histories of the South abound. Every student is confronted with the standard works covering the entire ante-bellum era. Central themes, classical and revisionist, are supported by a mass of detail culled from manuscript collections across the South. In all of them the problem of selection was crucial. Accounts of a European traveler, memoirs of a planter, and the recollections of a former slave might support three entirely different studies with diverse views on the nature of Southern civilization. The recent emphasis on statistical analysis avoids the many pitfalls inherent in personal documents, and produces information about all segments of society, not just the literate upper class. A detailed study of one small area provides an in-depth analysis not possible in an overview history. In the process the validity of different general theories can be tested for one specific time and place.

This paper proposes to examine in some depth changes that occurred in Albemarle County, Virginia between 1850 and 1870. There was no preconceived idea of vindicating or destroying any particular interpretation or proving any specific points. It is an attempt to discover what changes took place in land ownership, slave ownership, and industry. More specifically,

it seeks to determine whether the planter class consolidated its land and slave holdings, or whether democratization of them occurred. Finally it seeks to determine the influence of three important events on the County: the tobacco boom of the 1850s, the transportation revolution brought by the railroads, and the Civil War.

Albemarle County has been the subject of several books, dozens of articles and a few theses and dissertations. The former two are almost all stereotype interpretations. They dwell on Revolutionary glory, followed by a patriarchal planter era, destroyed, after many heroics, by the War Between the States. Occupation, federal reconstruction and threatened Negro domination are hastily passed over until restoration brings a happy ending, leaving county residents free to dwell on their past. Most of the scholarly works reflect current attitudes or schools of southern history. While attempting to present sociological studies, many of the Phelps-Stokes writers are caught up in the racial stereotypes of the early twentieth century and treat their subjects in a paternalistic manner. More modern studies closely follow historians such as Frank Owsley and Charles Sydnor and arrive at similar conclusions.

This paper depends almost exclusively on an examination of the returns in the manuscript censuses for 1850, 1860, and 1870. Population, slave, agricultural, and industrial returns were all consulted. The choice of the census over tax returns

presented the first difficulty. A comparison of the two for a selected group of men revealed large discrepancies in some cases. The tax records probably have a slight edge in accuracy. The census taker tended to round off figures while both the county and the individual had an interest in seeing that property was neither under or overestimated. It was decided to deal with the census figures exclusively: 1. They give information on age and occupation not found in the tax records. 2. They are easier to work with. Property figures on each individual are totalled, whereas the tax collector listed the value of each plot separately. 3. The census contains more detailed information on agriculture and industry. 4. All slaves are counted in the census, not just those over twelve. 5. The slave schedules contain information on hiring.

The name, age, occupation and real property value of every man in the county in 1850 was listed. The 1860 and 1870 figures were read back against the 1850 ones and matched whenever possible with new names listed at the end. The 1850 census taker did not record the amount of personal property but indicated its presence by a check; hence personal figures could not be compared. The same matching was done for the slave and industrial schedules.

Rather than record total ownership and value figures, the information in the population, slave and agricultural schedules was broken down into categories similar to those used by Frank Owsley, Ralph Wooster and Fabian Linden. That

is, the number of men owning one to five slaves, or having $1-499 worth of property, or raising 1-499 pounds of tobacco were kept together and then totalled. The percentages of growth and decline for any given category through the two decades could be calculated. These figures give an idea of what segment of the populace was growing what amount of a certain crop or holding what percentage of the slave population.

Finally, a random sample was constructed based on one out of every five families continuing through the two decades. All the information from the four different schedules was included. Will and deed books for the county were searched and information on the attainment and distribution of property plus many items of useful miscellaneous information were recorded. The sample proved invaluable in verifying trends indicated by the percentages; identifying who succeeded and who failed and why; and illustrating the relationship among type and extent of staple crop production, amount of acreage, and slave holdings in the county.

I would like to thank my advisor, Mr. Edward Younger, for his patience, encouragement and suggestions. Mr. Josef Barton read the manuscript and offered a critique of the methodology. Mr. Charles B. Dew, now of the University of Missouri, originally suggested the topic and approach, and saw the work through its initial stages. Finally, Miss Donna Purvis proved to be an accurate and efficient typist.

II

INTRODUCTION

Colonial Albemarle had a typical Southern staple crop agriculture. The settlers hastily burned over forest land and planted it with tobacco year after year until it was exhausted. They made no attempt to conserve or reclaim the soil. Exhausted lands were abandoned to scrub pine while the farmers repeated the process on new acreage. Fifty years after the county was settled, Madame de Riedesel, wife of a Hessian general imprisoned in the county, was appalled by the continued destruction of remaining forest land.

> The woods were besides often wasted by the fires of negroes and herdsmen; indeed, nobody here seems to care much for trees. Whole forests are sometimes burned down for the purpose of agriculture.[1]

The average farmer saw no need to conserve land with so much untouched or to grow other crops when tobacco brought the best returns. Even if he had desired to raise another cash crop, it would have been impractical. Albemarle County was an isolated area. Food stuffs would have perished on the long haul to market.

The embargo and the War of 1812 ended the long era of Virginia tobacco prosperity. In May 1813 Jefferson wrote "Tobacco (except for favorite qualities) is nothing. Its

---

[1]Madame de Riedesel as quoted in Mary Rawlings, Albemarle of Other Days (Charlottesville: the Michie Co., 1925), p. 42.

culture is very much abandoned."[2] A brief resurgence followed the war, but protected European crops soon lowered the demand for U.S. tobacco and a glutted market drove down prices. In an era of low returns the remaining Virginia planters on their worn out lands could not compete against the new growers in Kentucky.

Some desperately continued to grow tobacco, making enough returns in the good years, or selling enough slaves South in the lean ones to continue on their old plantations. By 1839 they were barely producing more than in colonial days.[3] The planters of Albemarle were part of this trend. In 1820 the census taker listed 10,659 slaves. In 1860 there were 13,106, a figure far short of the one that should have been produced by a natural increase rate of 24.2 per cent a decade.[4]

For many, emigration was the only recourse. Hundreds of local families joined the exodus over the mountains to new lands in the West and lower South.[5]

A few planters began pushing scientific farming and diversified crops as the solutions to Virginia's agricultural

---

[2]Thomas Jefferson, Writings (Ford), IX, p. 353, as quoted in Lewis Cecil Gray, History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860, Vol. II (Washington: Carnegie Institute, 1933), p. 766, n. 88.

[3]Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 757.

[4]Frederick Bancroft, Slave Trading in the Old South (Baltimore: J.H. Furst Co., 1931), pp. 383-385.

[5]Edgar Woods, Albemarle County in Virginia (Bridgewater, Va.: The Green Bookman, 1932), pp. 386-395.

difficulties. In Albemarle, Thomas Jefferson pursued such a program long before most other Virginians saw a need for it. While Minister to France he toured the rich agricultural districts of France and Italy to observe farming methods. After returning to Monticello Jefferson began a program of rotation and fertilization to restore his own farms. He introduced European crops he thought adaptable to the American climate and cooperated with James Madison in importing pure-bred Merino sheep.[6]

As early as 1793 Madison experimented with contour plowing. Jefferson's son-in-law, Thomas Mann Randolph, continued his work. By 1808 he had designed a plow that enabled him to perfect a system of contour plowing on the red clay Albemarle hills. Old ways were hard to change and Randolph met with a great deal of ridicule until an unusually heavy down pour in 1810 washed away all crops but his own. The more enterprising planters immediately adopted Randolph's method but many of the poorer farmers and tenants continued to plow in the familiar vertical fashion.[7]

In 1817 Jefferson and 29 other leading Piedmont planters banded together in the Albemarle Agricultural Society, a group devoted to scientific husbandry. In a similar fashion

---

[6]Frank Donovan, ed., The Thomas Jefferson Papers. Reprint Edition (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1963), pp. 253-257.

[7]William H. Gaines, "Thomas Mann Randolph, Piedmont Plowman," Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society, XI (1950-1951), pp. [37]-43.

other individuals and groups across the state exerted much time and effort to revitalize Virginia agriculture. Edmund Ruffin discovered the benefits of marl for neutralizing acid soil and making it receptive to natural fertilizers. Fielding Lewis promoted the application of lime for the same purpose when marl was unavailable.[8] In 1819 the experimenters received an opportunity to disseminate their views when John Skinner began publishing The American Farmer.

John H. Cocke, a founding member of the Albemarle Agricultural Society from neighboring Fluvanna County, was a conspicuous leader in the movement. Convinced that tobacco caused the moral as well as economic ills of Virginia, he renounced the staple entirely. General Cocke experimented with a variety of crops. He sent specimens to his neighbors and faithfully reported results to the American Farmer. On one occasion he published a broadside on contour plowing for distribution to those who did not subscribe to the journal.[9] To insure that the next generation of planters followed his lead, General Cocke presented anti-tobacco medals to small boys who promised never to smoke or grow tobacco.

The general populace remained unconvinced of the need

---

[8]Kathleen Bruce, "Virginia Agricultural Decline to 1860? A Fallacy," Agricultural History, VI (January, 1932), pp. 8, 11. Avery O. Craven, "The Agricultural Reformers of the Antebellum South," American Historical Review, XXXIII (January, 1928), p. 311.

[9]John Hartwell Cocke Papers, University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #8561-a and Cocke Family-Bremo Recess Papers, University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #9513.

for new methods, especially before 1820 when the market was depressed. A disgruntled Virginia farmer reported that "It is not worthwhile to make crops, we can get nothing for them. . . . Neither is it any object to improve lands. . . ."[10] Even after the country recovered from the panic of 1819 few saw the value of diversification. A variety of crops may have helped stop debilitation of the soil but they did not necessarily return a profit. J.B. McClelland reported that

> I persevered and gave his [Cocke's] system a fair and honest trial, and found at the expiration of five or six years, that . . . several of my slaves had taken up their permanent residence in that State [Alabama], having been sold to meet deficiencies.[11]

McClelland had a point. Most planters and farmers were caught up in the vicious cycle of living off the next crop's anticipated returns, and were forced to continue in tobacco, whether they wished to or not. Only a few wealthy Virginians, like Cocke, who had prosperous cotton plantations in Alabama, could afford to renounce tobacco entirely.

Tobacco remained a major crop for some time but the continued success of the innovators convinced many Virginians to adopt some scientific methods. By 1840 they employed improved plows, reapers, and threshing machines. The census that year showed that farmers used lime and marl where they

---

[10] Craven, "Agricultural Reformers," p. 308.

[11] J.B. McClelland, "Tobacco Culture Not Necessarily Exhausting or Demoralizing," Southern Planter, IX (1849), pp. 29-30 as quoted in Joseph Robert Clark, The Tobacco Kingdom (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1936), p. 29, n. 51.

were available. Planters probably put no more than 1/20 of Virginia lands through Ruffin's soil conservation programs but these increased in value by $30,000,000 between 1830 and 1850.[12] Western migration slowed, a sure indication that Virginians did not view their situation as hopelessly as they once had.

In Albemarle farmers continued to grow some tobacco. Most eventually diversified as tobacco profits diminished. Land restored with grasses and fertilizers soon produced good returns in wheat. Also, in an era when southwest cotton booms drove up slave prices, fewer slaves were needed to cultivate acres of wheat than to nurture tobacco plants. Several turnpikes and two canal systems brought the county closer to grain-hungry eastern markets. By 1850 local farmer William W. Gilmer recorded that Albemarle was a "country where corn and wheat are staples. . . ."[13]

In 1843 the Hole and Corner Club had replaced the defunct Albemarle Agricultural Society. Under its auspices planters conducted agricultural experiments and reported conclusions to the main body and often to The Southern Planter. In 1850 Gilmer summarized the state of agriculture in an article for the journal. He found the planters producing spectacular crops of wheat, from 20 to 49 bushels per acre

---

[12] Craven, "Agricultural Reformers," p. 311.

[13] William W. Gilmer to The Southern Planter, X, no. 12 (Dec. 1850), p. 355.

"but when we count all, it would come down far below this amount. I would not suppose our county would reach ten bushels." Corn yields varied greatly also from 20 to 25 bushels per acre near Scottsville to 40 or 50 bushels per acre in other sections. Clover and hay that year yielded one to three tons per acre "which is the greatest crop I ever heard of in Virginia." Dairy farming did not extend beyond supplying each farmer's own needs but some farmers saw a new source of income in "fattening beeves for market."

In addition

> Sheep--We are just beginning to pay attention to this stock; my neighbor, Wm. Garth, Esq. has one of Reybold's rams; weighing 250 lbs. and a fine lot of 75 ewes of the Bakewell stock. Divers other persons are improving their stock of sheep.
>
> Barley and rye not made in Albemarle to any extent. Oats made largely. One and a half to two bushels on good to prime land; considered an exhausting crop. Peas not used as a renovator.
>
> Hemp is not cultivated here, except by home consumption, and not by one man in ten to that extent. Root crops . . . we make but a small amount of all such things. Irish potatoes are made for home consumption, the sweet on the same scale but some persons get better from Richmond than can be made here. Fruit-the culture is receiving more attention.
>
> Lime is used in the lower part of our county as a manure, and acts on gray land most beneficially. . . . [but] in my neighborhood it has been tried with no visible effect.
>
> Immense quantities of plaster[14] are sown here about. We usually put it on at the rate of one half bushel per acre annually.

---

[14] In the early nineteenth century farmers treated their land with plaster of paris. It was used as a fertilizer and as a moisture retainer.

Gilmer summarized by pointing out that

> The yield per acre is not so great as it was twenty-five years since on good land. Our fathers had fresh land, no fly, joint worm, or such pest to mar their prospects but the country is greatly improved, and I think the average better than when I was a boy.[15]

[15] Gilmer to The Southern Planter, pp. 354-357.

III

ALBEMARLE COUNTY, 1850-1860

The agricultural history of Albemarle County between 1850 and 1860 is reflected in the population schedules of the U.S. census.[1]

Category	1850		1860		Percent difference
Households	2022		2290		+13
Households with land	895		1285		+44
Households without land	1127		1005		-11
Individuals with land	916		1317		+44
Farmers	858		909		+ 6
Farmers with land	654		706		+ 8
Farmers without land	204		202		- 1
		Fred.		St. Anne	
Farm laborers[2]	-	160	[346]	[115]	
Day laborers	-	168			
Total laborers	72	[328]	[567]	239	
Overseers[3]	153		281		
Total engaged in farming[4]	1011		1420		

[1] U.S. Manuscript Census 1850 and U.S. Manuscript Census 1860. Population Schedules, Albemarle Co., Va. (Microfilm deposit, U.Va. Library).

[2] Two men gathered the 1860 census. The first recorded farm laborers and day laborers in Fredericksville Parish, placing 160 men in the first category. The compiler for St. Anne's Parish began in the same fashion and then dropped the farm and day categories and listed only laborers. It is impossible, consequently, to obtain an accurate count on St. Anne's farm laborers, but an approximation can be reached. The 168 day laborers for Fredericksville were added to the 160 farm laborers to give 328 total laborers for the parish.

Land ownership of both individuals and households grew faster than the general population, indicating that professionals and successful tradesmen purchased land, as well as farmers. At the same time farmers failed to keep pace with the population growth, increasing only 6 per cent as compared to an overall 13 percent. The 1805 census taker reported 858 men as farmers and 153 as farm managers. But 204 of the listed farmers owned no land, leaving 654 land owners out of the at least 1,011 men actively engaged in farming, or only about 60 percent. In 1860, 908 men reported themselves as farmers though 202 owned no land. This left 706 land owners or 49 percent of the approximately 1,420 men

---

The 160 farm laborers represented 48 percent of the total laborers in Fredericksville. Forty-eight per cent of the 239 known total laborers of St. Anne's gave an approximate 115 farm laborers for that parish. The 160 known farm laborers of Fredericksville added to the 115 approximate farm laborers of St. Anne's gave about 346 farm laborers for the county as a whole.

[3]One further discrepancy affected the farming population figures. The 1850 census taker recorded the occupation of the head of the household only. The 1860 census taker listed all working family members. In the 1850 census, therefore, few men under 25 have occupations. In the 1860 census many men between 18 and 25 are listed as laborers, overseers, and apprentices. Therefore the increases in these categories were out of proportion to the actual growth, so percentages were not calculated.

[4]There were at least 1,011 men engaged in farming in 1850. Farmers among the laborers and men between 18 and 25 employed on their father's farms must have raised the total. With the exact number of farm laborers in St. Anne's in 1860 unknown, the total engaged in farming that year can only be approximated.

pursuing agricultural careers. The consolidation of the farm owning class undoubtedly occurred as smaller farmers without the financial resources to take advantage of the decade's opportunities, or tide them over a poor year or financial setbacks, gradually lost out to their more prosperous neighbors.

The growth of land ownership over the decade can be broken down into several categories.

Value of Land	1850 owners	1860 owners	per cent difference
$1 - 499	69	136	+ 97
$500 - 999	123	135	+ 10
$1,000 - 4,999	428	506	+ 18
$5,000 - 9,999	144	214	+ 49
$10,000 - 24,999	115	227	+ 97
$25,000 - 49,999	26	72	+177
$50,000 - 99,999	11	24	+118
$100,000 +		3	can't calculate
	916	1317	+ 44

The number of men who became land owners for the first time proved the decade's prosperity. The larger increases in the planter classes came from the greater ability of established farmers to take advantage of the decade's opportunities.

The large farmers alone had the knowledge and resources to employ scientific methods, conduct experiments, and use the latest agricultural implements. For several years in the early 1850s Frank Ruffin of Albemarle edited The Southern Planter and encouraged neighbors to contribute. Almost every issue contained a letter from an individual experimenter or the report of a groups' project. Activities recorded included searches for the varieties of wheat most resistant to joint

worm; the most efficient methods of ploughing, of reaping wheat, and of planting corn; the best methods of manuring fields, fattening hogs, constructing corn cribs and hot beds; the most productive ways to breed cattle, horses, and sheep; the curing of diseases in horses and cattle; the use of Jerusalem artichokes as hog feed; and insect control.[5] In addition to these reports the editor made a special trip to the farm of George Blaetterman to observe how he had restored worn-out lands through the diligent application of lime and a four year crop rotation.[6]

The Hole and Corner Club investigated ways the state could aid agriculture. It suggested that other internal improvement companies be forced to ship fertilizer at little more than cost as the Virginia Central did, that sheep herding be aided by revised fencing laws and taxes on dogs, that an agricultural journal be underwritten by the state and that a "State geologist and Chemist" be employed to lecture and analyze soil.[7]

One development touched everyone in the county alike, from the town dweller, to the small farmer to the large planter. In November 1850 the Virginia Central Railroad reached Charlottesville and continued westward. By 1854 it had crossed the Blue Ridge on temporary track, and a year

---

[5]The Southern Planter, X, XI, XII, XII (1850-1853).

[6]Ibid., X, No. 1 (Jan. 1850), p. 29.

[7]Ibid., X, XI, XII, XII (1850-1853).

later it rolled forty miles beyond into the Shenandoah Valley. That same year the Orange and Alexandria Railroad began pushing south from Gordonsville to Lynchburg, a journey completed in 1859.[8]

Other transportation systems in the county soon felt the railroads' power. In 1852 the James River Turnpike Company collected $5,486,56 in tolls on its road west. In 1860 it collected $293.45. The Rockfish and Rivanna Gap Turnpike Company sold out in 1857 and three years later the Brown's Gap Turnpike Company followed suit.[9]

The canals put up a fight. The Rivanna Navigation Company spent more money on improvements in the 1850s than it had in its entire previous history. In 1850 the James River and Kanawha Canal began constructing a spur to the Rivanna to join both river systems in a giant waterway. It was never completed.[10] The stage coach lines cut fares but none could match the two-and-one-half cents per ton mile and three-and-one-half cents per passenger mile charged by the Virginia Central in 1861.[11]

---

[8]Newton Bond Jones, "Charlottesville and Albemarle County, Virginia, 1819-1860." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1950), pp. 176-177.

[9]Ibid., pp. 179-180.

[10]Ibid., pp. 171, 173, 178.

[11]Charles Turner, "The Virginia Central Railroad at War, 1861-1865," Journal of Southern History, XII (Nov. 1946), pp. 510-533.

The railroads had an immediate impact on the county. Albemarle residents could soon buy a selection of goods from all over the East. The newspapers bulged with advertisements for fresh seafood from Norfolk, ready made clothes from Baltimore, and imported liquor from Philadelphia.[12]

The railroads affected the county in a deeper, more essential way than providing formerly unavailable fancy goods. Wherever railroads appeared they encouraged specialization. Fast transportation opened up vast new markets for previously unobtainable commodities. Farmers concentrated on cash crops for eager distant markets. The greater profits realized by by such specialization were spent on other produce and manufactured articles. In Albemarle the farmers turned again to their old staple, tobacco. The railroads and their new markets together with a nationally healthy economy and a decade of good growing seasons all encouraged a tobacco boom that brought a surge of prosperity to the county.

Though the railroads were a boon to all farmers in the county, the more initially prosperous among the farmers were able to exploit them to a greater degree than their less fortunate neighbors. Even with the low freight rates, the cost of transporting a large amount of goods beyond local markets was still prohibitive for many. Thomas Jefferson Randolph sent an itemized account of his receipts and expenses

---

[12]Jones, "Charlottesville and Albemarle," pp. 182-183.

for the years 1855 through 1859 to The Southern Planter. Each year he spent more on railroad charges than he did for taxes, slave hires, overseer's wages and "sundries." It cost him between $294.75 and $642.23 a year for freight and commissions.[13]

The railroads made possible the importation of bulky fertilizers. Again, only the more wealthy were able to purchase and pay shipping costs on fertilizers, particularly Peruvian guano. The rage of guano swept up the planters of Albemarle County to a greater extent than did any other improvement. One Southern Planter correspondent reported in 1850 that

> The guano seems almost the universal topic--as the cholera was a few months since--and augers well of the interest generally felt in agriculture. Certainly there must be a strong desire for improvements to cause such an extensive demand for so costly an article. Never before was there so much of intellect and energy devoted to agriculture, and their amount is increased with each new discovery.[14]

Both individual farmers and the Hole and Corner Club conducted experiments with guano, studying the effect on different crops, the amount to use per acre, the number of applications and the most receptive type of land.[15] Most reported a fair success. Peter Meriwether found that seventy pounds per acre on oats tripled his yield from 300

---

[13]Thomas Jefferson Randolph, "Farm Account," The Southern Planter, XXI, no. 3, (March 1861), pp. 139-141.

[14]The Southern Planter, X, no. 2 (Feb. 1850), p. 62.

[15]Ibid., XI, no. 9 (Sept. 1851), pp. 280-281 and XII, no. 3 (March 1852), pp. 77-79.

to 900 bushels. Two hundred per acre increased William Garth's wheat from two to fourteen bushels per acre, while Hugh Minor had good results after using it on corn, potatoes and watermelon.[16] Those who did not receive good returns placed the blame on improper application, or a substandard mixture. William W. Gilmer cautioned that

> Guano is used by many persons and some of my neighbors have sown thirty tons per annum. My experiments have resulted in no visible difference either in wheat or grass after it. I have this fall sown one ton, and do not calculate on seeing where it was put; tried it to satisfy my mind only. . . . I fear it will turn out as the morus multicaulis, a most stupendous humbug. . . .[17]

Despite such guarded comments the mania continued through the decade, reaching its zenith in 1854 when 163,662 tons were imported into Virginia.[18] After that year its use declined. It was simply too expensive for general use; with prices averaging $45 to $65 a ton, only the wealthier could afford it. Thomas Jefferson Randolph, for example, spent between $731.56 and $900.24 per year on fertilizer, including guano, grass seed, and plaster. It was by far the largest item among his expenses and two times fertilizers accounted for more than half of his total outlay.[19]

---

[16] Jones, "Charlottesville and Albemarle," p. 150.

[17] William Gilmer to The Southern Planter, XI, no. 12 (Dec. 1850), p. 357.

[18] Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 806.

[19] Randolph, "Farm Account," pp. 139-141.

The Virginia Central Railroad may have shipped a little more than cost but the listed price was still $2.00 per 200 pounds.[20] Nevertheless Gilmer reported that 700 to 1,000 tons were shipped into the county in 1850.[21] The Hole and Corner experiments that year used 70 to 300 pounds per acre with an average of 200, indicating that about 7,000 to 10,000 of the county's acreage was treated in one year. The richer farmers probably held most of this land.

The transportation revolution, the guano craze, and the diligent pursual of scientific agriculture all affected agriculture during the 1850s.

Wheat[22]

Amount of wheat grown in	% difference 1850-1860	Growers of wheat in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 49 bu.	- 8	1 - 49 bu.	+ 5
50 - 99 bu.	-24	50 - 99 bu.	-28
100 - 499 bu.	-25	100 - 499 bu.	-30
500 - 999 bu.	- 7	500 - 999 bu.	-12
1000+ bu.	+39	1000+ bu.	+14
	+ 6 overall		-18 overall

[20] The Southern Planter, XI, no. 1 (Jan. 1851), p. 26.

[21] William Gilmer to The Southern Planter, XI, no. 12 (Dec. 1850), p. 357.

[22] U.S. Manuscript Census 1850 and U.S. Manuscript Census 1860. Agricultural Schedules. Albemarle County, Va. (Microfilm Deposit, Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va.)

Corn

Amount of corn grown in	% difference 1850-1860	Growers of corn in amounts of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 499 bu.	+ 4	1 - 499 bu.	- 2
500 - 999 bu.	+ 4	500 - 999 bu.	+ 2/5
1,000 - 4,999 bu.	-15	1,000 - 4,999 bu.	- 2
5,000+ bu.	-41	5,000+ bu	-44
	- 9 overall		- 1 overall

In all but the largest category of production the amount of wheat grown decreased. The increase here from 111,771 bushels to 155,158 bushels was enough to offset the decrease in every other category. At the same time the number of men growing wheat in each category declined except for those at the very top and bottom of the scale. The number of new men in the landholding category combined with the great decline in the next largest category explains the 5 percent increase in men growing up to 49 bushels of wheat. The 8 percent decrease in the bushels grown by those men however meant that each individual farmer grew far less wheat in 1860 than in 1850. The increase at the very top indicates that only the wealthiest planters had the land or the desire to grow more wheat.

There was a 95¢ difference between the highest and lowest prices commanded by a bushel of wheat between 1850 and 1860:[23]

[23]Gray, History of Agriculture, Table 51, p. 1,039.

1850	$1.01	1853	$1.38	1856	$1.38	1859	$1.30
1851	$ .81	1854	$1.76	1857	$1.24	1860	$1.40
1852	$ .96	1855	$1.67	1858	$1.35		

Thomas Jefferson Randolph listed wheat in the account he sent The Southern Planter.[24]

Year	Price per bushel	Bushels	Receipts
1855	$1.89	1892	$3,531.95
1856	$1.39	2145	$2,991.60
1857	$1.19	2136	$2,546.51
1858	$1.35	1322	$1,789.42
1859	$1.10	2095	$2,312.33

The Crimean War influenced the price commanded by wheat. With the great wheat lands of Russia cut off by the war, Western Europe turned to the United States for its supply. When the conflict ended, Russian wheat again provided for most of Europe's needs. The market for U.S. wheat dwindled and prices foundered.

The number of farmers raising corn decreased only 1 percent over the decade. Since corn was a dietary staple for humans and the shocks were often fed to animals, few men neglected it entirely, though the overall amount grown decreased.

The 1860 growing season was hot and dry. Tobacco, corn and wheat were all affected.[25] The poor year probably accounted for part of the decline in wheat and corn. Since

---

[24]Randolph, "Farm Account," pp. 139-141.

[25]Jones, "Charlottesville and Albemarle," p. 169.

tobacco is an 18 month crop, the ill effects did not appear on the census.

Tobacco

Amount of tobacco grown in	% difference 1860-1870	Growers of tobacco in amounts of	% difference 1860-1870
1-499 lbs.	+148	1-499 lbs.	+ 71
500-999 lbs.	+ 71	500-999 lbs.	+ 63
1,000-4,999 lbs.	+120	1,000-4,999 lbs.	+ 97
5,000-9,999 lbs.	+176	5,000-9,999 lbs.	+171
10,000-49,999 lbs.	+380	10,000-49,000 lbs.	+325
50,000+ lbs.	can't calculate[26] +264 overall	50,000+ lbs.	can't calculate +143 overall

Albemarle experienced a tobacco boom in the 1850s. Average annual tobacco prices for 1850 to 1859 were 40 percent higher than they were in the previous decade. Anyone planting tobacco received a handsome return for it.[27] More people began planting, even in areas "where, in former times, people have grown up to manhood without ever having seen a growing crop of tobacco.[28] The size of the crop throughout the state increased spectacularly from 32,598 hogsheads in 1850 to 76,997 hogsheads in 1859.[29] In Albemarle County production rose from 1,456,300 pounds to 5,429,395 pounds or approximately 1,214 hogsheads to 4,524

---

[26] In 1850 no one produced 50,000 lbs. In 1860 five men grew 312,000 lbs.

[27] Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 769.

[28] U.S. Agricultural Society Journal, VIII, p. 184, as quoted in Gray, p. 769, n. 105.

[29] Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 769.

hogsheads, making Albemarle one of the four principle tobacco counties in Virginia.[30]

Randolph's tobacco accounts are sketchier than those for his wheat. In 1857 he received $7.68 per hundred pounds of tobacco, in 1858 $6.79 per hundred pounds and in 1859 $5.17 per hundred pounds. By increasing the size of his crop he received a greater return in 1859 than in 1857.[31]

Not only did more farmers grow tobacco, but each man produced a larger crop. New farmers went into tobacco heavily and so did those who had concerned themselves exclusively with wheat and corn in 1850. A random sample of Albemarle County residents confirms this.[32] In 1850 fifteen men grew tobacco. In 1860 forty-one grew tobacco, thirty-eight farmers and three non-farmers. Of the nineteen men who began growing tobacco during the decade, eight were new farmers who owned no land in 1850 and eleven were established farmers who had not grown any previously. Of the fifty-one farmers in the sample only thirteen grew no tobacco in 1860. Of these thirteen, two were retired, five were farmers by name and desire only. They held no land and must have been farm laborers or tenants. In all, few farmers failed to take advantage of the tobacco boom.

---

[30]Samuel T. Bitting, Rural Land Ownership Among Negroes of Virginia With Special Reference to Albemarle County (Phelps - Stokes Fellowship Papers, no. 2, University of Virginia, 1914), p. 18.

[31]Randolph, "Farm Account," pp. 139-141.

[32]See p. 77 for construction of the random sample.

Seventeen men grew rye in the county in 1850 and 163 ten years later. The names of twelve of the seventeen appeared in the census near that of Samuel Moon, a planter known to have lived near Scottsville. If the census taker worked geographically, the crop was raised mainly in the Scottsville area. Gilmer mentioned it briefly in his 1850 report to The Southern Planter but did not say why a few farmers chose to grow it. Most probably grew it for home consumption. It was popular among German farmers in the Valley who used it for dark breads and amoung mountaineers for whiskey.[33] On the random sample, one man grew rye in 1850 and eleven in 1860. No one grew it as a major crop, for all of them grew either wheat or tobacco in marketable quantities. A price rise may have spurred the new growers. Also, with the railroads rye could be shipped over the mountains to Valley homes.

Peas and Beans

Amount of P. & B. grown in	% difference 1860-1860	Men growing P. & B. in amounts of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4 bu.	- 80	1 - 4 bu.	- 86
5 - 9 bu.	- 28	5 - 9 bu.	- 26
10 - 19 bu.	+ 56	10 - 19 bu.	+ 49
20 - 49 bu.	- 46	20 - 49 bu.	+ 57
50+ bu.	can't calculate	50+ bu.	can't calculate
	- 32 overall		- 54 overal

[33] Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 820. Kentucky farmers used rye as winter pasture but Gray does not indicate whether the practice was followed elsewhere.

[34] In 1850 no one grew more than 50 bushels of peas and beans. In 1860 three men grew 200 bushels.

Irish Potatoes

Amount of I.P. grown in	% difference 1850-1860	Men growing I.P. in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4 bu.	-13	1 - 4 bu.	+29
5 - 9 bu.	-21	5 - 9 bu.	- 8
10 - 19 bu.	+ 1	10 - 19 bu.	- 4
20 - 49 bu.	-17	20 - 49 bu.	-28
50 - 99 bu.	+ 7	50 - 99 bu.	+ 4
100 - 499 bu.	+17	100 - 499 bu.	+33
	= overall		-13 overall

Sweet Potatoes

Amount of S.P. grown in	% difference 1850-1860	Men growing S.P. in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4 bu.	-80	1 - 4 bu.	-83
5 - 9 bu.	-57	5 - 9 bu.	-45
10 - 19 bu.	+13	10 - 19 bu.	+ 6
20 - 49 bu.	+31	20 - 49 bu.	+21
50 - 99 bu.	+17	50 - 99 bu.	+13
100+ bu.	+72	100+ bu.	+1720
	+20 overall		-6 overall

The overall decreases in farmers growing vegetables reflected the county's tobacco mania. With the railroads the county could ship in produce and devote more of its own acreage to tobacco. Poorer farmers, especially, might be tempted to scrimp on vegetables in expectations of profitable tobacco returns. Only the wealthier farmers with unimproved acreage to spare expanded production of these less profitable crops but they did not grow enough to off-set the overall decline.

Sweet potatoes were a staple in the diet of the poor who used them for everything "from bread to bear."[35] Many farmers

---

[35]Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 827.

grew them as supplementary fodder for their livestock.[36] The rise in the county's population, both free and slave, and a significant increase in livestock undoubtedly accounted for higher sweet potato production.

The 1860 agricultural census contained two new categories: orchard produce and market garden produce. Only sixteen men tended market gardens and their total return was less than $1,000.

Farmers had planted the first Albemarle orchards in the last decades of the eighteenth century. Apples dominated. The popularity of the local Albemarle Pippin zoomed when U.S. ambassador Alexander Stevenson, an Albemarle native, presented a basket to Queen Victoria in 1838. In the next decades apples were shipped regularly to Richmond.[37] Their pre-eminence continued into the 1850s when commercial orchards received new attention in the South and fruit culturists noted "the superior qualities of the Albemarle pippin."[38]

Eleven men in the random sample had orchards in 1860. All of them received larger returns from tobacco and other staples. In the county as a whole seven men grossed over $500 from their fruit and three made $1000 and over. For most farmers in the

---

[36]Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 827.

[37]Atcheson L. Hench, "The Name 'Albemarle Pippin'," The Magazine of Albemarle County History, Vol. XIV (1954-1955), pp. 24-25.

[38]Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 826.

county the sale of fruit was a sideline in their total operation. Only a handful treated it as a staple crop.

Southerners were notorious for neglecting livestock through the ante-bellum era. Animals were raised chiefly for their manure; milk and meat for home consumption were of secondary importance. Few bothered to send livestock to market. Consequently little interest developed in improving the quality of the stock.[39] Most foraged for themselves or ate "corn tops, shucks, and wheat straw."[40] Many suffered from antiquated veterinary practises such as bleeding calves to produce whiter veal.[41] After decades of this treatment most southern livestock was of poor quality, and so an early concern for agricultural societies. Planters imported prize European stock but the effect was often temporary. With no change in treatment, neglect and undernourishment often reduced award winning herds to the same appearance as the stock they were meant to improve. The societies persisted and many eventually convinced their members of the need for better care and feeding. Piedmont Virginia helped lead the movement for quality stock.[42] Albemarle did not lag behind. A visitor noted in 1858 that

> The farmers of Albemarle are, however, beginning to turn their attention more to the improvement of their stock. Messrs. Ficklin and Farish, near Charlottesville,

---

[39] Gray, History of Agriculture, pp. 835, 843.

[40] Ibid., p. 845.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid., p. 837.

> recently purchased a number of thoroughbred short horn Cattle . . . which will prove a valuable addition to the Stock of this section.[43]

Ficklin and Farish were not the only men making an effort to raise standards. The purebred animals of John R. Woods, William Garth and William C. Rives carried off many prizes in the Virginia State Agricultural Society fairs at Richmond.[44]

Horses

Horses owned in groups of	% difference 1850-1860	Men owning horses in groups of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4	+ 4	1 - 4	- 8
5 - 9	+ 5	5 - 9	+ 6
10 - 19	+ 1/2	10 - 19	+ 15
20+	+167	20+	+140
	+ 13 overall		+ 3/10 overall

Asses and Mules

A. & M. owned in groups of	% difference 1850-1860	Men owning A. & M. in groups of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4	+237	1 - 4	+113
5 - 9	+187	5 - 9	+188
10 - 19	+ 13	10 - 19	=
20+	can't calculate	20+	can't calculate
	+185 overall		+131 overall

---

[43] John H. Moore (ed.), "A Hometown Boy Looks at Charlottesville, 1858: A Letter of Benjamin F. Harlow," Magazine of Albemarle County History, XVIII (1959-1960), pp. 34-35.

[44] Jones, "Charlottesville and Albemarle," p. 162.

[45] In 1850 no man owned more than 20 asses or mules. In 1860 three men owned 69 among them.

Working Oxen

Oxen owned in groups of	% difference 1850-1860	Men owning oxen in groups of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4	+14	1 - 4	+ 7
5 - 9	+19	5 - 9	+23
10 - 19	+12	10 - 19	+24
20+	can't calculate[46]	20+	can't calculate
	+22 overall		+13 overall

Expanded crop production in the county created a need for more working animals. The average farm bought hard working asses, mules or oxen, while the wealthy planter put his proceeds into horses. Though asses and mules show a spectacular leap, they were actually the smallest category of working animals. In 1860 only 196 men owned 982 of them while 487 owned 2,210 oxen. Mules never gained popularity in the northernmost Southern states during the ante-bellum era. Since the days of James Monroe, one of the first to employ them, Virginians preferred oxen. They cost 1/5 of the price for horses and afrer a useful five to six years of field work could be fattened and butchered.[47] Though the prosperity of the decade must have tempted some farmers to try mules, the majority stayed with the more familiar ox.

Milch Cows

Cows owned in groups of	% difference 1850-1860	Owners of cows in groups of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4	+ 1/3	1 - 4	+15
5 - 9	- 5	5 - 9	+66
10 - 19	+10	10 - 19	=
20+	+301	20+	+33
	+5 overall		+20 overall

[46] In 1850 no man owned more than 20 oxen. In 1860 four men owned 103 among them.

[47] Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 852.

Butter

Butter produced in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860	Producers of butter in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 49 lbs.	-79	1 - 49 lbs.	-81
50 - 99 lbs.	-40	50 - 99 lbs.	-40
100 - 499 lbs.	+42	100 - 499 lbs.	+19
500 - 999 lbs.	+57	500 - 999 lbs.	+44
1000+ lbs.	-21	1000+ lbs.	-11
	+24 overall		- 7 overall

In 1843 a Richmond newspaper lamented the unavailability of butter.[48] Most Southerners supplied their family only, if they did that. Though the South had as many head of cattle per capita as the North it produced far less butter and cheese. The border states ranked highest with half to 2/3 the amount of butter per capita as the North.[49] Albemarle was typical. Though 1,219 men owned milch cows, only 876 reported butter to the census taker. The number of cows in the county did not increase very much through the decade but their distribution through the populace changed. Some planters increased their herds but for the most part, more people owned fewer cows. Established farmers probably sold stock to the newer farmers. Fewer men produced butter than in 1850 but those who did manufactured more. No one processed cheese.

---

[48] Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 838.

[49] Ibid., pp. 838-839.

Other cattle owned in groups of	% difference 1850-1860	Owners of other cattle in groups of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4	-41	1 - 4	+ 6
5 - 9	-18	5 - 9	-23
10 - 19	-11	10 - 19	-21
20 - 49	-12	20 - 49	-20
50 - 99	-14	50 - 99	-13
100+	-16	100+	=
	- 9 overall		-9 overall

Swine

Swine owned in groups of	% difference 1850-1860	Owners of swine in groups of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4	+ 20	1 - 4	+167
5 - 9	+132	5 - 9	+131
10 - 19	- 18	10 - 19	- 21
20 - 49	- 15	20 - 49	- 18
50 - 99	- 15	50 - 99	- 19
100+	- 36	100+	- 34
	- 21 overall		- 9 overall

Sheep

Sheep owned in groups of	% difference 1850-1860	Owners of sheep in groups of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4	+66	1 - 4	+61
5 - 9	+13	5 - 9	+21
10 - 19	-26	10 - 19	-26
20 - 49	-23	20 - 49	-28
50 - 99	-63	50 - 99	-61
100+	-61	100+	-56
	-44 overall		-26 overall

Wool

Wool produced in quantities of	% difference 1850-1860	Producers of wool in quantities of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 49 lbs.	-34	1 - 49 lbs.	-41
50 - 99 lbs.	- 9	50 - 99 lbs.	- 9
100 - 499 lbs.	-21	100 - 499 lbs.	-29
500+ lbs.	-16	500+ lbs.	-30
	-20 overall		-30 overall

Livestock herding moved west with the frontier. Expanding plantation systems in the Southern states pushed herders onto the marginal lands of each area. Virginia experienced such a decline soon after the Revolution. In 1818 the State contained less stock than it had 30 years previously.[50] By the 1850s the Appalachians were the only major cattle herding region left in Virginia and even these mountainous areas were threatened by encroaching farms.[51] Every year many Appalachian cattle were driven down out of the mountains to marketing areas in the East or sold en route to grain farmers who fed them on roughage from their corn and wheat. Though the farmers of Albemarle raised less cattle for market in the 1850s, a few began wintering western cattle and fattening them for market the following autumn. In the winter of 1849-1850, 2,000 head of cattle pastured in Albemarle. Of that number, 1,296 were on the farms of 31 men, with the rest scattered through the populace in groups of no more than five to a farm. Since profit that year amounted to only one dollar per head after deduction of pasturing and marketing expenses, the effort was worthwhile only for those who dealt in large numbers.[52] The supply of cattle never ceased and some of the men must have thought it worthwhile to continue. Thomas Jefferson Randolph bought and

---

[50]Gray, History of Agriculture, pp. 838-839.

[51]Ibid.

[52]William W. Gilmer to The Southern Planter, Vol. X, no. 6 (June, 1850), pp. 161-163.

sold cattle in both 1858 and 1859. The latter year he bought 20 head for $400 and sold 23,040 pounds of beef for $851.45.[53]

By Randolph's account the price of pork decreased from 8 1/2¢ a pound in 1855 to 7¢ a pound in 1858 and up slightly to 7 71/100¢ a pound in 1859.[54] Randolph himself realized a greater profit every year by increasing his herd. He received $190.01 for 2,306 pounds of pork in 1855 and $261.63 for 8,060 pounds in 1859.[55] Few others followed his example, a curious fact in light of the increase in both the slave and free population. Possibly the county raised enough for its own needs and no longer shipped hogs to market. Since swine, as well as cattle and sheep were driven to market, from the West, farmers may have preferred to use tobacco profits to buy their families' supplies from the herds going through the county to market. The increase on the bottom of the scale probably resulted from well-to-do farmers selling off surplus or poorer stock to newer or less fortunate farmers.

Flocks of sheep diminished more rapidly than herds of cattle and hogs. For the border states as a whole, however, sheep decline 72% between 1850 and 1860.[56] The Charlottesville Woolen Mills probably prevented Albemarle flocks from keeping

---

[53] Randolph, "Farm Account," p. 141.

[54] Ibid., pp. 139-141.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 832.

the downward pace with the rest of Virginia. The Mills had a barter arrangement with local farmers. It would card wool for a farmer if part of the payment was rendered in raw wool for the Mills' own use.[57] Railroads importing cheap woolens from the north and the increasing acreage needed for tobacco probably induced many farmers to abandon sheep herding despite the Mills. The more hesitant among them received added impetus in 1852 2hen heavy rains broke the dam and closed the Mills for three years.[58]

Randolph reported that he sold an unspecified number of lambs in 1855 for $71.50. Sheep did not appear in his accounts again until 1859 when he sold 524 pounds of mutton at eight cents per pound for $41.92 and 388 pounds of wool at 22 1/2¢ per pound for $87.30. In both years these were the smallest figures in his receipts column.[59]

Oats

Oats grown in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860	Men growing oats in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 49 bu.	+ 3	1 - 49 bu.	- 1
50 - 99 bu.	+ 1	50 - 99 bu.	- 7
100 - 499 bu.	+11	100 - 499 bu.	- 1
500 - 999 bu.	+20	500 - 999 bu.	+20
1,000 - 4,999 bu.	+18	1,000 - 4,999 bu.	+14
5000+ bu.	can't calculate	5,000+ bu.	can't calculate
	+10 overall		-10 overall

[57]Harry Edward Poindexter, "A History of the Charlottesville Woolen Mills 1820-1939." (University of Virginia: unpublished Master's thesis, 1955), pp. 17-18, 34-35.

[58]Poindexter, pp. 27-30.

[59]In 1850 no one grew 5,000 bushels or more of oats. In 1860 one man grew 5,000 bushels.

Hay

Hay grown in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860	Men growing hay in amounts of	% difference 1850-1860
1 - 4 tons	+ 9	1 - 4 tons	-19
5 - 9 tons	+51	5 - 9 tons	+32
10 - 19 tons	+27	10 - 19 tons	+32
20 - 49 tons	+100	20 - 49 tons	+94
50 - 99 tons	+18	50 - 99 tons	=
100+ tons	+31	100+ tons	+20
	+48 overall		+20 overall

The increase in work animals and cattle produced a corresponding rise in fodder crops. Part of the credit must go to the agricultural societies and journals that constantly called for better livestock diets. The populace was not easily convinced. Even as enlightened a farmer as William Gilmer boasted that "I have as fat teams as any in Albemarle - have not cut a ton of hay in 15 years, and never calculate on cutting another. In a country where corn and wheat are staples there is no occasion for cutting hay. . . ."[60]

In the above statistics the overall increase in oats almost precisely matches the increase in horses. In both cases the percentage growth in the amount of hay and oats grown far outstripped the percentage growth in farmers. Men convinced of the value of fodder increased their production to feed additional stock while their more backward neighbors saw better uses for their lands.

---

[60]William W. Gilmer to The Southern Planter, Vol. X, no. 12 (Dec. 1850), p. 354.

The returns for bushels of clover seed were too small to be charted. In 1850 four men grew 33 bushels. In 1860, 75 men produced 848. Mountain cattle wintered in Piedmont Virginia fattened on clover in the spring.[61] They might account for the great increase in clover and small number of men involved. At the same time bushels of grass seed produced dropped 43 per cent as growers plummetted from 67 to 12. The census did not list types of grass. A multitude of varieties were used for manuring the soil, pasturing stock and halting erosion.[62] The decline in hogs and sheep, intensive planting of tobacco, the guano craze, and cheaper railroad shipments from elsewhere may all have affected the 1860 returns.

Livestock Value

Livestock owned in groups worth	% difference 1850-1860	Owners of live-stock worth	% difference 1850-1860
$1 - 49	-54	$1 - 49	-56
$50 - 99	+25	$50 - 99	+23
$100 - 499	-22	$100 - 499	- 4
$500 - 999	+16	$500 - 999	+ 8
$1,000 - 4,999	+78	$1,000 - 4,999	+60
$5,000+	+33	$5,000+	+250
	+15 overall		+15 overall

[61] Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 840.

[62] Ibid., p. 823.

Value of animals slaughtered

Livestock slaughtered worth	% difference 1850-1860	Owners of livestock slaughtered worth	% difference 1850-1860
$1 - 49	- 67	$1 - 49	- 71
$50 - 99	- 27	$50 - 99	- 39
$100 - 499	+ 57	$100 - 499	+ 26
$500 - 999	+102	$500 - 999	+100
$1,000+	+254	$1,000+	+220
	+ 75 overall		- 1 overall

Although roughly the same number of men slaughtered animals the value of their product rose dramatically. Rising meat prices may have accounted for some of the increase. As more farmers saw greater profits in tobacco, and their expanded improved acreage carved into grazing lands, livestock was slaughtered for home consumption or local markets and not replenished. The great increase in the top category may come from the wintered beef cattle of the wealthier planters. These men constituted a small segment of the population so that their statistics did not measurably affect the overall trend.

The increase in working animals and milch cows producers the rise in livestock value. At the same time the decreases in hogs, sheep and other cattle as well as individual farmer's rises into higher categories must have caused the few decreases noted in the livestock value column.

The railroads were a major factor in two other areas, flax and home manufactures. Flax had been a staple among backwoods farmers who grew it commercially for its seeds

which were processed into linseed oil. By 1859 production in all the border states had declined to less than 1/3 of the peak figures.[63] In Albemarle between 1850 and 1860 the amount of flax grown decreased 43 percent and growers 82 percent. Railroads meant importation of manufactured materials from the North and the tapping of other sources of supply for both flax and oil.

Between 1850 and 1860 the value of home made manufactures in the county declined from $32,385 to $19,203 and produced from 635 men to 340 men. Home manufactures had been prevalent among isolated families with little ready cash. Products could be made more cheaply than they could be bought. The railroads and the tobacco boom brought many families from a subsistence to a market economy. In the 1850 sampling of Albemarle residents twenty-nine of the thirty-six men listing such manufactures had estates of $5,000 or less. In 1860 twelve of twenty-four manufacturers had estates worth less than $5,000. While many of the smaller farmers abandoned home production, many of the wealthier began manufacturing products at home during the decade. They may have been among the patriotic citizens responding to the appeals of The Southern Planter to throw off the yoke of Northern manufacturing and produce goods at home to build a stronger more self-sufficient South. The value of the products remained small. Of the total

---

[63]Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 821.

340 men involved in 1860 273 produced less than $100 worth. Only two men exceeded $400.

Agricultural production throughout the county revolved around tobacco. Its cultivation expanded at the expense of other crops and may have even effected the amount of livestock raised. Small farmers abandoned grains and vegetables and rushed to put their acreage into tobacco. Many made small profits which they soon tied up in heavy mortgages. For the most part they ended up at an even greater disadvantage to the larger farm owners. The latter could more readily absorb shipping costs, purchase additional acreage and properly fertilize it. Consequently, only these men made substantial profits. They invested their newly acquired capital in land, slaves, business and industry, thereby increasing the inequalities of the land structure and overall wealth in the county.

Improved Acreage

Land in units of	% difference 1850-1860	Men holding land in units of	% difference 1850-1860
1-49 acres	-18	1-49 acres	-16
50-99 acres	+21	50-99 acres	+13
100-499 acres	+ 7	100-499 acres	- 1
500-999 acres	+16	500-999 acres	+10
1,000+ acres	+17	1,000 acres	+14
	+11 overall		=

Unimproved Acreage

Land in units of	% difference 1850-1860	Men holding land in units of	% difference 1850-1860
1-49 acres	- 4	1-49 acres	- 9
50-99 acres	+ 5	50-99 acres	- 7
100-499 acres	+12	100-499 acres	+ 7
500-999 acres	-16	500-999 acres	+19
1,000+ acres	+33	1,000+ acres	+18
	+ 5 overall		- 1 overall

Cash Value Farm

Farms worth	% difference 1850-1860	Men owning farms worth	% difference 1850-1860
$1-499	- 64	$1-499	- 65
$500-999	- 41	$500-999	- 46
$1,000-4,999	- 10	$1,000-4,999	- 11
$5,000-9,999	+ 34	$5,000-9,999	+ 30
$10,000-49,999	+103	$10,000-49,999	+ 86
$50,000+	+ 89	$50,000+	+186
	+ 69		=

The farming class consolidated during the decade. Although the number of farmers remained the same, the acreage they owned increased and its value rocketed. Farmers in the smallest categories either moved up a bracket or lost out completely. Improved land climbed at a greater rate than unimproved land as farmers put fallow acreage into cultivation. Fewer men had the capital needed to invest in new land. Albemarle farms sold at $30 to $60 an acre in 1853.[64] In 1851 James Fife wrote to a friend that land he had bought for $18 an acre he resold after restoration for $64.[65]

The county had been settled over 100 years by 1850. Most good land was in the hands of the richer planter families. Though the farmers received excellent returns for their crops, put more of their own land under cultivation and saw the value of their acreage rise only the wealthiest could

---

[64]Gray, History of Agriculture, p. 644.

[65]James Fife to unidentified recipient, Nov. 19, 1851. Shepherd Papers, University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #4241.

have afforded to buy large sections of good land.

There was another area in which successful farmers could expand--slaves. Instead of selling surplus hands south, many owners probably found it easier and less rending to the slaves to sell within the county to newly prosperous farmers.

Slaves

Slaves owned in groups of	1850	1860	% difference
1 - 5	1,229	1,866	+52
6 - 10	1,849	1,767	- 4
11 - 19	3,374	3,198	- 5
20 - 49	4,802	4,467	- 7
50 - 99	1,518	1,970	+23
100+	334	134	-60
	13,106	13,402	+ 2

Owners of slaves in groups of	1850	1860	% difference
1 - 5	433	890	+106
6 - 10	238	227	- 5
11 - 19	241	225	- 7
20 - 49	168	154	- 8
50 - 99	25	30	+ 20
100+	3	1	- 67
	1,108	1,527	+ 37

Despite a noticeable rise in slave ownership a good many slaves were still being sold south. The mere 2 percent increase in slaves themselves meant that about 3,000 slaves must have been sent out of the county. Given Bancroft's natural increase rate of 24.2 percent a decade, Albemarle County's slave population should have been over 16,000 by 1860.

In 1850, 54 percent of the households in Albemarle County owned at least one slave. But only 196 men or 18 percent of the slaveholders were planters owning twenty or more. These men owned 51 percent of the slaves at an average of 33.9 a piece. In the next ten years the households increased 13 percent and total slave ownership increased 38 percent. The number of planters declined to 185 or just 10 percent of the holders. These men now owned only 41 percent of the slaves at an average of 35.5 a piece.

Some of the loss from the planters was taken up by the newly prosperous small farmers. In 1850, 433 men owned 1,229 slaves in groups of one to five. These men averaged 2.8 hands a piece. They held 9 percent of the slaves in the county and they themselves made up 39 percent of the slave holding populace. In 1860, 890 men owned 1,866 slaves in groups of one to five. This lowest group now averaged only 2.1 slaves a piece. But they owned 14 percent of the county's total slaves and themselves constituted 58 percent of the slaveowners.

The greatest losses happened in the middle ranks. Both the number of owners and the number of slaves they owned decreased. These men sold off surplus hands to the smaller farmers. Again, expanding tobacco production provided the explanation. Nurturing of tobacco plants required more labor than grain cultivation. In the face of soaring land costs the newly prosperous small farmer bought field hands. Extra land, without the labor to work it, would have been useless. Also,

the illusive prestige factor that went with slave ownership may have given added impetus to some. On the other hand, the planters and the middle-sized farmers had enough slaves already. Natural increase provided new hands needed to work additional acreage. Surplus could be sold, largely without the county and occasionally within. Between tobacco and slave profits these men had the money to buy expensive land or invest in industry.

On the random fifty-six men had property which increased in value. Fifteen of them bought slaves, eighteen bought land and eight bought both. Of the men who did not buy land, eight put more acreage into cultivation.

Despite agricultural prosperity prices were too high for more than a few men to work their way up from the bottom to wealth. The membership of the 1860 planter class confirms this. On the census that year, seventy-five men appeared for the first time as owners of twenty or more slaves. Twenty-eight of them had owned at least ten slaves in 1850.

Many inherited their slaves. Charles Hancock received his father's twenty-nine. James H. Burnley's leap from none to sixty-eight was aided by the inheritance of the thirty-one slaves his father had held in 1850. Charles A. Scott lived and worked on his uncle David's plantation and received both land and slaves on the latter's death in 1851. Several of the new owners were widows of 1850 planters like Anna Moon whose

husband E.H. Moon held fifty-two slaves in 1860.

Twenty-two of the new planters bore the family name of deceased 1850 planters and nine more the name of deceased owners with less than twenty slaves in 1850. Less than ten did not have obvious prominent Albemarle connections. One of these, Uriah P. Levy, the Philadelphia navy captain who purchased Monticello, brought his wealth into the county.

The granting of slaves among several inheritors probably helped account for the decline in total number of planters. In 1850 Tucker Coles, the leading Albemarle County planter, had 131 slaves. In 1860 he had only fifty-four but other members of his family recorded substantial gains. Thomas Jefferson Randolph's slave holdings dropped during the decade, and both his son and son-in-law showed increases.

Despite the agricultural prosperity, the rags-to-riches syndrome of the colonial tobacco and Southwestern cotton booms was not repeated. The high price of good land worked against the ambitious poor. Capable field hands were also expensive. In 1857 a Richmond dealer offered hands at $1,100 to $1,550. Prices for women averaged about $200 less.[66] John S. Mosby, a local attorney, reported that a slave trader offered him $1,300 for two young boys in 1869.[67] Few men without family

---

[66]Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution, Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South ("Vintage Books": New York: Random House, 1966), pp. 415-416.

[67]John S. Mosby, Undated clipping of an essay by him in a family scrapbook. John S. Mosby Papers. University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #9836.

connections and a substantial base in land and slaves could make a leap from poverty to wealth.

Families without the capital outlay to buy slaves could hire them. The practice became increasingly important during the decade. By recording renting and hiring statistics[68] the census taker acknowledged the significance of the system. It was not a new development. Hiring in the cities had existed for decades. Its expansion in the late ante-bellum era gave the entire system, urban and rural, a new flexibility.

> The development of the hiring out system, moreover greatly broadened the opportunity for the use of slaves. Under this practice, masters who owned more blacks than they could utilize either at home or in their business hired some to shorthanded employers. This custom greatly lessened the rigidity of slavery, allowing a constant reallocation of the labor supply according to demand.[69]

Masters rented their slaves for a variety of reasons. Renting was the ideal substitute for the sale of slaves, if the latter was thought morally or socially objectionable. The slaves generally remained in their native county and the master lost no prestige. Aged slaves or those no longer physically capable of field work could still be rented for less physically demanding tasks by a master who could not or would not sell them. Renting provided a comfortable income

---

[68] See appendix for explanation of terminology and problems.

[69] Richard C. Wade, Slavery in the Cities of the South, 1820-1860 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 38.

for widows or children and temporarily disposed of slaves while estates were settled. Slaves with unusual skills or trades were rented to a succession of people requiring their services for a brief time. Families of domestic servants were rented by city masters who had no use for additional hands. Religious and charitable institutions rented endowed slaves. Renting was an established method for teaching slaves a trade, the equivalent of apprenticeship among the free populace. Men who needed more hands during harvest time or for other seasonal and short term needs hired the extra help. Men beginning in business or manufacturing hired the help they could not buy. Hired slaves aided in the building and maintenance of turnpikes, canals and railroads.[70]

Evidence for most of these practices can be found in the Albemarle County 1860 census and in the county deed and will books, 1850-1860. In 1860, 236 people who did not own slaves hired them. Women appeared frequently as renters. Trustees and executors rented out slaves from several estates. The Virginia Central Railroad hired three slaves as did many other firms such as the Charlottesville Slate Company with two and Joseph F. Wingfield, saw mill owner, with one. Most companies hired only a few though J.M. Crowden and Co., tobacconists, employed twenty-four. Leading citizens in the

---

[70]Bancroft, Slave Trading, pp. 145-147. Stamp, pp. 67-71. Joseph Clark Robert, The Tobacco Kingdom (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1938), pp. 199-200.

community often took an active interest in infant businesses and rented a slave a piece to them. Large planters with slaves of their own occasionally hired another, for example, John S. Cocke, who owned 42 and hired two more.

Slave owners found renting an excellent way to increase their income. As Thomas Jefferson Randolph explained in 1832

> The interest on money is 4 to 6 percent. The hires of male slaves is about 15 percent upon their value: in ten years or less, you have returned your original principal with interest.[71]

In the 1850s slaves brought 10 to 20 percent of the market value with the average at 12 to 15 percent annually.[72] In northern Virginia between 1850 and 1860 male field hands rented at $80-$140 a year, females at $40-$80, and children at $25-$75. Railroad hands and mechanics, the most valued workers, brought $150-$175 a year.[73] In 1855 Randolph paid $316.88 to hire an unspecified number of slaves.[74]

In Albermarle County in 1860 owners rented out 9 percent of the recorded slave population, a figure slightly lower than the 10 to 12 percent estimated for Fauquier County that year, and far beneath the 25 percent for the city of Alexandria.[75]

---

[71]Thomas Jefferson Randolph as quoted in Bancroft, p. 156, n. 33.

[72]Bancroft, Slave Trading, p. 156.

[73]Ibid., p. 158.

[74]Randolph, "Farm Account," p. 139.

[75]Bancroft, Slave Trading, pp. 147-148.

On the random survey five men, a merchant, an attorney, a physician, and two farmers rented nine slaves among them. Sixteen men hired twenty-three: seven farmers, three merchants, a wheelwright, two physicians, a postmaster, a shoemaker, and a minister. Two men appeared in both renting and hiring categories. Of the hirers, five did not own any slaves. The remaining eleven owned between two and thirty-two.

Over the decade, buying and hiring of slaves both absorbed some of the county's surplus capital and served as a potential source of more profit.

After land and slaves, business and industry formed the third major area of potential investment. It is impossible to record accurately the development of business and industrial ventures for the decade. Each census taker had a different idea about what belonged on an industrial schedule. The census for 1860 had only half the pages of the 1850 census.[76] Several firms that disappeared from the 1860 census emerged again in 1870. Business enterprises were never systematically recorded. A careful culling of county deed books, newspaper advertisements and spotty county histories gives a feel for what existed in the county but no reliable statistics.

---

[76] U.S. Manuscript Census 1850 and U.S. Manuscript Census 1860 Industrial Schedules (Microfilm Deposit, Virginia State Library).

Industry	1850	1860	missing 1860 reappears 1870
grist mills	40	32	4
saw mills	13	16	1
tanneries	7	5	
cotton & woolen mills	4	2	
foundries machine	1	1	1
machine shops		2	
tobacco factory		1	
mattress factory		1	
shoemakers	2	4	
carpenters	1		
coopers	1	1	
blacksmiths	26		1
wheelwrights	6		1
carriage makers	5		
cabinet makers	4		
milliners	3		
saddlers	2		1
hatters	1		
plowmaker	1		

	1850	1850 selected	1860	1860 selected
capital investment[77]	$311,390	$277,500	$249,140	$235,640
value product	348,795	481,845	314,900	490,905
men employed	301	155	216	179
monthly wages	$ 4,998	2,114	3,666	2,869
women employed	97	92	25	22
monthly wages	$ 518	$ 460	$ 181	$ 136

The 1860 census taker did not include the skilled tradesmen and mechanics on the schedules as the 1850 recorder had.

---

[77] The 1850 census taker reported that John Timberlake had cotton factory with a capital investment of $100,000. If the census taker did not err, Timberlake's establishment was by far the most valuable in the county. The nearest to it was the cotton factory of Henry W. Jones, with a $20,000 capital investment. With Timberlake's factory aside, selected capital investment increased a sizeable amount over the decade.

A few mills were either missed or inoperative that year. The tradesmen and mechanics listed on the 1850 schedule and the shoemakers and cooper on the 1860 schedule fell far short of the actual number in the county according to the population schedules. These men may have been the most successful at their craft and had establishments large enough to be considered factories. All but two employed at least one other person. Without further information all of them were deleted so that the industrial schedules for the two years matched.

Only eight of the forty-nine mills were owned by their operators. About eight more were owned by farmers or merchants and run by other members of their families. The four shoe factories, one of the machine shops and at least two of the tanning establishments were owned by the craftsmen who ran them. The remainder of the mills belonged to wealthy farmers or merchants who hired employees at $15 to $20 a month.

The 1860 population schedule listed ninety-three factory and mill owner-operators and employees. Only fourteen of them held the same positions in 1850. Twenty-seven were too young to have appeared on that schedule. Thirty-two older men are listed for the first time in 1860. The remaining twenty had other occupations in 1850: seven farmers, two overseers, two laborers, two wheelwrights, two carpenters, one blacksmith, one merchant, one carpenter, one tanner and one unemployed. Without knowing the former occupations of the new men or the family history of the young men it is difficult to draw

conclusions. But it seems likely that the small factories and mills of Albemarle attracted men who had failed elsewhere, natives who lost their former employment through ineptness or misfortune, and the sons of wage earners or farmers whose holdings were too small to subdivide.

The men listed in the population schedules as working in mills and factories do not reach even half of the total number of hands on the industrial schedules. Some of the factory workers may have regarded their jobs as socially demeaning that they reported themselves as laborers. It is more likely that the remaining employees were Negro slaves. Fifty-seven men on the 1850 industrial census owned slaves. Thirty-six men on the 1860 census owned slaves and an additional eight hired at least one. The tobacco factory of J.M. Crowder ran entirely by Negro labor. The company hired twenty-four slaves and employed at least two freedmen.

The cotton factor of John Timberlake accounted for the large number of women employees in 1850. Sixty of the ninety-seven worked there. Sometime during the decade Timberlake sold out and bought a farm. Even with Timberlake's employees aside, and the five women who worked for the milliners and hatter discounted, women employees dropped 21 percent during the decade. The push of unemployed men into lower paying jobs, or the greater availability of cheaper hired slaes might explain the drop.

Finally while the number of grist mills dropped 20 percent the number of saw mills climbed 23 percent. Agriculture in the county probably produced both changes. The decrease in wheat production meant a need for fewer grist mills. At the same time some men who made profits in tobacco may have put some of their capital into timber land and have begun lumbering.

In the summer of 1860 the editor of The Southern Planter visited the county and reported

> The more we saw of the country, the more we were pleased, and the more we felt it to be excusable for Virginians to be proud of the Old Dominion. . . . having within her own borders the elements of wealth, prosperity and greatness.[78]

For most people the decade brought mild prosperity, not great wealth. Few people made their fortunes from scratch. On the random sample twenty people increased their property value from zero. Seventeen of them accumulated less than $5,000 and seven of these less than $1,000. Only eight were farmers. One was a professional, two were merchants, and the remainder were skilled craftsmen.

Twelve more men on the sample gained over $10,000 during the decade. Eight of them had had at least $10,000 in 1850. The other four had between $3,600 and $7,000. All of them were either farmers or merchants.

Land value, slave ownership, and industrial output increased significantly in Albemarle County in the decade

---

[78] The Southern Planter, XX, no. 7 (July 1860), p. 438.

between 1850 and 1860. The county was a prosperous one but primarily for those who had the initial outlay to take advantage of the decade's economic opportunities.

IV

ALBEMARLE COUNTY 1860-1870

The history of the next decade can be read in a glance at a chart of land and farming.

	1860[1]		1870[2]		% difference 1860-1870
households	2,290		5,276		+ 230
households with land	1,285		1,165		- 9
households without land	1,005		4,111		+ 299
individuals with land	1,317		1,186		- 10
		white	black	total	
farmers	908	1,308	64	1,372	+ 50
farmers with land	706	641	12	653	- 8
farmers without land	202	667	52	719	+ 256
farm laborers	231	524	2,694	3,218	
total engaged in farming	1,420			4,585	

The land owning class continued to consolidate. Few men, especially freed men, had the capital to buy land after the war. Many of those who had gained land for the first time in the favorable fifties lost their meagre holdings in the next decade.

---

[1]The 1860 figures are for the free populace only.

[2]The farming figures for 1870 are probably inaccurate. The two men who collected the census for Rivanna, Ivy, and Whitehall districts lumped almost all black agricultural workers the same way: "works on farm." The man who collected in Sam Miller and Scottsville districts made some attempt to differentiate between classes of black agricultural workers calling some "farmers" and others "farm hands" though in both cases the men involved were landless.

The break down in land ownership points out where the losses occurred.

Land worth	1860 owners	1870 owners	% difference 1860-1870
$1 - 499	136	157	+ 15
$500 - 999	135	164	+ 21
$1,000 - 4,999	506	463	- 8
$5,000 - 9,999	214	175	- 13
$10,000 - 24,999	227	159	- 30
$25,000 - 44,999	72	51	- 29
$50,000 - 99,999	24	17	- 29
$100,000 +	3	1,186	can't calculate
	1,317		- 10

This time the ownership increase in the lower categories came from established farmers losing land and dropping further down the scale.

County histories for the period give rather sketchy information. Years later many memoir writers recalled grim days during and after the war but none gave inclusive, precise statistical accounts. The county remained relatively untouched until 1864 when a Union cavalry raid swept by Rio Mills five miles northeast of Charlottesville. A reporter to the Lynchburg Daily Republican claimed that the federal troops burned fences and took away slaves of at least nine farmers as well as their stock and provisions.[3] Losses then were mild compared to some of the devastation that occurred in early March 1865 when General Philip Sheridan's troops came through the county bent on destruction of the railroads "to prevent troops

---

[3]John R. Brown, "The Battle of Rio Hill, February 29, 1864." The Magazine of Albemarle County History, XXII (1963-1964), pp. 30-32.

massing from either Richmond or Lynchburg."[4] The invaders did not confine their attentions to the railroads. Sheridan himself succinctly reported that "forage and subsistence were found in great abundance around the vicinity of Charlottesville."[5]

After the army left Egbert R. Watson sent his daughter an account of the occupation:

> The day after the arrival of the enemy here they began their search for public property, of which not a great deal was left in town. Some stores were broken open, and many things taken away by negro and some white persons. . . .
>
> As a general thing the citizens of the town suffered but little, many of them had guards. A good many lost meat, flour, corn and hay . . . our country friends have suffered dreadfully. Corn, meat, flour, horses and negroes, were all in great demand. . . .
>
> I can form no correct estimate but I suppose the County has lost many hundred horses, and from 1500 to 2000 negroes. Some families lost everything they had, their household stuff being taken away or destroyed. . . . indeed almost all of our farmers suffered terribly.[6]

Watson's estimate of "many hundreds horses" was probably correct. The troops found enough good mounts in the county to replace 300 of their own worn out beasts. Mrs. Virginia

---

[4] The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, Series I, Vol. 46, Part I (Washington, D.C., 1880-1901), p. 477 as quoted in Margaret W. Fowler Clark, "The Surrender of Charlottesville." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XVII (1958-1959), p. 72, n. 28.

[5] Ibid., n. 26.

[6] Mary Rawlings (ed.), "Sheridan's Raid Through Albemarle, from a letter written by E.R. Watson to his daughter, Mrs. J. Henry Smith." Magazine of Albemarle County History, Vol. XIV (1954-1955), pp. 11-13.

Mosby recorded in her diary on March 11 that "the vile creatures have gone to Jas. River, & are camped on the farm of Wm. D. Cabell. They killed three hundred of their broken down horses on his farm, and took all his horses."[7]

Thomas C. Devin, 1st Cavalry Division Commander enumerated his men's systematic destruction of local property.

> At Charlottesville was destroyed 2000 lbs tobacco, 15 Wagons, loaded with Corn, Wheat, etc. One tannery containing 1,000 hides. The Reserve Brigade destroyed at Ivy Depot, the Water tanks, warehouses containing tobacco and Commissary Stores. On March 6th marched to Scottsville, arrived 3:00 p.m. Three canal boats captured, one loaded with 9,600 shells, two loaded with Government Commissary stores and tobacco.
>
> These were totally destroyed and burned together with a large Cloth Mill, a five story flouring Mill, candle factory, Machine Shop, and tobacco warehouse. Each of these buildings were crammed with products of its manufacture to a suprising extent.
>
> . . . Destroying the Bridge at Palmyra together with one flouring mill, with 500 bushels of Wheat, and 500 barrels of flour, together with one cotton mill, 1500 lbs of wool, and 2 tons of cotton, marching same night to Scottsville. . . . to destroy aqueduct over Hardware River. . . . [and then] to Howardsville destroying 5 locks and two tobacco warehouses containing 200 hogsheads tobacco.[8]

When the troops left many slaves went with them.

---

[7]Mrs. Virginia Mosby, Diary, 1865-66. Entry for March 11, 1865. John S. Mosby Papers. University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #9836. Mrs. Mosby's account contradicts the published one in the Lynchburg Daily Virginian, March 11, 1865, as quoted in Clark, "Surrender," p. 73. That laconically notes that Union troops "shot about 300 broken down horses" in a field near Scottsville but neglects to mention that the horses were their own and not county ones.

[8]General Devin from the Official War Records as quoted in John R. Brown, "Sheridans Occupation of Charlottesville, March 3rd to 6th 1865," Magazine of Albemarle County History, XXII (1963-1964), pp. 43-44.

> Large numbers of Negroes mounted on stolen horses were seen going off with the Yankees. Women with little children in their arms seemed as eager to be off as the men. The Yankees did not wish to be troubled with them . . . some cursed the Negroes telling them they were better off where they were. One of the officers stationed at Mr. S.W. Ficklin's said it was not for love of the Negro that induced them to take away the slaves, but it was to prevent agricultural operation.[9]

The war ended a month later and the county turned to the tasks of reconstruction. The first years after the war were trying ones. In 1867 merchant Samuel Miller, one of the fortunate wealthy few wrote to a friend that

> I am almost daily annoyed by persons of all ages and colors for assistance. Some have no bread, no meal in the house. This is a heavy tax on me, and it seems the country is getting in a more destitute condition than ever before.[10]

Four years later Charles Wertenbaker recalled that immediately after the war

> Abject poverty was looking nearly all of them in the face and many of the men, who had been raised in luxury and ease, went to work on the Chesapeake and Ohio railroad (then the Virginia Central) as bridge builders, etc. Some worked on farms, some were fortunate to get work at their trades, and others did what ever turned up. . . . The writer supported himself and family by making willow baskets. . . .[11]

---

[9] Lynchburg Daily Virginian, March 9, 1865 as quoted in Clark, "Surrender of Charlottesville," p. 73, n. 30.

[10] Samuel Miller to Nicholas Murrell Page as quoted in Bernard P. Chamberlain, "Samuel Miller, 1792-1869: Albemarle Philanthropist," Magazine of Albemarle County History, XXVII & XXVIII (1968-1969 & 1969-1970), p. 126, n. 8.

[11] Charles Wertenbaker, "Records of the Monticello Guard from the surrender of General R.E. Lee at Appomatox Court House, April 9th, 1865 to the present time [1871], Albemarle County Historical Society, Papers, I (1940-41), p. 32.

All Virginia endured the same fate. High taxes during Reconstruction and depletion of the laboring force raised the cost of production almost beyond the profit margin. Land values dropped throughout the state from an average of $13.79 per acre in 1860 to $10.34 in 1870.[12] Even so, few men, black or white, were able to purchase land. As one planter pointed out to a Federal officer

> If you had taken our land and left us our Negroes, we would have been much better off than we are, for we might have worked or sold the Negroes, whereas we can neither work the land nor sell it.[13]

While the old plantation masters lamented defeat and poverty their former slaves experienced even greater deprivation. With no money and no political power the vast majority of freedmen had no way of gaining even a measure of economic independence and turned for support to their old masters. Share cropping resulted. The new Southern Planter apologetically explained in 1867.

> With a larger population to be fed and clothed out of the productions of our desolated fields, very few persons possess the necessary implements to till them and a large majority are destitute of money to command the necessary labor, the aggregate supply of which is wholly inadequate to meet the needs of the people, even if there was no lack of capital among them. Besides this general absence of individual capital, we are affected with an unprecedented deficiency of a circulating medium, so indispensibly necessary to facilitate the

---

[12] W.H. Brown, The Education and Economic Development of the Negro in Virginia ("Phelps-Stokes Fellowship Papers," No. 6, University of Virginia, 1923), p. 82.

[13] Thomas Nelson Page, The Old Dominion, p. 355 as quoted in W.H. Brown, Education . . . of the Negro in Virginia, p. 82, n. 4.

> current exchanges of business, and lubricate the joints of industry.
>
> . . . It appears than, that all classes except a highly favored few are compelled to resort to temporary expedients which their judgment condemns, to obtain the means of procuring labor to work their lands at all. Hence while every one condemns the policy of paying for labor by a share of the crop there are comparatively few who are not driven by stress of circumstances to the adoption of this mode of compensation. Those who successfully cultivated tobacco and cotton the last year have been relieved from this alternative, having acquired means of paying the wages of labor in money, but those who are compelled to submit to the evils of a bad system must await the slow accretion of years of toil and self denial before they reach the point of independence, when they shall be free to adopt that system which their best judgment approves.[14]

Little changed in the lives of the Albemarle freedmen. Their social position remained unchanged. Most began share cropping soon after the war. Ex-slaves labored for former masters, many of whom retained a paternalistic interest in their old servants.[15] In fact, the provost master complained in 1866 that some of the old masters had difficulty in accepting emancipation and continued to dominate the Negroes as they had in the past.

> The plain fact that freed men are free and not subject to them cannot be realized by the whites, and they are constantly using and carrying into effect their illogical maxim and arguement, 'if the freed men whom I employ, support and pay, will not do as I tell, if on my scolding "sauce" me, am I not justified in having recourse to physical power?[16]

---

[14] The Southern Planter, New Series I, no. 2 (March, 1867), pp. 124-126.

[15] Joseph C. Vance, "Race Relations in Charlottesville During Reconstruction," Magazine of Albemarle County History, XIII (1953), pp. 28-30.

[16] Freedmen's Bureau Records, CXXVIII, p. 9 as quoted in Vance, "Race Relations," p. 30.

At the same time he did not find the Negroes guiltless. After generations of slavery many confused freedom with irresponsibility. Their actions appeared ". . . insolent, sullen and disobedient and their behavior frequently provoked employers to whip or strike them. . . ."[17] Misunderstanding was only natural when behavior formerly tolerated as amusing by old masters became criminal in the eyes of new bosses. Hunger was an impetus in the new era, as it had been in the old. The local Freedmen's Bureau sadley lamented that "the Freedmen in this county are much addicted to thieving . . . opening smoke houses and stealing therefrom."[18]

Albemarle blacks, especially in the Scottsville district probably came under the wage rates established in January 1866 by a convention of James River farmers. The group adopted a scale ranging from $10 a month for a "first class field hand" to $5 a month for a "third class field hand." Those hired by the year were to fare slightly better or from $130 down to $70 annually. Women could receive $3 to $5 a month.[19]

The black men's only chance at the political power necessary to gain economic independence came in the fall of 1867 when elections were held for the Virginia constitutional convention. Thomas Jefferson Randolph led a conservative

---

[17] Ibid., p. 31.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Richmond Times, Jan. 9, 1866, as quoted in W.H. Brown, Education of the Negro in Virginia, pp. 83-84, n. 8.

effort to gain black cooperation. The freed men rejected his offer of political friendship and elected a Radical slate that included an Albemarle black, J.T.S. Taylor.[20] When the "black and tan" convention adopted the test oath and a new public school system, conservatives in the county rallied. The Charlottesville Chronicle indulged in some genteel rabble rousing and scare campaigns. Negroes were threatened with the introduction of Chinese labor. The rumored violence never materialized but an aroused white populace carried the election. Taylor and his Radical white running mate lost in their bids for legislative seats.[21]

By 1870 blacks were firmly entrenched in the share cropping system. They had been assigned a place in Albemarle County and were to keep it. Good behavior was rewarded but no stepping out of line was tolerated. In 1867, for instance, Thomas Jefferson Randolph granted the deacons of Union Baptist Church one acre of land to build a church and school house for "religious exercises and purposes of education" only and not "political gatherings."[22] In addition, if Randolph objected to a teacher the deacons would remove him.[23] Unable to enforce their political rights, the freedmen had no choice

---

[20] Vance, pp. 39-40.

[21] Ibid., pp. 41-43.

[22] Albemarle County Deed Book LXIII, pp. 369-370.

[23] Ibid.

but to submit to social, legal, and economic subservience.

The 1870 census recorded their plight. Only fifty-six people out of a total Negro population of 14,994[24] owned land. Total value of their property came to $83,911, $36,000 of which was owned by four individuals, only three of whom were legally Negroes.[25] An additional twenty-one people possessed some personal property.

The census taker listed 64 farmers and 2,712 farm laborers. The rest of the population held traditional occupations: domestic, carpenter, blacksmith, washwoman, cook, shoemaker, and railroad hand.

During and after the war Albemarle County farmers pursued the same agricultural course they had followed in the ante-bellum era. The same crops appear on the 1870 census though in each case the amount grown plummeted.

---

[24]This figure is probably too high. A careful scrutiny of the census reveals that more than a few blacks were counted twice: once where they lived and once where they worked.

[25]William H. Brown, a 32 year old restaurant owner was the only Negro. Septimia Barnett, 43, was born free. In 1863 she and her sister Martha were brought before the county court by their mother. White witnesses certified that the girls were less than one-fourth Negro and the justices duly ruled that henceforth they should be considered white (Albemarle County Court Minute Book XVII (1859-1862), p. 323. Brothers Robert and James Scott, 66 and 60, were not freedmen at all but one-fourth Indian. They and their father before them were famous fiddlers at resorts and social events throughout the State. (Mary Rawlings, (ed.), Early Charlottesville, Recollections of James Alexander, 1828-1874 (Charlottesville: Albemarle County Historical Society, 1942), p. 84.)

Tobacco

Amount of tobacco grown in	% difference 1860-1870	Growers of tobacco in units of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 499 lbs.	+13	1 - 499 lbs.	+ 8
500 - 999 lbs.	+40	500 - 999 lbs.	+40
1,000 - 4,999 lbs.	-26	1,000 - 4,999 lbs.	-19
5,000 - 9,999 lbs	-61	5,000 - 9,999 lbs.	-58
10,000 - 49,999 lbs.	-77	10,000 - 49,000 lbs.	-75
50,000 + lbs.	can't calculate[26] -67 overall	50,000 + lbs	can't calculate -40

During the war Kentucky surpassed Virginia as the chief tobacco producing state. The Louisville and Nashville Railroad carried Western tobacco to market at the same time that the war cut off Virginia tobacco markets.[27] After the war Bright tobacco from North Carolina and Burley from Mississippi gained in popularity over the bitterer Virginia variety. The competition of new areas and new strains plus the burden of land and labor problems limited tobacco production. Not until 1910 did Virginia growers equal their 1860 crops.[28]

In Albemarle fewer men grew less tobacco per person than in 1860. The rise in the lower levels occurred as farmers slid down the production scale from higher categories.

---

[26] In 1860 five men grew 312,000 lbs. in units of 50,000 or more. No one grew this amount in 1870.

[27] Joseph C. Robert, The Story of Tobacco in America (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), p. 116.

[28] Samuel T. Bitting, Rural Land Ownership Among Negroes in Virginia With Special Reference to Albemarle County (Phelps-Stokes Fellowship Papers, no. 2. University of Virginia, 1915), p. 18.

Again the increase was probably caused by a slide from higher categories and family food grown by sharecroppers.

Orchard Produce

Produce worth	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of orchards worth	% difference 1860-1870
$1 - 49	-30	$1 - 49	-30
$50 - 99	- 1	$50 - 99	-12
$100 - 499	-26	$100 - 499	-19
$ 500+	+55	$500+	+14
	+ 3		-22 overall

In 1870 only 155 men tended orchards, a drop from 213 in 1860. The 55 percent increase in the highest category was caused by one woman, Nancy Massie, whose orchard yielded $4,000, $2,700 more than it had in 1860 and $2,500 more than anyone else in 1870. With her produce deleted there would have been a gain of only $500 or eight percent in her category and an overall decrease of 13 percent. All together only eight people received amounts in excess of $500 for their fruit.

The union army destroyed both produce and livestock in its sweep through the county. In addition, with the county's central location among Valley, Northern Virginia and Peninsula battlefields, it is unlikely that Albemarle farmers successfully eluded the Confederate commissariat.

Every variety of livestock decreased dramatically over the decade, but the individual breakdowns reveal a few interesting variations.

Corn

Amount of corn grown in units of	% difference 1860-1870	Growers of corn in units of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 499 bu.	- 8	1 - 499 bu.	+30
500 - 999 bu.	-40	500 - 999 bu.	-37
1,000 - 4,999 bu.	-60	1,000 - 4,999 bu.	-51
5,000 + bu.	-42	5,000 bu	-60
	-47 overall		-12 overall

Wheat

Amount of wheat grown in units of	% difference 1860-1870	Growers of wheat in units of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 49 bu.	-41	1 - 49 bu.	-23
50 - 99 bu.	+11	50 - 99 bu.	+ 7
100 - 499 bu.	+13	100 - 499 bu.	+17
500 - 999 bu.	-19	500 - 999 bu.	-17
1000 + bu.	-47	1000 + bu.	-32
	-26 overall		- 3 overall

Slides from higher categories partially caused the percentage increases at the lower levels. The 30 percent increase in small corn growers probably meant that corn was a non-cash food crop grown by share croppers for their personal use. A return of men who had ridden the tobacco boom probably helped cause the increase in the middle categories of wheat producers and growers. With the county readjusting agriculturally and the market reduced, the less demanding cultivation of wheat must have attracted some. On the random sample, of the forty-nine active farmers in 1870 twenty-three increased wheat production and twenty decreased it. Seven increased tobacco and 14 decreased it. Thirteen of these farmers had property which increased in value between 1860 and 1870. Nine

of these agriculturally astute or lucky few increased their wheat crop and four decreased it. Ten decreased or grew no tobacco and three increased it.

The amount of rye grown was never very large. Over the decade the crop decreased by 64 percent and the growers by 58 percent.

The vegetable crops showed even greater decreases. Share cropping traditionally encouraged the raising of staple cash crops to the detriment of others. In Albemarle every category of peas and beans went down by at least 82 percent. Overall production of peas and beans dropped 97 percent and farmers 95 percent. Irish potato production went down by 26 to 70 percent in the individual categories with an overall 58 percent decrease in the crop and 52 percent decrease in growers. Only sweet potatoes registered an increase and it was at the lowest level.

Sweet Potatoes

Sweet Potatoes grown in units of	% difference 1860-1870	Men raising S.P. in units of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4 bu.	+39	1 - 4 bu.	+43
5 - 9 bu.	-40	5 - 9 bu.	-48
10 - 19 bu.	-53	10 - 19 bu.	-53
20 - 49 bu.	-80	20 - 49 bu.	-77
50 - 99 bu.	-91	50 - 99 bu.	-92
100 + bu.	can't calculate[29]	100 + bu.	can't calculate
	-78 overall		-64 overall

[29] In 1860, 182 men grew 2,170 bushels of sweet potatoes in units of 100 bushels or more. In 1870 no farmer grew that many.

Horses

Horses owned in groups of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of horses in groups of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4	-14	1 - 4	+ 3
5 - 9	-33	5 - 9	-32
10 - 19	-39	10 - 19	-45
20 +	-35	20+	-83
	-35 overall		-16 overall

Asses and Mules

A. & M. owned in groups of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of A. & M. in groups of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4	-44	1 - 4	=
5 - 9	-40	5 - 9	-35
10 - 19	-32	10 - 19	-25
20 +	can't calculate[30]	20 +	can't calculate
	-54		-11

Oxen

Owned owned in groups of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of oxen in groups of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4	-35	1 - 4	-32
5 - 9	-55	5 - 9	-44
10 - 19	-82	10 - 19	-83
20 +	can't calculate[31]	20 +	can't calculate
	-54		-40

All of these animals would have been in demand by the army, especially in the latter years of the war when the fall of the Mississippi River cut off the supply of cattle and

---

[30] In 1860 three men owned a total of 69 asses and mules in groups of 20 or more. None owned that many in 1870.

[31] In 1860 four men owned 103 oxen in groups of 20 or more. None owned that many in 1870.

mules from the Southwest. Any livestock of use to the Confederacy was a prime target for the Union invaders. Those that owned the most lost the most, through either patriotism or raids. The government may have been more reluctant to take from the small farmer and the raiders less zealous in chasing down livestock scattered through the backwoods when they could, for example, run off seventeen horses at once from Thomas Jefferson Randolph's farm.[32]

The number of horses in the county may have actually increased in the early war years. In 1862 the government raised money by selling condemned horses at public auction. The Lynchburg paper noted the purchase of 576 animals and voiced the hope that "the fine pasture lands in this vicinity will make these limping, lean beasts fat, sleek and young again."[33] Whether they recovered or not, the owners eventually lost them.

Milch Cows

Cows owned in groups of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of cows in groups of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4	- 2	1 - 4	- 9
5 - 0	-43	5 - 9	-66
10 - 19	-47	10 - 19	-45
20+	-63	20+	-54
	-32 overall		-34 overall

[32]Rawlings, "Sheridan's Raid," p. 14.

[33]"Letter from Charlottesville in the Lynchburg Daily Republican, April 25, 1862," Albemarle Historical Society, Papers, X (1949-1950), p. 29.

Butter

Butter produced in units of	% difference 1860-1870	Producers of butter in units of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 49 lbs.	-36	1 - 49 lbs.	-31
50 - 99 lbs.	-57	50 - 99 lbs.	-54
100 - 499 lbs.	-73	100 - 499 lbs.	-67
500 - 999 lbs.	-77	500 - 999 lbs.	-79
1000 + lbs.	can't calculate[34]	1000 + lbs.	can't calculate
	-76		-66

According to the census, butter production decreased twice as fast as milch cows in the county. Eight-hundred-six farmers owned milch cows but only 298 produced butter. Unfortunately these figures are not reliable. The census taker for Sam Miller district recorded almost no butter, perhaps because he treated it as he did milk, and recorded only the amount sold and not the total production.

Other Cattle

Cattle owned in groups of	& difference 1860-1870	Owners of cattle in groups of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4	+50	1 - 4	- 6
5 - 9	-21	5 - 9	-14
10 - 19	-29	10 - 19	-28
20 - 49	-53	20 - 49	-52
50 - 99	- 3	50 - 99	-15
100+	can't calculate[34]	100+	can't calculate
	-34		-17 overall

[34]In 1860 17 men produced 20,100 lbs of butter in units of 1000 lbs and more. No one produced that much in 1870.

[35]Six men owned 733 cattle in herds of 100+ in 1860. None had that number is 1870.

Swine

Swine in groups of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of swine in groups of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4	+94	1 - 4	+106
5 - 9	+71	5 - 9	+ 81
10 - 19	+33	10 - 19	+ 43
20 - 49	-53	20 - 49	- 45
50 - 99	-83	50 - 99	- 82
100+	can't calculate[36]	100+	can't calculate
	-59 overall		- 12

Sheep

Sheep in flocks of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of sheep in flocks of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 4	+39	1 - 4	+22
5 - 9	-19	5 - 9	-13
10 - 19	-40	10 - 19	-36
20 - 49	-59	20 - 49	-56
50 - 99	-75	50 - 99	-76
100 - 499	-71	100 +	-71
	-59 overall		-39 overall

Wool

Wool produced in units of	% difference 1860-1870	Producers of wool in units of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 49 lbs.	-38	1 - 49 lbs.	-34
50 - 99 lbs.	-68	50 - 99 lbs.	-68
100 - 499 lbs.	-68	100 - 499 lbs.	-69
500 + lbs.	- 8	500+ lbs.	-57
	-58 overall		-54 overall

The sole increase in cattle probably occurred when owners of larger herds short on ready cash sold off poorer or surplus stock.

---

[36] In 1860 47 men owned 5,784 swine in herds of 100+. None owned over 100 in 1870.

The decline in swine and sheep noted between 1850 and 1860 continued during the next decade. Even the most poverty-stricken kept a few pigs. Consequently ownership of swine decreased at a much slower rate than the swine population itself declined.

In 1865 Union soldiers under George Custer accidentally burned the Charlottesville Woolen Mills while destroying the adjacent railroad bridge. The Mills did not resume production until 1867.[37] From 1867 to 1871 raw wool brought extremely low prices.[38] With no well paying local outlet county farmers did not attempt to replenish depleted flocks and sold off poorer stock to small farm owners.

Oat, hay and grass seed production declined with the animal population.

	Overall % decrease in crop	Overall decrease in farmers
Oats	-12	- 8
Hay	-23	-31
Grass seed	-43	-82

Fewer animals required less fodder. In addition farmers with less acreage and labor shortages may have preferred to let stock forage for themselves and reserved their land for cash crops. Grass seed production declined the most

---

[37] Poindexter, Charlottesville Woolen Mills, pp. 42, 50.

[38] Ibid., pp. 69-70.

drastically. Scientific agriculture and its experiments in erosion control, rotating crops and enclosed pastures belonged to a more prosperous era.

Livestock Value

Livestock worth	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of livestock worth	% difference 1860-1870
$1 - 49	+286	$1 - 49	+276
$50 - 99	+ 10	$50 - 99	+ 18
$100 - 499	+ 17	$100 - 499	+ 21
$500 - 999	- 26	$500 - 999	- 25
$1,000 - 4,999	- 52	$1,000 - 4,999	- 52
$5,000 +	- 76	$5,000 +	- 79
	-42 overall		-13 overall

Value of Animals Slaughtered

Animals worth	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of animals worth	% difference 1860-1870
$1 - 49	+44	$1 - 49	+70
$50 - 99	-14	$50 - 99	=
$100 - 499	-52	$100 - 499	-39
$500 - 999	-73	$500 - 999	-72
$1,000 +	-57	$1,000 +	-63
	-57 overall		-32 overall

The same trends observed on previous pages are summarized here. Farmers who had the most livestock suffered the greatest losses and many slid down the scale a category or more. They undoubtedly found it more profitable to put their acreage into cash crops like wheat and tobacco. Herds required time and money before they returned a profit while farmers could sell wheat at the end of one season and tobacco in 18 months. Southwestern ranchers could raise livestock more cheaply and the expanding national railroad brought their animals to

market. County farmers must have raised and slaughtered for home consumption and no more.

The great decline noted in flax and home manufactures between 1850 and 1860 became almost total by 1870. Only two men still grew flax. Eight reported home manufactures worth a total of $606. Railroads and inexpensive Northern goods obliterated the production of both.

With decreases in every category of agricultural production the amount of improved and unimproved acreage declined as well.

Improved Acreage

Improved land in units of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of land in units of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 49 acres	+13	1 - 49 acres	+17
50 - 99 acres	-27	50 - 99 acres	-24
100 - 499 acres	-21	100 - 499 acres	-18
500 - 999 acres	-16	500 - 999 acres	-15
1,000+ acres	-41	1,000+ acres	-57
	-22 overall		-15 overall

Unimproved Acreage

Land in units of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of land in units of	% difference 1860-1870
1 - 49 acres	- 3	1 - 49 acres	=
50 - 99 acres	-20	50 - 99 acres	-10
100 - 499 acres	-20	100 - 499 acres	-21
500 - 999 acres	-24	500 - 999 acres	-23
1,000+ acres	-26	1,000+ acres	-38
	-21 overall		-15 overall

Cash Value Farms

Farms with a value of	% difference 1860-1870	Owners of farm with a value of	% difference 1860-1870
$1 - 499	+94	$1 - 499	+107
$500 - 999	+ 6	$500 - 999	+ 6
$1,000 - 4,999	-15	$1,000 - 4,999	- 12
$5,000 - 9,999	-26	$5,000 - 9,999	- 25
$10,000 - 49,999	-38	$10,000 - 49,999	- 36
$50,000 +	-53	$50,000 +	- 55
	-36		- 18 overall

In 1870 there were fewer farmers, less total acreage, fewer acres per farmer and each farm was worth less. Again the increase in the lowest category came from men whose holdings had shrunk rather than new men entering the farming class.

The agricultural prosperity enjoyed by county residents during the fifties was destroyed by the war. Men who had land lost some of it and no longer commanded the resources to till the remainder. Poverty of freed men and former planters forced both into the debilitating share cropping system that emphasized soil depleting tobacco year after year. The newly landed small farmer of 1860 fell back into tenantry and the laboring class. Tobacco, wheat and livestock raised for non-local consumption and profit had to compete with products raised less expensively elsewhere. Markets closed by the war were not readily recovered. In 1870 the county still had years of hard work ahead to recover the lost prosperity of the fifties.

Industry

	1860	1870
grist mills	32	30
saw mills	16	4
tanneries	5	3
material factories	2	4
foundries	1	1
machine shops	2	
tobacco factory	1	1
mattress factory	1	
blacksmiths		12
wheelwrights		7
carriage makers		1
cabinet makers		3
saddlers		2
shoemakers	4	8
carpenters		5
coopers	1	2
tailors		2
tinner		1
brickmaker		1
marble yard		1
gunsmith		1
bakers		2
wheat fan factory		1
distilleries		3[38]

	1860	1860 selected	1870	1870 selected
capital	$249,140	$235,640	$222,925	$192,450
product value	514,900	490,905	344,082	337,105
men	216	179	227	100
wages, monthly	3,666	2,869		
women	25	22	13	10
	181	136		
children			16[39]	8

[38]The 1870 Peyton map marked at least 12 distilleries.

[39]The 1870 industrial schedule was the first to have a column for children. It is impossible to tell if they had always been employed, or if their use was a new phenomenon since the war. Eight of them worked for skilled craftsmen and may have actually been apprentices.

In 1870 about thirteen of the mills were owned by their operators or another family member. Three of the tanners owned their own establishments and two millers.

The population schedule listed 118 owners and employees in the selected industries. Seventeen of them had the same occupation in 1860. Only six of four millers and two tanners were still around since 1850.[40] Twenty-six of the men were too young to have been recorded in 1860, and seventeen had worked at something else. In this group were five former laborers, four farmers, four overseers, one machinist, one carpenter, one postmaster, and one collector. A little less than half, fifty-eight were new older men, two of whom were German immigrants. Again it appears that these jobs drew some of the less fortunate white men in and out of the county, a conclusion reinforced by the halving of women employed.

In 1860 half the wage earners must have been hired slaves. The 1870 population schedule provided the names of enough white men to fill all the wage earning positions in the selected industries. It listed one Negro as a miller. Though the number of wage earners on the industrial census fell the number of white men employed rose. In industry as in agriculture, the black men lost out as the poorer whites in the county

---

[40]The tanners were the Luptons, father and son. The father, Jacob Colvin Lupton, had been in business in Charlottesville since 1813. (Lupton family papers, University of Virginia Manuscripts collection #6714-a).

pushed into jobs formerly occupied by skilled slaves. Unless they found employment for their skills elsewhere after the war, these ex-slaves, in turn, fell back into the vast laboring and share cropping class.

Overall selected capital invested decreased by 10 percent and product value declined 31 percent. Most factor and mill owners still had their 1860 buildings and apparatus intact but they had been able to invest little more. Some of their profits between 1850 and 1860 must have gone into the war effort. In August 1861 the Richmond Examiner reported that the county had already spent between $75,000 and $100,000 to equip twenty-four companies.[41] If this early patriotism continued, many of the county's assets were into Confederate money and bonds. In 1870 only three grist mills and one tanning firm were in year round operation. Thirteen of the forty-one craftsmen employed year round help. Such sporadic and seasonal operation not only cut down on total product value but left many men unemployed for several months of the year.

On the whole industry in Albemarle was buffeted, but certainly not destroyed, by the war and the economic dislocations which followed.

---

[41] Richmond Examiner, August 27, 1861 as cited in Chalmers L. Gemmill, "The Charlottesville General Hospital, 1861-1865," Magazine of Albemarle County History, XXII (1963-1964), p. 98.

V

ASSESSMENT

The majority of Albemarle residents enjoyed prosperity in the fifties and suffered reverses in the 1860's although by 1870 many were worth slightly more than they had been in 1850. Altogether 420 people can be definitely traced through the two decades. Eighty four of them were collected into a random sample. On this sample, twenty-five men represented the 125 people whose property increased steadily in value. Twenty-nine were randomly selected from the 155 who gained in the first decade and lost in the second though they were still worth more in 1870 than in 1850. Seventeen men were chosen from the eighty-eight who followed the same pattern of rise and decline but fell below their 1850 level. Seven people represented the thirty-four who lost steadily through the two decades. Two smaller groups of eleven and seven lost and then gained, the first not up to their 1850 holdings and the second beyond them. Two people a piece appear for them. The land, slave and industrial holdings, family connections, and agricultural practices for these sample people were recorded. The county will and deed books were searched for any other information about their property and financial status.

Only nine of the twenty-five men who increased their holdings through the two decades were farmers. There were six merchants, four professionals (one minister, one druggist, one physician, one lawyer), and six skilled craftsmen (two bricklayers, one slater, two carpenters). The latter gained the least, generally increasing from $0 to $1,000 or $2,000 worth of property. Three non-farmers and all but one of the farmers in the group took advantage of the tobacco boom. Not one of these men grew tobacco in 1850; eleven did in 1860. In 1870 eight men still grew tobacco including three new farmers who had been in other occupations in 1850. The pull of farming as a prestige occupation remained strong. A merchant, a brick layer and the lawyer owned farms and called themselves farmers in 1870. In addition to them, a carpenter, a bricklayer, and a merchant owned productive farms but continued in their old professions.

Most importantly, five of the men engaged in land speculation, buying and selling city lots. Only one man making more than $10,000 over the two decades was not a member of this group. Although these men proved the most successful, others regarded their dealings with suspicion. The father-in-law of Benjamin C. Flanagan made a bequest to his daughter alone, with special provisions insuring that his son-in-law could not touch it, because he was engaged in "speculation and business of hazard."[1] Flanagan was one of the richest men in the

---

[1]Walker Timberlake, Will. Albemarle County Will Book, XXVII, p. 296.

county; owner of a $50,000 farm, a grist mill and a cotton factory. In 1852 he encorporated the Charlottesville Building Association and in 1867 he formed the Charlottesville Milling and Manufacturing Corporation, a multi-product business that produced flour, plaster, wine, liquor and tanned hides. In addition he was president of a local bank and speculated heavily in city lots.

Finally, it might be worth noting that the average age of these men in 1850 was 34 1/2 making them the youngest of the four major groups. Their relative youth may have been a factor in adapting to and taking advantage of changing times.

The largest group consisted of those men who gained property and lost it again but did not fall below their 1850 level. Occupationally they divided into twenty-one farmers, three merchants, two professionals and one mechanic. The farmers followed the tobacco boom. In 1850 nine farmers and one physician planted tobacco. In 1860 twenty farmers planted tobacco and three did not. In 1870 fifteen were still planting. Nineteen of them grew wheat in 1850. Twenty did in 1860 with exactly half growing more than before and half growing less. In 1870 twenty-one grew wheat, thirteen of them in greater quantities than in 1860.

Between 1850 and 1860 52 percent of these men increased their acreage and 38 percent increased their slaves. Of the twenty-five gainers discussed previously only 24 percent increased their farm lands and 36 percent increased slaves.

The new acreage probably left many in the second group "land poor" after the war and forced them into share cropping, a possible reason why so many continued to invest heavily in tobacco.

With one exception these men stuck strictly to farming or their profession. John C. Patterson, a dry goods merchant, engaged in land speculation on a scale comparable to those in the first group. He bought and sold lots in Charlottesville and acreage in the county. In 1859 he bought a tannery at auction. Patterson had "extensive financial contacts in the north."[2] H.C. Marchant, owner of the destroyed Woolen Mills sought his aid in 1867 and the two journeyed north to seek new financing for the factory. With Patterson's aid Marchant obtained the necessary funds. When the mill began production Patterson and his partner were sole selling agents.[3] Though his business must have suffered in the disruptive war and reconstruction years, he appeared to be on the road to recouping his losses by 1870.

The men in the group who profited and then lost to below their starting point break down into three categories: retired, bankrupt, and tenants.

Five men appeared on the 1870 census as retired farmers. Three more were over seventy by 1870 and were probably

---

[2]Poindexter, p. 48. His source for this appears to be an interview with a descendant of Marchant.

[3]Ibid.

retired. A sixty-three year old farmer had sold most of his land to relatives. Many of them appeared in the deed books as having granted their land to sons or sons-in-law in return for support for themselves and wives for the remainder of their lives.

James W. Mason and his partner John O. Lewis [not in this group] were successful Scottsville merchants and land speculators for a time. Unfortunately Lewis used all his profits and borrowed more capital in 1860 to purchase an Alabama plantation which he lost during the war. The firm of Mason and Lewis struggled on, selling land when they could to satisfy creditors but finally went bankrupt in the spring of 1869.[4] James Beale [also of this group] a Scottsville speculator and business associate of Mason and Lewis apparently went down with them. Among Mason's property holdings in 1860 was a flour and corn mill. In 1870 the former merchant appeared as a miller and Beale worked on the railroad.

The remaining six consisted of four farmers, one shoemaker, and one carpenter in 1850 who became a farmer by 1860. James Baber with $1,000 in property was the wealthiest of the group in 1850. Another had $600 and the rest had nothing. In the good years all bought a little land ranging from a couple of acres for the shoemaker to small farms. In 1860 the shoemaker had $100 worth of property and the others between

---

[4]Albemarle County Deed Book, LXIV, pp. 228-229.

$1,000 and $2,100. By 1870 all of them had lost everything. Though the five farmers insisted on calling themselves such, none appeared on the agriculture schedule for 1870. They had undoubtedly failed on their land payments somewhere in the decade, or met with some disaster causing a financial reverse, lost their land and fell back into the tenant-laborer class.

Seven men on the sample lost property steadily. One was the John O. Lewis mentioned above. In his case, the first loss was caused by a transferral of property to Alabama and the second by bankruptcy. Three more were small farmers with a few acres which they had lost by 1870. The remaining three were extremely wealthy men in 1850 who lost thousands of dollars worth of property over the two decades but still had considerable fortunes in 1870. Rev. John T. Randolph's property loss came when he sold his farm. His personal property remained a constant $30,000. Randolph was a partner of Benjamin Flannagan and was involved with him in the selling of city lots during and after the war, and the rebuilding of Charlottesville Woolen Mills. In his case the drop in personal property probably represented a reallocation of resources rather than a total loss.

Thomas Jefferson Randolph sold his farm Shadwell to his son in 1869 and his real property showed a drop in the census the following year. William D. Hart was a director of the Orange and Alexandria Railroad and may have put large sums into rebuilding. T.J. Randolph and Hart also registered

drastic declines in personal estate. Hart's estate dropped from $35,125 to $1,175 and Randolph's from $88,200 to $6,000. Both of them must have put huge sums into the war effort or reconstruction since both had enough initial resources to absorb losses from personal war destruction and agricultural disruption.

The remaining two classes are so small that their occupants may all be exceptions rather than parts of county trends. Edwin Bates and Zach Broch were typical of eleven people who had more property in 1850 and 1870 than in 1860, but their 1870 holdings did not come up to their 1850 possessions. The schedules on which Bates appeared gave different pictures of his wealth. He lost all but one of his twelve slaves before the war. The agricultural schedule reported his farm as doubling in value between 1850 and 1860, chiefly from tobacco, though his actual acreage decreased. Bates was not a prominent man, nor from a well-known family. He was not mentioned in will or deed books. Without further information the reasons for his contradictory gains and losses remain hidden.

Zach Broch, a freedman, owned $400 in property in 1850, none in 1860 and $88 in 1870. Broch was involved in a suit in the early 1860s over acreage he had purchased years before but for which he had never received title. Broch took the first owner to court and won but the man died before giving Broch the deed. This first owner had bequeathed all his

property to his children, one of whom purchased his siblings' shares and then died. Broch went to court again and the second owner's executor finally conveyed the deed to him for court costs in 1863.[5]

Septimia Barnett and Tyree Dellings [also Dollins] represented the seven people whose property decreased in 1860 and then climbed to or beyond the 1850 mark by 1870. Barnett was mentioned earlier as the free mulatto whose race was officially changed to white by court order. In 1860 she owned three slaves, women aged twenty-seven, nine, and two. In 1850 she had owned none. She may have sold some of her property in the 1850s to purchase these women, probably some members of her family. By 1870 she owned $10,000 worth of property. The census taker never listed an occupation for her. She did not own a farm but lived in Charlottesville and bought and sold a few lots. In 1869 she purchased 800 acres in the county which brought her property value up to $10,000.

Dellings was a fairly prosperous miller who purchased farm acreage and an additional mill in the 1850s. Since the land was mortgaged[6] the census taker may have chosen not to include it in the total valuation of Delling's property in 1860. Dellings listed himself as a farmer in 1860 and 1870 though he appeared on the 1860 agricultural schedule only. He never appeared on the industrial schedules though he is listed

---

[5]Albemarle County Deed Book, LXI, p. 139.

[6]Ibid., LXIII, pp. 434-436.

in two different deed books as a mill owner.[7]

People engaged solely in farming generally profited from the tobacco boom and increased their property in the 1860s. If they were fairly prosperous to begin with and had some capital to invest they came out ahead after war losses and agricultural disruptions. Penniless farmers profited in the 1850s but were heavily mortgaged and lost their meagre gains in the next decade. Only professionals and skilled craftsmen rose from nothing and maintained their new wealth. Land speculators and business entrepreneurs accumulated the largest fortunes but not all engaged in such risky ventures succeeded. Fortune and continued success in the county blessed only those with an initial advantage in family, land, or profession.

---

[7] Ibid., and XLVIII, p. 121.

IV

APPENDIX

The following terms were arbitrarily assigned to end a confusion of definition in discussing the Albemarle County census.

Ownership refers to the entire number of slaves owned by an individual, including those slaves who worked for someone else.

Renting refers to those slaves who were owned by one master but who worked for another person at the master's discretion.

Hiring refers to slaves who worked for an individual who did not own them.

It is assumed that the census taker did not list slaves twice. Hired slaves appeared under the name of the hirer with the renter's name listed as cross reference. The number of slaves listed after each master's name, then, was only the number who worked directly for him, and not his total ownership.

The census taker began his cross-referencing to owners on page 18 of a 170 page schedule. The first pages contained names of hirers only. Total numbers of slaves hired and slaves rented do not match. There are 1,197 hired slaves and 1,019 rented slaves listed.

This 18-page lack was not the only cause of discrepancy, however. If an owner hired slaves to supplement his own crew, the hired slaves and their renter's name appeared underneath the hirer's name. The census taker was not always precise in indicating how many were owned and how many were hired.

The cross-referencing was sketchy. The renter of a hired slave was often designated by surname and initials: Miss Michie, J.O. Carr, Dr. Randolph. It was frequently difficult to match renters and owners. Dr. Randolph the renter was most certainly Dr. Benjamin Franklin Randolph the owner. But was Miss Michie the renter, owner Sarah or Abigail Michie, and did J.O. Carr stand for James or John Carr?

Finally, there was no hindrance on hiring out of the county. Slaves rented by Albemarle men to men from another county did not appear on the census. Conversely, many of the hired slaves probably did not have Albemarle County owners. This explains the number of men listed as renters but not owners.

Because of the cross-referencing done by the census taker it was possible to combine ownership and renting figures to obtain total ownership. These total ownership figures were used in the compilation of all statistics. It was felt that total ownership, with its acknowledged discrepanices, was still closer to the actual number of slaves in Albemarle than simple ownership with the inaccurate renting figures omitted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

Albemarle County, Va. Court Minute Book, XVII (1859-1862). Deposit in Albemarle County, Va. Court House, Charlottesville, Va.

Albemarle County, Va. Deed Books, XLVIII - LX (1850-1865). Microfilm Deposit, Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va.

Albemarle County, Va. Deed Books LXI - LXVI (1865-1871). Deposit in Albemarle County, Va. Court House, Charlottesville, Va.

Albemarle County, Va. Will Books XIX - XXVII (1848-1867). Microfilm Deposit, Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va.

Albemarle County, Va. Will Book XXVIII (1867-1874). Deposit in Albemarle County, Va. Court House, Charlottesville, Va.

Cocke, John Hartwell. Papers. University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #8561-a.

Cocke family-Bremo Recess. Papers. University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #9513.

Lupton family. Papers. University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #6714-a.

Mosby, John S. Papers. University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #9836.

Shepherd family. Papers. University of Virginia Manuscript Collection #4241.

U.S. Census. Albemarle County, Va. Agricultural Schedules, 1850-1870. Microfilm Deposit, Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va.

U.S. Census. Albemarle County, Va. Industrial Schedules, 1850-1870. Microfilm Deposit, Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va.

U.S. Census. Albemarle County, Va. Population Schedules, 1850-1870. Microfilm Deposit, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Va.

U.S. Census. Albemarle County, Va. Slave Schedules, 1850-1860. Microfilm Deposit, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Va.

Newspaper

The Southern Planter, X, XI, XII, XIII, XX, XXI, New Series I. Richmond, Va.: 1850-1853, 1860-1861, 1867.

Unpublished Works

Jones, Newton Bond. "Charlottesville and Albemarle County, Virginia, 1819-1860." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1950.

Poindexter, Harry Edward. "A History of the Charlottesville Woolen Mills 1820-1939," Unpublished master's thesis, University of Virginia, 1955.

Books

Bancroft, Frederick. Slave Trading in the Old South. Baltimore: J.H. Furst Co., 1931.

Bitting, Samuel T. Rural Land Ownership Among Negroes of Virginia With Special Reference to Albemarle County. University: helps-Stokes Fellowship Papers. No. 2, 1915.

Brown, W.H. The Education and Economic Development of the Negro in Virginia. University of Virginia: Phelps-Stokes Fellowship Papers. No. 6, 1923.

Donovan, Frank. The Thomas Jefferson Papers. Reprint Edition. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1963.

Gray, Lewis Cecil. History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860. Vol. II. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institute, 1933.

Rawlings, Mary. The Albemarle of Other Days. Charlottesville: The Michie Co., 1925.

Rawlings, Mary, (ed.) Early Charlottesville, Recollections of James Alexander, 1828-1874. Charlottesville: Albemarle County Historical Society, 1942.

Robert, Joseph Clark. The Story of Tobacco in America. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

Robert, Joseph Clark. The Tobacco Kingdom: Plantation, Market, and Factory in Virginia and North Carolina, 1800-1860. Durham, N.C., 1938.

Stampp. Kenneth M. The Peculiar Institution, Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South. "Vintage Books," New York: Random House, 1956.

Wade, Richard C. Slavery in the Cities of the South, 1820-1860. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Woods, Edgar. Albemarle County in Virginia. Bridgewater, Va.: The Green Bookman, 1933.

Articles

Brown, John R. "The Battle of Rio Hill Feb. 29, 1864." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XXII (1963-1964), pp. [23]-33.

Brown, John R. "Sheridan's Occupation of Charlottesville March 3rd to 6th 1865." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XXII (1963-1964), pp. [37]-44.

Bruce, Kathleen. "Virginia Agricultural Decline to 1860: A Fallacy." Agricultural History, VI (January, 1932), pp. 3-13.

Chamberlain, Bernard. "Samuel Miller, 1792-1869: Albemarle Philanthropist." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XXVII & XXVIII (1968-1969) & (1970-1971), pp. [119]-127.

Clark, Margaret W. Fowler. "The Surrender of Charlottesville." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XVII (1958-1959), pp. [67]-73.

Craven, Avery O. "The Agricultural Reformers of the Ante-Bellum South." American Historical Review, XXXIII (January, 1928), pp. 302-314.

Gaines, William H. "Thomas Mann Randolph, Piedmont Plowman." Albemarle County Historical Society Papers, XI (1950-1951), pp. [37]-43.

Gemmill, Chalmers L. "The Charlottesville General Hospital, 1861-1865." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XXII (1963-1964), pp. [91]-160.

Hench, Atcheson L. "The Name Albemarle Pippin." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XIV (1954-1955), pp. [21]-25.

"Letter from Charlottesville in Lynchburg Daily Republican April 25, 1862." Albemarle County Historical Society Papers, X (1949-1950), pp. 28-30.

Moore, John H. (ed.). "A Hometown Boy Looks at Charlottesville, a Letter of Benjamin F. Harlow." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XVIII (1959-1960), pp. [33]-37.

Rawlings, Mary (ed.). "Sheridan's Raid Through Albemarle from a letter written by E.R. Watson to his daughter Mrs. J. Henry Smith." Magazine of Albemarle County History XIV (1954-1955), pp. [9]-15.

Turner, Charles W. "The Virginia Central at War, 1861-1865." The Journal of Southern History, XII, no. 4 (Nov. 1946), pp. 510-533.

Vance, Joseph C. "Race Relations in Charlottesville During Reconstruction." Magazine of Albemarle County History, XIII (1953), pp. [28]-44.

Wertenbaker, Charles. "Records of the Monticello Guards from the surrender of Gen. R.E. Lee at Appomatox C.H. April 9th 1865 to the present time [1871]." Albemarle County Historical Society Papers, I (1940-1941), pp. [31]-34.