

Points of Analysis

Slavery brought not only wealth but also roads, bridges, railroads, canals, and turnpikes to Augusta, in an elaborate display of building, enterprise, and growth. [Citation: Key = TAF01]

Both counties exhibited elaborate built infrastructures of bridges, railroads, major roads, minor roads, footpaths, and wagon roads, but Augusta's road mileage per capita outpaced Franklin's and presented a highly developed economic infrastructure. The dense networks of transportation and communication made these places elaborately connected both internally and externally. Over half of Franklin residents lived within a mile of a town, while residents of Augusta often dwelt a few miles from villages. Major and minor roads criss-crossed both counties.

Augusta had more minor roads than Franklin, nearly double the mileage, but fewer major roads. For every square mile of the county, Franklin had 1.26 miles of major road and .53 miles of minor road, while Augusta had .64 miles of major road and 1.23 miles of minor road. It is possible that Franklin's commitment to major roads was tied to its significant wheat production and that Augusta's greater reliance on minor roads showed its localized corn production. Augusta, though, had a higher per capita number of miles of both major and minor roads than Franklin. Northern visitors, then, might have seen few major roads in the Southern community and considered it less invested in transportation. Augustans, on the other hand, could see that for every person in the county they had made a significant investment in local transportation.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Rivers (map) [Citation: Key = E009]

Augusta County, Va., Railroads and Roads (map) [Citation: Key = E010]

Franklin County, Pa., Rivers (map) [Citation: Key = E014]

Franklin County, Pa., Railroads and Roads (map) [Citation: Key = E015]

Comparison, Rivers (map) [Citation: Key = E020]

Comparison, Railroads and Roads (map) [Citation: Key = E021]

Distances to Major Institutions (table) [Citation: Key = E124]

Road Networks, Franklin and Augusta Counties, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E163]

Related Historiography

Randolph B. Campbell, "Planters and Plain Folk: Harrison County, Texas, as a Test Case, 1850-1860," *Journal of Southern History* XL (No. 3), (1974): 369-398. [Citation Key = H006]

Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1986). [Citation Key = H046]

Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H054]

Franklin's wealth, like much of the North's, was located not in its cities and towns but in its rural agricultural land, where its richest citizens depended on the movement and production of wheat, oats, and livestock. [Citation: Key = TAF02]

Franklin had a much higher proportion of households in its urban areas than Augusta. Its urban households' mean wealth (\$4,759) was lower than its rural households' wealth (\$7,334), but in Augusta mean urban wealth (\$13,777) outpaced rural wealth (\$12,006). Many of Augusta's leading citizens lived in town, at the same time owning and managing scattered plantations and businesses across the county. These men, especially those in the professions, probably considered Staunton, or even Waynesboro, a more cultured and connected place where the energy and talent of commerce congregated. In Augusta the smaller villages seem to have produced the same concentrating effect on wealth. In Franklin towns were more crowded and there the median wealth was significantly lower (\$1,400) than the median wealth in the rural areas (\$4,300).

Supporting Evidence

Town and Rural Distribution of Household Wealth (table) [Citation: Key = E168]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1986). [Citation Key = H046]

Slaveholders in Augusta did not monopolize the best soil nor did they crowd out nonslaveholders or small slaveholders. [Citation: Key = TAF03]

Non-slaveholding residents in Augusta were just as likely to reside on the very best soil in the county as the largest plantation owners. Of 526 nonslaveholders in our data set, 72 percent of them lived on the best soil in the county. In the group of slaveholders with 11-20 slaves, 76 percent of them also resided on the soil rated most suitable for agriculture.

Slaveholders of nearly every category lived and farmed on some of the worst soil in Augusta. Thirty-seven percent of Augusta's land mass contains soil of poor suitability for agriculture, yet between 5 and 8 percent of slaveholders farmed it. Augusta's medium soil region, a narrow band of soils making up just 4 percent of the county's land, also held between 4 and 9 percent of slaveholders.

While 71 percent of Franklin County's land mass (total of 765 square miles) contained soil of high or average suitability, over 95 percent of its residents lived on this soil. In Augusta 63 percent of its total soil contained soil of high or average suitability, and 92 percent of its residents lived in these areas.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Soil Types (map) [Citation: Key = E003]

Augusta County, Va., Agricultural Production (map) [Citation: Key = E006]

Augusta County, Va., Elevation (map) [Citation: Key = E007]

Franklin County, Pa., Elevation (map) [Citation: Key = E012]

Land Values in Augusta and Franklin Counties (table) [Citation: Key = E132]

Slaveholders and Soil Quality (table) [Citation: Key = E143]

Slaveholders and Agricultural Productivity Correlations (table) [Citation: Key = E144]

Slaveholders and Agricultural Productivity (table) [Citation: Key = E145]

Soil Types (table) [Citation: Key = E146]

Related Historiography

Randolph B. Campbell, "Planters and Plain Folk: Harrison County, Texas, as a Test Case, 1850-1860," *Journal of Southern History* XL (No. 3), (1974): 369-398. [Citation Key = H006]

John D. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia Before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H045]

Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1986). [Citation Key = H046]

Slavery was ubiquitous and systemic in Augusta County's economy and society. No town or place in Augusta was without slavery, no person distant from it. Slavery extended into every corner of

the county, concentrating in no one area. [Citation: Key = TAF04]

In fact, slaveholding shows no statistical relationship to soil type, land elevation, household wealth, farm value, or proximity to geographic features. Eight hundred and eleven whites in Augusta owned 5,616 slaves. They were distributed evenly throughout the county in proportion to overall population density. Slaveowners were just as likely to live in the mountainous regions of western Augusta as were nonslaveholders, and at every elevation slaveholders lived in the same proportion as nonslaveholders.

Slavery wove its way deep into the wealthiest families. Thirty-eight slaves--22 men and 16 women--made possible the profusion of livestock and grain on M. G. Harman's place. Harman also hired out six slaves, three men and three women, to neighbors in Augusta. Moreover, his brothers, all in their thirties, also owned substantial numbers of people. A. W., a farmer, held six, and John, another farmer, held fifteen. Their brother William, an attorney, owned thirteen, and Thomas, a stock dealer, owned seven.

Members of prominent families bore many kinds of relationship to slavery. Benjamin Crawford worked 12 black men and 8 black women on his plantation. The other 22 Crawfords in the county owned 155 slaves among them. Some, such as Mary Crawford, had only one, probably a cook or domestic servant; some, such as William, did not rent out any of the sixteen people he owned; others, such as John, a minister, rented out the only enslaved person he owned. While Benjamin Crawford was 55 years old and Margaret, owner of 22 slaves, was 61, other slaveholders in the Crawford family, such as Virginia, were only in their twenties.

Various members of the Crawford family rented enslaved persons to other whites in Augusta, tying the white people of Augusta together in their dependence on slavery. Benjamin Crawford rented one woman each to J. Cochran, C. T. Cochran, and to William Donaghue, all of rural Augusta. J. H. Crawford rented to the Western Lunatic Asylum; J. S. Crawford rented to Jonathan Strafford of Staunton, J. Crawford to Jacob Politz of Staunton, and Mary Crawford rented female slaves to three households in Staunton. Town and country, rich and middling, farmer and professional, male and female, newcomer and long-time native--all bought into slavery, literally and figuratively.

The workings of the market in enslaved people were intense, and some wondered whether Virginia might be drained of slaves. *The Vindicator* thought not and offered early reports from the 1860 United States census to prove its case. "As compared with the census of 1850, these figures show an increase of 8,152, of which 300 are slaves. It will thus be seen that notwithstanding the plaintive appeals of demagogues as to the decrease of slave population in Virginia, here in Augusta county there has been really an increase. We believe, further, that in Western Virginia, notwithstanding the extensive trade in this species of property, the result will exhibit that we have more slaves than in 1850." They were correct: slavery was expanding in Virginia, and especially in the mountains of the southwest. The most powerful white men of Augusta counted on their county's continued involvement in slavery. The proportion of the county's population constituted by slaves had remained constant for the last forty years, carefully regulated by ongoing sale, and people did not expect that to change anytime soon.

Not everyone welcomed the prospect of Augusta's continued dependence on slavery. Joseph Waddell, one of the editors of the *Spectator*, confided to his diary his disgust with slavery. Waddell, who owned

two men and one woman, was approached by an acquaintance about selling the woman. "Dr. McGill proposed to buy Selena today, and offered me \$1000--I would not have sold her for \$20,000, unless she desired to go, or had grossly misbehaved. This thing of speculating in human flesh is utterly horrible to me--the money would cut into my flesh like hot iron." Waddell, who never wrote a word against slavery in his paper, admitted in private that "Slavery itself is extremely repulsive to my feelings, and I earnestly desire its extinction everywhere, when it can be done judiciously and so as to promote the welfare of both races." But, even to himself, he rushed to delimit his objections. "Yet I am no abolitionist. The day for emancipation with us has not come, and we must wait God's time. For the present all that the most philanthropic can do is to endeavor to ameliorate the institution, but it is hard to do this in the midst of the mischievous interference of outside fanatics." In his estimation, abolitionists prevented the natural and gradual end of slavery.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Residences with Slavery (map) [Citation: Key = E032]

Slave Population Comparison, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E070]

Joseph Addison Waddell, Diary, October 15, 1856 [Citation: Key = E179]

Related Historiography

Lloyd Benson, "Planters and Hoosiers: The Development of Sectional Society in Antebellum Indiana and Mississippi," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1990. [Citation Key = H002]

Randolph B. Campbell, "Planters and Plain Folk: Harrison County, Texas, as a Test Case, 1850-1860," *Journal of Southern History* XL (No. 3), (1974): 369-398. [Citation Key = H006]

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

In Augusta, almost every group of white people owned property and homes worth more than their counterparts in Franklin, most of it tied inextricably to slavery. [Citation: Key = TAF05]

The difference was most pronounced for personal property. Since slaves constituted an entire category of wealth prohibited in the North, the average farmer in Augusta owned three times as much personal property as the average farmer in Franklin. Slavery seemed responsible, at least in the eyes of whites, for a standard of living that benefited all whites.

Occupations did not differ markedly between the two counties. In both places, professionals, merchants, clerks, and proprietors together accounted for one jobholder in ten. About the same proportion of women worked for wages. One man in five worked as an artisan in both Augusta and Franklin. The southern county employed a quarter of its working population in farming compared to a fifth in the northern county. In both places, the largest single group of workers were unskilled; about three out of ten fell into this category in Augusta, about four out of ten in Franklin.

Women headed a roughly comparable number of households in both counties (just less than 2 percent of households), but in Augusta they were more likely to own real estate and hold personal property. Women headed 781 families in Franklin and 361 in Augusta. The average age of female household heads in both places was almost the same--52 years old--and indicated that many were widowed. In both places a similar proportion of women heading households were white, about 92 percent. A higher percentage of Franklin women heads of household listed their occupation as "farmer," nearly four times the number in Augusta. A higher percentage of Augusta women listed a female occupation, such as sewing or washing, than their counterparts in Franklin. Yet, in Augusta women heads of households possessed on average over \$3,500 in real estate and over \$1,400 in personal property. In Franklin, by contrast, women heads of households owned on average just over \$2,600 in real property and just \$400 in personal property.

The distribution of real property was about equal in the two communities, but personal property distribution diverged significantly because of slavery. In both counties, the poorest 40 percent of household heads owned nothing. The top 10 percent of the heads of households in Franklin controlled 62 percent of the county's real estate--almost identical to the proportion owned by the top 10 percent in Augusta. The two counties did diverge in one important respect: the richest 10 percent in Franklin owned 57 percent of personal property, while, due to the value of slaves, the richest 10 percent in Augusta owned 70 percent of all personal wealth. In Franklin, personal property amounted to less than a third of the value of real estate. In Augusta, by contrast, personal property, mostly held in slaves, added up to \$10.1 million, nearly three quarters of the \$13.8 million of farmland, town lots, and hotels in the prosperous county.

Supporting Evidence

Real Estate and Personal Estate Valuation, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E117]

Wealth and Slaveholding Correlations (table) [Citation: Key = E120]

Property Holding of Heads of Household (table) [Citation: Key = E142]

Occupations in Augusta and Franklin, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E152]

Women in Augusta County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E155]

Women in Franklin County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E156]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1986). [Citation Key = H046]

Free blacks of Augusta County lived in tenuous circumstances surrounded by slavery, but they

managed to find work, and some acquired significant property in the community. [Citation: Key = TAF08]

Like their counterparts throughout the United States, the free blacks of Augusta County held the jobs of lowest status and lowest pay. The men mostly worked as day laborers, the women as washerwomen and domestics. But some women became seamstresses and some men became coopers, carpenters, shoe makers, and blacksmiths. Despite their hard work, only 14 of the 586 free black people in Augusta owned a house or land worth at least one hundred dollars. The personal possessions of the great majority were measured in tens of dollars. Of Augusta's total free black population, 25 percent worked either as an unskilled laborer or domestic worker, 3 percent were artisans, and fewer than 1 percent were farmers. In Franklin the proportion was similar: 28 percent were unskilled and domestic workers, 2 percent artisans, and almost none were farmers. In Franklin three blacks listed themselves in the census as professionals or merchants, while in Augusta no blacks rose to this class or occupation.

In Franklin County, black residents owned on average \$493 in real estate and just \$86 in personal property; in Augusta these averages were nearly double: \$1,189 in real and \$230 in personal property. One Augusta free black man, Robert Campbell, was the local barber and amassed over \$10,000 in real estate and a stunning \$9,000 in personal property. In Franklin Henry Shoeman, a remarkable farmer, managed to obtain property worth \$10,000 in real estate and \$2,000 in personal property. On the whole, free blacks in Augusta had as much or more real and personal wealth as their counterparts in Franklin.

To maintain "the state of inferiority" of free blacks in Augusta, they had been required since 1810 to register with the county court clerk. Only about a third of the county's free blacks did so, leading *The Vindicator* to complain of "a number of free negroes about town, who are not registered, and consequently have no business here. It is the duty of the proper authorities to forthwith commence the correction of the serious evil by notifying them to leave, or suffer the penalty imposed by law of remaining." Those who did register tended to have money or children to shelter. A document from the County Court Clerk might be the only protection they would have from those who would kidnap them or their children and sell them into slavery. The clerk, for a twenty-five cents fee, replaced and updated these precious pieces of paper, worn from much handling.

The registration was intended to provide a way for county officials to keep track of the free African Americans in their midst. The law required all former slaves freed by their masters to leave Virginia within twelve months, though counties could determine who could stay and who could leave. Fifty people emancipated in the 1850s came before the Augusta County Court. Thirty-six had been freed at their masters' death by will, a practice especially common among female slaveholders. The emancipated divided about equally between males and females. They ranged in age from infancy to seventy years old, from "black" to "bright mulatto."

Of the fifty who petitioned to stay in Virginia after their freedom, Augusta denied thirty-two the right to stay. The great bulk of those denied came in two large groups of slaves freed at their owners' death. When John S. Black died in 1856, he freed by will eleven adult slaves plus seven of their children. Betsy, a "light mulatto infant," and two other children were told to leave, as were Judith Easter and her three children (one "bright mulatto") and Charlotte and her two children. John Black was a prominent man and left his widow, Virginia, with eight other slaves; his sons remained well-to-do farmers after his

death. But apparently they were unable or unwilling to persuade the county court to permit this large number of former slaves to stay in Augusta and Virginia. Similarly, when Elizabeth Via died the following year, the seventeen people she freed, ranging in age from two to thirty, from bright to dark, in all likelihood were forced to leave.

Supporting Evidence

Free Blacks as a Percentage of Total Population, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E069]

Real Estate and Personal Estate Valuation, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E117]

Free Blacks in Augusta County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E153]

Related Historiography

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

In Franklin black residents lived clustered in towns and segregated from whites, their position in the county secure only in their tightly defined communities. [Citation: Key = TAF09]

In Franklin County most black families lived in the southern and easternmost portions of the county, clustered in a band running south of Chambersburg and just north and east of the county seat into Southampton Township. Few blacks lived across much of the northern and western sections of the county. In Chambersburg this pattern persisted, as black families overwhelmingly congregated in the South Ward--439 blacks lived in the South Ward while just 84 lived elsewhere in Chambersburg. The largest concentration of black citizens lived in Montgomery Township and Mercersburg, just a few miles from the Maryland line. Taken together, blacks in the South Ward of Chambersburg and Montgomery Township constituted over half of all black residents in Franklin. Two townships in Franklin--St. Thomas and Mont Alto--had no black residents, while seven had at most one or two black families.

Most Augusta free blacks (67 percent) lived in the North Subdivision of the county, while 18 percent lived in the Staunton District No. 1 and 13 percent in the 1st District. Newspapers in Augusta did not refer to a black area of town or the county. While the majority of free blacks lived in Staunton, at least one-third lived in the rural areas of the county outside Staunton and alongside white residents.

Supporting Evidence

Free Blacks as a Percentage of Total Population, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E069]

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

Free Blacks in Augusta County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E153]

Blacks in Franklin County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E154]

Related Historiography

John D. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia Before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H045]

Although Franklin's wealth was concentrated in its rural agricultural commodities, the county was a commercial hub with numerous businesses and shops more densely concentrated than its Southern counterpart. [Citation: Key = TAF11]

Overall, Franklin's per capita number of commercial establishments was higher than Augusta's by 50 percent--for every 49 persons in Franklin there was one business, in Augusta the ratio was 75 to one. Augusta, however, possessed a higher concentration of mills and mines, nearly double the per capita number of Franklin's.

Both communities were closely connected to their respective trading cities--Richmond for Augusta and Philadelphia for Franklin. In both places the vast majority of advertisements in the newspapers were local (75 to 80 percent). In Augusta the next largest group of advertisers came from Richmond (14 percent), while in Franklin Philadelphia advertisers took up 10 percent of the ads. Augusta and Franklin looked for business and for leadership in the regional economy to Richmond and Philadelphia respectively, not to Baltimore.

Franklin and Augusta were both central places for the surrounding counties, and their per capita investment in manufacturing was similar to other counties in the Border region. Border counties from Virginia west to Ohio (61 counties) averaged \$37.90 manufacturing capital per free person. Slaveholding counties along the border averaged \$27.43 of capital investment per person while nonslaveholding counties averaged slightly higher (\$29.92). The border region, then, included a range of counties with investment in manufacturing. Augusta's capital investment was significantly higher than the average of its contiguous neighbors, but Franklin's was only slightly higher than its neighbors, which included a county with slaves, Washington County, Maryland. Franklin, then, was surrounded by counties with similar levels of manufacturing investment. Augusta was, by contrast, a hub in a broader local area that had little or no capital investment in manufacturing.

Supporting Evidence

Profitability of Business Sectors, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E064]

Annual Value of Manufacturing Per Capita, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E067]

Value of Manufacturing, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E118]

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

Capital Investment by Industry, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E147]

Industries Using Enslaved Labor (table) [Citation: Key = E148]

Regional Comparison (table) [Citation: Key = E161]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

Edward Conrad Smith, *The Borderland in the Civil War* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1927). [Citation Key = H010]

Kevin Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars: Religion, Politics, and the Triumph of Anglo-America* (New York: Basic Books, 1999). [Citation Key = H011]

William H. Pease and Jane H. Pease, *The Web of Progress: Private Values and Public Styles in Boston and Charleston, 1828-1843* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). [Citation Key = H013]

John D. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia Before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H045]

Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H054]

Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H054]

Kenneth W. Noe, *Southwest Virginia's Railroad: Modernization and the Sectional Crisis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994). [Citation Key = H007]

Enslaved labor was integral to Augusta's industries--woolen mills, distilleries, flour mills, lumber mills, and iron foundries--while skilled white artisan shops were small in number and scale and virtually free of enslaved labor. [Citation: Key = TAF12]

Nearly all of the largest slaveholders in Augusta owned industrial enterprises. The manufacturing census shows that most of these large businesses employed just one or two white wage workers to run, for example, a flour mill or saw mill. When the proprietors listed in the manufacturing census are cross-checked with the slaveowner schedule, the connections between enslaved labor and these industries becomes clear. In distilleries 13 out of 18 business owners were slaveholders, in the flour mills 24 out of 43, in lumber 5 out of 7, in sawmills 12 out of 19, in iron foundries 4 out of 4. Many of these slaveholders owned over 10 enslaved people and probably deployed them in a range of work throughout their holdings, from farm to mill. White artisans in Augusta, on the other hand, held almost no enslaved persons. Just 3 of 16 blacksmiths held enslaved people (each of the three held two), while 1 of 5 carriage makers, and none the five coopers held any.

Augusta used enslaved labor to boost its low-capital, high-labor industries while Franklin concentrated

on high-skilled industries. The manufacturing census reveals striking similarity in the relative percentage of the costs of raw materials and labor, and in the value of products produced by manufacturing establishments. Sixty-six percent of the value of products in both places was the cost of raw materials, while 14 percent of the value was the cost of labor. Capital investment by industry in Augusta and Franklin revealed a distinct difference--Augusta concentrated its capital investment in low-skill industries, such as lumber mills, iron foundries, and distilleries, where enslaved labor could be exploited to advantage, while Franklin concentrated on investment in skilled artisanal industries, such as leather goods and tinning.

Supporting Evidence

Annual Value of Manufacturing Per Capita, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E067]

Capital Investment by Industry, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E147]

Industries Using Enslaved Labor (table) [Citation: Key = E148]

Regional Comparison (table) [Citation: Key = E161]

Related Historiography

Fred Bateman and Thomas Weiss, *A Deplorable Scarcity: The Failure of Industrialization in the Slave Economy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H047]

Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H054]

Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H054]

Kenneth W. Noe, *Southwest Virginia's Railroad: Modernization and the Sectional Crisis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994). [Citation Key = H007]

The Chambersburg newspapers sold a greater range of products than their counterparts in Staunton, and businesses there faced greater competition as well. [Citation: Key = TAF14]

The density of business establishments in Franklin contributed to its newspapers' advertising base, and, when compared with Augusta, Franklin relied more on its local establishments for a diverse range of manufactured products. Tin, iron, appliances, shoes, leather goods, pharmaceuticals, and farming machinery were all sold in the Chambersburg papers regularly, while in Staunton of these only pharmaceuticals were regularly advertised. The character of these advertisements called attention to fashion, style, and culture in cities, including London and European cities. Businesses and individuals took out a large number of advertisements in Chambersburg and Staunton newspapers. There were approximately 200 advertisements in a typical issue of the Southern paper and over 300 in a typical

issue of the Northern paper. A typical issue's advertisements in Franklin contained 80 percent ads from Franklin establishments, 10 percent from Philadelphia, 3 percent from New York, and 2 percent from Baltimore. In Augusta, the pattern was somewhat similar: 70 percent from Augusta businesses, 14 percent from Richmond, 6 percent from Baltimore, and one or two ads from New York. Augusta's ads, then, drew more heavily from other regional cities and possibly indicate greater dependence on outside producers. When the ads are broken down by type of business, the difference between Augusta and Franklin becomes more significant. In the ironware business, for example, half (5 out of 10) of an Augusta issue's ads were from businesses in Richmond, while only 1 out of 25 ironware ads in Franklin's issues was from out of the county. For appliances the disparity between Augusta and Franklin is similar to the ironware industry, while in dry goods and professional ads in both places the local businesses predominated.

Chambersburg newspapers advertised significantly more lawyers, a profession attendant to the growing diversity and intensity of commercial activity. Both Chambersburg and Staunton served as the county seat with the courthouse and an attendant "lawyers' row" of townhouses, but in Chambersburg lawyers were engaged in a broader, more commercial, practice than their counterparts in Staunton.

Franklin's Democratic paper regularly and enthusiastically advertised Virginia land for sale, while Staunton papers never advertised lands outside of Virginia. Chambersburg agents, Eyster and Bonebrake, attorneys at law, marketed Virginia land as "a good chance to get a bargain and make money." These ads often offered farms of 250 or more acres, which "can be divided into three farms if desired." Brokers also ran ads for Pennsylvania lands for sale, carefully listing the soil quality and current cultivation of crops. Franklin's Democratic paper aggressively promoted the South as a land of economic opportunity for the white men of the North, featuring stories of local men who had done well in the South.

Supporting Evidence

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

Newspaper Classified Ads by Business Type (table) [Citation: Key = E169]

Newspaper Article Reprints by Region (table) [Citation: Key = E170]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

John D. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia Before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H045]

Fred Bateman and Thomas Weiss, *A Deplorable Scarcity: The Failure of Industrialization in the Slave Economy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H047]

Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University

Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H054]

Kenneth W. Noe, *Southwest Virginia's Railroad: Modernization and the Sectional Crisis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994). [Citation Key = H007]

On a per capita basis, Franklin farmers grew far less corn and more wheat than their counterparts in Augusta, and their commitment to wheat was seen by many as both the symbol of the North's wealth and the evidence of its superior labor system. [Citation: Key = TAF17]

Franklin farmers grew only half the value of the Augusta corn crop; instead, they concentrated on wheat. Their crop mix was on average 37 percent wheat, 34 percent corn, 7 percent rye, and 23 percent oats. In Augusta on average farmers devoted 59 percent of the crop production to corn, and 25 percent to wheat, 14 percent to oats, and 5 percent to rye. In both Augusta and Franklin the higher the farm value the more concentrated the farm became in wheat and the less concentrated (almost bushel for bushel) in corn. Soil type, too, played a role as those farmers in the best soil were more relatively more concentrated in wheat than in corn, and vice versa. In Augusta while slaveholders and nonslaveholders differed only slightly (less than 2 percent in their crop mix ratios), slaveholders managed to more than double the average value (dollars) in wheat and corn production of nonslaveholders.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Soil Types (map) [Citation: Key = E003]

Franklin County, Pa., Soil Types (map) [Citation: Key = E004]

Franklin County, Pa., Agricultural Production (map) [Citation: Key = E005]

Augusta County, Va., Agricultural Production (map) [Citation: Key = E006]

Acres of Farm Land, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E065]

Cash Value of Farms Per Capita Comparison, 1850 and 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E066]

Agricultural Productivity, Augusta and Franklin County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E121]

Wheat and Corn Production in Dollars (table) [Citation: Key = E122]

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

Wheat and Corn Production by Household Wealth (table) [Citation: Key = E133]

Soil Types (table) [Citation: Key = E146]

Regional Comparison (table) [Citation: Key = E161]

Related Historiography

Carville Earle, "A Staple Interpretation of Slavery and Free Labor," *Geographical Review* LXVIII (1978): 51-65. [Citation Key = H003]

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

Sam Bowers Hilliard, *Hog Meat and Hoecake: Food Supply in the Old South, 1840-1860* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972). [Citation Key = H005]

Randolph B. Campbell, "Planters and Plain Folk: Harrison County, Texas, as a Test Case, 1850-1860," *Journal of Southern History* XL (No. 3), (1974): 369-398. [Citation Key = H006]

Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1986). [Citation Key = H046]

Kenneth E. Koons and Warren R. Hofstra, ed., *After the Backcountry: Rural Life in the Great Valley of Virginia, 1800-1900* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H053]

Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H054]

Kenneth W. Noe, *Southwest Virginia's Railroad: Modernization and the Sectional Crisis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994). [Citation Key = H007]

The richest farm households in Augusta, however, had a high correlation with relatively high wheat production and low corn production, and slavery enabled even greater success on these farms. [Citation: Key = TAF18]

In the lowest two categories of household wealth, 44 percent devoted their farms to high levels of corn production, while in the highest two categories of household wealth 41 percent placed their farms in high levels of wheat production. Of 135 farms in high corn production, 36 percent owned slaves, and on these farms the mean number of slaves was almost 2. Poorer and middling corn farmers had access to enslaved labor; a significant percentage held enslaved people and many could hire them. Their crops were sold directly to staple-crop slaveholders in Augusta and other parts of the Valley and Virginia.

Augusta's heavy corn production was used to feed its enslaved and white population, as well as to satisfy the demands of over seventeen distilleries. Augusta's population could be estimated to consume 395,152 bushels in 1860, and the county's farmers produced 748,815 bushels. Augusta's seventeen distilleries processed 65,228 bushels of corn and produced \$113,577 in whiskey. Franklin by contrast maintained just seven distilleries, more of which used rye, and produced just \$53,215 in whiskey. Augusta's remaining surplus in corn, which can be estimated at nearly 280,000 bushels, was probably exported and used for seeding next year's crop.

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. Augusta's slaveholders accomplished this jump without a significant expansion of the amount of land dedicated to a specific crop. These large farms' percentage of total grain in wheat and corn did not differ markedly from the middle and upper quintiles of farms. So, their productivity leap was a function not of crop difference but of large-scale slavery.

Augusta and Franklin were broadly representative of the border region and the counties contiguous to them in their average farm value and land value by acre. The differences between Augusta and Franklin are also evident along the border in sixty-one counties and between the counties bordering Augusta and Franklin. In both comparisons, the slaveholding Southern counties maintained a lower value per acre and a higher cash value of farms. This consistent pattern marked one of the defining differences between Northern and Southern communities.

Supporting Evidence

Acres of Farm Land, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E065]

Cash Value of Farms Per Capita Comparison, 1850 and 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E066]

Agricultural Productivity, Augusta and Franklin County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E121]

Wheat and Corn Production in Dollars (table) [Citation: Key = E122]

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

Wheat and Corn Production by Household Wealth (table) [Citation: Key = E133]

Slaveholders and Soil Quality (table) [Citation: Key = E143]

Slaveholders and Agricultural Productivity Correlations (table) [Citation: Key = E144]

Slaveholders and Agricultural Productivity (table) [Citation: Key = E145]

Regional Comparison (table) [Citation: Key = E161]

Related Historiography

Carville Earle, "A Staple Interpretation of Slavery and Free Labor," *Geographical Review* LXVIII (1978): 51-65. [Citation Key = H003]

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

Sam Bowers Hilliard, *Hog Meat and Hoecake: Food Supply in the Old South, 1840-1860* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1972). [Citation Key = H005]

Randolph B. Campbell, "Planters and Plain Folk: Harrison County, Texas, as a Test Case, 1850-1860," *Journal of Southern History* XL (No. 3), (1974): 369-398. [Citation Key = H006]

Stanley L. Engerman, "Antebellum North and South in Comparative Perspective: A Discussion," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1154-1160. [Citation Key = H009]

Kenneth E. Koons and Warren R. Hofstra, ed., *After the Backcountry: Rural Life in the Great Valley of Virginia, 1800-1900* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H053]

Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H054]

Kenneth W. Noe, *Southwest Virginia's Railroad: Modernization and the Sectional Crisis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994). [Citation Key = H007]

Newspapers in Franklin were little different from those in Augusta, but the orientation of the Repository and Transcript as the lead Republican paper set the county apart from its neighbors and from those in the South. [Citation: Key = TAF19]

In Franklin two papers represented the political parties there--the Republican *Franklin Repository and Transcript* and the Democratic Chambersburg *Valley Spirit*. The Democratic paper followed the national party line, putting forward its rhetoric and news in the community with little subtlety or variation. The Republican paper, by contrast, shaped itself more closely to the local community, linking national party ideas and issues to more local circumstances, personalities, and news. The Democratic paper, for example, reprinted twice as many articles, almost all of them from New York, as did the Republican paper.

With the telegraph linking these communities to larger cities, newspaper editors in both communities turned primarily to New York for information. Editors reprinted far more information from New York papers than from any other source, including Philadelphia or Richmond. Eighteen city newspapers provided copy to editors in Chambersburg and Staunton. The Whig paper in Staunton and the Democratic paper in Chambersburg led their counterparts in reprinting material from other cities both Northern and Southern. The Chambersburg Democratic paper, the *Valley Spirit*, was the most aggressive reprinter, pulling stories from a wide network of Democratic papers in the North and South. When not using material from New York, Staunton editors turned almost exclusively to the Upper South for material, virtually ignoring Lower South editors.

Supporting Evidence

Distances to Major Institutions (table) [Citation: Key = E124]

Newspaper Classified Ads by Business Type (table) [Citation: Key = E169]

Newspaper Article Reprints by Region (table) [Citation: Key = E170]

Related Historiography

William H. Pease and Jane H. Pease, *The Web of Progress: Private Values and Public Styles in Boston*

and Charleston, 1828-1843 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). [Citation Key = H013]

John D. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia Before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H045]

Staunton newspapers bore visual and textual markings of slavery, as they regularly contained ads for runaway slaves, slave agents, and slave sales. [Citation: Key = TAF20]

Newspapers brought much of the information to local communities and helped create and sustain the networks. Typically, these papers were weeklies with four or eight page formats. In Augusta, two papers competed for advertisers and subscribers--the Whig-oriented *Staunton Spectator* and the Democratic *Staunton Republican Vindicator*. The Whig paper reprinted twice as many articles from Southern newspapers as did the Democratic paper and drew most of them from Richmond.

The woodcut of a runaway slave with a stick and sack slung over the shoulder marked nearly every issue of each paper in Augusta County, a recurrent symbol of slave resistance. Agents brokered the sale, hire, movement, and delivery of human chattel, much as they facilitated similar dealings in cattle and other property. Indeed, many "general agents" in Staunton offered a range of services: "Thomas J. Bagby, General Agent, For Hiring Negroes, Renting Houses, and Collecting Claims." (*Spectator*, Jan. 31, 1860)

Supporting Evidence

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

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

Newspaper Article Reprints by Region (table) [Citation: Key = E170]

Related Historiography

William H. Pease and Jane H. Pease, *The Web of Progress: Private Values and Public Styles in Boston and Charleston, 1828-1843* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). [Citation Key = H013]

Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *Rude Republic: Americans and Their Politics in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H052]

Newspapers in Franklin championed agricultural production as the means to future wealth and prosperity. [Citation: Key = TAF21]

In Augusta the Democratic newspaper called the farmer "our primary capitalist" and asserted that when the farmer prospers "all the other attendants upon trade and commerce flourish with him." In Franklin the Democratic paper emphasized the bulging corn crop and the crop's rise in the 1850s as a major export for the county. The Franklin Republican paper largely ignored the growth in corn production in the county and instead boasted of the county's wheat production, proudly pointing out that Franklin in the 1850 census ranked sixth nationally in total wheat production. The paper observed that Washington County, Maryland, Franklin's slaveholding counterpart just south of the Mason Dixon line, ranked

seventh, a result of "her position--her contiguity to free soil and good company." The Republican editor's explanation might have been wishful thinking, as slavery in Maryland, just as in Augusta, was increasingly turned to wheat production, and additionally to an array of low-skill manufactures and to the highly productive corn crops.

Supporting Evidence

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

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

Related Historiography

Lloyd Benson, "Planters and Hoosiers: The Development of Sectional Society in Antebellum Indiana and Mississippi," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1990. [Citation Key = H002]

William H. Pease and Jane H. Pease, *The Web of Progress: Private Values and Public Styles in Boston and Charleston, 1828-1843* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). [Citation Key = H013]

White people in Augusta rarely discussed slavery openly and for the most part only did so under provocation when they hoped to defend their institution. [Citation: Key = TAF23]

Newspapers in Augusta, both Democratic and Whig, told their readers about free blacks who reenslaved themselves, committed petty crimes, and ran off with white women. Slaves mutilated themselves rather than be sold and were on rare occasions whipped to death. Just as rarely, paternalistic whites publicly venerated aged blacks as beloved and admired.

In one of its defenses of slavery during the political crisis, the *Spectator* bragged on the ability of hard-working enslaved people to earn extra money--often hundreds of dollars a year--by working overtime. Such payments, the paper proudly noted, are "practiced more or less all over the State. We know it is not uncommon in this region." Indeed, such slaves "like millions in the Southern States, are not only plentifully provided for in every way, but they are saving money to use as they may find best in coming years--and withal they seem as happy as lords." This exaggerated and romanticized scene held an element of truth: slaveowners were indeed turning toward hiring out and other kinds of payment to slaves as the 1860s began, adapting slavery to changing constraints and opportunities.

Slavery's adaptability did nothing to lessen the harsh terms by which masters held enslaved persons. Yet, slaveholders could turn virtually any episode into evidence of their beneficence. In one especially unlikely train of logic, the *Spectator* drew a comforting moral from the brutal murder of an enslaved person in another county: "On the morning of the 4th of July last, at 8 o'clock, one of the hottest days of the past Summer, Hudson stripped the woman, naked as she came into the world, tied her to a persimmon tree, and whipped her for three consecutive hours, with occasional intermissions of a few minutes, until he had worn out to stump fifty-two switches, and until the bark of the body of the tree was rubbed smooth and greasy by the attrition of the body of the victim. The ground around the tree for seven or eight feet, though it had been freshly plowed, was trodden hard." Neighbors had heard both the switch and the screams as the master beat the woman to death, but the fellow whites had done nothing.

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

"The poor creature was buried the same afternoon only some ten inches beneath the ground, in a rough box, without any shroud." The jury found Hudson guilty of murder and sentenced him to eighteen years, the maximum sentence and one he was not likely to live out since he was 68 years old.

Then came the moral, as the judge delivered a rebuke biblical in its phrasing and weight: "You have thus committed a great crime against both human and divine law. You have outraged the feelings of the community among whom you lived." The judge named an additional crime Hudson had committed against the white community of the South: "You have enabled their enemies to fan the flame of fanaticism, by charging against them the enormity and cruelty of your hard and unfeeling heart, although that community cordially loathe and condemn cruelty and oppression towards black or white." To the *Spectator*, the moral seemed clear: "it is one of those cases which thoroughly vindicate the Southern character against the aspersions cast upon us by our enemies at the North. It develops what is as true of us as of any other people on the civilized globe, that we utterly detest and abhor cruelty and barbarity, whether to whites or blacks." Whites ignored the fact that their legal order tolerated virtually any barbarity by a slaveholder that did not end in death.

Augusta whites had few misgivings about even the most brutal displays of violence, which they thought a rarity; instead, they considered slavery so benevolent and positive that blacks actually appreciated the institution. They eagerly read of "Departure of Emancipated Negroes--Don't Want to Leave." The article told of "a crowd of not less than one thousand negroes assembled on the basin to take leave of the negroes" belonging to an estate in Lynchburg that had freed them. "The whole number set free was forty-four men women and children, but only thirty-seven left, the balance preferring to remain in servitude in Old Virginia rather than enjoy their freedom elsewhere." Another way to put this, of course, was that former slaves were being driven away from their families and loved ones and that, despite their loss, only seven stayed. But the article dwelt on what it wanted to emphasize: "when the boats started from their wharves, the freed negroes struck up 'Carry me back to Old Virginnny,' which was joined in by one and all, and in a tone which indicated plainly that if left to their own free will, they would gladly spend the remainder of their days in servitude in the home of their birth."

Supporting Evidence

Maria Perkins, Maria Perkins to Richard Perkins, October 8, 1852 [Citation: Key = E045]

J. Beck, J. Beck to John H. McCue, February 8, 1858 [Citation: Key = E046]

W. W. Gibbs, W. W. Gibbs to John H. McCue, December 18, 1858 [Citation: Key = E047]

E. H. Wills, E. H. Wills to John H. McCue, March 25, 1857 [Citation: Key = E048]

C. T. Wills, C. T. Wills to John H. McCue, December 7, 1853 [Citation: Key = E049]

William S. Eskridge, William S. Eskridge to John H. McCue, May 21, 1858 [Citation: Key = E050]

Jonathan G. Coleman, Jonathan G. Coleman to John H. McCue, May 29, 1859 [Citation: Key = E051]

John G. Imboden, John G. Imboden to John H. McCue, November 13, 1859 [Citation: Key = E052]

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

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

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

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

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

Related Historiography

Steven Hahn, *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Georgia Upcountry, 1850-1890* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983). [Citation Key = H015]

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

John W. Quist, *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998). [Citation Key = H039]

Charles B. Dew, *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001). [Citation Key = H044]

J. Morgan Kousser, "The Irrepressible Repressible Conflict," *Reviews in American History* 21 (1993): 207-212. [Citation Key = H048]

Black people enslaved in Augusta married, raised families, and worked at all sorts of jobs, but they were never far removed from the tangled affairs of whites. [Citation: Key = TAF49]

At least one enslaved person from Augusta County, Maria Perkins, wrote a letter that survived. Perkins wrote from across the mountains in Charlottesville to her husband in Augusta County to let him know that she and one of their children were to be sold. One of their children, Albert, was already sold, and Perkins did not "want a trader to get me" for she knew that her fate would be entirely unpredictable. Instead, she appealed to her husband to appeal to his "master" to buy her. "Heartsick," her family broken up, her "things" scattered across several counties, Perkins emphasized her precarious position. She estimated that she had little time before the matter was even further out of her already severely constricted control.

While Augusta's enslaved people battled these terrifying experiences, whites wrote dozens of letters barely mentioning their slaves. Only runaway or resistant slaves received attention from whites. "Wilson has run off," one slaveholding mother reported to her lawyer son-in-law, "such a sly negro that he may have more in his head than we know of." Her son-in-law was occupied with buying and selling his "negroes" and his various industrial ventures insuring their lives as well. When another runaway, "Old York," sought refuge at the home of his old master's son, it opened up a whole tangle of family sins and omissions. As property, slaves were bartered and bequeathed, bought and sold, hired out, and sent as gifts. Whites mentioned these transactions in brief notes at the end of letters.

Supporting Evidence

Maria Perkins, Maria Perkins to Richard Perkins, October 8, 1852 [Citation: Key = E045]

J. Beck, J. Beck to John H. McCue, February 8, 1858 [Citation: Key = E046]

W. W. Gibbs, W. W. Gibbs to John H. McCue, December 18, 1858 [Citation: Key = E047]

Industries Using Enslaved Labor (table) [Citation: Key = E148]

Hiring of Enslaved Persons, Augusta County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E162]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

Thomas B. Alexander, "Antebellum North and South in Comparative Perspective: A Discussion," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1150-1154. [Citation Key = H008]

John D. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia Before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H045]

Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Pantheon, 1975). [Citation Key = H077]

Eugene Genovese, *The Slaveholders' Dilemma: Freedom and Progress in Southern Conservative Thought, 1820-1860* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992). [Citation Key = H078]

Franklin County's papers spent more ink--almost all of it negative--on its nearly two thousand free blacks than Augusta did on its five thousand enslaved people. [Citation: Key = TAF24]

The Valley Spirit, Franklin's Democratic paper, considered blacks better off in slavery than in the North. The paper regularly ran stories of blacks in the South who reenslaved themselves rather than remain freed and lascivious reports of white women eloping with black men. The Democratic paper was also deeply concerned about the presence of black voters in the North, reporting on the Ohio elections in November 1860 that the black vote carried the day for Lincoln and that 14,000 blacks voted in Ohio despite constitutional bars. The paper concluded that "Ohio is thus ruled not by white men, but by negroes." In Pennsylvania, the Democrats estimated that blacks made \$15,000 in financial contributions to the Republicans for Lincoln's election--"it must have been funny," the *Valley Spirit* editors sneered, "to see Forney . . . soliciting money from the niggers for the Republican cause."

Republicans considered such jabs a ridiculous joke. They pointed out that the Whigs disenfranchised blacks in Pennsylvania and they did so because blacks generally voted Democratic. The editors barely used the word "black" in 1859-1860 in their papers. When they did, it was to ridicule whites with a story of black soldiers who did not know their right from their left foot or to relate the misadventures of an

African visitor in Baltimore. The Republican paper featured stories of the virtues of black resettlement to Liberia and the travesties of local black crime.

Supporting Evidence

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Related Historiography

Steven Hahn, *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Georgia Upcountry, 1850-1890* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983). [Citation Key = H015]

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

John W. Quist, *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998). [Citation Key = H039]

Charles B. Dew, *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001). [Citation Key = H044]

J. Morgan Kousser, "The Irrepressible Repressible Conflict," *Reviews in American History* 21 (1993): 207-212. [Citation Key = H048]

Franklin was slightly more churchd than Augusta. Its denominations were more concentrated in the German traditions, but Augusta's churches were larger and more expensive. [Citation: Key = TAF25]

Churches were important social institutions in both counties. Augusta was home to 54 churches and Franklin 92, according to the 1860 U.S. Census. Augusta had one church for every 513 persons, while Franklin had one for every 458. Churches in Augusta could accommodate 65 percent of the county's

total population (82 percent of its white population), while Franklin's churches could hold 80 percent of the county's population. The value of church property compared favorably, as both counties invested almost \$4 per capita in their churches. In Augusta 49 percent of residents and in Franklin 55 percent of residents lived within one mile of a church. No citizen of either place was farther than 5 1/2 miles from a church. Augustans were concentrated in Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist congregations, and they built large, expensive churches. In Franklin these denominations were less substantial than the Lutherans, German Reformed, and Mennonites.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Churches and Schools (map) [Citation: Key = E001]

Franklin County, Pa., Churches and Schools (map) [Citation: Key = E002]

Augusta County, Va., Churches and Voting Precincts (map) [Citation: Key = E017]

Franklin County, Pa., Churches and Voting Precincts (map) [Citation: Key = E018]

Comparison, Churches and Schools (map) [Citation: Key = E019]

Distances to Major Institutions (table) [Citation: Key = E124]

Denominational Statistics for Augusta and Franklin Counties (table) [Citation: Key = E150]

Franklin County Churches and Voting Precincts (table) [Citation: Key = E164]

Churches and Voting Precincts, Augusta (table) [Citation: Key = E165]

Related Historiography

Vernon O. Burton, *In My Father's House Are Many Mansions: Family and Community in Edgefield, South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985) [Citation Key = H012]

William H. Pease and Jane H. Pease, *The Web of Progress: Private Values and Public Styles in Boston and Charleston, 1828-1843* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). [Citation Key = H013]

The white literacy rates and educational opportunities in both places were relatively high, but substantially better in Franklin. [Citation: Key = TAF26]

Although the nearly universal literacy ascribed to both places by the census taker seems unlikely, whites in both Augusta and Franklin enjoyed standards of literacy high by international standards. Franklin County maintained a school system of much greater reach than its Augusta counterpart, which relied more on private schools and academies rather than public schools. Elite white Southerners had ample educational opportunities, but their poorer neighbors had less of a chance of getting schooling than their northern peers. In Augusta in 1850 only 745 pupils attended 23 public schools, and these schools received just \$1,423 in public funding, none of it from taxation. In Franklin nearly all children were enrolled in free public schools paid for with taxation. Taxpayers contributed \$19,764 to fund 177 public

schools in the county, and over 8,500 students were enrolled in them. Even Augusta's private academies were less substantial than Franklin's, where 174 students attended and over \$3,500 was paid in tuition. Augusta could claim just 226 students in private schools and \$210 in private school funding through endowments.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Churches and Voting Precincts (map) [Citation: Key = E017]

Franklin County, Pa., Churches and Voting Precincts (map) [Citation: Key = E018]

Comparison, Churches and Schools (map) [Citation: Key = E019]

School and Literacy, 1850 (table) [Citation: Key = E119]

Franklin County Churches and Voting Precincts (table) [Citation: Key = E164]

Churches and Voting Precincts, Augusta (table) [Citation: Key = E165]

Related Historiography

Vernon O. Burton, *In My Father's House Are Many Mansions: Family and Community in Edgefield, South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985) [Citation Key = H012]

William H. Pease and Jane H. Pease, *The Web of Progress: Private Values and Public Styles in Boston and Charleston, 1828-1843* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). [Citation Key = H013]

In Franklin and Augusta men who listed their occupation as a laborer or day laborer often did not own any property or wealth at all. In Franklin these workers were more likely to have accumulated at least some property. [Citation: Key = TAF27]

The average age of Augusta's farm laborers was 34, while Franklin's was 24. For both day laborers and laborers it was the reverse--Franklin's was 35 and Augusta's younger (29 and 27 respectively). On average Franklin and Augusta laborers of all kinds held similar real and personal wealth, but on average a higher proportion of Franklin's male laborers held real and personal estate than their Augusta counterparts. For example, 6 percent of Augusta's day laborers and laborers held real estate of any worth, while 20 to 24 percent of Franklin's held at least some real estate wealth. The pattern was similar for personal property holdings. In Franklin 60 to 65 percent of day laborers and laborers held at least some personal property, while in Augusta between 38 and 44 percent owned personal property.

Supporting Evidence

Laborers in Augusta and Franklin, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E158]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American*

Historical Review 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

Robert William Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1989). [Citation Key = H019]

Enslaved people were hired out to non-slaveholding farmers, railroad companies, and other businesses. [Citation: Key = TAF28]

The practice of enslaved hiring was widespread in Augusta County. In 1860 370 entries in the slaveowners census schedule recorded employers, listing 570 enslaved people hired out in the year (out of 5,616 total slaves or 10 percent). The average number hired out to a given employer was one enslaved person. A railroad corporation or a business sometimes hired out more--the highest number employed in Augusta in 1860 was 22. Employers who hired enslaved people were diverse--small planters, women heads of households, heirs of estates, trustees, businesses, and corporations. The Virginia Central Railroad hired laborers from twelve different slaveholders. The Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Institute and the Western Lunatic Asylum in Staunton also hired dozens of enslaved people from various owners. A wide range of individuals took part in this market too, including both other slaveholders and nonslaveholders.

The Staunton *Vindicator*, in fact, considered "the policy of permitting slaves to hire their own time, or get persons to stand as their masters" a "source of great annoyance to our town. The habit induces idleness among slaves, and is the cause of all kinds of trafficking among them, which is more or less connected with petty thefts. These evils should be radically corrected without delay. The quicker the better."

Slaveholders viewed their enslaved as part of a larger portfolio of property. John Imboden, an attorney and clerk of Augusta's county court, wrote a friend of his financial thinking. "I have brought 4 young and handsome negroes over from Charlotte, and have the offer of any others we may wish. Mary & I dont think we will take but one more, possibly two at Christmas. This will save me a good deal in negro hire." The same kind of calculation that could lead some white people to hire slaves, in other words, could lead others with more money to purchase instead.

The enslaved people hired out to whites worked in several kinds of arrangements. Some received wages and then handed them over to their owner. Some arranged for their clothes, food, and shelter, deducting the cost from the money they earned. While such relatively loose supervision was not uncommon in Richmond, a hundred miles away, hiring out may have been more controlled in Augusta. A contract between John McCue and Mrs. Mary Carrington of neighboring Nelson County specified the details of an arrangement involving Sally: "Twelve months after date I promise to pay Mrs Mary Carrington the just and full sum of Forty three Dollars & fifty cents it being for the hire of Sally, a negro girl belonging to the sd Mary Carrington, the said hiring to date and take effect from the 2nd of Jany 1854 and to determine the 25th of Decr. of the same year, at which time the sd servant is to be returned to the sd Mrs Mary Carrington at Fleetwood in the Co. of Nelson. The taxes of sd girl are to be pd by me and the usual clothing furnished during the term, and when returned." In this bargain, Sally handled no money and enjoyed no greater latitude than if she had stayed with Mrs. Carrington.

Those who hired slaves devoted considerable energy to acquiring them. W. W. Gibbs looked for a female slave for John McCue: "I went to every place I thought I could procure you a cook or nurse but

could find none all having been disposed of. I hear Tho Bowan near Greenwood Tunnel has a good cook for hire if you are not supplied you had best write to him or come over and see him such as you want is hard to find." Networks of hiring stretched from city to city, city to town, and farm to farm.

Supporting Evidence

C. Alexander, C. Alexander to John H. McCue, December 18, 1858 [Citation: Key = E038]

F. Davis, F. Davis to John H. McCue, September 5, 1859 [Citation: Key = E039]

G. W. Imboden, G. W. Imboden to John H. McCue, April 12, 1860 [Citation: Key = E040]

W. J. D. Bell, J. D. Bell to John H. McCue, April 21, 1860 [Citation: Key = E041]

Slaveowners and Employers, Augusta County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E157]

Hiring of Enslaved Persons, Augusta County, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E162]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

Kenneth E. Koons and Warren R. Hofstra, ed., *After the Backcountry: Rural Life in the Great Valley of Virginia, 1800-1900* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H053]

Chambersburg was a larger place than Staunton, but no more vibrant or connected to the market than its Southern counterpart. [Citation: Key = TAF29]

Chambersburg claimed one hundred blocks, laid out in a grid pattern, and over 4,700 residents. The county seat held 11 percent of the county population. The town was built around a square, known locally as "The Diamond," that was intersected by the two major streets of the town, Front and Market. Its imposing courthouse stood on the Diamond, and 32 of the 37 attorneys in the county lived and practiced in Chambersburg. The town claimed 15 of 63 physicians and 39 of the 144 merchants, far out of proportion to the town's share of the county population.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Towns (map) [Citation: Key = E011]

Franklin County, Pa., Towns (map) [Citation: Key = E016]

Comparison, Towns (map) [Citation: Key = E022]

Comparison, Elevation (map) [Citation: Key = E023]

Franklin County Town, Fannettsburg (map) [Citation: Key = E026]

Franklin County Town, Greencastle (map) [Citation: Key = E027]

Augusta County Town, Parnassus (map) [Citation: Key = E028]

Augusta County Town, Waynesborough (map) [Citation: Key = E029]

Augusta County Town, Lebanon White Sulpher Springs (map) [Citation: Key = E030]

Franklin County Town, Pleasant Hall (map) [Citation: Key = E031]

Population of Cities and Towns, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E116]

Town and Rural Distribution of Household Wealth (table) [Citation: Key = E168]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

John D. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia Before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H045]

Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1986). [Citation Key = H046]

Fred Bateman and Thomas Weiss, *A Deplorable Scarcity: The Failure of Industrialization in the Slave Economy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H047]

Franklin and Augusta exhibited different spatial organizations, with a more organized and commercial approach in Franklin and a settlement in Augusta that followed the contours of soil and land more closely. [Citation: Key = TAF30]

Few towns appeared in Augusta outside of the county seat of Staunton. Instead, the county had numerous clusters of settlement that have place names associated with them and a few non-residential institutions, places that might be labeled "villages."

In Augusta, 57 percent of residents lived more than a mile from a town or village, while in Franklin only 45 percent lived that far away. In Augusta town development followed geographic features, as residences clustered around a sulphur spring, a mountain gap, or a creek. These clusters of residences usually surrounded either a mill, church, or school and were not arranged on a gridded layout. In Franklin, by contrast, gridded streets were common.

Staunton held 13 percent of the county's white population, but was laid out in no particular order. Large sections of the town were developed in blocks but not in ways that connected them to the already developed sections of town. Instead, Staunton was built on a series of promontories, from which large houses and institutions might hold prominence. The courthouse was just one of several major institutions in Staunton, including the Western Lunatic Asylum, the Augusta Female Seminary, and the

Wesleyan Female Institute. The town held 40 of 101 merchants in Augusta, 14 of 57 physicians, 7 of 27 ministers, and 5 of the 11 attorneys.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Towns (map) [Citation: Key = E011]

Franklin County, Pa., Towns (map) [Citation: Key = E016]

Comparison, Towns (map) [Citation: Key = E022]

Comparison, Elevation (map) [Citation: Key = E023]

Franklin County Town, Fannettsburg (map) [Citation: Key = E026]

Franklin County Town, Greencastle (map) [Citation: Key = E027]

Augusta County Town, Parnassus (map) [Citation: Key = E028]

Augusta County Town, Waynesborough (map) [Citation: Key = E029]

Augusta County Town, Lebanon White Sulpher Springs (map) [Citation: Key = E030]

Franklin County Town, Pleasant Hall (map) [Citation: Key = E031]

Population of Cities and Towns, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E116]

Distances to Major Institutions (table) [Citation: Key = E124]

Town and Rural Distribution of Household Wealth (table) [Citation: Key = E168]

Related Historiography

Edward Pessen, "How Different from Each Other Were the Antebellum North and South," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1119-1149. [Citation Key = H004]

John D. Majewski, *A House Dividing: Economic Development in Pennsylvania and Virginia Before the Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H045]

Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1986). [Citation Key = H046]

Fred Bateman and Thomas Weiss, *A Deplorable Scarcity: The Failure of Industrialization in the Slave Economy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981). [Citation Key = H047]

The visible differences that slavery made in the arrangement of the landscape were apparent to many observers, but Northerners and Southerners interpreted them differently. Northerners focused on land value per acre and Southerners on the dollar value of their crops. [Citation: Key =

TAF31]

There were 1,552 farms in Augusta in 1860 or 1.6 farms per square mile. In Franklin, by contrast, there were 3.26 farms per square mile. The visible differences in population led many visitors to Augusta to assume that the slavery-based economy was less productive, or worse inefficient. Northerners observed lower farm values on the larger farms typical of Augusta. Indeed, the largest farms had farm values of less than half the value (\$21.8 per acre) of the smallest farms (\$46.9 per acre) in Franklin. But Augusta farmers and planters understood the greater productivity that resulted from the use of enslaved labor. Across all farm sizes and values Augusta farms outproduced their Franklin counterparts in the dollar value of corn--the most labor-intensive crop planted in these counties. On the largest farms using slaves Augusta farmers nearly tripled the dollar value of the corn crop of Franklin's largest farmers. Slaveholders, in particular, benefited from the dollar value of their crop, not the land value per acre, and might have seen it as the key measure of slavery's success and efficiency.

Supporting Evidence

Total Population as a Percentage of Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E068]

Percentage Increase in Total Population, 1860 (graph) [Citation: Key = E071]

Wheat and Corn Production in Dollars (table) [Citation: Key = E122]

Land Values in Augusta and Franklin Counties (table) [Citation: Key = E132]

Slaveholders and Agricultural Productivity (table) [Citation: Key = E145]

Regional Comparison (table) [Citation: Key = E161]

Road Networks, Franklin and Augusta Counties, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E163]

Related Historiography

Thomas B. Alexander, "Antebellum North and South in Comparative Perspective: A Discussion," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1150-1154. [Citation Key = H008]

Stanley L. Engerman, "Antebellum North and South in Comparative Perspective: A Discussion," *American Historical Review* 85 (1980): 1154-1160. [Citation Key = H009]

Vernon O. Burton, *In My Father's House Are Many Mansions: Family and Community in Edgefield, South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985) [Citation Key = H012]

William W. Freehling, *The Reintegration of American History: Slavery and the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994). [Citation Key = H055]

In Augusta, Whig Party activists were more likely to own slaves and to own bigger and more valuable farms than their Democratic counterparts. [Citation: Key = TAF32]

Fifty percent of Augusta Whig activists, as identified in the newspapers, held enslaved people, and the great majority of them held farms valued over \$7,500. Although some Democrats, notably William A. Harman and George Baylor, held slaves in large numbers, Democratic activists worked smaller farms, and two-thirds of them were nonslaveholders. Democratic activists were more likely to reside in towns (50 percent of them lived within 1 mile of a town while 35 percent of Whig activists lived within one mile of a town). Democratic activists still maintained significant household wealth, as more than half of them were worth more than \$22,000.

Supporting Evidence

Political Activists in Augusta and Franklin Counties (table) [Citation: Key = E151]

Party Affiliation, Augusta County (table) [Citation: Key = E159]

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

Related Historiography

Daniel W. Crofts, *Old Southampton: Politics and Society in a Virginia County, 1834-1869* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992). [Citation Key = H001]

Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *Rude Republic: Americans and Their Politics in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H052]

In Franklin, Democratic and Republican activists were strikingly similar in their relative household wealth, farm size, and farm values, but had different occupational and social profiles, with the Republicans appearing more 'respectable.' [Citation: Key = TA34]

Democratic Party activists, identified in the newspapers, were more prevalent than Republicans, 57 percent to 43 percent respectively. Neither had an advantage in wealth, farm value, farm size, or proximity to town. Almost 74 percent of both Democrats and Republicans lived within 1 mile of a town.

Republican activists had a higher proportion of farmers (26 percent) and professionals (28 percent) in their ranks than Democrats. Democratic activists conversely had a higher proportion of laborers (10 percent), artisans (29 percent), and businessmen (19.5 percent) in their ranks than did Republicans. The average age of Democratic activists was slightly lower at thirty-nine years old than the Republicans' forty-three years. Republican activists had a higher percentage of household heads, while Democratic activists included a higher percentage of boarders.

But the younger Republican activists were more organized than their Democratic counterparts. The "Wide-Awakes" organized across the North for the 1860 election. A hundred Franklin men joined the local unit and marched at every opportunity. Each Wide-Awake wore a black glazed cap and cape and carried "a neat, convenient torch--a swinging lamp, on a pole about six feet long." The Chambersburg men "erected a nice pole, over an hundred feet high" in front of the *Transcript's* office. "From the top of the pole floats a small streamer composed of red, white and blue ribbons. About twelve feet from the top there is a pretty blue Streamer with the names of our candidates--LINCOLN, HAMLIN,

CURTIN,--thereon, in white letters. Some twelve feet lower down is suspended a handsome national flag."

The Democrats, of course, made fun of the Wide-Awakes. "Many of them, if we may judge from appearance, will not be able to vote unless they begin at 19," the *Valley Spirit* laughed. "The Wide Awakes about here consist principally of capes, a small cap, a broom handle with a lamp tied to one, and a youthful aspirant to citizenship at the other. They spend their evenings in drilling, and learning to carry their torches perpendicular, when their bodies ought to be horizontal." Young Republicans tossed such criticisms aside. Representative Edward McPherson's nephew wrote his uncle that "I have often heard that politics is a very dangerous subject for a 'Young American' to meddle with. If that be true, I am afraid I am pretty far gone. But lest it might lead to evil, I will close this subject by saying 'Hurrah for Lincoln.'"

A native of Perry County in central Pennsylvania, Alexander K. McClure became Franklin County's Republican leader by the age of thirty. As a young man McClure abandoned an apprenticeship as a tanner for a life in journalism and politics. By his nineteenth birthday he had begun publication of a small newspaper in Perry County and served in small political offices. In 1852 he purchased the Franklin "Repository," and began to move up in the state Whig ranks. After an unsuccessful campaign for state auditor-general in 1855, he became an attorney by reading law with a local lawyer. In 1857 he was one of a handful of Pennsylvania Republicans elected to the state legislature, and in 1859 he became a state senator. In these years McClure turned the *Repository* into one of the state's first Republican newspapers and became one of Franklin County's leading trial lawyers. McClure's law offices, and often the courthouse steps, became Franklin County's unofficial Republican Party headquarters. In 1860 McClure capped his young political career with an appointment as Chairman of the State Republican Committee. From this office he masterminded Andrew Curtin's successful campaign for Governor of Pennsylvania. The shrewd McClure helped Curtin outmaneuver rival Republican factions, including one led by Simon Cameron, and win the governorship in 1860.

In Franklin McClure's Whigs and later Republicans included many of the locally prominent men of Chambersburg, such as George Eyster and John Stoufer. Their organization criticized the Democrats as disorganized, divided, proslavery, and misguided on economic development. Democrats in Franklin campaigned to equalize the tax burden, defend Catholics, and back candidates in the boroughs outside of Chambersburg.

Supporting Evidence

Alexander K. McClure, *Old Time Notes of Pennsylvania*, 1905 [Citation: Key = E180]

Political Activists in Augusta and Franklin Counties (table) [Citation: Key = E151]

Party Affiliation, Franklin County (table) [Citation: Key = E160]

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

Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1856 Election (map) [Citation: Key = E171]

Related Historiography

Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *Rude Republic: Americans and Their Politics in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H052]

In Augusta, Democratic and Whig activists had different occupational and social profiles, with the Whigs appearing more 'respectable.' [Citation: Key = TAF35]

Democratic activists had a higher proportion of artisans (28 percent) and businessmen in their ranks than Democrats, while Whigs had a much higher proportion of farmers in their ranks (60 percent) and no artisans. Whig activists were more uniformly head of their households, and less likely to be boarders than Democratic activists. The average age of the Democrats (44) was slightly older than Whigs (42). In the professions and businesses, lawyers and merchants were evenly split among the parties, but physicians were uniformly Whigs.

Alexander H. H. Stuart in Augusta operated at the national party level, becoming a leader in the Whig Party. No such comparable figure for the Democrats could be found in Augusta. In 1836 Stuart, a successful lawyer in Staunton, entered politics. He was elected a delegate in the Virginia state legislature and was reelected until 1839, when he stepped down. Stuart considered himself from the Clay wing of the Jacksonian Democratic-Republican Party and he began to identify his interests in the new Whig Party. He ran for Congress in 1840 as a Whig and was elected, serving one term. Stuart was elected a presidential elector in both 1844 and 1848 for the Clay and Taylor tickets respectively. In 1850 President Millard Fillmore appointed Stuart Secretary of the Interior. Stuart continued to work in electoral politics and served as a member of the American ("Know-Nothing") Party convention of 1856, which nominated Fillmore for the presidency. Stuart reentered Virginia electoral politics as a candidate for the State Senate. He ran as a "Whig" even though the party was dying and won, serving from 1857 to 1861.

In Augusta, where the Whigs under Stuart's leadership dominated politics, the Democratic Party claimed to be the only "national" party, sharply criticizing the Whigs in the county and in Virginia and the South as the minority wing of a party made up mainly of "the Black Republicans, the Abolitionists, and all the isms of the north, the Fanny Wright men, the anti-renters, the Mormons." Democrats included some of the most wealthy and powerful men in the county: William G. Harman and George Baylor, whose extended families together included 121 men, women, and children, owning over 120 slaves between them. The Whig Party, on the other hand, lamented the decline of its national banner and the rise of Republicanism in the North. Some Whigs grew annoyed with the party's tight leadership by Stuart, John B. Baldwin, and John Imboden, calling them the "Clique." Some complained that they would "like to have more candidates in the field for another reason; it would perhaps arouse the Whig party from the Van Winkle sleep into which they have fallen."

Supporting Evidence

Political Activists in Augusta and Franklin Counties (table) [Citation: Key = E151]

Party Affiliation, Augusta County (table) [Citation: Key = E159]

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

Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1856 Election (map) [Citation: Key = E171]

Related Historiography

Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *Rude Republic: Americans and Their Politics in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). [Citation Key = H052]

In the first half of 1860 Republican editors in Franklin's Repository and Transcript attacked slavery as a violation of nature that stole from the workingman the fruits of his labor; they focused mainly on slavery's potential to undermine free labor. [Citation: Key = TAF37]

While the Republicans in Franklin condemned slavery as a social ill and immoral, they paid more attention to the ways the institution threatened the position of white working men in 1860. Containment of slavery was necessary, they argued, because slavery was such an aggressive, insidious threat that it would find its way into new and unexpected places. The result, they contended, would be stagnation and ruin for the average white working man. "Who among working men, that has any respect for himself and for his wife and children," the Republicans asked, "wishes to see this free State of Pennsylvania overrun with Slavery?" The editors did not distinguish white from black "working men" but they clearly struck hard on the idea that the form of slavery they saw across the border could infiltrate all aspects of Northern society. "Every branch of industry," the editors pointed out, "which now affords support for thousands of white people, who are willing to work for a living, [would be] supplied with the labor of negroes whose bodies and souls (while in the flesh) belong to their masters--recognized as such by law." They called to the "mechanics" and the "different branches of industry" in Franklin and asked whether they wished to be "degraded by the competition of Slave labor."

Supporting Evidence

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Related Historiography

Robert William Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1989). [Citation Key = H019]

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

John W. Quist, *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998). [Citation Key = H039]

Eugene D. Genovese, "Yeomen Farmers in a Slaveholders' Democracy," *Agricultural History* 49, no. 2, (April 1975). [Citation Key = H040]

Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970). [Citation Key = H049]

In the first half of 1860 Democratic editors in Franklin County emphasized slavery's compatibility with the Northern economy and society and Northern complicity in the South's institution. [Citation: Key = TAF38]

Editors of the *Valley Spirit* denied that slavery was a political question. Republicans, they argued, were responsible for injecting the slavery question into politics purely to advance their partisan ends. Slavery, they suggested, made Northerners more wealthy and secure, since business in Pennsylvania depended on Southern products produced with enslaved labor. "If Slavery be a crime," the Democrats charged, "let him who thinks so keep his hands free from it; let him say before God and man that he will have no part in it." Such a position seemed impossible to the Democrats, and yet, they argued, the Republicans holier-than-thou pronouncements suggested as much. Slavery, the Democrats responded, was so tightly interwoven, so much a part of nearly every product, good, service, and enterprise in the American economy that it was folly to suggest one could stand apart from it, clean and untainted. Democrats saw the Republicans and those who voted for them as nothing less than two-faced. Pittsburgh, the Democrats charged, was a fine example of these Northern hypocrites; they vote Republican "for the sole purpose of opposing 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."

Democratic editors furthermore tried to portray those who criticized slavery as the modern equivalent of the man in Jesus' parables who would point out the speck in the eye of another while failing to see the log in his own eye. At every turn the Democrats charged the abolitionists for this sin, and their criticism knew few boundaries. They pointed to the "professed humanitarians" in England and suggested that they

"look to their own deplorable system of slavery" before they went about meddling with "our more humane institutions." When they looked south, the Democratic editors saw a system of slavery that was very much like what "we in the North do of any business transactions; it is like the apprentice system of the North."

Supporting Evidence

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

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

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

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

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

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

Related Historiography

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

John W. Quist, *Restless Visionaries: The Social Roots of Antebellum Reform in Alabama and Michigan* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998). [Citation Key = H039]

Eugene D. Genovese, "Yeomen Farmers in a Slaveholders' Democracy," *Agricultural History* 49, no. 2, (April 1975). [Citation Key = H040]

Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970). [Citation Key = H049]

In the heat of the campaign of 1860 both Franklin Democrats and Republicans shifted their emphasis on slavery. [Citation: Key = TAF39]

Democratic editors became more vitriolic and defensive of the institution while Republicans subtly stressed their moderate position on the issue, repeating that Republicans had no intention of tampering with slavery where it already existed. The Republicans tempered their ideological argument that slavery debased free labor wherever it existed and instead began to counter the Democratic accusations of politicizing the issue. They argued that Democrats, not Republicans, politicized slavery; Republican candidates, Republicans insisted, would not take radical measures but instead move only to stop the spread of slavery into the territories, shutting down the geographic and political threat to free labor institutions. In "How Slaves Drive Out Free Labor," the *Repository* editors in August 1860 point to Missouri, where 50,000 white men are unemployed, as a telling example of the threat slavery posed to

free labor. A month later, the *Repository* was drawing a picture of moderation and careful moves when they are victorious at the polls. "The first work of the Republicans," they reassured readers, "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." They also promised a future politics free of the kind of agitation Democrats practiced on slavery--"encouraging filibusterism, hatching schemes for stealing the possessions of our weak and peaceful neighbors, encouraging the revival of the African Slave Trade, and creating dissensions and ill-feeling between the sections."

Democratic editors responded with heightened rhetoric about the issue, labeling Republicans irresponsible abolitionists. The agitation of the slavery issue, they charged, was all Republican. "It is high time that there be a stop" to it, they argued. It put the country before the world as a "laughingstock amongst world powers," and it was particularly dangerous talk for it encouraged slaves to rebel against their masters. Abolitionists, Democrats cried, were "men professing to be friends of the whole nation" who threw "one fire brand after another into the slaveholding states, exciting their negroes to rebellion and to cause domestic strife, war and bloodshed."

Supporting Evidence

John B. McPherson, John B. McPherson to Edward McPherson, November 9, 1860 [Citation: Key = E035]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alexander K. McClure, Old Time Notes of Pennsylvania, 1905 [Citation: Key = E180]

Related Historiography

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970). [Citation Key = H049]

Augusta's Whig Party emphasized that slavery was safer within the Union than without and that in the 1860 election slavery had become needlessly politicized. The Augusta Whigs moved to develop a new party around Constitutional Unionism. [Citation: Key = TAF40]

The editors of the Staunton *Spectator* considered both the Republican and Democratic parties increasingly sectional and secessionist. They argued that only a new party dedicated to Union could prevent the country from falling into internecine warfare and at the same time protect slavery. Whigs in Augusta were concerned about "whether the peace of the country and the Union itself must be sacrificed to abstract theories." They wanted slavery as a political issue removed from the debate--"The only way we know of is to agree to disagree upon questions of really no practical importance. 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."

The Constitutional Union Party of John Bell, attractive to many old Whigs and Unionists in Augusta, had no party machinery in place. Fractional politics held sway. Augusta men, to be sure, put on a brave face. The *Spectator* agreed with other border-state papers that the disruption of 1860 might be just what Southern Unionists needed. With the Democrats committing suicide, perhaps the former Whigs of Virginia would finally have their chance, long overdue, within their own state. "For years and years seventy thousand gentlemen, comprising the pith and flower of the Virginia population, have been virtually disfranchised," the *Spectator* spat with undisguised class resentment. "Men of wealth, of learning, of influence, of the first order of ability in all things pertaining to public affairs, they have nevertheless had no more lot or part in the State government than if they had lived in China or Timbuctoo." But 1860 offered the chance of a lifetime. "A glorious hour is at hand for the Whigs of Virginia." And what was glorious for Virginia would be glorious for the Union. The great talents of Southern Union men, squandered for the last decade, would finally have a chance to save the entire country, steering it between the detested Republicans and the reviled Democrats. "A noble work, a great work, a task worthy, so unselfish, so unconquerable, so patriotic a band, is to be done."

Those who distrusted Douglas because he seemed to value the North over the South and slavery "should vote for Bell, who is as firm and true a friend of the 'peculiar institution' of the South as any man who was ever born upon its soil or breathed its atmosphere." Bell, from the patrician Whig point of view of Augusta, supported slavery for the right reasons: he believed that slavery possessed "the sacred sanction of the Bible--that it is religiously, morally, socially, and politically right." Bell also understood that slavery "is the fountain from which springs the vast stream of our national wealth and prosperity--that it is the Midas which converts all it touches to gold." A Southern man did not have to sell out on slavery to support the Union. (*Staunton Spectator*, July 17, 1860)

The Unionists mobilized Augusta. The parties formed clubs in every hamlet, fourteen of them by early October, in Sherando, Churchville, Hamilton's school house, Middlebrook, and Mt. Solon, with Greenville, Midway, Newport, and Craigsville soon joining in. (*Staunton Spectator*, October 9, 1860) They put their tallest men on their highest horses to ride along the Valley Road. (*Staunton Spectator*, October 2, 1860) They rang bells at every opportunity. They advertised that seats would be provided for ladies at the speeches. They sent children with "Bell and Everett grapes" for the editor. They brought in speakers from other states and counties. They enlisted any local man who could screw up the nerve to stand in front of his neighbors and speak. They printed the name of every man who came to their club meetings.

At a local rally for the Unionists, State Senator Alexander H. H. Stuart, a long-time leader of the Whigs, Americans, and Unionists, spoke for an hour and thirty-five minutes. "He delivered an able, clear, and eloquent address, exhibiting a great deal of accurate information upon all the questions discussed. He gave a history of the rise and progress of the slavery agitation between the North and South so clearly and succinctly that no man could fail to understand it." Stuart offered a "withering rebuke of those unworthy sons" of Virginia who would allow her to be "dragged into a common destiny with the disunion States."

Even the Democrats' *Vindicator* had to admit that the Union rally seemed a great success. "Bells and flags (expense being not a consideration) tossed and dinged, evidencing at least energy was not wanting in the contest." The *Spectator*, glowing with pride, had no doubt that "Those who traveled many miles through the mud and rain were more than compensated for all their toil and trouble." The moral seemed clear: "If the destiny of this country and the fate of the Union were in the control of Augusta, the watchman on the tower of Liberty might confidently exclaim: 'All is well--All is well--the country is safe!'"

Supporting Evidence

Lucas P. Thompson, Lucas P. Thompson to John H. McCue, November 1, 1860 [Citation: Key = E034]

William S. Garvin, William S. Garvin to Simon Cameron, January 24, 1861 [Citation: Key = E061]

C. Alexander, C. Alexander to John H. McCue, December 12, 1859 [Citation: Key = E062]

Alexander H. H. Stuart, Alexander H. H. Stuart to Reverend W. G. Brownlow, August 18, 1856
[Citation: Key = E063]

The Reverend Abraham Essick, Diary, 1849-1864 [Citation: Key = E181]

John G. Imboden, Letter to John H. McCue, December 3, 1860 [Citation: Key = E060]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Related Historiography

William G. Shade, *Democratizing the Old Dominion: Virginia and the Second Party System, 1824-1861* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996). [Citation Key = H023]

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

Augusta's Democratic Party emphasized that slavery was the country's economic engine of success, protected in the territories by the Dred Scott decision, and they defended Stephen Douglas to the end as the best candidate to defeat Lincoln. [Citation: Key = TAF41]

For Democratic editors in Augusta slavery was the basis for economic growth not only in the South but also in the North and in England, where cotton textile workers depended on the productivity of the South. Democrats could hardly comprehend why the Methodist Episcopal General Conference in 1860 would call slavery "evil" and get involved in what they considered a "purely political" matter. Democrats disliked any consideration of slavery as an abstraction. "We have, as we contend and the compromisers acknowledge," the *Vindicator* editor proclaimed, "the same abstract right to protection for our slave property in the territories which we have to protection for our lives, liberty and property here in Virginia." The issue was property, Democrats insisted, and the right of slaveholders to control and manipulate their property.

Augusta's Democratic editors were furious that some in the county supported Breckinridge and they considered the "seceders" within the Democratic Party politically misguided. Like their Whig counterparts, they were worried about the battle over "abstract" principles of slavery. "The declaration of the abstract right of the South to the protection of its property in the Territories can be of no possible practical good at this time," they warned, "but which we are sure if insisted upon must result in the defeat of the Democratic party, and the rending asunder of this Union of States."

The *Vindicator* supported Stephen Douglas, but the Breckinridge men enjoyed the benefit of the patronage bestowed by President Buchanan. They would have no conciliation and compromise. The Breckinridge men treated Douglas supporters like "fungi to be lopped off from the party organization."

Stephen Douglas came to Augusta in early September. All along the Virginia Central Railroad as it crossed the Blue Ridge, "groups of men, women and children were assembled at each Depot to catch a

glimpse of the great statesman and patriot." "An immense concourse" of three thousand people greeted Douglas as the train station in Staunton, the "largest audience we have ever seen congregated" in the town. The Staunton Artillery escorted Douglas; the unit's captain, John Imboden, took the lead. William H. Harman introduced Douglas, telling him that "To you, sir, all eyes are turned!" The people of the Valley, of Virginia, and of the nation were counting on Douglas to "roll back the swelling tide of sectionalism and fanaticism which threatens to engulf them," to preserve "this magnificent republican edifice reared by our fathers."

Douglas, to repeated cheers, spoke modestly. He declared that "he was not courting votes for the Presidency. If the people would put down the two sectional parties which are threatening the perpetuity of the Union--rebuke fanaticism both North and South--he did not care who they made President." Unlike the other men in the field, Douglas had seen all of America and knew what people had in their hearts. He feared for the Union above all else. At the end of his speech, cheers echoing through Staunton, Senator Douglas went by carriage to the home of M. G. Harman, where hundreds of people came to visit and where Turner's Cornet Band serenaded the visitor. After a day of rest, Douglas headed down the Valley to Harrisonburg to spread his warning and plea once more. (*Republican Vindicator*, September 7, 1860)

The paper resented Yancey's ignorance of the Valley. He could not understand that Augusta could remain unshaken both in its commitment to slavery and in its ties to the Union. "Mr. Yancey, when down in Alabama, remote from the 'slave depopulated' border State of old Virginia (all bosh--we have more slaves now than we had ten years ago) can write his disunion manifestoes." Yancey and the Breckinridge Democrats could not wrap their minds around the subtlety of the situation of the Border. Like the Republicans, they thought only in opposites, not in the shifting shades of gray that enveloped the slaveholding Unionist South. (*Republican Vindicator*, October 5, 1860)

Supporting Evidence

J. H. Cochran, J. H. Cochran to Mother, October 8, 1860 [Citation: Key = E033]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Related Historiography

William G. Shade, *Democratizing the Old Dominion: Virginia and the Second Party System, 1824-1861* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996). [Citation Key = H023]

William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854, Volume 1* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). [Citation Key = H037]

In Augusta clusters of contiguous precincts gave their support in the 1860 presidential election in similar patterns. [Citation: Key = TAF42]

Precincts with high Breckinridge, Bell, and Douglas support were connected. High Breckinridge precincts hugged the broad middle plain of the county and the eastern border. High Douglas precincts guarded the northern flat region of the county above Staunton. High Bell precincts formed a ring along the westernmost boundary of the county, touching the Allegheny Mountains. Differences in slaveholding, agricultural production, and wealth separated these clusters of precincts.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Agricultural Production (map) [Citation: Key = E006]

Augusta County, Va., Election of 1860 (map) [Citation: Key = E008]

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

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

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

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

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

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

Politics, Augusta County, Slaveholding and Precinct Crosstabulation (table) [Citation: Key = E141]

Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1860 Election (map) [Citation: Key = E172]

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

National Election Returns, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E174]

Related Historiography

Daniel W. Crofts, *Old Southampton: Politics and Society in a Virginia County, 1834-1869* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992). [Citation Key = H001]

Daniel W. Crofts, *Reluctant Confederates: Upper South Unionists in the Secessionist Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993). [Citation Key = H014]

James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). [Citation Key = H016]

James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: Knopf, 1982). [Citation Key = H017]

Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992). [Citation Key = H018]

Michael F. Holt, *Forging a Majority: The Formation of the Republican Party in Pittsburgh, 1848-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). [Citation Key = H021]

Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). [Citation Key = H022]

William G. Shade, *Democratizing the Old Dominion: Virginia and the Second Party System, 1824-1861* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996). [Citation Key = H023]

William E. Gienapp, "The Crisis of American Democracy: The Political System and the Coming of the American Civil War," *Why the Civil War Came* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996): 81-124. [Citation Key = H026]

Peyton McCrary, Clark Miller, and Dale Baum, "Class and Party in the Secession Crisis: Voting Behavior in the Deep South, 1856-1861," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 8 no. 2 (Winter 1978): 429-459. [Citation Key = H050]

Paul Bourke and Donald Debats, *Washington County: Politics and Community in Antebellum America* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995). [Citation Key = H056]

Whigs accounted for the most visible party activists in Augusta County, but activists in both parties exerted significant influence. [Citation: Key = TAF43]

In high Douglas precincts identified Whig activists outnumbered the Democrats 7-3, a margin of 2.3 to

1. In high Breckinridge precincts Whig activists outnumbered Democrats 4 to 1, and in high Bell precincts they outnumbered Democrats 6.5 to 1. The presence of party activists and their activities in these precincts were directly connected to the distribution of wealth and slaveholding in these places.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Election of 1860 (map) [Citation: Key = E008]

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

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

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

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

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

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

Politics, Augusta County, Slaveholding and Precinct Crosstabulation (table) [Citation: Key = E141]

Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1860 Election (map) [Citation: Key = E172]

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

National Election Returns, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E174]

Related Historiography

Daniel W. Crofts, *Old Southampton: Politics and Society in a Virginia County, 1834-1869* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992). [Citation Key = H001]

Daniel W. Crofts, *Reluctant Confederates: Upper South Unionists in the Secessionist Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993). [Citation Key = H014]

James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). [Citation Key = H016]

James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: Knopf, 1982).
[Citation Key = H017]

Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992).
[Citation Key = H018]

Michael F. Holt, *Forging a Majority: The Formation of the Republican Party in Pittsburgh, 1848-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). [Citation Key = H021]

Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). [Citation Key = H022]

William E. Gienapp, "The Crisis of American Democracy: The Political System and the Coming of the American Civil War," *Why the Civil War Came* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996): 81-124. [Citation Key = H026]

Peyton McCrary, Clark Miller, and Dale Baum, "Class and Party in the Secession Crisis: Voting Behavior in the Deep South, 1856-1861," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 8 no. 2 (Winter 1978): 429-459. [Citation Key = H050]

Paul Bourke and Donald Debats, *Washington County: Politics and Community in Antebellum America* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995). [Citation Key = H056]

Precincts in Augusta that supported Breckinridge at a high level in 1860 represented the extremes of wealth, as the wealthiest and the poorest precincts drew more support for Breckinridge than any other precincts. [Citation: Key = TAF44]

These precincts--Middlebrook, Stuart's Draft, and Sherando--supported Breckinridge at a level three times higher than in the county as a whole. Middlebrook and Stuart's Draft had household wealth and farm value well above the county average, while Sherando's was the lowest in the county. Identified Whig Party activists in these precincts outnumbered Democrats by a ratio of 4 to 1. These places, especially in Middlebrook and Stuart's Draft, considered themselves secure enough to demand more in the political arena, to withstand change in order to secure future rights and opportunities. These self-confident places represented the strongest pro-Southern, pro-slavery areas in the county. Sherando shared a broad contiguous relationship with Stuart's Draft, its closest center of commercial activity.

Precincts in Augusta that had relatively higher support for Breckinridge also had a higher proportion of slaveholders. Slaveholders accounted for 28 percent of household heads in high Breckinridge precincts (Middlebrook and Stuart's Draft, the largest of the three, had an average of 37 percent). High Douglas precincts, by contrast, averaged just 17 percent slaveholding and the high Bell precincts 24 percent slaveholding, the county average. The highest slaveholding regions of the county went for Breckinridge, while the lower slaveholding regions went for Douglas.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Election of 1860 (map) [Citation: Key = E008]

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

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

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

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

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

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

Politics, Augusta County, Slaveholding and Precinct Crosstabulation (table) [Citation: Key = E141]

Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1860 Election (map) [Citation: Key = E172]

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

National Election Returns, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E174]

Related Historiography

Daniel W. Crofts, *Old Southampton: Politics and Society in a Virginia County, 1834-1869* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992). [Citation Key = H001]

Daniel W. Crofts, *Reluctant Confederates: Upper South Unionists in the Secessionist Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993). [Citation Key = H014]

James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). [Citation Key = H016]

James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: Knopf, 1982). [Citation Key = H017]

Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992). [Citation Key = H018]

Michael F. Holt, *Forging a Majority: The Formation of the Republican Party in Pittsburgh, 1848-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). [Citation Key = H021]

Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). [Citation Key = H022]

William G. Shade, *Democratizing the Old Dominion: Virginia and the Second Party System, 1824-1861* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996). [Citation Key = H023]

William E. Gienapp, "The Crisis of American Democracy: The Political System and the Coming of the American Civil War," *Why the Civil War Came* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996): 81-124. [Citation Key = H026]

Peyton McCrary, Clark Miller, and Dale Baum, "Class and Party in the Secession Crisis: Voting Behavior in the Deep South, 1856-1861," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 8 no. 2 (Winter 1978): 429-459. [Citation Key = H050]

Paul Bourke and Donald Debats, *Washington County: Politics and Community in Antebellum America* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995). [Citation Key = H056]

The precincts with high Bell support had average household wealth and farm value well below county averages. For these marginal places a vote for Bell represented a safe course, the least change. [Citation: Key = TAF45]

Deerfield, Churchville, and Craigsville precincts supported Bell at 87 percent while the county went for Bell at 66 percent. All three places occupied the western reaches of the county, where most slaveowners had fewer than 5 slaves and where many farms occupied higher elevations. Here, support for Bell and unionism represented a decision for continued opportunity and growth that slavery offered within the context of the Union. Old line Whigs in the county consistently argued that slavery was safer in the union than if the South tried to secede. In these precincts, where identified Whig Party activists outnumbered Democrats by a margin of 6.5 to 1, nearly double the margin of the county as a whole, voters apparently agreed that slavery was safer with Bell than either of the Democratic candidates.

Supporting Evidence

Augusta County, Va., Election of 1860 (map) [Citation: Key = E008]

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

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

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

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

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

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

Politics, Augusta County, Slaveholding and Precinct Crosstabulation (table) [Citation: Key = E141]

Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1860 Election (map) [Citation: Key = E172]

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

National Election Returns, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E174]

Related Historiography

Daniel W. Crofts, *Reluctant Confederates: Upper South Unionists in the Secessionist Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993). [Citation Key = H014]

James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). [Citation Key = H016]

James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: Knopf, 1982). [Citation Key = H017]

Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992). [Citation Key = H018]

Michael F. Holt, *Forging a Majority: The Formation of the Republican Party in Pittsburgh, 1848-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). [Citation Key = H021]

Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). [Citation Key = H022]

William E. Gienapp, "The Crisis of American Democracy: The Political System and the Coming of the American Civil War," *Why the Civil War Came* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996): 81-124. [Citation Key = H026]

Peyton McCrary, Clark Miller, and Dale Baum, "Class and Party in the Secession Crisis: Voting Behavior in the Deep South, 1856-1861," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 8 no. 2 (Winter 1978): 429-459. [Citation Key = H050]

Paul Bourke and Donald Debats, *Washington County: Politics and Community in Antebellum America* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995). [Citation Key = H056]

In Franklin County, John Breckinridge won a majority in six precincts, most of them in the far northern and western belt of the county, where few blacks lived and farmers planted corn not wheat. [Citation: Key = TAF46]

Precincts that went for Breckinridge were significantly poorer than either the precincts that Lincoln won or those that were closely contested. Breckinridge precincts had an average household wealth and farm value below the county average, and their farms tended to grow relatively more corn and less wheat than the county average. Breckinridge's highest level of support came in the Concord precinct, where the average household wealth was about \$3,500 and average farm value just \$2,050. The county average in Franklin for household wealth was about \$5,800 and for farm value \$7,300. Farms in the Breckinridge precincts, such as Lurgan and Concord, planted far more corn, nearly 40 percent of their total crop, and far less wheat, just 18 percent of their total crop mix, than either the county average or the Lincoln districts. These districts had significantly fewer black residents; at least two of them were all-white townships.

Supporting Evidence

Franklin County, Pa., Agricultural Production (map) [Citation: Key = E005]

Franklin County, Pa., Election of 1860 (map) [Citation: Key = E013]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Related Historiography

James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). [Citation Key = H016]

James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: Knopf, 1982). [Citation Key = H017]

Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992). [Citation Key = H018]

Robert William Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1989). [Citation Key = H019]

Michael F. Holt, *Forging a Majority: The Formation of the Republican Party in Pittsburgh, 1848-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). [Citation Key = H021]

Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). [Citation Key = H022]

William E. Gienapp, "The Crisis of American Democracy: The Political System and the Coming of the American Civil War," *Why the Civil War Came* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996): 81-124. [Citation Key = H026]

Paul Bourke and Donald Debats, *Washington County: Politics and Community in Antebellum America* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995). [Citation Key = H056]

Lincoln won sixteen precincts in Franklin, ten of them by margins greater than 55 percent, with support mainly from the urban center of the county and places with the highest numbers of black residents--even though black men could not vote in Pennsylvania. [Citation: Key = TAF47]

Lincoln's precincts had a different age profile than Breckinridge's. They included households with a greater proportion of voters (men over 21) in their twenties and thirties. They also included households with a slightly lower average age of the head of household. Lincoln's support in Franklin probably came from the younger voters and places with younger household heads.

Lincoln swept the South Ward of Chambersburg, where nearly all of the black residents in the town lived, and Peters Township, another place in the county with large numbers of black residents. In both Montgomery and Southampton, the largest black settlements outside of Chambersburg, Lincoln won by 60 and 59 percent respectively. In the North Ward of Chambersburg, where many fewer blacks lived, Lincoln won by 56 percent. With the exception of Metal Township, every precinct that went for Lincoln by more than 59 percent was a place where blacks lived in relatively large numbers.

Democratic newspapers vilified the Republicans for courting black voters and black contributions during the 1860 election. Only after the election did the extent of black support for Republicans in Philadelphia and Ohio become clear.

Supporting Evidence

Franklin County, Pa., Election of 1860 (map) [Citation: Key = E013]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1860 Election (map) [Citation: Key = E172]

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

National Election Returns, 1860 (table) [Citation: Key = E174]

Related Historiography

James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). [Citation Key = H016]

James M. McPherson, *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: Knopf, 1982). [Citation Key = H017]

Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992). [Citation Key = H018]

Robert William Fogel, *Without Consent or Contract: The Rise and Fall of American Slavery* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1989). [Citation Key = H019]

Michael F. Holt, *Forging a Majority: The Formation of the Republican Party in Pittsburgh, 1848-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969). [Citation Key = H021]

Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). [Citation Key = H022]

William E. Gienapp, "The Crisis of American Democracy: The Political System and the Coming of the American Civil War," *Why the Civil War Came* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996): 81-124. [Citation Key = H026]