

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, A White Heiress Elopes with a Negro, January 19, 1859
[Citation: Key = E058]

Summary

Race mixing was an ever present fear in the minds of the Valley Spirit Democrats. "A more complete retribution for the crime of fanaticism we never heard of," the editors proclaimed on the elopement of a white woman with a black man.

Excerpt

"The partner of her flight was a black man, who has been in the employment of her father for some time in the capacity of farm hand. the first intimation that the father had of the intention of the parties was conveyed by the fact of their flight. They immediately crossed over to Windsor, upon reaching the city, fully sensible that they could not accomplish their unnatural designs on this side, as no official or clergyman could have been found who would have so far transgressed the bounds of decency as to unite the couple."

"The emotions of a brother at such a sight can better be imagined than described. Some men would have blotted out their disgrace with a single blow, but he had been taught that it was no sin against God or man that his young sister should repose in the embrace of a negro."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/jan59.html#1.19a>

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, A Row, February 16, 1859 [Citation: Key = E059]

Summary

Racial flare-ups in Franklin County could turn on any perceived affront to a white person. This small notice in the Democratic paper emphasizes the racial conflict in an incident.

Excerpt

"Considerable of a muss was kicked up on the Diamond 'all of a sudden' on Monday night, by a negro boy hitting a white man with a stone, and breaking a glass in the large bulk window of Shryock & Co's Book Store."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/feb59.html#2.16b>

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, How Our Negroes Live, March 30, 1859 [Citation: Key = E057]

Summary

Democratic editors considered black residents of Franklin to be hopeless citizens. The editors reported to their readers on a tour through the black section of town and focused exclusively on drunkenness and crime, as well as filthy living conditions.

Excerpt

"Some twelve years ago we indited [sic] the following description of how our negroes then lived. It would appear by the columns of one of our local contemporaries that their morals and their manner of living have not much improved since that day. So long as miserable huts of the character we have described are erected, 'filthy, theiving, whisky drinking negroes' will seek our community to inhabit them. If there were no such 'local habitations' provided for them they would take up their abode in other quarters and this neighborhood would get rid of their troublesome presence. Strike at the root of the crib!"

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/march59.html#3.30a>

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, A Good Idea, April 20, 1859 [Citation: Key = E055]

Summary

Democratic editors disdained local blacks and presented them regularly as criminals, unfit for free society and law. They want a special session of the court to deal only with black defendants.

Excerpt

"This will afford them time to gather together as many cases as will occupy the Court and time; and also to crowd our petty Court House with a crowd of drunken, worthless darkies, who can ornament the building by poking their heads out of the windows, standing around in every hole and corner, and squirting tobacco juice on the passers by."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/april59.html#4.20d>

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Crop Production, 1859, July 13, 1859 [Citation: Key = E036]

Summary

The Democratic paper called Franklin an excellent place for the production of agricultural products. The paper championed both wheat and corn production in the county.

Excerpt

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/july59.html#7.13b>

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Save the Union, January 25, 1860 [Citation: Key = E072]

Summary

The proslavery argument is invoked in this reprint from the Catholic Mirror to describe slavery not only as a humane system of labor but as a form of social welfare as well. The Northern Democratic editors consider slavery a positive good, stressing that the issue is not political.

Excerpt

"The South does not ask of the North to approve of slavery, does not even ask any of her own denizens to approve of it. Every man who has traveled through the South has heard the free expression of southern sentiment in regard to slavery. It is generally spoken of as an inherited evil, not a crime, however, that must be borne until such time as the people concerned can manage without violence, or shock, to rid themselves of it."

"It is madness, or worse than madness, for outsiders to attempt to put down the institution of slavery in the Southern States."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.01.25.01.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Food for Mercantile Digestion, February 1, 1860
[Citation: Key = E073]

Summary

This article makes an economic argument for maintaining slavery that directly links the profits enjoyed by Northerners to the South's system of labor. Voting Republican, therefore, the editors suggest, is a symbolic slap in the face of the very system that enables Northern businesses to thrive.

Excerpt

"Pittsburgh, we say, puts herself upon a sectional platform, sides with an exclusively sectional, geographical party for the sole purpose of opposing slavery. Yet Pittsburgh is in part supported by slavery, as the numerous plows, chains, bells, pumps, engines, and coal, which she sends down to New Orleans to be bought by slaveholders, and paid for by the money which slaveholders make by slave labor, and which in goodly quantities are now in New Orleans and Louisiana and other parts of the South, most conclusively prove."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.02.01.01.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Court Week, April 20, 1859 [Citation: Key = E056]

Summary

Democratic editors regularly lampooned "Toad Island," the section of Chambersburg where many black citizens lived.

Excerpt

"We think it would not be difficult to make out as strong a complaint against it as against 'Toad Island.' the negroes of that 'nuisance,' and other similar localities about town, regularly take possession of our Court House each session to have their drunken fights fought over again and fixed up according to law! How ridiculous."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/april59.html#4.20b>

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, White Slavery in England, April 18, 1860 [Citation: Key = E074]

Summary

The article tacitly acknowledges that slavery, as a system of labor, is unfair, yet, Northern Democratic editors contend that the American form of bondage is not as bad as that in England where white workers, they argue, are forced to endure even worse conditions than in the South.

Excerpt

"Here are facts which should admonish the professed humanitarians of England to look to their own deplorable system of slavery, and not meddle with our more humane institutions. No slavery in our Southern States equals the cruel servitude imposed by them upon their weak, helpless and distressed white laborers."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.04.18.04.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Jefferson and the Black Republicans, May 9, 1860
[Citation: Key = E075]

Summary

This editorial railed against the idea that the Republican party was the proper inheritor of Thomas Jefferson's Republican-Democratic party's principles. The Democratic editors could hardly believe such assertions and defended Jefferson as a slaveholder who fought against sectionalized parties and resisted the Missouri Compromise. Jefferson, they argued, put no limitations on the growth of slavery. The editors asserted that Jefferson's "firebell in the night" was not slavery itself but sectionalized parties.

Excerpt

"While Jefferson was thus a deadly opponent to just such slavery agitation as Doolittle is engaged in, it is as much a fact as it is that he wrote the Declaration of Independence, that he was in favor of allowing slavery to diffuse itself over any territory where the people desired it."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.05.09.04.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, The Folly of Dividing the Democratic Party about Abstractions, May 16, 1860 [Citation: Key = E077]

Summary

The article, reprinted from the Harrisburg Patriot and Union, steered clear of pronouncements upon the merits or morality of slavery; instead, it focused on the politicization of slavery. The editors suggested slavery was a divisive issue only because it is dealt with as an abstraction, not as a reality. Democratic editors contended that parties and politicians need not address such abstractions. In fact, the editors asserted, it was an issue that can and must be avoided for the health of the party.

Excerpt

"We should not be asked to sacrifice the Northern Democracy in defense of an abstraction--an abstraction so pure that the Southern advocates of Congressional protection to slavery cannot point to the Territory where they would have this protection applied."

"They [white Southerners] have the right to hold also that slavery is the best condition of the negro--that it conduces to his happiness, humanization, and elevation--that it transforms him from a barbarian into one of the elements of civilized society; but they have no right to compel every man at the North who is ready to fight for the maintenance of Southern rights under the Constitution, to think precisely as they do upon these points, which are in no way essential to a proper respect and reverence for the compromises of the Constitution."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.05.16.01.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Slave Labor in Charleston [sic], May 16, 1860 [Citation: Key = E076]

Summary

According to the editor of the Rome (New York) Sentinel, slavery in Charleston was humane, efficient, modern, and progressive. The editor suggested that the slave is in many ways in a better position than the free wage laborers in the North.

Excerpt

"I am more fully confirmed in previous belief, that the free States fail entirely to understand the system, as well as the views and feelings of the slave owners, but more particularly of the slaves themselves. . . The system of slavery is looked upon here, both by the owners and the slaves themselves, as we at the North do of any business transactions: it is like the apprentice system of the North, where the master does not consider he is committing a crime to take an indentured apprentice for a term of years--say from the time he is ten until he is twenty-one, nor does the bound apprentice consider he is disgraced or demeaned because he is thus bound out."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.05.16.01.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, The Slavery Question in Congress, July 25, 1860
[Citation: Key = E078]

Summary

The article depicted slavery as a contentious political topic that was being pushed to the fore by Republicans, not Democrats. Republican abolitionists, the editors claimed, seek to destroy not only the system of labor in the South but also its racial hierarchy.

Excerpt

"Every true friend of our country must deprecate the agitation of the slavery question."

"It is high time that there be a stop put to this slavery agitation--The welfare of the country suffers by it, whilst our people are made the laughingstock amongst foreign powers."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.07.25.04.pdf

**Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Slavery in the Territories--The Democratic Doctrine,
October 3, 1860 [Citation: Key = E079]**

Summary

The Northern Democratic paper took the position that slavery was protected in the territories under the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision and that slaves were merely property, completely protected under the Constitution.

Excerpt

"The Douglas men continually misrepresent the Breckinridge platform by asserting that it calls for Congressional protection to Slavery. It does no such thing. . . It pledges its protection to constitutional rights, no matter what those rights may be, and there is not a single line in the platform to which Douglas men dare enter his disclaimer."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.10.03.01.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, The Course Lincoln Will Pursue, October 10, 1860
[Citation: Key = E080]

Summary

The article excerpted from the New York Herald a description of Lincoln's objectives. It argued that the Republicans, led by Lincoln, will pursue a war against the South if they are elected. The Democratic editors had little doubt that Republicans will use the slavery question to polarize public opinion. If the Republicans stopped their agitation, they argued, the issue would fall from the spotlight and work itself out.

Excerpt

"The first step will be the appointment to every post of executive or administrative power within the gift of the President, of men who believe that slavery is an evil and a sin; that it is their moral and social, as well as political duty, to make war upon it in every way."

"With men holding these views as judges and officers of the federal courts, as postmasters and collectors of customs, as district attorneys and marshals of the United States, there will commence an agitation of the slavery question such as the world never witnessed."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.10.10.01.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, The True Doctrine, October 24, 1860 [Citation: Key = E081]

Summary

The article set out the opposition to Lincoln on the issue of slavery and abolitionism and was addressed to those who are "leaning toward Lincolnism." Excerpted from a speech by James W. Gerard of New York, the editors agreed that they oppose Lincoln because he maintained that the South and North are incompatible.

Excerpt

"It is vain for the respectable and conservative portion of that party to assert that their policy is to prevent the spread of slavery into the Territories now free; that may be their view, and they may sincerely think so, but that is not the limit to the policy of their leaders, (whose dupes they are) if their own acts and speeches are to be credited. The secret circulation of Helper's book in the Southern States was not necessary to keep slavery out of the Territories; a conflict between the free labor of the North and the slavery labor of the South, which they say must be so severe, (irrepressible) that one party or the other must yield, is not necessary to prevent slavery being extended to the Territories."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.10.24.02.pdf

Newspaper: Chambersburg Valley Spirit, Black Republicanism is Nullification, October 31, 1860
[Citation: Key = E082]

Summary

The article, reprinted from the Pennsylvanian, argued that the Republicans not only intend to free the slaves, but were also intent on giving the former bondsmen the vote. The Democratic editors contended that "Black Republicanism" proposed to overthrow the government of "our fathers." They considered it "worse than secession--it is nullification" because Republicans want to overthrow by political means the Supreme Court's decision in Dred Scott.

Excerpt

"They [Republicans] propose negro suffrage and the adoption of measures that will lead to the 'extinction of slavery.' The framers of our Constitutions provided for the delivery to the owner of all fugitive slaves. The Black Republicans declare that fugitive slaves shall not be delivered up."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/vs1860/pa.fr.vs.1860.10.31.04.pdf

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, The Bark James W. Page, September 14, 1859 [Citation: Key = E054]

Summary

Republicans wanted to believe that colonization to Liberia was a viable solution to problem of slavery, a solution that would avoid the presence of blacks in the North.

Excerpt

"The liberated Africans from the slaver Echo are doing well in Monrovia. Many are distributed among private families, and learn fast the habits and customs of civilized life. The intelligent colored people that have emigrated from the United States to Liberia speak in the highest terms of the latter country."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frsept59.html#9.14e>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, A Native African, February 22, 1860 [Citation: Key = E053]

Summary

When an African who spoke little English arrived in Baltimore, the Repository editor picked up the report from the Baltimore Sun. Republican editors published accounts of the potential enslavement of free Africans and hinted at the reopening of the slave trade.

Excerpt

"Having reached the age of twenty years, Pabla, as the man calls himself, obeyed the custom of his land and took five wives, with all of whom he says he lived happily. . . An idea has lately haunted him that some of his own color wanted to sell him as a slave, and having been born a free man, he became terribly excited by fear."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frfeb60.html#2.22d>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Slavery in Nebraska , February 1, 1860 [Citation: Key = E083]

Summary

The tone of this article towards slavery was clearly negative, yet it was not shrill. It argued that slavery had been imposed upon people who did not want it, and that the controversy would disappear if Democrats did not agitate the issue. Democratic aggressiveness in promoting slavery, the Repository editors contended, was proof of their desire to "aggravate the political disorders to the utmost."

Excerpt

"Mr. Buchanan and the Administration sought by the most outrages [sic] measures, to establish Slavery in Kansas in the face of a popular majority of 10,000 against it. He stood by the Lecompton Constitution to the last, and stands by it now."

"The Administration backs the Slave Power not only in those of its aggressions which promise favorable results, but yields to its malignant dictates where apparently it only seeks to humiliate those who oppose its universal sway."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frfeb60.html#2.1a>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Is Poverty a Crime, April 11, 1860 [Citation: Key = E085]

Summary

Slavery was described in highly negative terms as a system of labor that impoverished and degraded white laborers, reducing them to the level of bondsmen, even if they were not actually enslaved. When U.S. Senator Louis Wigfall of Texas stated that "poverty is a crime" on the floor of the Senate, Republican editors excoriated the statement. They suggested that the slave South makes no room for poor men and reduced them to a state of abject slavery. They warned that Northern men, especially poor men, must resist "the manacles of a slavery extending party."

Excerpt

"It is high time for poor men in the North, who have heretofore assisted in fastening upon their limbs the manacles of a slavery extending party, to pause, before it is forever too late. Now they possess the power of saying to slavery--their natural foe--remain within your present limits; extend no further; thus far shalt thou go, but no farther; and here shall thy proud tyranny be stayed; but hereafter--if the aggressions of slavery are not arrested--the free men of the North, the bone and sinew of the land may be unable to assert their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The 'poor white' of the South are now in a condition of helplessness in every respect as degrading as that of slavery itself. How long would Northern 'poor men' enjoy any greater liberty of slavery becomes--as locofocos desire it shall--national, and freedom becomes sectional?"

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frapril60.html#4.11a>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Strike for Freedom, May 5, 1860 [Citation: Key = E183]

Summary

Republicans made clear that they planned to move the party into the South and to bring its opposition to slavery with it.

Excerpt

"The election of a Republican President would be the signal for the uprising of Republicanism in the South. The masses, who have been so long down-trodden by the Slave Oligarchy, would arise in their might and emancipate themselves from a bondage that is even worse than slavery of the body--the loss of their birth-right as American citizens."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu:8090/xslt/servlet/ramanujan.XSLTServlet?xml=/vcdh/xml_docs/valley_news/ne

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Equal Rights in the Territories, July 18, 1860 [Citation: Key = E086]

Summary

Republican editors scorned the Democratic (Douglas) view that slavery can only work and thrive in southern climes and that it will remain only where it is profitable--not in the "temperate mainly grain growing region." To the opponents of slavery these supposed limitations seemed dubious. Slavery's movement into Missouri and Kansas flew in the face of this logic, and the editors argued here not that it was morally wrong to own slaves, but that slavery deprived working people of the fruits of labor and rewarded those who did nothing but own slaves. In this sense, they argued, slavery perverted the natural process of reward for work and of the rights to the pursuits of happiness.

Excerpt

"The Douglas Democratic idea is that of the Equal Right of Slavery with Free Labor in any and every Territory. This idea denies that Slavery is a natural or moral wrong--denies that Man has a natural moral right to the direction of his own energies, the products of his own industry, and maintains that the ownership of his own limbs and faculties by the laborer or by a master is question of political economy and social expediency to be determined by considerations of climate, soil, products &c."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frjuly60.html#7.18k>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Mr. Breckinridge as a Logician, July 18, 1860 [Citation: Key = E087]

Summary

This article relied heavily on material from the New York Tribune. The Repository editors took issue with Breckinridge's views on slavery in the territories. Breckinridge and other Southern Democrats took the Dred Scott decision as the opportunity to extend their logic of the Constitution's protection of slave property. He contended that territorial governments cannot outlaw slavery, but Republicans argued that the same logic meant that these governments cannot allow it either.

Excerpt

"Regarding Slavery in the light in which it is seen by the Republican party--as a moral, social, political and economical evil--it would be impossible to consent to that action on the part of Congress thus demanded by Mr. Breckinridge and his party for the introduction of Slavery into the Territories."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.shtml/pa.fr.fr.1860.07.18.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, The Necessary Consequence, July 18, 1860 [Citation: Key = E088]

Summary

The Republican editors argued that the "lords of the lash" controled the Democratic party and conspired with weak-kneed Northern Democrats to lower tariffs. They traced the results right to Franklin County pointing out that the number of furnaces had declined significantly since the repeal of the Tariff of 1842. The Democratic party, "Locofocoism," according to the editors, was completely wedded to the "designs of pro-slavery fanatics in spreading the accursed institution."

Excerpt

"The reason why these and other furnaces have ceased to be used is, because there is no disposition on the part of our Locofoco rulers to give American mechanics and working me a chance to compete with the low-wages operatives of Europe."

"The whole policy of the Nigger Democracy has been, for years, to crush out Free White Labor and substitute the unpaid toil of negro slaves in the places accustomed to be filled by white sons and daughters of industry, who regardless of the sneers of the oligarchy, voluntarily prefer to work with their own hands for an honest livlyhood [sic] to living in idleness, supported by the sweat and toil of a despised, abused, persecuted race of helpless, hapless beings--poor, ignorant Africans."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgml/pa.fr.fr.1860.07.18.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Address of the Republican Executive Committee of Maryland, August 1, 1860 [Citation: Key = E089]

Summary

The Repository editors printed in full the Maryland Republican Party executive committee appeal which neatly summarized the position of the party along the border region. Slavery should be opposed, the committee stated, not because blacks were equal but because it jeopardized free labor and had a negative impact on white workers. They openly maintained the Republican party was a "white man's party" and that the issue at stake was whether slavery will be "nationalized" or not.

Excerpt

"The assertion, either so ignorantly or maliciously made, that the Republican Party proposes by force to abolish slavery and elevate the negro to a social equality with the white man, we denounce as a most unfounded accusation."

"This party is essentially the white man's party. Its sympathies are enlisted in behalf of the white race, and its fundamental object is to protect and ennoble free labor."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgm/pa.fr.fr.1860.08.01.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, How Slaves Drive Out Free Labor, August 1, 1860 [Citation: Key = E092]

Summary

The Republican editors continued to argue that slavery was displacing white labor and moving into new climates and agricultural sectors.

Excerpt

"There are now in Missouri at least fifty thousand men who cannot get full employment for their energies and enterprise, owing to the depression of the past two years, and there are now in Missouri more than one hundred thousand slaves, occupying [sic] and filling the most lucrative agricultural and mechanical positions . . . It is the demand of the Republican party that slave labor shall make room for free white labor, and take itself away."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/fraug60.html#8.8a>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Important Southern Testimony, August 1, 1860 [Citation: Key = E091]

Summary

Slavery was portrayed as the cause of social ill, a destructive corrupting influence that affected both slaves and masters. All were debased, according to the editors, by slavery.

Excerpt

"The most telling part of Mr. Sumner's recent speech in the Senate was that in which he portrayed the debasing influence of slavery upon masters. His argument is more than confirmed by Southern testimony."

"Can that man be a Christian who deliberately omits to use any influence, moral or political, which God has put in his hands, to prevent the spread of such heathenish degredation?"

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgm/pa.fr.fr.1860.08.01.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, The Work of the Campaign, August 1, 1860 [Citation: Key = E090]

Summary

In this New York Independent article reprinted in the Repository, slavery was cast as an immoral system because of its effects on blacks (rather than on working whites, as is usually the case in the Repository). The editors used an outside newspaper to express the view of slavery as "an injustice and upheld by a wrong."

Excerpt

"The criminality of slavery is the only ground upon which it can be effectively opposed."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgml/pa.fr.fr.1860.08.01.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Douglas Deprecating Agitation, August 8, 1860 [Citation: Key = E093]

Summary

Republican editors criticized Douglas for his remarks in Boston that the business of the nation is being held up while debates continue on slavery and slavery extension. The editors charged Douglas with hypocrisy for his role in introducing the slavery question into politics. They considered Douglas two-faced on the issue, arguing for slavery extension on the one hand and suggesting that the nation has more important business on the other.

Excerpt

"After a conflict which has no parallel in our history, Mr. Douglas, spurred on by the hope of outstripping all competitors for the favor of the Slavery Extensionists, succeeded, by his tireless energy and force of will, in protrating this old landmark [the Missouri Compromise]."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frac60.html#8.8b>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Electoral Votes of the States, August 8, 1860 [Citation: Key = E094]

Summary

Slavery has allowed an aristocratic minority to highjack the government's agenda for the past 60 years, Republican editors charged. Because of the three-fifths rule in the Constitution, the "Slave Power" provided the South with virtually equivalent power in the Senate despite the South's decidedly smaller white population. The editors contrasted slavery with "freedom" and tie "freedom" to the political inequality they perceived in the representation from the North "with its teeming millions of white Freemen."

Excerpt

"This insignificant number [slaveholders], devoting their time and attention exclusively to politics, and possessing the principal part of the wealth of the South, are thus armed with an overpowering influence, which is always directed to secure the political promotion of those of their own class, while the nonslaveholders are kept in the back-ground or overshadowed by these lords-of-the-lash."

"We have permitted a miserable, sectional minority too long to override and insult the majority; and if it is permitted to continue, and if by our supineness we consent to the declaration that, 'Freedom is sectional and Slavery is national,' by allowing the Republican party to be defeated, then we tacitly admit the interests of Slavery in this Republic are paramount to those of Freedom."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgml/pa.fr.fr.1860.08.08.sgn

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, The End of Slavery Agitation, August 15, 1860 [Citation: Key = E095]

Summary

Slavery would disappear as a source of conflict if a Republican won the presidency, the editors asserted in this reprinted article from the New York Courier and Enquirer. They considered Democrats the agitators in the issue. Republicans, they argued, would not touch slavery in the Southern states out of deference to the Constitution and would support enforcement of the fugitive slave law.

Excerpt

"The rights of the South ... would be far safer in the hands of such men as Seward or Lincoln, than they ever because, while they would necessarily prevent the extension of slavery into free territory, they would scrupulously stand by all the constitutional rights of the slave States, and exercise a moral influence at the North favorable to a faithful execution of the fugitive slave law, and adverse to the interference to a handful of troublesome Abolitionists, whose incendiary conduct was disgusting Republicans, at the same time that scheming Democratic leaders privately encouraged their interference with the South in order to foster slavery excitement."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgml/pa.fr.fr.1860.08.15.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Let Us Alone, August 22, 1860 [Citation: Key = E097]

Summary

Proslavery advocates contended that they are being persecuted and want to be left alone, the Republican editors pointed out, but it is they, in fact, who were "guilty of imposing" slavery--a vile institution--"upon their neighbors." The expansion of slavery into the territories threatened the liberty that the country was built upon, they maintained, and those who advocate it were "acting in opposition to the plans of the founders of this great Republic." Slavery, they argued, has corrupted the South and the free North as well by taking "hold" upon "the minds of men."

Excerpt

"The South, the minority of the people, have been accustomed to rule the land--as they do their own plantations, most tyrannically."

"Knowing, as we do, the pernicious effects upon White men of the curse of slavery, why should we 'let them alone' who are striving to extend its black form over all our beautiful domain? Why should we remain quiet while the foes to freedom are binding the goddess of liberty hand and foot preparatory to declaring it a crime, punishable with death, for any to speak to write in favor Man's inherent right to Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness?"

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgml/pa.fr.fr.1860.08.22.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Republicans Not Innovators, August 22, 1860 [Citation: Key = E096]

Summary

Opposition to slavery was a time-honored tradition, one that could be traced to the nation's earliest years, the editors of the Baltimore Patriot observed. They pointed out that the Revolutionary generation tried often to "narrow its area." By contrast, these editors argued, the proslavery argument is a recent creation of Southern Democrats.

Excerpt

"The doctrine that slavery is right in the abstract was never heard in this country until lately, when it has become an instrument of Southern Democratic ambition."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgm/pa.fr.fr.1860.08.22.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Morton McMichael's Speech, September 12, 1860 [Citation: Key = E098]

Summary

Morton McMichael from Philadelphia gave a speech in Chambersburg on the principles of the People's Party. The editors praised McMichael for steering the political debate away from the slavery issue toward substantive policy issues, such as the tariff and economic issues.

Excerpt

"Except to repel the charge made by Stephen A. Douglas, one of the Locofoco candidates for president--who attempts to fasten the blame of Slavery agitation in the country upon every person but himself, the real author of all the trouble on that vexed question--he never said one word upon the subject of slavery. Mr. McMichael feels too deeply the importance of fostering the industrial interests of Pennsylvania, and of the whole land, to spend his precious time talking about that which does not particularly concern him--slavery in the South."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgm/pa.fr.fr.1860.09.12.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, What Republicans Intend to Do, September 12, 1860 [Citation: Key = E099]

Summary

Slavery was cast as an issue brought to the fore by those who wished to undermine the Republicans' chances of victory in the election. In essence, these editors charged, slavery should be a non-issue. By avoiding the slavery question, they desired to focus attention on the plight of white men rather than African Americans. Republican priorities were, they argued, to stop the agitation over the slavery issue, make the territories open to "free, white laboring men," protect American industry and the jobs of free white men, aid commerce through railroad and transportation development, and to restore public virtue and morals to the government.

Excerpt

"The first work of the Republicans will be to put an end to the disturbed state of public mind arising from the discussion of the Slavery question, by showing that they have no desire to interfere with the institution of slavery where it now exists, and only want to prevent its spread into territories now and always free, and that only by means recognized and provided for in the Constitution of the United States."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frsept60.html#9.12b>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, Playing 'Possum, October 10, 1860 [Citation: Key = E100]

Summary

Slavery was cast by these New York Republican editors as a sly and incredibly flexible institution that could be altered whenever necessary. It could thrive in any condition, even if it was not wholly profitable.

Excerpt

"Slavery Extension has been driven at last, by dire necessity, to playing 'possum. It has no other remaining resource. The people are hard upon it, and die it must--unless it can avoid that catastrophe by merely seeming to be dead. Hence all Northern journals in the interest of Slavery Propaganda are now ringing the charges on the cry that Slavery cannot be extended--that its limits are reached, its destiny attained, and that the Republican party is fighting a chimera--or, rather, pretending to fight one, in pursuit of sinister ends."

"Slavery is notoriously out of place and unprofitable in New York; yet there would be twenty thousand slaves in New York to-day if our laws permitted them to be held here. Slavery is a clear mistake to-day in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia; yet with what a death-gripe it holds on there! And New Mexico is quite as well adapted to Slavery as three-fourths of Virginia."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/news/s_newsfilter.pl?file=/institute/web/staunton/fr1860.sgml/pa.fr.fr.1860.10.10.sgm

Newspaper: Franklin Repository, The Nigger Democracy, March 7, 1860 [Citation: Key = E084]

Summary

Slavery was portrayed as a degenerate system of labor that threatened to undermine the independence of the white working class and reduce its members to the level of poor Southern whites. The Republican editors cast the issue in terms of family security, calling for Northern citizens to protect their family's future.

Excerpt

"Who, among working men, that has any respect for himself and for his wife and children, wishes to see this free State of Pennsylvania overrun with Slavery; every branch of industry, which now affords support for thousands of white people, who are willing to work for a living, supplied with the labor of negroes whos bodies and souls (while in the flesh) belong to their masters . . . Who among the high-minded, independent, intelligent mechanics of Franklin County, desires to see his means of supplying the wants of those dependant [sic] upon him, degraded by the competition of Slave labor?"

"Slavery, with all its blighting effects, will again be introduced into every Northern State, if the policy of the Nigger Democracy is suffered to be carried out . . . The Editor of [the Valley Spirit], and the Editor of every other locofoco paper, knows as well as do we, that the object of the leaders of the odious dogma of Slavery extension is to carry their systems of labor not only into the Territories, but into all the Northern States. The bolder among the hotspurs have, over and over again, declared that slavery is the best form of labor that capital can employ. Certain leading Southern locofoco orators have had the impudence to declare that 'color had nothing to do with slavery;' and that the rightful and normal condition of all poor laboring men is slavery."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frmarch60.html#3.7a>

Newspaper: Franklin Repository and Transcript, Crop Production, 1860, July 18, 1860 [Citation: Key = E037]

Summary

The Republican paper praised Franklin wheat farmers for their tremendous output. The paper pointed out Washington County, Maryland, produced nearly as much wheat and suggested its proximity to "free soil and good company" as the reason.

Excerpt

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/frbrowser/frjuly60.html#7.18f>

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, A Sensible Negro, September 25, 1860 [Citation: Key = E044]

Summary

Whig editors in the South liked to portray slavery as so benevolent and appealing to blacks that they would enslave themselves if given the opportunity. The Whig editor in Staunton reported this story from the neighboring county, Rockbridge.

Excerpt

"Mary Elizabeth, a free woman of color, twenty-two years of age, who was emancipated by the will of Wm. Miller, sr., dec'd, voluntarily enslaved herself at the present session of the Circuit Court of Rockbridge, under the Act of Assembly of February, 1856, which authorizes the voluntary enslavement of free negroes. -- Lex. Gazette."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/sssept60.html#9.25b>

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, The Late Slave Murder Case, October 16, 1860 [Citation: Key = E042]

Summary

Whigs considered the murderer of a slave guilty of a crime against "human and divine law," but they were especially concerned because such brutal treatment would "fan the flame of fanaticism" and bring shame on the community.

Excerpt

"The jury hesitated much between a conviction for murder in the first and murder in the second degree. But finally they agreed and ascertained the term of imprisonment in the Penitentiary at eighteen years--the longest term known to the law."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/ssoct60.html#10.16a>

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, Export of Slaves from Virginia, October 11, 1859 [Citation: Key = E175]

Summary

The editor of the Staunton Spectator considered the sale of slaves to the Lower South as a dangerous demographic trend that might weaken slavery.

Excerpt

"The consequence will be a steady and constant drain of slaves and for every one that goes out a white man from the North will in all probability come into Virginia and the neighboring states. It requires no prophetic vision to foresee the result of this kind of operation in the course of time. Is not the true interest of Virginia and the South generally to oppose the acquisition of territory, that her slaves may remain in her own limits, instead of being exported by thousands to supply the wants of new slave territory."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu:8090/xslt/servlet/ramanujan.XSLTServlet?xml=/vcdh/xml_docs/valley_news/ne

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, Hostile Legislation, January 10, 1860 [Citation: Key = E101]

Summary

The Whig editor excerpted an article from the New York Times which argued that Northern legislation on personal liberty laws had been minimal (just two states passed such legislation). Most Northern states, the editor argued, have defeated such laws, passing instead ineffectual resolutions. Northern aggressiveness on the issue of slavery, according to this Whig argument, had been overdrawn and blown out of proportion.

Excerpt

"Resolutions may and probably have been passed by several State Legislatures, expressing opinions hostile to slavery and to the Fugitive Slave Law; but we need not remind our Southern contemporaries that these resolves have no legal validity, and are usually intended to have no effect beyond influencing some local election."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/ssjan60.html#1.10a>

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, Civil, Not Sectional War, January 24, 1860 [Citation: Key = E102]

Summary

The Whig position asserted that Northerners were divided among themselves about slavery and that any future conflict would likely be among Northerners rather than sectional conflict between North and South.

Excerpt

"No one who knows anything of the northern people believes that they are united in the aggressive anti-slavery movement, or that they even agree in their views of slavery in the abstract."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/ss1860/va.au.ss.1860.01.24.02.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, State of the Country, January 31, 1860 [Citation: Key = E103]

Summary

The Whig editor quoted extensively from a letter from Rev. Dr. Breckinridge of Kentucky to his nephew Vice-President John Breckinridge on the state of the nation. The Whig position on the sectional crisis was clearly embedded in this editorial: the border was the key to effecting future national interests, war and bloodshed were a real possibility because of agitation of extremists on both sides, enforcement of the laws was required to resolve the crisis, and "soil and climate" would determine and settle the boundaries of slavery in the territories.

Excerpt

"It may be confidently asserted that posterity will hold these border states, on both sides, responsible for the fate of the nation, if they permit the country to be ruined, and themselves thrown into a position of endless mutual hostility, along a common frontier of fifteen hundred miles."

"With the exception of a few extreme men at the South, the people of this section are not "slavery propagandists"--they have no desire to carry slavery into any Territory now free, and it is not their interest to do so."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/ssjan60.html#1.31a>

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, Democracy and Slavery, February 7, 1860 [Citation: Key = E104]

Summary

The Whig editor pointed out the danger of the Democratic party in Virginia's constant badgering of the Whigs on the issue of which party was "sound" on slavery. The result, the editor suggested, of such politicization of the slavery issue was John Brown's raid--the mistaken belief in the North that some Virginians might buckle under pressure and abandon slavery. The Whig editor considered the Democrats to blame for John Brown's mistaken views and for distorting the unanimity of mind on the protection of slavery.

Excerpt

"On the contrary, the last steps of [John Brown's] career upon the soil of our State, as the avowed leader of a crusade against slavery and slaveholders, even to bloodshed and death, is of itself sufficient to establish the fact that he had been watching the course of affairs in the State of Virginia with special and peculiar interest....To those who are familiar with the political history of the State it is scarcely necessary to say that from them he heard, probably for the first time, of a difference of sentiment among the people of Virginia on the subject of negro slavery."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/ssfeb60.html#2.7a>

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, The Position of Mr. Bates, April 3, 1860 [Citation: Key = E105]

Summary

Slavery was a controversial subject, the Whig editor argued, but one that would easily fall from the spotlight if extremists let it alone. The Spectator believed that Edward Bates would receive very little support in the South for a Presidential nomination, as he had come down on the Republican side of the slavery issue.

Excerpt

"We do not desire a slavery-propagandist candidate, but one who will let the subject alone."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/ss1860/va.au.ss.1860.04.03.02.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, The Trouble at C[h]arleston, May 8, 1860 [Citation: Key = E106]

Summary

The Whig editor considered the break of the Democratic party along sectional lines a momentous event in which Whigs should not find comfort but instead concern for the "perpetuity of the Union." The Whig editor pointed out that agreement on the subject of slavery within either national party was impossible. The issue was irreconcilable, the Whig editors felt, and should be "let alone." The Whigs editors relied on the steady influence of reasonable and patriotic men with a national view.

Excerpt

"After a career of unparalleled success, the agitation of the slavery question, which, some how or other, has operated to [the Democrats'] advantage heretofore, has at last divided the party, with little prospect at present of a future re-union."

"If let alone, the question of slavery in the Territories will settle itself to the satisfaction of all reasonable and patriotic men in both sections of the Republic."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/ssmay60.html#5.8a>

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, Another Division in the M. E. Church Expected, June 12, 1860
[Citation: Key = E107]

Summary

The Whig editor parsed the meaning of the Methodist Episcopal Church's General Conference in Buffalo position on slavery. The editor suggested that some slaveholders were better than others, that some slaveholders debased their slaves as chattel, thinking no more of them than cattle. Still, the editor ended with a question to his readers--whether "we" can remain in a union in which slavery is deemed a sin.

Excerpt

"The old chapter declared slavery to be a great evil--but carefully abstained from calling it a sin. . . The new chapter declares that the buying, selling, or holding of human beings as chattels is inconsistent with the law of Christ . . . This is a plain declaration, that slaveholding is a sin against God and the Discipline."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/ss1860/va.au.ss.1860.06.12.02.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Spectator, John Bell's Slavery Record, October 2, 1860 [Citation: Key = E108]

Summary

The Whig editor reprinted Bell's voting record in Congress on the slavery issues, asserting that the candidate was safe on the issue, a strong defender of slavery as an institution. Breckinridge Democrats, the editor pointed out, have accused Bell of weakness on slavery.

Excerpt

"Though a Southern man, born and all his life identified with, by association and individual interest, the institution of slavery--though for twenty years the representative and agent of a slaveholding community in the councils of the country--[John Bell] is still denounced as an Abolitionist, a traitor to the South, and an affiliator with the Republicans of the North."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/ss1860/va.au.ss.1860.10.02.01.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Departure of Emancipated Negroes--Don't Want to Leave, October 14, 1859 [Citation: Key = E184]

Summary

Out of 44 ex-slaves who had been set free, seven "chose to remain in servitude rather than enjoy their freedom outside Old Virginia."

Excerpt

"Some of those who did leave, were thrown on the boat by main force, so much opposed were they to leaving, and many expressed their determination of returning to Virginia as soon as opportunity afforded."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1859/va.au.rv.1859.10.14.02.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, The Results of African Labor in the New World, February 10, 1860 [Citation: Key = E109]

Summary

The Democratic editor depicted slavery as an economic boon that advanced the production of agricultural goods and the state of civilization in the New World. Without the institution, the West would not be as prosperous, nor would white workers--even in the North--enjoy the same employment opportunities. The editor avoided use of the term "slavery" at all, instead referring to it as "African labor."

Excerpt

"And yet we find the monstrous doctrine taught that African labor is inimical to the free labor of the North."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1860/va.au.rv.1860.02.10.01.pdf

**Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Cotton and American Slavery, February 24, 1860 [Citation:
Key = E110]**

Summary

The Democratic editor portrayed slavery as an engine of economic growth that fueled the textile industry in England, providing thousands of jobs for needy families. Consequently, those "Britons" opposed to American slavery, such as the excerpt from Lord Brougham, the editor suggested, should think twice before criticizing it.

Excerpt

"Let us create new fields of produce if we can; but meanwhile, it is neither just nor dignified to buy this raw material [cotton] from the Americans, and revile them for producing it."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1860/va.au.rv.1860.02.24.01.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Methodist General Conference, May 18, 1860 [Citation: Key = E111]

Summary

The Democratic editor castigated the Conference for labeling slavery an "evil," and admonished it for involving itself in political issues, such as the "slavery question."

Excerpt

"The Methodist Discipline assumes a postulate which, in our belief, is erroneous in ethic and unconstitutional in theory, when it brands slavery as an evil, and intimates it can be 'extirpated,' in propounding the question, 'what shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery?' That slavery is purely a political question is sufficiently attested by the early legislation of the country, and its recognition as such in the Federal Constitution itself."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/rvmay60.html#5.18c>

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, The Protection of Slavery in the Territories, June 29, 1860
[Citation: Key = E112]

Summary

The Democratic editor reprinted this article from the Vernon Times in Louisiana. Democrats argued that slavery was protected in the territories by the Dred Scott decision and that the final arbiter of constitutional issues regarding slavery was the court. Agitation for a federal slave code, the editor suggested, only exacerbates the situation by conceding the judiciary's decisions.

Excerpt

"The advocates for a slave code in the Territories deny, we believe that the question of protection of slavery is a judicial question, and they will not consent to leave the matter to be decided by the Courts."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1860/va.au.rv.1860.06.29.01.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, For the Vindicator, July 13, 1860 [Citation: Key = E113]

Summary

This letter to the editor, signed by Augusta, argued that the Republicans were intent on not only limiting slavery in the territories but also eliminating it in the states. The writer considered the North and South complementary but cautioned that Southerners must unite against the Republican enemy "thundering at our own gates."

Excerpt

"Thus the conflict is BETWEEN THE STATES, or their systems of labor, slave or free; and they [Republicans] argue that THEY CANNOT EXIST PERMANENTLY IN THE SAME UNION. Why so? -- Do they conflict? Do they produce the same things? Do they impair the industry or lessen the employment of the other? No. They occupy different fields of labor. They are not hostile and rival, but subsidiary and mutually beneficial."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1860/va.au.rv.1860.07.13.03.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Judge Douglas in Staunton, September 7, 1860 [Citation: Key = E185]

Summary

The Democratic papers built up Douglas' arrival. "The Masses in Motion!!!" its headline ran.

Excerpt

"Thence to Staunton, groups of men, women, and children were assembled at each Depot to catch a glimpse of the great statesman and patriot, who, whatever the political difference, could not withhold from him a tribute of admiration. At Staunton he was met by an immense concourse of people, who anxiously and eagerly awaited his appearance on the platform, while the 'deep mouthed' cannon thundered forth its welcome in a hundred rounds."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1860/va.au.rv.1860.09.07.02.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, For the Vindicator, September 7, 1860 [Citation: Key = E114]

Summary

A local Breckinridge supporter wrote to the editor of the Vindicator--who supported Douglas--to argue that Breckinridge supporters believed they have a constitutional right to extend their property (slaves) into the territories. He asserted that Breckinridge supporters had no need for a federal slave code for the territories.

Excerpt

"Now this what we want, and nothing more. The assertion that we want Congress to legislate slavery into the territories (which assertion was also made by Mr. Douglas on last Saturday) we unhesitatingly pronounce false and absurd, and ask any man who has ever advanced such an idea, to prove it. We ask Congress to protect the property of all the people in the Territories against unconstitutional legislation, Northern Aid Societies, &c., so that the South may emigrate and have a chance to extend her Territory, and not be encompassed by those who together with the final overwhelming negro population, will crush us out of existence. "

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/rvsept60.html#9.7b>

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Judicial Protection in the Territories, September 28, 1860
[Citation: Key = E115]

Summary

The Democratic editor urged Breckinridge men to consider that their reckless actions were destroying the national party. The editor stood by Douglas as the defender of states' rights and the rights of Southern slaveholders.

Excerpt

"To sum the whole diversity in a few words--the Douglas party stand by the Cincinnati platform and the judicial decisions of the U.S. Courts; the Breckinridge party assert an independent power in Congress to move for the protection of slavery in the Territories."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1860/va.au.rv.1860.09.28.02.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Hon. Wm. L. Yancey, October 9, 1860 [Citation: Key = E178]

Summary

Even the Democratic editor was unwilling to countenance William L. Yancey's criticism of Virginia's commitment to slavery.

Excerpt

"While at times the [unclear] of a great mind would mark its line through the mass of his sophistry and superfloidity [sic], yet as one could fail to perceive that he relied upon impassioned appeals to sectional prejudice, and excited denunciation and execration to produce an effect. For instance, in alluding to the charges preferred against him, based upon his own writings, of entertaining disunion sentiments, he denied that he did, and indignantly exclaimed--'I scorn it--(stamp)--I trample it under my feet--(stamp)--I grind it beneath my heel'--(stamp). This kind of logic did not answer the demand of a reading, intelligent people like the audience that listened to him."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1860/va.au.rv.1860.10.05.02.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Untitled, November 2, 1860 [Citation: Key = E177]

Summary

Democrats tried to rally in Augusta to support Douglas and to "save the Constitution."

Excerpt

"Every man must be up and doing. . . redeem Virginia from the suspicion of disunion and Douglas and Constitution will triumph over Whiggery, Know Nothingism, Congressional Slave Codes and every species of [unclear] and mockery. . . . We are safe. Our household idols and our domestic tranquility which rest under the aegis of Union will be vindicated and secured and prosperity will follow in our footsteps as a people and a nation."

"Strike a blow for your country. Vote early and vote often!"

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/newspaper_images/rv1860/va.au.rv.1860.11.02.02.pdf

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Desperate Negro Woman, January 11, 1861 [Citation: Key = E043]

Summary

When an Augusta County slave mutilated herself to prevent being sold and takes a swing with an axe at her master as well, the editors called attention to her as "desperate" and fit for jail and punishment. They implied that only crazy, deranged, or "desperate" slaves would resist the institution.

Excerpt

"While she was going to get her clothes, she picked up an axe which she had concealed, and deliberately cut three of her fingers off."

Full-text web version can be found at:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Browser1/aubrowser/rvjan61.html#1.11c>

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Some Supporters of Judge Douglas, February 8, 1861 [Citation: Key = E181]

Summary

The Democratic editor denied the Spectator's assertion that Douglas supporters had allied with the secession men and accused the Spectator of deserting the South.

Excerpt

"When a man at this time deserts the South, and goes over, as the editor of the Spectator has done, bag and baggage, to the enemies of this section, the Union and their God, it does not become such a man to say aught to the supporters of anybody. I think the times have changed since the Presidential contest. If they have not, I for one have--Before I'll bend my knee to Lincoln and Seward, and their Virginia cohorts, I will see this land run in rivers of blood; and as the gallant supporters of Judge Douglas in the Illinois Legislature have said to the Republican members, 'If you attempt to coerce the South, before you cross the Ohio river, you will have to pass over the dead bodies of the men of Egypt.'"

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu:8090/xslt/servlet/ramanujan.XSLTServlet?xml=/vcdh/xml_docs/valley_news/ne

Newspaper: Staunton Vindicator, Untitled, March 29, 1861 [Citation: Key = E182]

Summary

The Democratic paper argued that Virginia had to decide whether it will go with the North or the South, and it saw no alternative but to protect slavery or face "degradation and ruin."

Excerpt

"The question is not "Union." That is irretrievably, hopelessly broken up. No compromise of right--no palliation of wrong, or denunciation of its resistance, can restore its fallen columns. Nor can past glory reconcile to a future of degradation. The only question is, where shall we go? With the North or the South? If with the North, what are we to do with our Negroes? Converted into pests and vampyres as they soon must be in such connexion, they will suck out the very lifeblood of the Commonwealth. And there will be no help for us. The North would gloat over our distresses, while the South, in self-defense, would be compelled to close her doors against us. The "irrepressible conflict" will then be upon us with all its horrors. Such must inevitably be our condition. And who will not say, give us war, give us anything, extermination itself, rather than such a consuming life of degradation and ruin.

Let us accept, then, at once, and without delay, the sad alternative thus forced upon us. Our Christian Churches are yielding to the necessity; and if bonds so sacred and endearing are rent by it, how vain is the hope that other ties, less hallowed, can hold us together in peace."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu:8090/xslt/servlet/ramanujan.XSLTServlet?xml=/vcdh/xml_docs/valley_news/ne

**Newspaper: Valley Spirit, The Negro Government of the Black Republicans--Ohio Election,
November 7, 1860 [Citation: Key = E176]**

Summary

Democratic editors pointed to black voting as the evidence for their accusations that Republicans intended to bring social and political equality for blacks.

Excerpt

"Their votes carried the election. Ohio is thus ruled, not by white men, but by negroes, and that, too under a Constitution that excludes negroes from suffrage."

Full-text web version can be found at:

http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu:8090/xslt/servlet/ramanujan.XSLTServlet?xml=/vcdh/xml_docs/valley_news/ne

Table: African American Residence by Town, Franklin County, 1860 [Citation: Key = E149]

Summary

This table shows the residential patterns of Franklin County by race and township, showing where the black population lived.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Town	Black Population
Antrim	132
Borough of Chambersburg	84
South Ward of Chambersburg	439
Fannett	40
Borough of Greencastle	81
Greene	111
Guilford	79
Hamilton	22
Letterkenny	13
Loudon	2
Lurgan	2
Borough of Mercer	89
Metal	8
Mont Alto	0
Montgomery	331
Borough of Orrstown	1
Peters	115
Quincy (Township and Village)	43

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

St. Thomas	0
Southampton	124
Warren	6
Washington	47
Waynesboro	13

Table: Age and Party Affiliation, and Precinct Voting in 1860, Franklin County [Citation: Key = E167]

Summary

These tables show data on the head of household's age and party affiliation, the average age of all voting age males in the household, and precinct breakdown by age cohorts for the 1860 election. The results show that the average age differed only marginally between Democrats and Republicans. But precincts that voted for Lincoln differed from Breckinridge precincts in the average age of both the head of household and all voters in household. The age of voting men in households in Lincoln precincts was significantly lower than in Breckinridge precincts. Lincoln attracted younger voters, the "Wide-Awakes" who mobilized to support the Republican Party in 1860.

Processing

Age of Head of Household Cohorts	Party Affiliation		Total
	Democrat	Republican	
30 years old or younger	13	9	22
31 - 40 years old	23	24	47
41 - 50 years old	38	19	57
51 - 60 years old	3	17	20
More than 61 years old	8	5	13
Total	85	74	159

Age of All Males of Voting Age Cohorts	Party Affiliation		Total
	Democrat	Republican	
30 years old or younger	21	9	30
31 - 40 years old	36	27	63
41 - 50 years old	19	17	36

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

51 - 60 years old	2	15	17
More than 61 years old	4	4	8
Total	82	72	154

Voting Precinct	Victor	Age of Head of Household Cohorts					Total
		30 years old or younger	31 - 40 years old	41 - 50 years old	51 - 60 years old	More than 61 years old	
Chambersburg, South Ward	Lincoln	98	123	145	80	46	492
Chambersburg, North Ward	Lincoln	40	78	83	34	29	264
Antrim	Lincoln	13	30	55	30	41	169
Dry Run	Lincoln	1	8	15	16	12	52
Fayetteville	Lincoln	3	16	25	16	15	75
Green Village	Lincoln	3	13	13	20	9	58
Guilford	Lincoln	9	20	18	19	9	75
Hamilton	Lincoln	4	23	25	28	20	100
Letterkenny	Lincoln	5	9	15	10	10	49
Loudon	Lincoln	2	2	8	2	5	19
Montgomery	Lincoln	5	16	13	17	19	70
Metal	Lincoln	5	18	19	6	8	56
Peters	Lincoln	2	11	19	8	1	41
Quincy	Lincoln	15	29	40	33	21	138
St. Thomas	Lincoln	6	13	24	9	15	67
Southampton	Lincoln	6	6	16	10	9	47
Washington	Lincoln	12	38	32	35	20	137
Lincoln Precinct Average	13.3	26.6	33.2	21.9	17	112.3	112.3
Percentage		11.8%	23.7%	29.6%	19.5%	15.1%	100%
Concord	Breckinridge	1	10	11	7	8	37
Lurgan	Breckinridge	4	12	10	20	10	56

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Orrstown	Breckinridge	7	32	28	19	20	106
Sulphur Spring	Breckinridge	6	7	14	5	3	35
Warren	Breckinridge	4	8	10	5	11	38
Welsh Run	Breckinridge	15	23	22	18	24	102
Breckinridge Precinct Average	6.2	15.3	15.8	12.3	12.7	62.3	62.3
Percentage		10.0%	24.6%	25.4%	19.7%	20.4%	100%
County Average		11.4	23.7	28.7	19.4	15.9	99.3
County Percentage		11.5%	23.9%	28.9%	19.5%	16.0%	100%

Voting Precinct	Victor	Age of All Males of Voting Age Cohorts					Total
		30 years old or younger	31 - 40 years old	41 - 50 years old	51 - 60 years old	More than 61 years old	
Chambersburg, South Ward	Lincoln	151	161	96	52	22	482
Chambersburg, North Ward	Lincoln	63	91	65	20	18	257
Antrim	Lincoln	22	46	60	18	22	168
Dry Run	Lincoln	5	15	17	8	6	51
Fayetteville	Lincoln	10	27	21	12	5	75
Green Village	Lincoln	8	17	14	10	8	57
Guilford	Lincoln	15	33	14	7	5	74
Hamilton	Lincoln	15	32	26	12	14	99
Letterkenny	Lincoln	9	13	14	7	6	49
Loudon	Lincoln	3	6	6	1	3	19
Montgomery	Lincoln	9	18	14	14	13	68
Metal	Lincoln	9	19	18	4	3	53
Peters	Lincoln	5	11	17	7	0	40
Quincy	Lincoln	23	51	38	15	9	136

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

St. Thomas	Lincoln	8	23	24	4	7	66
Southampton	Lincoln	10	10	15	7	4	46
Washington	Lincoln	24	48	27	21	13	133
Lincoln Precinct Average	22.3	36.5	28.6	12.9	9.3	110.2	110.2
Percentage		20.2%	33.1%	26.0%	11.7%	8.4	100%
Concord	Breckinridge	3	14	9	4	7	37
Lurgan	Breckinridge	6	19	13	12	5	55
Orrstown	Breckinridge	14	41	25	16	10	106
Sulphur Spring	Breckinridge	6	9	15	3	2	35
Warren	Breckinridge	6	11	11	3	7	38
Welsh Run	Breckinridge	23	20	30	13	15	101
Breckinridge Precinct Average	9.7	19	17.2	8.5	7.7	62	62
Percentage		15.6%	30.6%	27.8%	13.7%	12.4%	100%
County Average		19.4	32.8	26.2	11.7	8.9	100.3
County Percentage		19.3%	32.7%	26.1%	11.6%	8.8%	100%

Table: Age and Party Affiliation, and Precinct Voting in 1860, Augusta County [Citation: Key = E166]

Summary

In Augusta Whigs and Democrats drew party activists from a similar range of ages. In the 1860 election precincts with high levels of Bell, Douglas, and Breckinridge support had similar average ages of voters. In Augusta in the 1860 election, the age of voters did not substantially differentiate the parties.

Processing

Age of Head Cohorts	1860 Candidate		
	Bell	Breckinridge	Douglas
30 years old or younger	4	1	1
31 - 40 years old	12	2	4
41 - 50 years old	10	2	0
51 - 60 years old	3	2	2
More than 61 years old	8	2	1
Total	37	9	8

Age of All Voting Males Cohorts	1860 Candidate		
	Bell	Breckinridge	Douglas
30 years old or younger	8	1	2
31 - 40 years old	12	3	4
41 - 50 years old	9	3	1
51 - 60 years old	5	1	1
More than 61 years old	3	1	0
Total	37	9	8

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Age of Head Cohorts	Party Affiliation	
	Whig	Democrat
30 years old or younger	10	1
31 - 40 years old	22	11
41 - 50 years old	12	3
51 - 60 years old	14	6
More than 61 years old	17	6
Total	75	27

Age of All Voting Males Cohorts	Party Affiliation	
	Whig	Democrat
30 years old or younger	14	1
31 - 40 years old	26	16
41 - 50 years old	13	4
51 - 60 years old	16	4
More than 61 years old	5	2
Total	74	27

Precinct	Victor	Age of Head Cohorts					Total
		30 years old or younger	31 - 40 years old	41 - 50 years old	51 - 60 years old	More than 61 years old	
Staunton, Precinct No. 1	Bell	2	15	11	7	3	38
Staunton, Precinct No. 2	Bell	4	19	13	7	6	49
Waynesborough	Bell	5	14	6	6	8	39

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Churchville	Bell	6	15	16	11	7	55
Mt. Sidney	Bell	5	14	6	13	9	47
Middlebrook	Bell	3	5	7	6	7	28
Greenville	Bell	1	7	5	10	3	26
Fishersville	Bell	14	12	5	6	7	44
New Hope	Bell	10	41	21	15	10	97
Mt. Meridian	Bell	7	10	8	5	10	40
Mt. Solon	Bell	10	18	16	8	5	57
Deerfield	Bell	2	7	8	9	7	33
Craigsville	Bell	5	11	2	4	6	28
Stuart's Draft	Bell	5	7	7	6	12	37
Swoope's Draft	Bell	9	5	12	12	4	42
Shernado	Bell	4	7	4	6	0	21
Parnassus	Douglas	7	11	10	11	6	45
Spring Hill	Bell	4	8	10	8	6	36
Newport	Bell	2	8	3	5	3	21
Midway	Bell	2	2	3	5	2	14
		13.4%	29.6%	21.7%	20.1%	15.2%	100%
Total		107	236	173	160	121	797

Precinct	Victor	Age of All Voting Males Cohorts					Total
		30 years old or younger	31 - 40 years old	41 - 50 years old	51 - 60 years old	More than 61 years old	
Staunton, Precinct No. 1	Bell	6	16	10	4	1	37
Staunton, Precinct No. 2	Bell	7	23	12	2	4	48
Waynesborough	Bell	6	18	7	3	4	38
Churchville	Bell	13	18	13	7	2	53
Mt. Sidney	Bell	9	19	6	7	4	45
Middlebrook	Bell	5	5	11	5	2	28

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Greenville	Bell	3	9	4	7	1	24
Fishersville	Bell	17	14	7	2	4	44
New Hope	Bell	21	41	18	11	6	97
Mt. Meridian	Bell	11	10	13	3	3	40
Mt. Solon	Bell	13	21	14	7	2	57
Deerfield	Bell	3	10	8	7	5	33
Craigsville	Bell	4	10	5	6	3	28
Stuart's Draft	Bell	7	12	9	3	4	35
Swoopes Depot	Bell	10	14	9	6	2	41
Sherando	Bell	6	6	3	5	1	21
Parnassus	Douglas	7	17	13	6	1	44
Spring Hill	Bell	6	10	15	4	1	36
Newport	Bell	4	8	4	4	1	21
Midway	Bell	3	7	2	1	1	14
Total		161	288	183	100	52	784

Precinct	High Candidate Support	Age of Head Cohorts					Total
		30 years old or younger	31 - 40 years old	41 - 50 years old	51 - 60 years old	More than 61 years old	
Churchville	Bell	6	15	16	11	7	55
Deerfield	Bell	2	7	8	9	7	33
Craigsville	Bell	5	11	2	4	6	28
Average High Bell		4.3	11	8.7	8	6.7	38.7
Percentage		11.1%	28.4%	22.5%	20.7%	17.3%	100%
Stuart's Draft	Breckinridge	5	7	7	6	12	37
Sherando	Breckinridge	4	7	4	6	0	21
Middlebrook	Breckinridge	3	5	7	6	7	28
Average High Breckinridge		4	6.3	6	6	6.3	28.7

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Percentage		13.9%	22.0%	20.9%	20.9%	22.0%	100%
Spring Hill	Douglas	4	8	10	8	6	36
Parnassus	Douglas	7	11	10	11	6	45
Mt. Sidney	Douglas	5	14	6	13	9	47
Average High Douglas		5.3	11	8.7	10.7	7	42.7
Percentage		12.4%	25.8%	20.4%	25.1%	16.4%	100%
County Average		13.4%	29.6%	21.7%	20.1%	15.2%	100%

Precinct	High Candidate Support	Age of All Voting Males Cohorts					Total
		30 years old or younger	31 - 40 years old	41 - 50 years old	51 - 60 years old	More than 61 years old	
Churchville	Bell	13	18	13	7	2	53
Deerfield	Bell	3	10	8	7	5	33
Craigsville	Bell	4	10	5	6	3	28
Average High Bell		6.7	12.7	8.7	6.7	3.3	38
Percentage		17.6%	33.4%	22.9%	17.6%	8.7%	100%
Stuart's Draft	Breckinridge	7	12	9	3	4	35
Sherando	Breckinridge	6	6	3	5	1	21
Middlebrook	Breckinridge	5	5	11	5	2	28
Average High Bell		6	7.7	7.7	4.3	2.3	28
Percentage		21.4%	27.5%	27.5%	15.4%	8.2%	100%
Spring Hill	Douglas	6	10	15	4	1	36
Parnassus	Douglas	7	17	13	6	1	44
Mt. Sidney	Douglas	9	19	6	7	4	45
Average High Douglas		7.3	15.3	11.3	5.7	2	41.7
Percentage		17.5%	36.7%	27.1%	13.7%	4.8%	
County		13.4%	29.6%	21.7%	20.1%	15.2%	100%

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Average

Table: Agricultural Production, Franklin and Augusta Counties, 1860, by Percentages [Citation: Key = E123]

Summary

Franklin farms devoted almost exactly the same proportion of their total grain production on average to wheat as they did to corn, but in Augusta farmers devoted twice as much production to corn on average. Farms of higher value and size in both Franklin and Augusta invested more heavily in wheat production than in corn.

Processing

Wheat (percent of Total Grain production)	Number of cases	Augusta		Franklin		
		Mean	Median	Mean	Median	
County Average	400	23%	21%	1028	37%	36%
Nonslaveholders	231	22%	20%			
Slaveholders	169	25%	23%			
Best Soil	329	24%	21%	485	41%	40%
Medium Soil	42	27%	24%	510	35%	33%
Worst Soil	29	15%	13%	33	27%	24%
Lowest Farm Value Quintile	66	15%	10%	171	32%	28%
Low-Medium Farm Value Quintile	88	19%	17%	225	34%	32%
Medium Farm Value Quintile	85	26%	25%	206	38%	38%
Medium-High Farm Value Quintile	79	26%	23%	202	39%	38%
High Farm Value Quintile	82	29%	27%	224	43%	42%
Smallest Farm Size Quintile	66	19%	17%	278	38%	34%

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Small-Medium Farm Size Quintile	202	25%	23%	637	37%	37%
Medium Farm Size Quintile	72	23%	21%	91	37%	36%
Medium-Large Farm Size Quintile	46	24%	23%	20	37%	36%
Largest Farm Size Quintile	14	21%	21%	2	34%	34%

Corn (percent of Total Grain production)	Number of Cases	Mean	Median	Number of Cases	Mean	Median
County Average	400	57%	57%	1026	34%	32%
Nonslaveholders	231	58%	57%			
Slaveholders	169	56%	57%			
Best Soil	329	57%	57%	484	34%	33%
Medium Soil	42	56%	56%	509	34%	31%
Worst Soil	29	62%	59%	33	44%	43%
Lowest Farm Value Quintile	66	61%	65%	175	40%	36%
Low-Medium Farm Value Quintile	88	59%	57%	223	37%	34%
Medium Farm Value Quintile	85	58%	57%	207	32%	30%
Medium-High Farm Value Quintile	79	55%	57%	197	32%	30%
High Farm Value Quintile	82	54%	56%	224	32%	31%
Smallest Farm Size Quintile	66	61%	66%	278	39%	35%
Small-Medium Farm Size Quintile	202	56%	56%	635	33%	31%
Medium Farm	72	56%	57%	91	33%	31%

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Size Quintile						
Medium-Large Farm Size Quintile	46	58%	61%	20	30%	27%
Largest Farm Size Quintile	14	56%	59%	2	27%	27%

Rye (percent of Total Grain production)	Number of Cases	Mean	Median	Number of Cases	Mean	Median
County Average	400	5%	2%	1055	7%	3%
Nonslaveholders	231	6%	2%			
Slaveholders	169	4%	2%			
Best Soil	329	5%	2%	488	5%	2%
Medium Soil	42	4%	1%	531	9%	5%
Worst Soil	29	9%	4%	36	17%	12%
Lowest Farm Value Quintile	66	9%	1%	186	12%	9%
Low-Medium Farm Value Quintile	88	7%	3%	235	8%	5%
Medium Farm Value Quintile	85	5%	3%	208	7%	3%
Medium-High Farm Value Quintile	79	4%	2%	202	5%	3%
High Farm Value Quintile	82	2%	5%	224	5%	2%
Smallest Farm Size Quintile	66	5%	5%	296	9%	3%
Small-Medium Farm Size Quintile	202	6%	3%	644	7%	4%
Medium Farm Size Quintile	72	6%	3%	93	8%	4%
Medium-Large Farm Size Quintile	46	3%	2%	20	4%	2%

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Largest Farm Size Quintile	14	2%	5%	2	12%	12%
<hr/>						
Oats (percent of Total Grain production)	Number of Cases	Mean	Median	Number of Cases	Mean	Median
County Average	400	14%	12%	1055	23%	24%
Nonslaveholders	231	13%	10%			
Slaveholders	169	15%	13%			
Best Soil	329	5%	2%	488	21%	21%
Medium Soil	42	4%	1%	531	25%	26%
Worst Soil	29	9%	4%	36	18%	17%
Lowest Farm Value Quintile	66	16%	9%	186	20%	23%
Low-Medium Farm Value Quintile	88	15%	13%	235	24%	24%
Medium Farm Value Quintile	85	11%	9%	208	24%	25%
Medium-High Farm Value Quintile	79	15%	14%	202	25%	26%
High Farm Value Quintile	82	14%	12%	224	21%	21%
Smallest Farm Size Quintile	66	15%	9%	296	19%	19%
Small-Medium Farm Size Quintile	202	13%	10%	644	24%	25%
Medium Farm Size Quintile	72	15%	14%	93	24%	23%
Medium-Large Farm Size Quintile	46	15%	13%	20	29%	30%
Largest Farm Size Quintile	14	22%	22%	2	27%	27%

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

	Augusta		Franklin	
Cows (percentage of Total Animals)	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
County Average	11%	10%	17%	14%
Nonslaveholders	12%	10%		
Slaveholders	11%	8%		
Swine	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
County Average	44%	43%	42%	42%
Nonslaveholders	48%	47%		
Slaveholders	39%	37%		
Cattle	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
County Average	17%	14%	20%	19%
Nonslaveholders	14%	12%		
Slaveholders	20%	17%		
Sheep	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
County Average	13%	5%	9%	0%
Nonslaveholders	12%	0%		
Slaveholders	15%	12%		
Horse	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
County Average	15%	13%	15%	14%
Nonslaveholders	15%	13%		
Slaveholders	15%	12%		
Mules	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
County Average	2%	0%	1%	0%
Nonslaveholders	7%	0%		
Slaveholders	4%	0%		
Oxen	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
County Average	3%	0%	2%	0%
Nonslaveholders	2%	0%		
Slaveholders	5%	0%		

Table: Agricultural Productivity, Augusta and Franklin County, 1860 [Citation: Key = E121]

Summary

Franklin County wheat farmers were more productive on average and on a per acre basis than their Augusta counterparts, especially on the best soil. Augusta's corn production exceeded Franklin's on average and on a per acre basis. In other major agricultural products the counties compared favorably.

Processing

	Augusta				Franklin			
	Production per farm		Production per acre		Production per farm		Production per acre	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
COWS								
County Avg.	4.60	4.00	0.04	0.03	4.80	5.00	0.06	0.04
Best Soil	4.70	4.00	0.04	0.03	5.10	5.00	0.05	0.05
Medium Soil	4.40	3.50	0.04	0.03	4.60	4.00	0.06	0.05
Worst Soil	3.60	3.50	0.04	0.03	3.80	3.00	0.06	0.05
CATTLE								
County Avg.	12.00	6.00	0.06	0.04	7.70	6.00	0.07	0.06
Best Soil	12.20	6.00	0.06	0.04	7.70	7.00	0.07	0.06
Medium Soil	11.60	6.00	0.06	0.04	6.20	4.00	0.05	0.04
Worst Soil	9.90	3.50	0.06	0.05	5.50	4.00	0.06	0.06
SWINE								
County Avg.	22.30	19.00	0.19	0.14	15.10	12.00	0.18	0.13
Best Soil	22.50	20.00	0.19	0.14	18.20	15.00	0.19	0.15
Medium Soil	27.20	16.00	0.19	0.15	12.10	10.00	0.16	0.11
Worst Soil	12.70	12.00	0.24	0.09	7.30	6.00	0.14	0.07
WHEAT								
County Avg.	248.40	165.00	1.50	1.20	334.20	277.50	3.20	2.70
Best Soil	225.20	175.00	1.50	1.20	425.30	400.00	4.00	3.80

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Medium Soil	281.50	200.50	1.70	1.50	246.80	200.00	2.40	2.00
Worst Soil	126.40	50.00	0.90	0.60	111.60	50.00	1.20	0.90
CORN								
County Avg.	548.80	400.00	3.50	3.00	286.40	200.00	3.00	2.30
Best Soil	556.80	400.00	3.50	3.00	343.80	300.00	3.40	2.80
Medium Soil	561.90	400.00	3.50	3.00	222.60	162.00	2.40	1.80
Worst Soil	441.20	225.00	3.10	3.00	203.90	115.00	2.00	1.70
HAY								
County Avg.	17.10	10.00	0.10	0.09	21.00	20.00	0.20	0.18
Best Soil	16.80	10.50	0.10	0.09	21.60	20.00	0.22	0.19
Medium Soil	21.90	11.00	0.12	0.13	18.80	18.00	0.18	0.17
Worst Soil	13.10	5.00	0.08	0.06	16.00	9.00	0.21	0.18

Table: Blacks in Franklin County, 1860 [Citation: Key = E154]

Summary

Blacks in Franklin County owned on average less real and personal property than their counterparts in Augusta. A few black men in both places managed to gain significant wealth.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/perl_scripts/search_popcensus.cgi?search_type=basic&start_page=0&year=1860&co

Table: Capital Investment by Industry, 1860 [Citation: Key = E147]

Summary

This table shows Augusta's high capital investment in unskilled labor industries, such as saw mills and woolen mills, and low levels of investment in industries with highly skilled labor.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112). Note: Augusta per capita figures use the entire population slave and free

Industry		No. Establishments	No. Residents per Est.	Total Capital Inv. (\$)	Capital Inv. Per Capita (\$)
Blacksmith	<i>Augusta</i>	17	1,632	7,750	0.27
	<i>Franklin</i>	27	1,560	10,100	0.23
Carriages	<i>Augusta</i>	5	5,550	12,100	0.43
	<i>Franklin</i>	15	2,808	28,500	0.67
Cooperages	<i>Augusta</i>	5	5,550	750	0.02
	<i>Franklin</i>	8	5,265	3,300	0.07
Flour Mills	<i>Augusta</i>	62	448	287,000	10.34
	<i>Franklin</i>	60	702	440,100	10.40
Iron Bar	<i>Augusta</i>	1	27,749	7,000	0.25
	<i>Franklin</i>	3	14,042	34,000	0.80
Iron Pig	<i>Augusta</i>	1	27,749	17,000	0.61
	<i>Franklin</i>	2	21,063	54,000	1.28
Lumber Sawmill	<i>Augusta</i>	22	1,261	39,562	1.40
	<i>Franklin</i>	26	1,620	19,250	0.45
Leather Goods	<i>Augusta</i>	12	2,312	39,300	1.41
	<i>Franklin</i>	25	1,688	191,983	4.55

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Distillery	<i>Augusta</i>	18	1,542	87,458	3.15
	<i>Franklin</i>	7	6,018	31,092	0.73
Tin	<i>Augusta</i>	2	13,874	2,225	0.08
	<i>Franklin</i>	10	4,213	18,800	0.44
Wagon Making	<i>Augusta</i>	3	9,249	1,000	0.03
	<i>Franklin</i>	5	8,425	2,350	0.05
Woollen Goods	<i>Augusta</i>	2	13,874	45,000	1.60
	<i>Franklin</i>	4	10,531	18,500	0.43
Total	<i>Augusta</i>	197	141	639,000	23
	<i>Franklin</i>	317	132	1,146,320	27

Table: Churches and Voting Precincts, Augusta [Citation: Key = E165]

Summary

In Augusta Bell's support was so widespread that precinct level breakdowns of parish locations are not useful.

Processing

Note: Precincts that gave "high" support to a candidate were defined as the 3 districts which gave the highest percentage of support to each candidate. Because this includes only 9 of the 20 voting precincts in Augusta, the church totals do not match those given in the table for the whole county.

Denominations	Bell	Douglas
African	2	0
African Methodist	1	0
Belvedere	1	0
Catholic	1	0
Dunker	4	1
Eagle's	1	0
Episcopal	3	0
Lutheran	6	0
Madley	1	0
Melancthon	1	0
Mennonite	1	0
Methodist Episcopal	1	0
Mt. Israel	0	1
Mt. Moriah	1	0
Presbyterian	5	0
Seceder	1	0
Shiloh	1	0
St. Paul's	1	0
Unknown	23	2

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Denominations	High Bell Precincts	High Douglas Precincts	High Breckinridge Precincts
African	0	0	0
African Methodist	0	0	0
Belvedere	0	0	0
Catholic	0	0	0
Dunker	0	1	1
Eakle's	0	0	0
Episcopal	0	0	1
Lutheran	1	1	1
Madley	1	0	0
Melancthon	0	0	0
Mennonite	0	0	0
Methodist Episcopal	0	0	0
Mt. Israel	0	1	0
Mt. Moriah	1	0	0
Presbyterian	1	1	1
Seceder	0	0	0
Shiloh	0	0	0
St. Paul's	0	0	0
Unknown	3	3	2

Denominations	High Bell Precincts	High Douglas Precincts	High Breckinridge Precincts
	Lutheran (1)	Dunker (1)	Dunker (1)
	Madley (1)	Lutheran (1)	Episcopal (1)
	Mt. Moriah (1)	Mt. Israel (1)	Lutheran (1)
	Presbyterian (1)	Presbyterian (1)	Presbyterian (1)
	Unknown (3)	Unknown (3)	Unknown (2)

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Table: Comparative Stores and Establishments Per Capita, Augusta and Franklin [Citation: Key = E134]

Summary

This table shows a higher per capita development of rural commercial establishments, such as mills and mines, in Augusta and a higher per capita development of urban commercial establishments, such as stores and hotels, in Franklin.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Augusta's per capita figures use the entire population free and slave.

	Augusta	Franklin
Population	27,749	42,126
Families	3,740	7,709
<i>Average Family Size</i>	5.82	5.49
Schools (public and private)	54	173
<i>Persons per school</i>	513	243
Churches	61	75
<i>Persons per church</i>	455	562
Towns	31	43
<i>Persons per town</i>	895	979
Commercial Establishments	289	856
<i>Persons per commercial establishment</i>	96	49
Mills and Mines	187	201
<i>Persons per mill or mine</i>	148	210
Blacksmiths	28	95
<i>Persons per blacksmith</i>	991	443

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Tanyards	11	29
<i>Persons per tanyard</i>	2523	1453
Hotels and taverns	8	45
<i>Persons per hotel or tavern</i>	3469	936
Stores	21	202
<i>Persons per store</i>	1321	209
Miscellaneous	34	36
<i>Persons per misc.</i>	816	1170

Table: Denominational Statistics for Augusta and Franklin Counties [Citation: Key = E150]

Summary

Augusta possessed larger parishes and invested more in its buildings than Franklin. Both places were highly churched though their denominations differed.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864.

Denomination	Augusta			Franklin		
	Number of Churches	Aggregate Accommodations	Value of Property	Number of Churches	Aggregate Accommodations	Value of Property
Baptist	1	450	8000	2	1200	2400
Baptist (Mennonite)	1	200	400	6	1800	2400
Baptist (Seventh Day Adventist)	0	0	0	1	400	700
Baptist (Tunker)	4	900	1800	2	1100	2800
Baptist (Winebrenner)	0	0	0	2	450	1600
Episcopal	2	1150	22500	1	250	1400
German Reformed	5	1200	8700	19	7860	58800
Lutheran	7	2400	14000	11	4800	42100
Methodist	21	5525	27850	31	9400	39250
Presbyterian	12	5800	45500	7	3450	22600
Presbyterian (Reformed)	0	0	0	4	1100	2700
Presbyterian (United)	0	0	0	2	550	3600
Roman Catholic	1	450	7000	3	850	14900
Union	0	0	0	1	460	3000

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Total	54	18,075	\$135,750	92	33,670	\$200,650
--------------	----	--------	-----------	----	--------	-----------

Table: Distances to Major Institutions [Citation: Key = E124]

Summary

Both Franklin and Augusta residences were clustered around social institutions. Franklin had more schools in closer proximity to residences.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

Distances to Major Institutions

Franklin

No residence is more than 6 miles from a town
No residence is more than 3 miles from a school
No residences is more than 5 1/2 miles from a church

Augusta

No residence is more than 5 1/2 miles from a town
No residence is more than 5 1/2 miles from a school
No residence is more than 5 1/2 miles from a church

Table: Franklin County Churches and Voting Precincts [Citation: Key = E164]

Summary

In Franklin County precincts that voted for Lincoln in 1860 also contained the majority of churches in the following denominations: Dunker, German Reformed, Manees, Methodist Episcopal, Union, and United Brethren. Some denominations (Lutherans and Catholics) had churches located in precincts that went for Lincoln as well as those that went for Breckinridge. The lone African church was located in a precinct that went for Lincoln. The geographic locations of churches relative to the precinct's voting pattern in 1860, then, reveal few clues about ethnicity and political expression.

Processing

Note: Precincts that gave "high" support to a candidate were defined as the 3 districts which gave the highest percentage of support to each candidate. Because this includes only 9 of the 23 voting precincts in Franklin, the church totals do not match those given in the table for the whole county.

Denominations	Lincoln	Breckinridge
African	1	0
Baptist	1	0
Catholic	1	1
Coventer	1	0
Dunker	4	1
German Episcopal	0	1
German Lutheran	1	0
German Reformed	8	4
Lutheran	4	4
Manees	5	0
Methodist	1	0
Methodist Episcopal	6	2
Methodist Presbyterian	1	0
Presbyterian & Methodist	1	0
Presbyterian	3	1
Seceder	1	0

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Union	7	1
Union Bethel	0	1
United Brethren	7	2
Unknown	5	1
White Presbyterian	1	0

Denominations	High Lincoln Precincts	High Breckinridge Precincts	High Douglas Precincts
African	0	0	0
Baptist	0	0	0
Catholic	0	1	0
Coventer	0	0	0
Dunker	0	1	2
German Episcopal	0	0	0
German Lutheran	0	0	1
German Reformed	1	2	1
Lutheran	0	1	0
Manees	0	0	2
Methodist	0	0	2
Methodist Episcopal	0	2	0
Methodist Presbyterian	0	0	0
Presbyterian & Methodist	0	0	0
Presbyterian	0	0	0
Seceder	0	0	0
Union	0	0	3
Union Bethel	0	0	0
United Brethren	0	2	2
Unknown	0	1	1
White Presbyterian	0	0	0

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

	High Lincoln Precincts	High Breckinridge Precincts	High Douglas Precincts
Denominations	German Reformed (1)	Catholic (1)	Dunker (2)
		Dunker (1)	German Lutheran (1)
		German Reformed (2)	German Reformed (1)
		Lutheran (1)	Manees (2)
		Methodist Episcopal (2)	Methodist (2)
		United Brethren (2)	Union (3)
		Unknown (1)	United Brethren (2)
			Unknown (1)

Table: Free Blacks in Augusta County, 1860 [Citation: Key = E153]

Summary

Free blacks in Augusta County owned on average more real and personal property than their counterparts in Franklin. A few black men in both places managed to gain significant wealth.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/perl_scripts/search_popcensus.cgi?search_type=basic&start_page=0&year=1860&co

Table: Industries Using Enslaved Labor [Citation: Key = E148]

Summary

This table shows the data on companies in the manufacturing census in Augusta cross referenced with the Augusta slaveholders census schedule. Slaveholders in Augusta predominated in low-skill industries, while artisans in Augusta rarely owned slaves.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Industry	No. Man. own Slaves	No. Establishments
Distilleries	13	18
Flour Mills	24	43
Lumber	5	7
Sawmills	12	19
Foundries	4	4
Wagon Makers	0	2
Carriage Makers	1	5
Blacksmiths	3	16
Coopers	0	5
Saddle/Harness Makers	3	4

Table: Laborers in Augusta and Franklin, 1860 [Citation: Key = E158]

Summary

This table shows the percentage of various laboring occupations that owned at least some real or personal wealth. Laborers in both counties accumulated some real and personal wealth.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow: <http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/govdoc/popcensus.html>

Table: Land Values in Augusta and Franklin Counties [Citation: Key = E132]

Summary

Franklin farms were more intensely cultivated, and held a much higher average value per acre of improved and unimproved land across all soil types. In Augusta the larger the farm size the lower the average value by acre.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

Average Farm Values by Acre in Dollars

	Augusta		Franklin	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
County Average	32.7	30.0	54.3	50.0
Nonslaveholders	31.1	25.4		
Slaveholders	35.1	33.1		
Best Soil	34.1	30.0	66.8	66.5
Medium Soil	32.0	31.8	45.1	40.0
Worst Soil	18.4	15.0	19.7	12.4
Lowest Farm Value Quintile	21.4	15.0	40.0	20.0
Low-Medium Farm Value Quintile	22.1	21.5	48.2	32.9
Medium Farm Value Quintile	42.7	31.5	50.7	46.1
Medium-High Farm Value Quintile	34.5	34.3	58.7	60.0
High Farm Value Quintile	41.9	40.0	71.9	70.0

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Smallest Farm Size Quintile	46.9	30.8	71.7	67.1
Small-Medium Farm Size Quintile	30.4	30.0	50.4	48.0
Medium Farm Size Quintile	30.8	30.0	32.6	30.2
Medium-Large Farm Size Quintile	29.0	30.2	26.4	21.9
Largest Farm Size Quintile	21.8	14.0	10.3	10.3

Table: Newspaper Article Reprints by Region [Citation: Key = E170]

Summary

New York supplied the most articles for reprinting for both Augusta and Franklin editors. The Augusta newspapers relied heavily on Richmond for news stories. Other Southern cities' papers, such as the Charleston Mercury for example, supplied only a handful of stories to these editors. In the case of Charleston, Staunton's Whig editor reprinted just six stories and Chambersburg's editors also picked up six stories total.

Processing

Data are derived from Katherine Pierce, "Networks of Disunion" (unpublished paper). Pierce surveyed 1,100 newspaper articles from the Valley of the Shadow Project between 1857 and 1865 in all four of the project's newspapers.

Place	Rep. Vindicator	Staunton Spectator	Franklin Repository	Valley Spirit
Southern Origin Totals	73	156	72	73
Richmond Totals	32	61	23	17
Baltimore Totals	2	13	17	9
Louisville Totals	0	0	4	13
Lynchburg Totals	4	13	0	0
Northern Origin Totals	64	106	180	308
New York Totals	47	77	57	159
Philadelphia Totals	2	8	31	28
Harrisburg Totals	0	0	15	35
Cincinnati Totals	0	6	2	11

Table: Newspaper Classified Ads by Business Type [Citation: Key = E169]

Summary

Newspapers in Augusta and Franklin ran classified ads from hundreds of businesses in each issue. The origins of these businesses show comparatively higher dependence in Augusta on outside businesses for goods and services.

Processing

Typical issues were compared across newspapers in 1860, and little difference was found for variance by time of year or political affiliation of the paper's editors. The data represent one issue from each county.

Augusta County, Staunton Spectator Ads							
Location	Pharmaceutical	Appliances	Dry Goods	Professionals	General Commission	Ironware	Total No. (includes other categories)
Alexandria							1
Arkansas				1			1
Baltimore		3	2		1	1	14
Boston			1				1
New York			1				2
Providence	1						1
Richmond	1	1	7		5	4	30
Albemarle							1
Clarke							1
Culpeper							2
Highland							1
Nelson							1
Orange							1
Rockbridge							1
Rockingham							1

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Augusta	8	11	22	9	2	5	144
Total	10	15	32	10	8	10	203

Franklin County, Valley Spirit Ads

Location	Pharmaceutical	Appliances	Dry Goods	Professions	General Commission	Ironware	Total No.
Boston							1
Baltimore		1			3		6
Clearspring							1
Hagerstown							1
Hancock							1
Harrisburg							1
New York	5						9
Philadelphia	1	1	7			1	30
Winchester							1
Franklin	52	3	23	28	8	25	242
Total	58	6	30	28	11	26	294

Table: Occupations in Augusta and Franklin, 1860 [Citation: Key = E152]

Summary

In nearly every occupational category Augusta residents owned more real and personal wealth than their counterparts in Franklin County. The discrepancy was particularly significant among female occupations and students. In Augusta both owned far more wealth than their Franklin counterparts. Only in the categories of artisans and unskilled workers did Franklin achieve similar levels of wealth to Augusta.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow: <http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/govdoc/popcensus.html>

Table: Election Returns in Augusta, Franklin, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, 1860 [Citation: Key = E173]

Summary

In the 1860 presidential election, Lincoln won decisively in Pennsylvania while Bell edged out Breckinridge for Virginia. Breckinridge barely registered among Augusta voters, but showed significant strength in Franklin.

Processing

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

<http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/vshadow2/govdoc/popcensus.html>

Table: National Election Returns, 1860 [Citation: Key = E174]

Summary

Lincoln won the national election, but with less than a majority of popular votes cast. Slave states split their votes between Breckinridge and Bell, while Free states voted primarily for Lincoln and Douglas.

Processing

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

<http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/vshadow2/govdoc/popcensus.html>

Table: Party Affiliation, Augusta County [Citation: Key = E159]

Summary

We identified a total of 406 party activists in Augusta County through the newspapers--72 percent Whig and 28 percent Democrat.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Whig	75	72.1
Democrat	29	27.9
Total	104	100.0

	Household Wealth Cohorts					Total
	0 - \$975	\$976 - \$4,187	\$4,188 - \$9,625	\$9,262 - \$21,999	\$22,000 +	
No. Record	155	143	131	126	109	664
Whig	0	6	14	24	26	70
Democrat	0	3	4	8	14	29
Total	155	152	149	158	149	763

Farm Value	Total
-------------------	--------------

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

	0 - \$1,999	\$2,000 - \$3,999	\$4,000 - \$7,570	\$7,571 - \$12,000	\$13,000 +	
No. Record	66	80	72	55	65	338
Whig	3	6	11	18	14	52
Democrat	1	3	3	6	3	16
Total	70	89	86	79	82	406

	Farm Size (in acres)					
	0 - 99	100 - 299	300 - 499	500 - 999	1000 +	
No. Record	66	173	54	34	11	338
Whig	3	22	13	12	2	52
Democrat	1	8	6	0	1	16
Total	70	203	73	46	14	406

	Number of Slaves Held							
	0	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 20	21 - 30	31 +	
No. Record	551	36	49	33	32	1	1	703
Whig	31	6	12	11	15	0	0	75
Democrat	18	2	3	4	2	0	0	29
Total	600	44	64	48	49	1	1	807

	Soil Ratings			
	Best	Medium	Worst	
No. Record	571	76	56	703
Whig	60	6	9	75
Democrat	25	2	2	29
Total	656	84	67	807

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

	Proximity of Household to Town		Total
	Greater than 1 Mile	Less than 1 Mile	
No. Record	546	157	703
Whig	53	22	75
Democrat	18	11	29
Total	617	190	807

Table: Party Affiliation, Franklin County [Citation: Key = E160]

Summary

We were able to identify 300 party activists in Franklin County through the newspapers--57 percent Democrats and 43 percent Republicans.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Democrat	171	57.0
Republican	129	43.0
Total	300	100.0

	Household Wealth Cohorts					Total
	\$0 - \$499	\$500 - \$1,299	\$1,300 - \$3,599	\$3,600 - \$9,739	\$9,740 +	
Democrat	14	16	14	31	21	96
Republican	9	10	16	19	25	79
Total	23	26	30	50	46	175

	Farm Size (in acres)					Total
	0 - 99	100 - 299	300 - 499	500 - 999	1000 +	

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Democrat	4	19	4	0	1	28
Republican	5	16	1	1	0	23
Total	9	35	5	1	1	51

	Farm Value					Total
	\$0 - \$2,499	\$2,500 - \$4,795	\$4,796 - \$7,799	\$7,800 - \$10,999	\$11,000 +	
Democrat	2	5	5	9	7	28
Republican	0	5	7	4	7	23
Total	2	10	12	13	14	51

	Soil Ratings			Total
	Best	Medium	Worst	
Democrat	87	76	3	166
Republican	55	70	0	125
Total	142	146	3	291

	Proximity of Household to Town		Total
	Greater than 1 mile	Less than 1 mile	
Democrat	42	124	166
Republican	34	91	125
Total	76	215	291

Table: Political Activists in Augusta and Franklin Counties [Citation: Key = E151]

Summary

Political activists include individuals mentioned in any newspaper in connection with a political event or position.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

		Farmer	Laborer	Artisan	Professional	Business
Augusta	<i>Whig</i>	23	2	0	11	2
	<i>Democrat</i>	5	0	4	3	2
Franklin	<i>Republican</i>	19	3	18	20	12
	<i>Democrat</i>	17	9	25	19	17

		Rank in Household			
		Head	First	Second	Boarder
Augusta	<i>Whig</i>	32	1	2	4
	<i>Democrat</i>	9	0	2	3
Franklin	<i>Republican</i>	66	1	2	5
	<i>Democrat</i>	65	3	3	16

Table: Politics, Augusta County, 1860 Presidential Election Voting by Precinct [Citation: Key = E135]

Summary

Constitutional Union candidate John Bell won Augusta with 66 percent of the vote, while Democrat Stephen Douglas--endorsed strongly by the local Democratic paper--took 28 percent. John Breckinridge, the strongest pro-slavery candidate, won less than 6 percent of the Augusta vote.

Processing

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow: <http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/outlines/1860augvo.html>

Table: Politics, Augusta County, 1860 Presidential Election Candidates and Precincts [Citation: Key = E140]

Summary

Identified party activists for each 1860 candidate supported Bell strongly. Fifteen activists identified with the Democratic Party candidates, split evenly between Douglas and Breckinridge.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Theissen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

Precinct	1860 Candidate			Total	
	No. Record	Bell	Breckinridge		
Staunton, Precinct No. 1	35	1	1	3	40
Staunton, Precinct No. 2	45	4	2	2	53
Waynesborough	36	3	0	0	39
Churchville	52	1	1	54	0
Mt. Sidney	47	0	0	0	47
Middlebrook	27	1	0	0	28
Greenville	25	1	0	0	26
Fishersville	38	4	1	0	43
New Hope	91	5	2	0	98
Mt. Meridian	41	1	0	0	42
Mt. Solon	56	2	0	0	58
Deerfield	28	4	0	1	33

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Craigsville	26	2	0	0	28
Stuart's Draft	34	3	1	0	38
Swoopes Depot	40	2	0	1	43
Sherando	18	1	2	0	21
Parnassus	42	2	0	0	44
Spring Hill	37	0	0	0	37
Newport	20	1	0	0	21
Midway	14	0	0	0	14
Total	752	38	9	8	807

Table: Politics, Augusta County, High Bell Precincts in the 1860 Presidential Election [Citation: Key = E138]

Summary

Bell districts were poorer than the county average. They held slaves in the same proportion as the county average, but their overall household wealth fell significantly below average. They devoted much more of the crop production to corn.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Thiessen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

Precinct	n	% for Bell	Mean Household Wealth	Median Household Wealth (in dollars)	Mean Farm Value (in dollars)	Median Farm Value (in dollars)	Corn as a percent of Total Grain	Wheat as a percent of Total with Slaves Grain	Percent of Households
County Average	2886	66.0	12,416	5,791	8,521	5,360	57%	23%	26%
Churchville	170	86.1	10,399	5,261	6,925	3,925	68%	18%	20%
Deerfield	85	90.1	7,592	2,949	3,152	2,000	67%	10%	24%
Craigsville	85	83.5	6,501	4,807	4,541	3,900	71%	11%	29%

Table: Politics, Augusta County, High Breckinridge Precincts in the 1860 Presidential Election
[Citation: Key = E136]

Summary

The high Breckinridge precincts were much wealthier than the county average and contained more slaveholding households.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Thiessen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

Precinct	n	% for Breckinridge	Mean Household Wealth (in dollars)	Median Household Wealth (in dollars)	Mean Farm Value (in dollars)	Median Farm Value (in dollars)	Corn as a percent of Total Grain	Wheat as a percent of Total Grain	Percent of Households with Slaves
County Average	2886	5.7	12,416	5,791	8,521	5,360	57%	23%	26%
Middlebrook	150	13.8	15,365	12,486	9,245	14,500	48%	16%	32%
Stuart's Draft	122	20.2	20,991	14,700	14,288	10,070	52%	26%	42%
Sherando	68	15	2,671	1,000	2,702	3,476	80%	4%	10%

Table: Politics, Augusta County, High Douglas Precincts in the 1860 Presidential Election
[Citation: Key = E137]

Summary

The high Douglas precincts contained fewer households with slaves than the county average but held household wealth on par with the county average.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Thiessen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

Precinct	n	% for Douglas	Mean Household Wealth (in dollars)	Median Household Wealth (in dollars)	Mean Farm Value (in dollars)	Median Farm Value (in dollars)	Corn as a percent of Total Grain	Wheat as a percent of Total Grain	Percent of Households with Slaves
County Average	2886	28.3	12,416	5,791	8,521	5,360	57%	23%	26%
Spring Hill	125	39.4	13,401	7,000	10,698	8,390	63%	25%	16%
Mt. Sidney	149	36.1	12,131	6,038	6,936	5,000	56%	30%	11%
Parnassus	136	58.7	11,561	7,258	5,855	3,000	65%	18%	24%

Table: Politics, Augusta County, Party Activists, 1859-60 [Citation: Key = E139]

Summary

Whig activists dominate in the county, while in Staunton Democratic activists outnumbered Whigs 2 to 1.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Thiessen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

Precinct No. Record	Party Affiliation		Total
	Whig	Democrat	
Staunton, Precinct No. 1	32	2	40
Staunton, Precinct No. 2	44	4	53
Waynesborough	33	5	39
Churchville	50	4	54
Mt. Sidney	45	1	47
Middlebrook	23	5	28
Greenville	23	3	26
Fishersville	36	5	43
New Hope	84	9	98
Mt. Meridian	37	5	42
Mt. Solon	56	1	58
Deerfield	29	3	33
Craigsville	21	6	28

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Stuart's Draft	32	4	2	38
Swoopes Depot	38	5	0	43
Sherando	17	3	1	21
Parnassus	41	3	0	44
Spring Hill	32	3	2	37
Newport	18	3	0	21
Midway	12	1	1	14
Total	703	75	29	807

Table: Politics, Augusta County, Slaveholding and Precinct Crosstabulation [Citation: Key = E141]

Summary

Of the 807 households in the Augusta GIS, 207 owned slaves--or 25 percent.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Theissen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

	No.	slaves	1 Slave	2-5 slaves	6-10 slaves	11-20 slaves	21-30 slaves	31+ slaves	Total
Staunton, Precinct No. 1	30	2	1	2	5	0	0	40	
Staunton, Precinct No. 2	42	0	2	6	3	0	0	53	
Waynesborough	30	3	2	2	2	0	0	39	
Churchville	43	4	4	1	2	0	0	54	
Mt. Sidney	42	0	3	1	1	0	0	47	
Middlebrook	19	1	3	1	4	0	0	28	
Greenville	13	1	5	1	6	0	0	26	
Fishersville	30	2	4	6	1	0	0	43	
New Hope	76	7	9	2	3	0	1	98	
Mt. Meridian	25	2	7	4	4	0	0	42	
Mt. Solon	44	8	3	2	1	0	0	58	
Deerfield	25	4	1	2	1	0	0	33	

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Craigsville	20	3	2	3	0	0	0	28
Stuart's Draft	22	3	1	4	7	1	0	38
Swoopes Depot	30	3	2	4	4	0	0	43
Sherando	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	21
Parnassus	37	0	5	0	2	0	0	44
Spring Hill	28	1	5	1	2	0	0	37
Newport	15	0	2	4	0	0	0	21
Midway	10	0	2	2	0	0	0	14
Total	600	44	64	48	49	1	1	807

Table: Politics, Franklin County, 1860 Presidential Election Precinct Comparison [Citation: Key = E126]

Summary

This table draws on data from the GIS to compare Franklin's precincts in the 1860 presidential election. Contested districts are defined as those where the victor did not receive more than 55 percent of the popular vote. In most respects the contested districts in Franklin fit the county average. The precinct that Breckinridge won by a significant margin is significantly poorer and more concentrated in corn than either the county as a whole or the Lincoln districts.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Theissen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

	County Average	Lincoln Districts	Breckinridge Districts	Contested Districts
Number of Districts		10	1	12
Lincoln:Breckinridge Vote Ratio	54:34	64:24	24:73	50:42
Mean Household Wealth	\$5892	\$5764	\$3553	\$6137
Median Household Wealth	\$2200	\$1925	\$2450	\$2500
Mean Farm Value	\$7314	\$7559	\$2050	\$7231
Median Farm Value	\$6000	\$6450	\$1900	\$6000
Corn as a percent of Total Grain	34%	34%	39%	34%
Wheat as a percent of Total Grain	37%	36%	16%	39%

Table: Politics, Franklin County, High Breckinridge Precincts in the 1860 Presidential Election
[Citation: Key = E129]

Summary

The high Breckinridge precincts were poorer than the county average in both household wealth and farm value and were more heavily invested in corn than wheat.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Thiessen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

	High Breckinridge Districts						
	Breckinridge Vote	Mean Household Wealth (in dollars)	Median Household Wealth (in dollars)	Mean Farm Value (in dollars)	Median Farm Value (in dollars)	Corn as a percent of Total Grain	Wheat as a percent of Total Grain
County Average	34.1	5,892	2,200	7,314	6,000	34%	37%
Concord	73.4	3,553	2,450	2,050	1,900	39%	16%
Lurgan	54.7	4,358	2,250	3,265	3,000	42%	22%
Welsh Run	52.9	5,739	2,450	7,569	6,500	31%	41%

Table: Politics, Franklin County, High Douglas Precincts in the 1860 Presidential Election
[Citation: Key = E130]

Summary

The high Douglas precincts were wealthier than the county average and more heavily invested in wheat.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Thiessen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

	High Douglas Districts						
	Douglas Vote	Mean Household Wealth (in dollars)	Median Household Wealth (in dollars)	Mean Farm Value (in dollars)	Median Farm Value (in dollars)	Corn as a percent of Total Grain	Wheat as a percent of Total Grain
County Average	8.4	5,892	2,200	7,314	6,000	34%	37%
Chambersburg, North Ward	31.4	4,255	1,100	7,226	7,000	32%	39%
Antrim	16.8	6,697	2,700	10,197	10,000	33%	40%
Guilford	22.8	8,270	7,650	9,349	7,000	35%	39%

Table: Politics, Franklin County, High Lincoln Precincts in the 1860 Presidential Election
[Citation: Key = E128]

Summary

Lincoln won areas of the county both above and below the county averages for wealth and farm values. His greatest support came from areas with strong concentration in wheat production.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Thiessen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

	High Lincoln Districts						
	Lincoln Vote	Mean Household Wealth (in dollars)	Median Household Wealth (in dollars)	Mean Farm Value (in dollars)	Median Farm Value (in dollars)	Corn as a percent of Total Grain	Wheat as a percent of Total Grain
County Average	56.4	5,892	2,200	7,314	6,000	34%	37%
Chamerbsburg, South Ward	71.0	3,974	1,000	11,501	6,500	30%	40%
Peters	77.3	11,122	9,200	9,107	8,000	23%	40%
Metal	68.1	4,492	2,560	4,140	4,000	40%	29%

Table: Politics, Franklin County, Party Activists, 1859-60 [Citation: Key = E131]

Summary

Democratic party activists in Franklin County outnumbered Republicans in nearly every precinct, but the younger Republican or People's Party rallied more voters in the 1860 election.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Original precinct boundaries are not available. Precinct boundaries were established in the GIS using Thiessen polygons around precinct stations as central places.

	Party Affiliation		Total
	Democrat	Republican	
Chambersburg, South Ward	54	45	99
Chambersburg, North Ward	35	27	62
Antrim	11	7	18
Concord	3	1	4
Dry Run	5	0	5
Fayetteville	5	1	6
Green Village	3	5	8
Guilford	4	0	4
Hamilton	3	3	6
Letterkenny	5	2	7
Loudon	3	1	4
Lurgan	4	1	5
Montgomery	4	7	11
Metal	1	5	6

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Orrstown	5	7	12
Peters	3	1	4
Quincy	1	2	3
St. Thomas	4	1	5
Southampton	3	2	5
Sulphur Spring	1	2	3
Warren	3	0	3
Washington	3	3	6
Welsh Run	3	3	6
Total	166	126	292

Table: Politics, Franklin County, 1860 Presidential Voting by Precinct [Citation: Key = E125]

Summary

This table shows the precinct level voting in votes and percentages for the candidates in the 1860 presidential election.

Processing

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow: <http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/outlines/1860vote.html>

Table: Population of Cities and Towns, 1860 [Citation: Key = E116]

Summary

U.S. Census aggregate figures listed just one town other than Staunton in Augusta County. That town, Waynesboro, was smaller in aggregate population than sixteen towns in Franklin County, where at least nine towns were more than double its size.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/govdoc/statistics/townpop.html>

Table: Property Holding of Heads of Household [Citation: Key = E142]

Summary

In both counties propertyless heads of households made up only a small percentage of the population. In both Augusta and Franklin nearly half of the households did not own any land.

Processing

	Augusta		Franklin	
Heads of Household with real estate wealth	2019	54.9%	4186	55.7%
Heads of Household with no real estate wealth	1659	45.1%	3324	44.3%
Heads of Household with personal property	3240	88.1%	7224	96.2%
Heads of Household with no personal property	438	11.9%	286	3.8%

Table: Real Estate and Personal Estate Valuation, 1860 [Citation: Key = E117]

Summary

Augusta County's massive personal estate valuation represented holdings in human property--slaves. In the value of real and personal estate, Augusta County's white residents held wealth on a per capita basis double that of the residents of Franklin County (\$1112 per capita in Augusta to \$633 in Franklin).

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/govdoc/statistics/estateval.html>

Table: Regional Comparison [Citation: Key = E161]

Summary

Augusta and Franklin's difference in land value by acre and average farm value differed markedly but in a pattern shared by other counties on the border region. In general, non-slaveholding Northern counties along the border had a much higher value per acre than their Southern neighbors. However, these counties also had a lower average farm value. When measured against their neighboring contiguous counties, Franklin and Augusta stand out as successful central places. Neighboring counties were less wealthy and diversified.

Processing

Note: The "contiguous" counties are all those counties (whether in the same state or not) whose border connects with Augusta or Franklin. The "border counties" are the 61 counties running along the north and south sides of the boundary between Ohio-Kentucky, Ohio-West Virginia, Pennsylvania-West Virginia, Pennsylvania-Maryland (the West Virginia counties were all part of Virginia in 1860). The "per capita capital investment in manufacturing" and the "per capita capital investment in manufacturing, free population" were both computed by dividing the total value of capital invested in manufacturing by the relevant population figure. The "total farmland" was computed by adding the "improved" and "unimproved land" categories. The "average farm value" was determined by dividing the "cash value of farms" by the "total number of farms," while the "land value, by acre," was computed by dividing the "cash value of farms" by the "total farmland."

	Number of Farms	Acres of		Total Land Farms (Total)		Value of	
		Improved Land	Unimproved Land			Farms (Average)	Land (per acre)
Augusta County	1552	224644	213515	438159	10997286	\$7,085.88	\$25.10
Counties Bordering to Augusta	770	126880	174100	300890	4752593	\$6,001.50	\$14.45
Franklin County	2494	261390	139925	401315	16265894	\$6,522.01	\$40.53
Counties Bordering Franklin	1635	164670	79738	244408	8538389	\$5,197	\$33.06
Border County Average	1591	146456	90537	236993	7663344	\$4,816.68	\$32.34

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Non-Slaveholding Border County Average	2514	185237	111458	296695	12000408	\$4,773.43	\$40.45
Slaveholding Border County Average	905	117647	74996	192643	4441525	\$4,907.76	\$23.06

	Free Individuals	Number of Families	Slaveholders	Manufacturing Capital Total Investment	Investment per capita, free population
Augusta	22133	3740	811	\$639,010.00	\$28.87
Counties Contiguous to Augusta	9478	1668	447	\$118,951.00	\$16.09
Franklin	42126	7709	0	\$1,146,320.00	\$27.21
Counties Contiguous to Franklin	27305	4988	0	\$740,468.00	\$26.11
Border Average	31023	5666	161	\$1,175,755.00	\$37.90
Non-Slaveholding County Average	42476	7753	0	\$1,798,431.00	\$29.92
Slaveholding County Average	22514	4115	281	\$713,196.00	\$27.43

Table: Road Networks, Franklin and Augusta Counties, 1860 [Citation: Key = E163]

Summary

On a per capita basis Augusta had more major and minor roads than Franklin. On a per square mile basis Franklin was more densely networked in major roads, but Augusta was more densely networked in minor roads.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules. Note: Augusta's per capita figures include the entire population, slave and free.

	Augusta	Franklin
Miles of major roads per capita	0.029	0.023
Miles of minor roads per capita	0.055	0.009
Miles of major roads per square mile	0.64	1.26
Miles of minor roads per square mile	1.23	0.53

Table: School and Literacy, 1850 [Citation: Key = E119]

Summary

This table compares in 1850 the numbers of students and teachers in schools in both counties. The 1860 census did not capture similar data. Augusta's investment in schools and education fell far below Franklin's in every category, except private academies.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Seventh Census [1850]. Population of the United States in 1850, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Seventh Census. Washington, D.C., 1854.

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/Reference/censi/CDAT35.html>

Table: Hiring of Enslaved Persons, Augusta County, 1860 [Citation: Key = E162]

Summary

Slaveowners regularly hired out their slaves to a range of businesses and individuals. At least 10 percent of the total slave population was hired out in 1860.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/perl_scripts/searchslaveemps.cgi

Table: Slaveowners and Employers, Augusta County, 1860 [Citation: Key = E157]

Summary

A wide variety of employers rented slaves from slaveowners, including railroad corporations, individuals, estates, and women.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/perl_scripts/searchslaveempstable.cgi

Table: Slaveholders and Agricultural Productivity Correlations [Citation: Key = E144]

Summary

Slaveholding and slavery as a independent variable does not capture the pervasive influence of the institution. Still, when measured as a variable slaveholding does not seem to have a significant correlation with the production of total wheat and corn within Augusta. Through slave hiring and rental, both slaveholders and nonslaveholders shared in the greater productivity and wealth that slavery made possible.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	R	r²
Slaveholding	Wheat production, by acre	0.087	0.005
	Total Wheat production	0.463	0.212
	Corn production, by acre	0.015	-0.002
	Total Corn production	0.470	0.219
	Swine production, by acre	0.092	0.006
	Total Swine Production	0.400	0.158
	Cow production, by acre	0.144	0.018
	Total Cow production	0.367	0.133
	Cattle production, by acre	0.152	0.021
	Total cattle production	0.414	0.169

Table: Slaveholders and Agricultural Productivity [Citation: Key = E145]

Summary

In corn and wheat production per acre there was relative equality among most slaveholders and nonslaveholders. For those few farms with the highest numbers of slaves, however, slavery enabled much higher rates of productivity.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

Number of Slaves	Wheat Production	Average production	Number of cases
	per acre	in bushels by farm	
0 slaves	1.4	163	236
1 slave	1.2	246	32
2 - 5 slaves	1.8	308	57
6 - 10 slaves	1.8	385	36
11 - 20 slaves	1.4	494	43
21 - 30 slaves	1.5	500	1
31+ slaves	3.6	1500	1
Number of Slaves	Corn Production	Average production	Number of cases
	per acre	in bushels by farm	
0 slaves	3.5	371	236
1 slave	2.9	557	32
2 - 5 slaves	4.3	670	57
6 - 10 slaves	3.2	707	36
11 - 20 slaves	3.4	1192	43
21 - 30 slaves	1.8	600	1

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

31+ slaves	4.8	2000	1
	Swine Production	Average production	Number of
	per acre	by farm	cases
0 slaves	0.22	18.4	236
1 slave	0.17	22.4	32
2 - 5 slaves	0.18	22.9	57
6 - 10 slaves	0.12	23.6	36
11 - 20 slaves	0.12	37.3	43
21 - 30 slaves	0.09	29.0	1
31+ slaves	0.48	200.0	1
	Cows Production	Average production	Number of
	per acre	by farm	cases
0 slaves	0.04	3.7	236
1 slave	0.05	4.3	32
2 - 5 slaves	0.04	5.0	57
6 - 10 slaves	0.03	5.9	36
11 - 20 slaves	0.02	7.4	43
21 - 30 slaves	0.03	9.0	1
31+ slaves	0.02	9.0	1

Table: Slaveholders and Soil Quality [Citation: Key = E143]

Summary

A significant majority of both slaveholders and nonslaveholders farmed on the best soil. The largest planter and slaveholder in the Augusta GIS data set resided on medium soil and achieved significantly higher productivity than nonslaveholders and slaveholders on the best soil.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

	Best Soil		Medium Soil		Worst Soil		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0 slaves	476	79.3	71	11.8	53	8.8	600	100.0
1 slave	40	90.9	2	4.5	2	4.5	44	100.0
2 - 5 slaves	53	82.8	6	9.4	5	7.8	64	100.0
6 - 10 slaves	42	87.5	2	4.2	4	8.3	48	100.0
11 - 20 slaves	44	89.8	2	4.1	3	6.1	49	100.0
21 - 30 slaves	1	100.0	0	0	0	0	1	100.0
31+ slaves	0	0	1	100.0	0	0	1	100.0
Total	656	81.3	84	10.4	67	8.3	807	100.0

Table: Soil Types [Citation: Key = E146]

Summary

Augusta was larger by a factor of 22 percent, but it contained a higher percentage of land poorly suited for agricultural purposes.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

Franklin Soil Types

Soil Type	Suitability for Agriculture	Total Area, in square miles	Area as a percent of whole county
Hagerstown-Duffield	high suitability	230.81	30.2
Highfield-Glenville	good suitability	7.72	1.0
Murrill-Laidig	suitable	68.22	8.9
Weikert-Berks-Bedington	suitable	235.02	30.7
Laidig-Buchanan	poor suitability	166.09	21.7
Dekalb-Laidig	not suitable	56.91	7.4
County Total		764.76	99.9

Augusta Soil Types

Soil Type	Suitability for Agriculture	Total Area, in square miles	Area as a percent of whole county
Types 1 - 3	good suitability	409.1	42.0
Types 11 - 14	good suitability	160.32	16.5

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Type 4	suitable	43.28	4.4
Types 5 - 10	poor suitability	361.35	37.1
Unidentified		0.20	0.0002
County total		974.05	100

Table: Town and Rural Distribution of Household Wealth [Citation: Key = E168]

Summary

Household wealth differed between Augusta and Franklin by the proportion concentrated in towns (one mile buffer around towns in each county). In Augusta just 178 (23 percent) of the households lived inside these towns, but in Franklin 1,469 (56 percent) lived in towns. But Augusta's town residents were more wealthy than their rural counterparts, while in Franklin rural households maintained a higher average wealth than the town households.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

	Augusta County	Franklin County
Rural Households	578	1154
Mean Household Wealth	\$12,006	\$7,334
Median Household Wealth	\$5,969	\$4,300
Income Quintiles		
20	\$918	\$755
40	\$4,060	\$2,500
60	\$9,620	\$6,700
80	\$19,960	\$12,100
Town Households	174	1469
Mean Household Wealth	\$13,777	\$4,758
Median Household Wealth	\$5,635	\$1,400
Income Quintiles		
20	\$1,000	\$350
40	\$4,050	\$1,000
60	\$9,000	\$2,200

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

80

\$23,603

\$7,000

Table: Value of Manufacturing, 1860 [Citation: Key = E118]

Summary

On a per capita basis Augusta invested nearly as heavily as Franklin in manufacturing. If only free white Augusta residents are the basis for comparison--not total population--Augusta had a higher per capita investment. Augusta and Franklin differed, though, on the industries they emphasized.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

<http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/govdoc/statistics/manufactures.html>

Table: Wealth and Slaveholding Correlations [Citation: Key = E120]

Summary

This table shows the correlations among some geographical and economic variables for Augusta and Franklin. Weak correlations between slaveholding and the other variables reveal that neither wealth nor slaveholding bore a strong relationship to geographic variables.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Augusta		Franklin	
		R	r2	R	r2
Household Wealth	Proximity to Railroad	0.057	0.002	0.092	0.008
	Proximity to a Major Road	0.060	0.002	0.008	0.000
	Proximity to a Church	0.041	0.000	0.098	0.009
	Proximity to a School	0.025	-0.001	0.073	0.005
	Elevation	0.106	0.010	0.043	0.002
	Soil Type	0.071	0.004	0.071	0.005
	Proximity to a Town	0.046	0.002	0.138	0.019
	Party Affiliation	0.203	0.040	0.034	-0.005
	Farm Value				
	Proximity to Railroad	0.082	0.004	0.144	0.020
	Proximity to a	0.044	-0.001	0.033	0.000

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

	Major Road				
	Proximity to a Church	0.054	0.000	0.009	-0.001
	Proximity to a School	0.065	0.002	0.046	0.001
	Elevation	0.150	0.020	0.105	0.010
	Soil Type	0.019	-0.002	0.230	0.052
	Proximity to a Town	0.020	-0.002	0.084	0.006
	Party Affiliation	0.138	0.017	0.088	-0.013
Farm Size		R	r2	R	r2
	Proximity to Railroad	0.040	-0.001	0.038	0.000
	Proximity to a Major Road	0.065	0.002	0.003	-0.001
	Proximity to a Church	0.152	0.021	0.022	0.000
	Proximity to a School	0.031	-0.002	0.030	0.000
	Elevation	0.004	-0.002	0.003	-0.001
	Soil Type	0.024	-0.002	0.024	0.000
	Proximity to a Town	0.034	-0.001	0.046	0.001
	Party Affiliation	0.138	0.017	0.143	0.001
Slaveholding		R	r2		
	Household Wealth	0.535	0.286		
	Farm Value	0.568	0.321		
	Proximity to Railroad	0.007	-0.001		
	Proximity to a Major Road	0.048	0.001		
	Proximity to a Church	0.052	0.002		
	Proximity to a School	0.028	0.000		
	Elevation	0.036	0.000		
	Soil Type	0.016	-0.001		
	Proximity to a	0.046	0.001		

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Town		
Party Affiliation	0.180	0.031

Table: Wheat and Corn Production by Household Wealth [Citation: Key = E133]

Summary

In Franklin County high levels of wheat production correlated positively with household wealth--the higher the level of production in wheat the more wealthy individuals were. Conversely, higher production of corn in Franklin did not correlate positively with household wealth.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

		Household Wealth					Total
		\$0 - \$499	\$500 - \$1,299	\$1,300 - \$3,599	\$3,600 - \$9,739	\$9,740 +	
Low Wheat Production	Count	2	26	84	86	61	259
	% within Level of Wheat Production	0.8%	10.0%	32.4%	33.2%	23.6%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	20.0%	51.0%	56.0%	34.0%	18.5%	32.7%
Medium Wheat Production	Count	3	12	39	87	130	271
	% within Level of Wheat Production	1.1%	4.4%	14.4%	32.1%	48.0%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	30.0%	23.5%	26.0%	34.4%	39.5%	34.2%
High Wheat	Count	5	13	27	80	138	263

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Production		Household Wealth					Total
		\$0 - \$975	\$976 - \$4,187	\$4,188 - \$9,625	\$9,262 - \$21,999	\$22,000 +	
	% within Level of Wheat Production	1.9%	4.9%	10.3%	30.4%	52.5%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	50.0%	25.5%	18.0%	31.6%	41.9%	33.2%
Total	Count	10	51	150	253	329	793
	% within Level of Wheat Production	1.3%	6.4%	18.9%	31.9%	41.5%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<hr/>							
		Household Wealth					Total
		\$0 - \$975	\$976 - \$4,187	\$4,188 - \$9,625	\$9,262 - \$21,999	\$22,000 +	
Low Wheat Production	Count	13	39	30	25	11	118
	% within Level of Wheat Production	11.0%	33.1%	25.4%	21.2%	9.3%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	54.2%	52.7%	33.0%	23.6%	12.4%	30.7%
Medium Wheat Production	Count	6	21	27	42	38	134
	% within Level of Wheat Production	4.5%	15.7%	20.1%	31.3%	28.4%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	25.0%	28.4%	29.7%	39.6%	42.7%	34.9%
High Wheat production	Count	5	14	34	39	40	132

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

	% within Level of Wheat Production	3.8%	10.6%	25.8%	29.5%	30.3%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	20.8%	18.9%	37.4%	36.8%	44.9%	34.4%
Total	Count	24	74	91	106	89	384
	% within Level of Wheat Production	6.3%	19.3%	23.7%	27.6%	23.2%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<hr/>							
		Household Wealth					Total
		\$0 - \$499	\$500 - \$1,299	\$1,300 - \$3,599	\$3,600 - \$9,739	\$9,740 +	
Low Corn production	Count	4	19	39	82	102	246
	% within Level Corn Production	1.6%	7.7%	15.9%	33.3%	41.5%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	44.4%	35.8%	26.0%	32.4%	31.4%	31.1%
Medium Corn production	Count	1	10	45	93	131	280
	% within Level Corn Production	0.4%	3.6%	16.1%	33.2%	46.8%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	11.1%	18.9%	30.0%	36.8%	40.3%	35.4%
High Corn production	Count	4	24	66	78	92	264
	% within Level Corn Production	1.5%	9.1%	25.0%	29.5%	34.8%	100.0%

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

	% within Household Wealth	44.4%	45.3%	44.0%	30.8%	28.3%	33.4%
Total	Count	9	53	150	253	325	790
	% within Level Corn Production	1.1%	6.7%	19.0%	32.0%	41.1%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<hr/>							
		Household Wealth					Total
		\$0 - \$975	\$976 - \$4,187	\$4,188 - \$9,625	\$9,262 - \$21,999	\$22,000 +	
Low Corn production	Count	6	25	20	37	32	120
	% within Level Corn Production	5.0%	20.8%	16.7%	30.8%	26.7%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth Cohorts	25.0%	33.8%	22.0%	34.9%	36.0%	31.3%
Medium Corn production	Count	8	16	33	38	39	134
	% within Level Corn Production	6.0%	11.9%	24.6%	28.4%	29.1%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	33.3%	21.6%	36.3%	35.8%	43.8%	34.9%
High Corn production	Count	10	33	38	31	18	130
	Production	7.7%	25.4%	29.2%	23.8%	13.8%	100.0%
	% within Household Wealth	41.7%	44.6%	41.8%	29.2%	20.2%	33.9%
Total	Count	24	74	91	106	89	384
	% within	6.3%	19.3%	23.7%	27.6%	23.2%	100.0%

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Level Corn Production						
% within Household Wealth	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table: Wheat and Corn Production in Dollars [Citation: Key = E122]

Summary

Slaveholders outperformed nonslaveholders in the value of corn and wheat production in Augusta, even though they did not necessarily monopolize the best soil. On the best soil Franklin wheat farmers outproduced their counterparts in Augusta, but on lesser soils Augusta's wheat farmers were just as productive. In corn production Augusta farmers were more productive across the range of soil types. In Augusta the farms in the highest quintile of farm value produced a crop value twice that of the next lowest quintile in both wheat and corn production. This leap was not evident at any other farm value in Augusta or Franklin.

Processing

The data are based on the GIS of Augusta and Franklin households--maps are derived from a D. H. Davison map of Franklin County, published in 1858, and a Jedediah Hotchkiss map of Augusta County, published in 1870, and based on surveys completed "during the war." The maps have been georeferenced at the Virginia Center for Digital History, using ESRI Arc Info to produce a Geographic Information Systems map and database of households based on U.S. census data from the population, agricultural, and slaveowners' schedules.

	Augusta			Franklin			
	Wheat, total crop	Number of cases	Mean Value (\$)	Median Value (\$)	Number of cases	Mean Value (\$)	Median Value (\$)
County Average		406	323	215	1028	434	361
Nonslaveholders		236	211	130			
Slaveholders		170	478	390			
Best Soil		334	332	228	485	558	520
Medium Soil		42	366	260	510	335	260
Worst Soil		30	164	66	33	158	65
Lowest Farm Value Quintile		70	79	26	171	134	72
Low-Medium Farm Value Quintile		89	119	91	225	194	156
Medium Farm Value Quintile		86	253	235	206	392	361

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Medium-High Farm Value Quintile	79	388	390	202	544	520
High Farm Value Quintile	82	764	656	224	845	780
Smallest Farm Size Quintile	70	70	39	278	206	130
Small-Medium Farm Size Quintile	203	253	208	637	505	455
Medium Farm Size Quintile	73	471	390	91	584	416
Medium-Large Farm Size Quintile	46	676	643	20	628	520
Largest Farm Size Quintile	14	673	650	2	780	780

Corn, total crop	Number of cases	Mean Value (\$)	Median Value (\$)	Number of cases	Mean Value (\$)	Median Value (\$)
County Average	406	494	360	1027	257	180
Nonslaveholders	236	334	270			
Slaveholders	170	716	540			
Best Soil	334	501	360	484	312	270
Medium Soil	42	506	360	510	209	180
Worst Soil	30	397	203	33	200	135
Lowest Farm Value Quintile	70	153	113	175	100	63
Low-Medium Farm Value Quintile	89	262	180	224	153	135
Medium Farm Value Quintile	86	388	360	207	226	180
Medium-High Farm Value Quintile	79	582	540	197	320	270
High Farm Value Quintile	82	1063	900	224	459	405

The Differences Slavery Made: A Close Analysis of Two American Communities
William G. Thomas, III and Edward L. Ayers

Smallest Farm Size Quintile	70	142	113	278	126	90
Small-Medium Farm Size Quintile	203	378	360	636	300	270
Medium Farm Size Quintile	73	678	720	91	322	270
Medium-Large Farm Size Quintile	46	1005	900	20	401	270
Largest Farm Size Quintile	14	1292	990	2	459	459

Table: Women in Augusta County, 1860 [Citation: Key = E155]

Summary

Women in Augusta County headed over 360 households. The average age of these heads of household was 51 years, and they owned more real and personal property than their counterparts in Franklin.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/perl_scripts/search_popcensus.cgi?search_type=adv&start_page=0&year=1860&cou

Table: Women in Franklin County, 1860 [Citation: Key = E156]

Summary

Women in Franklin County headed over 780 households. The average age of these heads of household was 53 years, and they owned less real and personal property than their counterparts in Augusta.

Processing

U.S. Census Office, Eighth Census [1860]. Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census. Washington, D.C., 1864. U.S. Census of Population, 1860. Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In U.S. National Archives and Records Administration. Eighth Census of the United States, 1860. Washington: National Archives and Records Administration (Augusta: Reels 1333 and 1387. Franklin: Reels 1111 and 1112).

Table Location in Valley of the Shadow:

http://valley.vcdh.virginia.edu/perl_scripts/search_popcensus.cgi?search_type=adv&start_page=0&year=1860&cou