

Slavery in the American Mountain South

Wilma A. Dunaway

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University*

MAISON DES SCIENCES DE L'HOMME



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Wilma A. Dunaway 2003

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2003

Printed in the United States of America

Typeface Plantin 10/12 pt. *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Dunaway, Wilma A.

Slavery in the American Mountain South / Wilma A. Dunaway.

p. cm. – (Studies in modern capitalism)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-81275-5 – ISBN 0-521-01215-5 (pbk.)

1. Slavery – Social aspects – Appalachian Region, Southern – History.
 2. Slaves – Appalachian Region, Southern – Social conditions.
 3. Plantation life – Appalachian Region, Southern – History.
 4. African Americans – Appalachian Region, Southern – Social conditions.
 5. Appalachian Region, Southern – Race relations.
 6. Appalachian Region, Southern – Social conditions.
- I. Title. II. Series.

E443 .D87 2002
306.3'62'0974 – dc21

2002071480

ISBN 0 521 81275 5 hardback
ISBN 0 521 01215 5 paperback

Contents

<i>List of Maps</i>	<i>page xi</i>
Introduction	1
1 Slavery's Grip on the Mountain South	15
2 Labor Management on Mountain Plantations	48
3 Slaves in Commerce and Travel Capitalism	70
4 Slaves in Industry and Manufacturing	103
5 Slavery and Poor Whites in the Mountain South	139
6 Repression and Antisystemic Resistance on Mountain Plantations	163
7 Cultural Resistance and Community Building on Mountain Plantations	198
Conclusion	241
<i>Notes</i>	263
<i>Bibliography</i>	299
<i>Index</i>	337

Introduction

This study breaks new ground by investigating enslavement in a subregion of the American South that has been ignored by scholars. I will explore the complexities of the Mountain South where slavery flourished amid a nonslaveholding majority and a large surplus of poor white landless laborers. In geographic and geological terms, the Mountain South (also known as Southern Appalachia) includes that part of the U.S. Southeast that rose from the floor of the ocean to form the Appalachian Mountain chain ten thousand years ago (see Map 1). In a previous book, I documented the historical integration of this region into the capitalist world system. The incorporation of Southern Appalachia entailed nearly one hundred fifty years of ecological, politico-economic, and cultural change. Beginning in the early 1700s, Southern Appalachia was incorporated as a peripheral fringe of the European colonies located along the southeastern coasts of North America. During the early eighteenth century, the peripheries of the world economy included eastern and southern Europe, Hispanic America, and “the extended Caribbean,” which stretched from the Atlantic colonies of North America to northeast Brazil. As the geographical space for several wars, the Mountain South became one of the major frontier arenas in which England, France, and Spain played out their imperialistic rivalry. Within two decades, the region’s indigenous people were integrated into the commodity chains of the world economy to supply slaves to New World plantations and to produce deerskins to fuel western Europe’s emergent leather manufacturing. After the American Revolution, Southern Appalachia formed the first western frontier of the new nation, so it was quickly resettled by Euroamericans.¹

Incorporation of the Mountain South into the World Economy

On a world scale, Southern Appalachia’s role was not greatly different from that of many other such peripheral fringes at the time, including



Map 1. Where is the Mountain South?

inland mountain sections of several Caribbean islands, Brazil, the West Indies, and central Europe. Incorporation into the capitalist world economy triggered within Southern Appalachia agricultural, livestock, and extractive ventures that were adapted to the region's terrain and ecological peculiarities. Yet those new production regimes paralleled activities that were occurring in other sectors of the New World that had been colonized by western Europe. Some Appalachian counties specialized in the cultivation of tobacco or cotton for export. Fundamentally, however, Southern Appalachia was a "provisioning zone" that supplied raw materials to other agricultural or industrial regions of the world economy.²

On the one hand, this inland region exported foodstuffs to other peripheries and semiperipheries of the western hemisphere, those areas

that specialized in cash crops for consumption by the core. Appalachian agriculture was neither irrational nor precapitalist; crops were planned and cultivated in response to distant market prices. The demand for flour, meal, and grain liquors was high in plantation economies (like the North American South and most of Latin America) where labor was budgeted toward the production of exotic staples, not foods. So it was not accidental that the region's surplus producers concentrated their land and labor resources into the generation of wheat and corn – often in terrain where such production was ecologically unsound. Nor was it a chance occurrence that Southern Appalachians specialized in the production of livestock, as did inland mountainous sections of other zones of the New World. There was high demand for meat, work animals, animal by-products, and leather in those peripheries and semiperipheries that did not allocate land to less-profitable livestock production.

On the other hand, Southern Appalachia was also a production regime that supplied raw materials to the emergent industrial cores of the American Northeast and western Europe. The appetite for Appalachian minerals, timber, cotton, and wool was great in those industrial arenas. In addition, regional exports of manufactured tobacco, grain liquors, and foodstuffs provisioned those sectors of the world economy where industry and towns had displaced farms. Much of the Appalachian surplus received in Southern ports was reexported to the urban-industrial centers of the American Northeast and to foreign plantation zones of the world economy. By the 1840s, the northeastern United States was specializing in manufacturing and international shipping, and that region's growing trade/production centers were experiencing food deficits. Consequently, by 1860, three-fourths of the Upper South grain received at Southern seaports was being reexported to the Northeast. In return for raw ores and agricultural products, Southern markets – including the mountain counties – consumed nearly one-quarter of the transportable manufacturing output of the North and received a sizable segment of the redistributed international imports (e.g., coffee, tea) handled by Northeastern capitalists.

Beginning in the 1820s, Great Britain lowered tariff rates and eliminated trade barriers to foreign grains. Subsequently, European and colonial markets were opened to North American commodities. Little wonder, then, that flour and processed meats constituted the country's major nineteenth-century exports, or that more than two-thirds of those exports went to England and France. Outside the country, then, Appalachian commodities flowed to the manufacturing centers of Europe, to the West Indies, to the Caribbean, and to South America.

Through far-reaching commodity flows, Appalachian raw materials – in the form of agricultural, livestock, or extractive resources – were exchanged for core manufactures and tropical imports.³

Peripheral capitalism unfolded in Southern Appalachia as a mode of production that combined several forms of land tenure and labor. Because control over land, the primary factor of production, was denied to them, the unpropertied majority of the free population was transformed into an impoverished *semiproletariat*. However, articulation with the world economy did not trigger only the appearance of free wage labor or white tenancy. Capitalist dynamics in antebellum Southern Appalachia also generated a variety of unfree labor mechanisms. “The process of incorporation . . . involved the subordination of the labor force to the dictates of export-oriented commodity production, and thus occasioned increased coercion of the labor force as commodity production became generalized.” As a result, the region’s landholders agglomerated an ethnically and sexually diverse labor force that combined *free* laborers from the ranks of the landless tenants, croppers, poor women, and wage laborers with *unfree* workers from four sources. Legally restricted from free movement in the marketplace, the region’s free blacks, Cherokee households, and indentured paupers contributed coerced labor to the region’s farms. However, Southern Appalachia’s largest group of unfree laborers were slaves who supplied long-term labor to one of every three farm owners and who accounted for one of every five agricultural laborer households.⁴

Why Study Slavery in the Mountain South?

Consisting of 215 mountainous and hilly counties in nine states, this large land area was characterized in the antebellum period by non-slaveholding farms and enterprises, a large landless white labor force, small plantations, mixed farming, and extractive industry. Because the Lower South was such a sharp contrast to these traits, Mountain South slavery has been historically misrepresented. Scholars have idealized the region’s yeomen farmers as egalitarian people whose lifestyle was alien to that of slaveholding Southerners. Consequently, the region’s economy is believed to have “generated no need or desire for slaves.” The conventional wisdom has long been that Appalachian agriculture “rested not on the labor of slaves but rather on small land-owning cultivators.” Poor soil, rugged terrain, and a cooler climate are offered as the causes for the failure of the Appalachian “enclave of plain folk farmers” to cultivate the labor-intensive staple crops that typified the Lower South. Beyond these economic and environmental factors, Southern Appalachians are portrayed as culturally “loath to follow the fortunes of the ardent pro-slavery

element.” Southern mountaineers have been lauded for their political opposition to slavery, and the birth of the abolition movement is inaccurately credited by some to the Mountain South.⁵

The prevailing scholarly view is that slavery was largely absent from the Mountain South and that the region’s few slaveholders were more kindly than their Lower South peers. In the words of Trouillot, “slavery here is a ghost, both the past and a living process.” As a result, Mountain slaves have remained a *people without history* because too many researchers have claimed that “the ‘peculiar institution’ never influenced Appalachian culture and society.” Over the last two decades, a few scholars have begun to cast doubt on the notion that Appalachians “hated slavery,” as Woodson claimed in the early 1900s. Indeed, writers like Inscoc have argued that slavery played an energetic role in some local economies, including the significant contributions of unfree laborers to the region’s antebellum railroad, salt, iron, and gold industries. The extent of slavery among the region’s Cherokees has even been documented. However, there are four weaknesses in these existing analyses. First, empirical evidence about Appalachian slavery has not been region-wide. Even revisionists have claimed to be talking about “Appalachian” slavery, even though they target only a single county or a handful of counties, failing thereby to depict subregional differentiation. Second, these writers have used very little quantitative analysis from census manuscripts, tax lists, or slaveholder records. Third, these studies do not explore the narratives of Mountain slaves, even when they ground their generalizations in the biased manuscript collections of slaveholders. Finally, these studies remain provincial in that they offer no comparative analysis between the Mountain South and other slaveholding regions. Consequently, the tendency has been to idealize this region as less racist and to overstate the degree to which its white residents were opposed to slavery.⁶

Unearthing historical silences and misperceptions is not the only reason we should be intrigued by the Mountain South. Analysis of Appalachian enslavement offers unusual opportunities to explore several areas of omission and debate within international slavery studies. First, the prevailing scholarly view is that enslavement of indigenous peoples ended abruptly with the import of Africans into the New World. However, there must have been an undocumented historical overlap between the two forms of slavery, as evidenced by the genealogy of mountain slaves. Indeed, one of every eight black Appalachians was a descendant of a Native American. Second, there is very little research about slave life on small plantations, like those that typified Appalachia. Fogel stresses that “failure to take adequate account of the differences between slave experiences and culture on large and small plantations” has been a fundamental blunder

by slavery specialists. Despite Crawford's ground-breaking finding that plantation size was the most significant determinant of quality of slave life, there has never been a study of a slaveholding region that was characterized by small plantations. On the one hand, the Mountain South was part of the Upper South where the median slaveholding was 15.3 black laborers, and more than one-third of all slaves were held in units smaller than ten. On the other hand, the Mountain South also contained some Lower South counties, thereby permitting internal comparisons between differently sized slaveholdings, between crop specializations, and between agricultural and nonagricultural producers.⁷

As a model for understanding the changes that occurred during different historical eras and geographical regions, Berlin drew an historical distinction between *societies with slaves* and *slave societies*.

Slaveholdings in societies with slaves were generally small, and the line between slave and free could be remarkably fluid, with manumission often possible and sometimes encouraged. But neither mildness nor openness defined societies with slaves. Slaveholders in such societies could act with extraordinary brutality precisely because their slaves were extraneous to their main business. . . . What distinguished societies with slaves was the fact that slaves were marginal to the central productive processes; slavery was just one form of labor among many. . . . In societies with slaves, no one presumed the master-slave relationship to be the social exemplar.

In slave societies, by contrast, slavery stood at the center of economic production, and the master-slave relationship provided the model for all social relations. . . . Whereas slaveholders were just one portion of a propertied elite in societies with slaves, they were the ruling class in slave societies. . . . Historians have outlined the process by which societies with slaves in the Americas became slave societies. The transformation generally turned upon the discovery of some commodity . . . that could command an international market. With that, slaveholders capitalized production and monopolized resources, muscled other classes to the periphery, and consolidated their political power. . . . Other forms of labor – whether family labor, indentured servants, or wage labor – declined, as slaveholders drove small farmers and wage workers to the margins.

An export for the world economy was not enough, according to Berlin, to transform a society with slaves into a slave society. More important than the discovery of an export commodity was “the presence of a planter class able to command the region's resources, mobilize the power of the state, and vanquish competitors. . . . The slaveholders' seizure of power was the critical element in transforming societies with slaves into slave societies.”⁸

Using that model, Berlin delineated four slave societies in eighteenth-century North America: the North, the tobacco-producing Chesapeake, the Southern coastal rice-growing low country, and the sugar and cotton plantations of the lower Mississippi Valley. Even though the Mountain

South formed the western frontiers of two of his identified societies, Berlin ignored this massive land area. There has been a scholarly presumption that slavery did not capture a region unless there were large numbers of plantations and/or large numbers of slaveholders and slaves. Such a generalization leaves unexplored several variables other than size. On the one hand, a Lower South farm owner was twelve times more likely to run a large plantation than his Appalachian counterpart. On the other hand, Mountain slaveholders monopolized a much higher proportion of their communities' land and wealth than did Lower South planters. This region was linked by rivers and roads to the coastal trade centers of the Tidewater and the Lower South, and it lay at the geographical heart of antebellum trade routes that connected the South to the North and the Upper South to the Lower South. Consequently, two major slave-trading networks cut directly through the region and became major conduits for overland and river transport of slave coffles. Moreover, this region was more politically divided over slavery than any other section of the South. Black and poor white Appalachians were disproportionately represented among the soldiers and military laborers for the Union Army. The Civil War tore apart Appalachian communities, so that the Southern Mountains were probably more damaged by army and guerilla activity than any other part of the country. Thus, the Mountain South was characterized by trends that Berlin associates with both his ideal types, most noticeably lacking only *largeness of scale* in its slaveholding operations. If his theoretical model is historically correct, where should we put a region like the Mountain South that fits neither of these ideal types neatly?⁹

Methods and Definitions

As in my previous work, this study avoids the socially constructed regional definitions that emerged in the 1960s around the War on Poverty. Instead, I define the Mountain South in terms of *terrain* and *geological formation*, resulting in a target area that stretches through nine states from western Maryland to northern Alabama. The vast majority of the Mountain South is not mountainous at all. Hill-plateaus and valleys adjacent to long ridges make up more than 80 percent of the acreage. Most of the highest, longest ridges of the mountain chain lie in the Appalachian counties of Virginia, a zone that some scholars would exclude because it was characterized by such a high incidence of slaveholding. Geologically, these counties are part of the Appalachian Mountain chain, so it requires some artificial, non-terrain construct to justify their ejection from the regional definition. Indeed, it is crucial to include Appalachian Virginia. The prevailing view has been that terrain like Virginia's ridges

prevented the expansion of slavery in North America. Thus, one could reasonably ask why slavery was so entrenched in Appalachian Virginia if rough terrain precluded the use of slave labor. Obviously, it is important to include all the subsections of the Mountain South in order to draw comparisons between zones characterized by diverse terrain, differently sized slaveholdings, and varied economic specializations. Even though it did not achieve statehood until 1863, the reader will find discussions of West Virginia throughout the book, and those references are not an historical error on my part. Because that area had the lowest incidence of enslavement in the American South, it is crucial to set it apart from the rest of Virginia. To ensure that my statistical analysis would not be corrupted by either an overestimation of slavery in Virginia's most western counties or an understatement of the extent of plantations in Blue Ridge and southwestern Virginia, I have separated out quantitative data and slave narratives for those counties that became West Virginia during the Civil War.¹⁰

Sources and Term Definitions

To research this complex topic, I have triangulated quantitative, archival, primary, and secondary documents. I derived my statistical analysis from a database of nearly 26,000 households drawn from nineteenth-century county tax lists and census manuscripts. In addition to those samples, I relied on archived records from farms, plantations, commercial sites, and industries. A majority of the slaveholder collections utilized for this research derived from small and middling plantations. However, I did not ignore rich Appalachian planters, like Thomas Jefferson or John Calhoun. Never to quote or cite an Appalachian planter is to deny that they existed and to ignore that they were the richest, most politically powerful families in Appalachian counties. Indeed, I present information about them to demonstrate that they are similar to their Lower South counterparts and, therefore, very different from the typical farmers in their communities. It is also necessary to draw upon planter documents to show that the larger plantations implemented different crop choices, surveillance strategies, and labor management practices than did smallholdings. Still, those rich planters account for less than 1 percent of all the citations and details provided in this study.¹¹

Throughout this book, I have used the term *plantation* consistently to refer to a slaveholding enterprise. I have purposely done this to distinguish such economic operations from the nonslaveholding farms that characterized the Mountain South. Far too many scholars confront me at meetings with the mythological construct that the "typical Appalachian

slaveholder” was a benign small farmer who kept only a couple of slaves to help his wife out in the kitchen. By using the term *plantation* to distinguish all slaveholding farms, I seek to erode the stereotype that small plantations might be the social, political, and economic equivalent of small nonslaveholding farms in their communities. On the one hand, small slaveholders could not have owned black laborers if they or their families had not accumulated surplus wealth far in excess of the household assets averaged by the majority of nonslaveholding Appalachians. On the other hand, planters and smallholders alike controlled far more than their equitable share of the political power and economic resources in their communities. Because small slaveholders aspired to be planters, they did not often align themselves with the political and economic interests of nonslaveholders. According to Berlin, “what distinguished the slave plantation from other forms of production was neither the particularities of the crop that was cultivated nor the scale of its cultivation. . . . The plantation’s distinguishing mark was its peculiar social order, which conceded nearly everything to the slaveowner and nothing to the slave.” That social order was grounded in a racial ideology in which chattel bondage and white supremacy became entwined. For that reason, it is crucial to distinguish a nonslaveholding farm from a slaveholder. In the Mountain South, a slaveholder did not have to reach planter status to be set apart from neighbors whose antagonism to enslavement would cause them to align themselves with the Union in greater numbers than in any other region of the American South. In order to distinguish plantations by size, I utilize the definitions that are typically applied by U.S. slavery specialists. A *planter* or *large plantation* held fifty or more slaves while a *middling plantation* or slaveholder owned twenty to forty-nine slaves. Thus, a *small plantation* was one on which there were nineteen or fewer slaves.¹²

Capturing Diversity Through State Subregions

In addition to contrasting county groups according to terrain types, this study analyzes intraregional variation by comparing the nine state subregions. Are state subregions the best method to analyze subregional economic variation? On the one hand, I previously published the only region-wide economic history of antebellum Southern Appalachia that exists to date.¹³ No other scholar has collected or analyzed an antebellum Appalachian statistical data set as massive or as chronologically extensive as mine – a data set, with which I have lived, eaten, slept, and traveled for twelve years, reevaluating data analysis methods numerous times with quantitative experts, cliometricians, and agricultural economists at six universities. Bottom line, I have not found any better analytical tools than

state subregions. When county economic indicators are grouped without regard to their state jurisdictions, the findings mask subregional diversity and obscure causative factors associated with political boundaries. Neither terrain nor an artificially constructed set of economic ideal types provide more effective mechanisms for analyzing subregional diversity. While state-level analysis permits ten levels of comparison across this vast geographical space, other possible approaches provide only two to four comparative categories. Simply put, there is no other economic or terrain variable that will generate more economic subregions than state-level analysis. On the other hand, no unified economic subregions clearly emerge from that regional data set. It is certainly not sound methodology for me to apply conceptual constructs that were derived from studies grounded in one or a few counties or that are grounded in economic trends that emerged after the antebellum period.

There is a second significant reason that I organized my statistical analysis by states. Because alternate economic subregions (e.g., terrain types) combine counties that are scattered all over the region, the findings would be suspect. First, antebellum residents of these areas did not identify themselves as “Appalachians” who coalesced politically, culturally, or economically across multistate boundaries. Nor is there any evidence that there were economic subregions of Appalachia that acted in a unified manner. Second, Appalachian counties have never been autonomous from their state governments. Antebellum states were strong determinants of subregional variation because they shaped the political economies of the counties within their jurisdictions, particularly through laws regulating land, labor, debt, taxation, and slavery. Moreover, the nine states that controlled Southern Appalachia enacted different laws and implemented disparate levels of funding for transportation networks, poor relief, schools, and economic development projects. Quite often, differences in those public policies accounted for or exacerbated economic trends. Furthermore, there are significant terrain differences within each of the state subregions, and each of them is characterized by the presence or absence of river systems, the most crucial conduits for distant travel and external trade in this historical era. Such terrain similarities among adjacent counties would disappear if those units were regrouped into economic subregions rather than states.

Slave Narratives from the Mountain South

History does not belong just to those who are reified in government and archival documents. The past is also owned by survivors of inequality and by those who live through injustice at the hands of powerful elites.

As Trouillot has recognized, “survivors carry history on themselves,” and care must be exercised in the construction of knowledge from their indigenous transcripts. “Silences enter the process of historical production at four crucial moments: the moment of fact creation (the making of *sources*); the moment of fact assembly (the making of *archives*); the moment of fact retrieval (the making of *narratives*); and the moment of retrospective significance (the making of *history* in the final instance).” To be as inclusive as possible in the final moment of history production, I have grounded this study in analysis of narratives of nearly 300 slaves and more than 400 white Civil War veterans. I spent many months locating Appalachian slave narratives within the Federal Writers Project, at regional archives, and among published personal histories. Beginning with Rawick’s forty-one published volumes of the WPA slave narratives, I scrutinized every page for county of origin, for interregional sales or relocations that shifted slaves into or out of the mountains, and for occurrences during the Civil War that displaced slaves. After that process, I identified other archival and published accounts, finding several narratives in unusual locations, including archives at Fisk University and the University of Kentucky. In this way, I did not ignore the life histories of slaves who were born outside the Mountain South and then migrated there or those who were removed to other regions. Ultimately, I aggregated the first comprehensive list of Mountain South slave narratives.¹⁴

How representative of the Mountain South are these narratives? In comparison to the entire WPA collection, Appalachian slave narratives are exceptional in the degree to which they depict small plantations. By checking the slave narratives against census manuscripts and slave schedules, I established that the vast majority of the Appalachian narratives were collected from individuals who had been enslaved on plantations that held fewer than twenty slaves. Consequently, Blue Ridge Virginia is underrepresented while the Appalachian counties of Kentucky, North Carolina, and West Virginia are overrepresented. Thus, those areas that held the smallest number of slaves in this region are more than adequately covered by narratives from slaves who resided there. Appalachian slave narratives are not handicapped by the kinds of shortcomings that plague the national WPA collection. Large plantations, males, and house servants are overrepresented among the entire universe of respondents. In addition, two-fifths of the ex-slaves had experienced fewer than ten years of enslavement. The most serious distortions derived from the class and racial biases of whites who conducted the vast majority of the interviews. Most of the Appalachian respondents had been field hands, and very few were employed full time as artisans or domestic servants. In terms of gender differentiation, the Appalachian sample is almost

evenly divided. In contrast to the entire WPA collection, three-quarters of the Appalachian ex-slaves were older than ten when freed. Indeed, when emancipated, one-third of the Southern Mountain respondents were sixteen or older, and 12 percent were twenty-five or older. Thus, nearly half the Appalachian ex-slaves had endured fifteen years or more of enslavement, and they were old enough to form and to retain oral histories. Perhaps the greatest strength of the Appalachian collection has to do with the ethnicity of interviewers. More than two-fifths of the Mountain narratives were written by the ex-slaves themselves or collected by black field workers, including many Tennessee and Georgia interviews that were conducted under the auspices of Fisk University and the Atlanta Urban League. The Southern Mountain narratives were collected over a vast land area in nine states. This collection offers another advantage. The geographical distances between respondents offer opportunities for comparison and for testing the widespread transmission of African-American culture.¹⁵

I have come away from this effort with a deep respect for the quality and the reliability of these indigenous narratives. When I tested ex-slave claims against public records, I found them to be more accurate than most of the slaveholder manuscripts that I scrutinized, and quite often they were much less ideologically blinded than many of the scholarly works I have consulted. Therefore, I made the conscious intellectual decision to engage in “the making of *history* in the final instance” by respecting the indigenous knowledge of the ex-slaves whose transcripts I analyzed. That means that I did not dismiss and refuse to explore every slave voice that disagreed with intellectual fad or convention. In most instances, I triangulated the indigenous view against public records and found the slave’s knowledge to be more reliable than some recent scholarly representations. In other instances, I perceived that Appalachian slaves are a *people without written history* and that it is important to document the oral myths in which they grounded their community building. Because Mountain slave narratives present a view of enslavement that attacks the conventional wisdom, I recognized that they and I were engaging in a process that Trouillot calls “the production of alternative narratives.” When contacted by a Fisk University researcher in 1937, one Chattanooga ex-slave comprehended that he possessed a knowledge about slavery that was different from the social constructions of the African-American interviewer. “I don’t care about telling about it [slavery] sometime,” he commented cynically, “because there is always somebody on the outside that knows more about it than I do, and I was right in it.” Clearly, this poorly educated man understood that historical facts are not created equal and that knowledge construction is biased by differential control of the means of

historical production. On the one hand, I set myself the difficult goal of avoiding the kind of intellectual elitism the ex-slave feared while at the same time trying to avoid the pitfall of informant misrepresentation. On the other hand, I heeded the advice of C. Vann Woodward and did not view the use of slave narratives as any more treacherous or unreliable than other sources or research methods.¹⁶

Organization of This Research Project

As we shall see in the following chapters, slaves made a much greater economic contribution to the Mountain South than scholars have previously acknowledged, especially to its antebellum development of town commerce, transportation networks, travel capitalism, manufacturing, and extractive industries. This book documents subregional variations in economic activities, the multifaceted occupations of slaves, the diverse business portfolios of slaveholders, the differences between small and large plantations, and the economic ties between slavery, agriculture, commerce, and industrial development. Moreover, the study offers numerous comparisons between mountainous, hill-plateau, and ridge-valley subregions. This study seeks to answer these important questions.

- To what degree did African and Native American enslavement overlap?
- Was a region buffered from the worst political, economic, and social impacts of enslavement so long as it was characterized by small slaveholdings, as Berlin's conceptualization contends?
- In this region characterized by small plantations and mixed farming, how were slaves utilized economically?
- How did labor management differ on small, middling, and large plantations?
- To what degree did slaves engage in resistance and community building?
- To what degree did slaves share the African-American culture that has been attributed to large plantations?
- Was Mountain South slavery exceptional, as some scholars have claimed?

Chapter 1 documents slavery's political and economic grip on the Mountain South, beginning with the colonial era of indigenous enslavement. Chapter 2 focuses on the agricultural labor management strategies of Mountain masters, drawing contrasts between differently sized plantations and between different slaveholding regions. Chapters 3 and 4 investigate the extent to which Mountain slaves were employed at nonagricultural occupations. Chapter 5 examines the ways in which Mountain masters captured the labor of poor whites, pinpointing the functional relationship between white tenancy and slavery. Chapters 6

and 7 examine resistance and community building by Mountain slaves, calling into question many scholarly presumptions about the absence of such counter-hegemonic activism on small plantations. In the conclusion, I have recast the most significant findings about the Mountain South within the context of ongoing debates in the field of slavery studies and against the backdrop of earlier assumptions about small plantations. This research project does not end with this monograph, however. A second book will explore the living conditions and household risks faced by black Appalachians during enslavement and early emancipation, calling into question the conventional paradigm of the African-American slave family.¹⁷

Online Archive of Source Materials

To publish all the information from sources, methods, and quantitative evidence would require publication of a third volume. To make those materials available to other researchers as quickly as possible, I have created a permanent electronic library archive. That site provides the tables that support the findings throughout this study, as well as a detailed discussion of methodological issues. A comprehensive list and a descriptive analysis of the collection of Mountain South slave narratives can also be found there. In addition, antebellum photographs and drawings have been put online for use by other researchers. Throughout the notes, you will see references to sources that can be accessed at this website: http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/vtpubs/mountain_slavery/index.htm.