



Miscegenation and the Free Negro in Antebellum "Anglo" Alabama: A Reexamination of Southern Race Relations

Author(s): Gary B. Mills

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 68, No. 1 (Jun., 1981), pp. 16-34

Published by: [Organization of American Historians](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1890900>

Accessed: 14/11/2012 12:41

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Organization of American Historians is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of American History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Miscegenation and the Free Negro in Antebellum "Anglo" Alabama: A Reexamination of Southern Race Relations

Gary B. Mills

More than a quarter-century ago, the southern historian Frank L. Owsley predicted: "If the history of every county, or even smaller community in every Southern State would be written from the *basic sources*, a history of the South would emerge vastly different from any previously written."¹ A new generation of historians has accepted this challenge, returning to those long-neglected basic sources. While their approach has been more topical than geographical (as Owsley suggested), the results have definitely called into question many of the standard interpretations of the antebellum South.

The southern free Negro—and the miscegenation that is credited with producing him—may serve as an excellent case at point.² Traditional interpretations of his genesis and evolution generally have followed a monolithic pattern. As a class, by and large, he owed his existence to libidinous, but conscience-stricken, white planters—male planters, necessarily, since the unwritten double-standard of southern white society winked at white male exploitation of Negro women but tolerated no sexual relations that hinted of racial equality, such as white female relations with Negro males or legal interracial marriages. Within free Negro society, allegedly, the family unit was unstable, due as much to the pattern of sexual incontinency that slavery forced upon blacks as to the desire of free black women to breed lighter offspring who might pass into white society. As a class, the free black is believed to have been a threat to the institution of slavery. Thus his contacts with slaves were limited, he was ostracized by white society (with the occasional exception of

Gary B. Mills is associate professor of history at the University of Alabama, Gadsden. Research for this article was funded in part by the Research Grants Committee of the University of Alabama.

¹ Frank L. Owsley, as quoted in Leah Rawls Atkins, *A Manual for Writing Alabama State and Local History* (Montgomery, 1976), frontispiece.

² In this article *Negro* is used as a general term for all Afro-Americans regardless of exact racial composition. The use of this nineteenth-century term, rather than its twentieth-century counterpart *black*, is not only appropriate to the period being discussed, but it will permit crucial distinctions to be made within the article between those of completely African ancestry (herein called *black*) and those with both Caucasian and African ancestry (herein called *mulatto*).

white immigrants and urban working-class whites), and he was all but legislated out of existence.³

Evidence now exists to suggest that a critical review and reinterpretation of these historical stereotypes may be necessary. My three-year pilot study conducted on a comprehensive grassroots basis in Owsley's home state of Alabama calls into question many of the generalizations that characterize textbook analyses (and popular views) of the Anglo South.⁴ Going beyond traditional studies of statutes, newspaper accounts, and the random collections of state and university archives, the Alabama project approaches the free Negro on an individual basis. Exhaustive attempts have been made to identify every free nonwhite who lived in Alabama from its earliest settlement to the close of the Civil War, with identification being made through a name-by-name search of every existing federal, state, and local census, a study of previously published works, and a page-by-page search of every extant volume in every antebellum county of the state.⁵ The life of each man, woman, and child—5,614 in all—has been reconstructed to every degree possible, from birth to death.⁶ Finally, analyses are being made, from the standpoint of each individual, of the real cause and effect of those commonly cited statutes and fiery letters to the

³ Since these traditional interpretations appear in numerous works, it is difficult to single out one source. Ira Berlin, *Slaves without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York, 1974), is the most comprehensive study of the southern free Negro. Because it capsules the findings of so many previous studies, it presents convenient examples of most of these interpretations. See pp. 108–11, 151, 195–96, 261–62, 266, 316, 343. Similar comments are to be found in such works as James Hugo Johnston, *Race Relations in Virginia and Miscegenation in the South, 1776–1860* (Amherst, Mass., 1970). The classic portrayal of an unstable Negro family life is E. Franklin Frazier, *The Free Negro Family: A Study of Family Origins before the Civil War* (Nashville, 1932). This portrayal is now being discredited by the work of Herbert Gutman, Robert William Fogel, Stanley L. Engerman, and others, but the stereotype still exists and has received even wider popularization with the publication of Alex Haley, *Roots: The Saga of an American Family* (Garden City, N.Y., 1976).

⁴ The traditional application of the term *Anglo* to Alabama and southern society has been challenged by extensive grassroots study that strongly indicates a predominantly Celtic origin for this society. For the purposes of the present article, the term *Anglo* is used in its popular sense because it is so closely identified with the character of the white Protestant South. For discussion of the Anglo-Celtic issue, see Forrest McDonald and Grady McWhiney, "The South from Self-Sufficiency to Peonage: An Interpretation," *American Historical Review*, 85 (Dec. 1980), 1095–118.

⁵ In a few counties antebellum records have been destroyed. Usually the loss was partial. In some instances an attempt was made to "reconstitute" prefire records by transcribing personal copies of legal documents held by individuals; in other instances, postfire records on free Negroes and their white associates have helped to fill the gaps created by the fire loss. A small portion of the records from these counties are now in state archives or in private hands. These have also been consulted to every extent possible. Although the contents of county archives vary, the basic series (and those most helpful to this study) are: Conveyances and Mortgages; Marriages; Probate Inventories, Minute Books, Administrators' Accounts and Final Records; Orphan's Court Records; Commissioner's Court Records; and the complete or final records of County Courts, District Chancery Courts, and District Circuit Courts. Some tax rolls and voter registration rolls exist for the period under study, although these are rare.

⁶ Federal census figures represent only the number of persons present in the state in a given census year. For Alabama's free Negroes these are: 1820, 571; 1830, 1,572; 1840, 2,039; 1850, 2,265; 1860, 2,690. The figure 5,614 represents the total number of individual free Negroes identified as residents of the state during the entire antebellum period rather than a static number for one isolated year. Of this number, 3,080 were residents of Anglo Alabama, and 2,534 were residents of Mobile and Baldwin counties. Francis A. Walker, *Ninth Census, Vol. I: The Statistics of the Population of the United States* (Washington, 1872), 11.

editor which are sometimes used by historians as an indication of free Negro freedom and a barometer of public opinion.⁷

In no way can Alabama be presented as a model of antebellum southern society, since it is not possible to construct a simplistic model of southern racial attitudes or of southern free Negroes. To the contrary, Alabama is presented here as an example of southern individuality. The extent to which free Negroes existed in the South and the roles they were assigned exhibited extreme variation—from the state of Maryland, whose Negro population was 49 percent free in 1860, to Arkansas, where free Negroes represented only 0.1 percent of the nonwhite population that year. Of the fifteen slaveholding states, Alabama ranked eleventh in the total number of free Negroes enumerated on the 1860 population census and twelfth in its proportion of Negroes who were free.⁸

The wide variance in southern attitudes toward miscegenation is also evident in the manner in which each state dealt with the question of interracial marriage; again Alabama stands as an extreme example of nonconformity to the stereotype. Although Virginia legislated against intermarriage in 1705 and the French colony of Louisiana (which included present Alabama) followed suit in 1724, North Carolina did not outlaw interracial marriages until 1838.⁹ The antebellum state of Alabama, on the other hand, never prohibited it. Both the 1805 and the 1833 marriage codes authorized designated officials to “solemnize the rites of matrimony between any free persons” who presented a license, although both carried the usual prohibitions against marriage within certain degrees of kinship or under certain ages.¹⁰ The *Code of Alabama*, prepared in 1852, indicates a change in the marriage law that is doubly significant. Article 1946 states that “marriage may be solemnized between free white persons, or between free persons of color, by any licensed minister,” while Article 1956 additionally ruled: “Any person solemnizing the rites of matrimony, with the knowledge that either of the parties is under the age of legal consent, or within the prohibited degrees; or when one of the parties is a negro and the other a white person is guilty of a misdemeanor.”¹¹ Thus, while

⁷ Berlin, *Slaves without Masters*, offers some 290 citations to state and local statutes that support the thesis that free Negroes suffered severe persecution and proscription. Yet little or no attempt is made to determine the extent to which these statutes were enforced or the effect that they had on individual lives. Similarly, Berlin’s summary “Crisis of the 1850’s” offers 128 citations to newspaper editorials or letters to the editor, from which Berlin evaluates public opinion on the eve of the Civil War.

⁸ Berlin, *Slaves without Masters*, 136–37.

⁹ Eugene D. Genovese, “The Slave States of North America,” in *Neither Slave nor Free: The Freedmen of African Descent in the Slave Societies of the New World*, ed. David W. Cohen and Jack P. Greene (Baltimore, 1972), 262; *Code Noir ou Loi Municipal Servant de Reglement* (New Orleans, 1778), article 6.

¹⁰ Harry Toulmin, *A Digest of the Laws of the State of Alabama, Containing the Statutes and Resolutions in Force at the End of the General Assembly in January, 1823* (Cahawba, Ala., 1823), 576–79; John G. Aikin, *A Digest of the Laws of the State of Alabama: Containing All the Statutes of a Public and General Nature, in Force at the Close of the Session of the General Assembly, in January, 1833* (Philadelphia, 1833), 305.

¹¹ John J. Ormand, Arthur P. Bagby, and George Goldthwaite, *The Code of Alabama* (Montgomery, 1852), 376–77.

the 1852 code imposed a fine upon officials who celebrated interracial marriages (or violated any of the other marital regulations), it did not declare an interracial union null and void, and it imposed no penalty upon the parties who contracted such a marriage.

The state of Alabama also poses a unique opportunity for a comparative study of two European cultural heritages whose racial attitudes are polarized within traditional historical interpretations. Within Mobile and Baldwin counties, where 46 percent of the identifiable free Negroes resided, the cultural heritage was predominantly French and Spanish. In the remaining 48 antebellum counties, both black and white settlers were predominantly migrants from the other southern states whose Anglo and Protestant views toward race and interracial sex are characteristically portrayed by some historians as far more intolerant than those of Latin societies.¹²

It has been calculated from the population schedule of the 1860 federal census that 78 percent of Alabama's free Negroes were mulatto, making Alabama second only to Louisiana in incidence of miscegenation.¹³ However, the responsibility for this sizable incidence in Alabama cannot be arbitrarily assigned to those of Latin ancestry in the Mobile region, as is frequently done, since a racial analysis of all free Negroes of Anglo Alabama alone reveals only a slightly lower figure of mulattoes, 71 percent, and since a large percentage of the free Negroes in the Mobile District, even those dating back to the colonial era, have Anglo ancestry instead of, or in addition to, Latin.

In all other respects—economic, social, legal, and even spiritual—the Alabama study has revealed significantly little difference between Anglo and Latin society. Therefore, in order to emphasize the degree to which race relations in the Anglo South may have been misinterpreted and to minimize the possibility that Latin incidences might alter statistical results reported for Alabama, the findings outlined in this paper have been restricted to the Anglo portion of the state. While some individuals did live, intermittently, in both regions, their experiences are restricted herein to those occurring in Anglo society.

The routine assumption that the free Negro class owes its origins in the lower South to white planter manumission of slave offspring is unsupported in Alabama, where the number of mulatto children manumitted by white fathers constituted only a negligible percentage of the total mulatto population. Thus far, records of 361 manumissions have been located in the studied area. Even if all of these individuals had remained in the state, in contradiction of the terms upon which many of them were freed and in opposition to the economic forces that prompted both black and white migration, the recorded manumissions would account for only 11 percent of the free Negro population. Of these 361 manumissions, only 89 were provable or even apparent offspring of white emancipators, and only 28 were documentable or even probable concubines. Miscegenation, therefore, accounted for only 32 percent of the total number of manumissions, with the remaining 68 percent being accomplished by self-

¹² Berlin, *Slaves without Masters*, 105.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 178.

purchase, by free Negro purchase and manumission of offspring, and by white benevolence that stemmed from nonsexual circumstances.

It appears, therefore, that most of the free mulattoes in Alabama were the natural increase of the small percentage of mulattoes who were freed for one of various reasons. Of the 1,859 free mulattoes identified in Anglo Alabama, 56 percent were born free and 6 percent were manumitted. The remaining 38 percent cannot yet be classified as either ex-slave or free-born, but if the established percentage can be applied to those for whom records have not been found, it may be projected that only 10 percent of all mulattoes there were manumitted slaves, while the remaining 90 percent were freeborn, natural increase.

One emerging pattern of free Negro society is that of sexual continency and family stability. The existence of the mulatto cannot be taken as evidence of immorality among black women, even when such is excused by allusions to their lowly station in life. Alabama records challenge this platitude.¹⁴

Genealogical studies of free Negroes are hampered by various factors, but not nearly to the extent that has been assumed. Official birth records were not kept in this period for either race. It has been asserted that free Negroes avoided white officials instinctively, and it is further assumed that Negroes, as members of the lower strata of society, did not create a wealth of estate records, deeds, donations, and family Bibles necessary to genealogical research.¹⁵ Nevertheless, there exist sufficient official records to trace lineages of a significant percentage of Alabama's free mulattoes.

To date, mothers have been identified for 64 percent of this population, and both mother and father have been identified for 30 percent. Ninety-four percent of those with two identifiable parents were offspring of a recognized, long-term, and apparently stable marital relationship, with only 6 percent resulting from casual coupling or the sexual exploitation of slave women by their white masters.

Moreover, considerable evidence of marital stability among free mulattoes exists even for those mulatto offspring whose parents cannot be identified by name. Free papers filed locally by free mulattoes abound with such white testimony as "Levina Bert . . . was born and raised in our said County of Hertford [North Carolina] of free parents," and "LaFayette Hunt . . . is a free man, having been born of free parents in Huntsville," thus indicating that the white witnesses knew and recognized the paternity as well as the maternity of the free mulattoes, even after a period of 20 or 40 years had elapsed.¹⁶

At the same time, documentary evidence of legal marriages within the free Negro population is more difficult to find. Of the 548 men and women (40 per-

¹⁴ The same patterns within slave society have been reported in the works of Robert William Fogel, Stanley L. Engerman, and Herbert G. Gutman. See Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (2 vols., Boston, 1974); and Herbert G. Gutman, *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom* (New York, 1976).

¹⁵ Berlin, *Slaves without Masters*, 222.

¹⁶ *Deed Record P*, 297, and *Deed Record BB*, 141, Madison County Records (Madison County Courthouse, Huntsville, Ala.).

cent of the total population reaching maturity before the Civil War) whose spouses have been identified, only 32 legal marriages have been located. While it may be assumed that a certain number of even the stable unions were common-law marriages, another possible explanation is suggested by the archives themselves: careless record keeping.¹⁷

An analysis of provable legal marriages and the other identifiable stable unions reveals that caste consciousness was an integral part of the free Negro psyche. Some 50 percent (137) of the unions were between men and women of similar racial composition. In less than 13 percent (33) of the unions, one spouse was mulatto and the other black. A small but noticeable tendency toward more mulatto women marrying darker spouses than mulatto men marrying darker women (18 to 15) could call into question the assumption that mulatto women purposefully bred their lines lighter. Less than 3 percent (7) of the unions involved a partner recognized within the community as Indian. The remaining 33 percent (83) of the long-term and openly recognized marital alliances were unions of a free Negro and a white.

Of the 32 legal marriages on record in Anglo Alabama, six were marriages of a white to a mulatto. Moreover, these interracial marriages provide an interesting cultural and geographical cross-section of the state. Two occurred in the south-central wiregrass region, a third in the northwest mountain and valley region, a fourth in the northeastern Appalachian mountain range, and the fifth and sixth in the city of Montgomery.¹⁸

Extralegal marriages were by far the most prevalent. An analysis of these unions yields startling statistics that question the alleged double standard whereby white female participation in interracial sex was viciously condemned while males who indulged in the same extralegal pleasures suffered little more than occasional reproof. Extant records, viewed statistically rather

¹⁷ In a free paper filed in Tuscaloosa for James Abbott, for example, Judge Henry W. Collier states "James Abbott and Fanny [Burgess] were married according to legal forms in the City of Tuscaloosa, as well as I remember, in 1829." *Deed Record U*, 177 Tuscaloosa County Records (Tuscaloosa County Courthouse, Tuscaloosa, Ala.). Yet no record of the Abbott-Burgess marriage appears among the extant marriage records of the county, although several other free Negro marriages are found there. Similarly, in the divorce suit *Hansford v. Hansford* of Montgomery, the plaintiff testified that he and wife were married in Montgomery "on the fifteenth day of November eighteen hundred and twenty-five in accordance with the laws of said state," and a witness testified that they "were married in his presence in Montgomery County by William Macksey an acting Justice of the peace." *Chancery Court Record 1847*, 639-57 (Montgomery County Courthouse, Montgomery, Ala.). Again, county marriage records do not include this union. In both of these counties, original marriage records were "reworked" by later county employees who may have omitted these free Negro marriages through error or design. On the other hand, even among the white population and even in counties in which the original records have been preserved, researchers face the same problem of nonexistent marriage records for couples who were, according to other sources, legally married.

¹⁸ Willis Lucas to Nancy Howard, *Marriage Record 1830-49*, 19, and William A. Walling to Rebecca A. Jackson, *Marriage Record D, July 1859 to December 1863*, 166, Pike County Records (Pike County Courthouse, Troy, Ala.); Riley Goin to Cynthia Wisner, *Marriage Licenses-Bonds, Bundle 1829* (Basement Files), and *Marriage Licenses Book B 1828-1841*, Lawrence County Records (Lawrence County Courthouse, Moulton, Ala.); John Ferlow to Sally Phillips, *Marriage Record, 1836-1845*, 207, Marshall County Records (Marshall County Courthouse, Guntersville, Ala.); Isaac Merrett to Rachael Lantorn, *Marriage Index G-N, 1817-1918*, 703, and Elias Evans to Catharine C. Reynolds, *Marriage Index N-Z, 1817-1918*, 974, Montgomery County Records.

than impressionistically, reveal that of the 83 open and stable interracial alliances that have been found in Anglo Alabama, 51 percent involved white women.

Clandestine interracial alliances involving white females were even more numerous. Of all free mulattoes identified thus far, almost 73 percent had mulatto mothers and 7 percent had black ones, while more than 20 percent had identifiable white mothers. Still, there are areas of racial interaction that statistics cannot adequately cover, and it must be recognized that among those 73 percent whose mothers were also mulattoes there existed a number whose fathers undoubtedly were white. A precise determination of this percentage is impossible, because the term "mulatto" was carelessly applied to free Negroes who were actually quadroons, octoroons, or another racial mixture. A minimal figure can be obtained from the numerous records still extant on the local level which describe free Negro complexions or designate paternity. Seventy of the 863 free mulattoes with identifiable mulatto mothers and unidentifiable fathers are described as having considerably "brighter" complexions than their mother, or as the offspring of an unidentified white male. Yet, when all known factors are tabulated, the extant records of Alabama's free mulattoes identify by name or indicate the existence of a white mother in 156 percent more cases than a white father.

Similarly, it might be argued that the known percentage of white mothers could be unrealistically low. If white female participation in interracial sex was as abhorrent to the southern mind as claimed, then the supposition might be made that other white mothers abandoned their mulatto children to avoid stigma or that those "public leaders" who allegedly vilified free blacks would have preferred to conceal white female acceptance of Negro lovers.

A racial analysis of the free Negroes involved in these interracial alliances reveals yet other nuances of the Anglo Alabama psyche. Both male and female whites involved in open relationships were considerably more prone to select mulatto mates than black ones. No instance has been found in which a white female established an open relationship with a black male, and only 13 percent of the white males who lived openly with a Negro female or acknowledged fathering a child by one had chosen a black female as his concubine. Such statistics indicate that subtle caste differences did exist in Anglo Alabama and that the well-known racial philosophy of Latin America, which regarded mulattoes as more socially acceptable than pure blacks, did have some counterpart in Anglo America.

Evidence also indicates that the mulatto descendants of white women were somewhat more prone to erect caste barriers between themselves and the black population than were mulattoes who did not descend from white women. While 13 percent of those free mulattoes with identifiable spouses chose black consorts, only 8 percent of those who had a white mother or grandmother married a black, and all free mulattoes in this group were male. The remaining Negro descendants of white women were fairly evenly divided among those who married other free mulattoes (52 percent) and those who chose white spouses (48 percent).

Other evidence exists to suggest that caste discrimination was a distinct part of the mental framework of free mulattoes born of white mothers. For example, a divorce suit was filed in the 1840s in Montgomery County by the free Negro Girard Hansford against his wife Maria George, who was the daughter of a white female. Adultery was proved. Indeed, the elderly Hansford had repeatedly forgiven his young wife for a series of indiscretions, since, as Hansford resignedly declared, he was aware of "the temptations which were held out to one of her cast in society." What Hansford could not tolerate was his wife's oath that her last child had been fathered by a white and that "she meant that all the ballance of her children . . . should be white." The mulatto husband's pride was wounded doubly by the white father's attempt to support the child, and Hansford was compelled to tell the court that "if she . . . designed to have all her children white hereafter it would not do for [their] family to be raised in one part white and well-supported by their fathers and the other colored and poor."¹⁹

Analyses of the social standing of white women involved in interracial liaisons in Alabama indicate that upper-class women were not involved to any traceable extent. In no instance does it appear that a white woman with a mulatto child or husband belonged to the social elite, the closest approximation being the daughter of a Black Belt Baptist minister of the small-planter class.²⁰ If interracial sex involving upperclass females of Anglo Alabama did occur, it did not become a matter of public record. Within the yeoman class and among the poor whites it frequently did.

Although free papers filed by adult free Negroes occasionally included white testimony that the mulatto was the offspring of a white woman, the white mother-mulatto child relationship is more readily established by records treating the mother and child as part of a family group.²¹ Most identifiable white mothers of mulatto children were those who kept and reared their children, extending to them the same apparent affection that would have been expected had the children been white. In Montgomery County in 1841, for example, a female identified as "a clear-blooded woman" testified that each of four mulattoes was not only freeborn but was "my own dear Born child."²²

¹⁹ *Hansford v. Hansford*. This suit, incidentally, is the only free Negro divorce suit located. *Chancery Court Record 1847*, 639-57.

²⁰ For data on this individual, see Seventh Census of the United States, Population Schedule, Marengo County, p. 46, Dwelling and Household 669; Will of Reverend Trueheart Tucker, *Will Record A*, 380; and numerous other documents on file on the family in Marengo County Records (Marengo County Courthouse, Linden, Ala.).

²¹ Census records are the most prevalent type of record in this category, although probate, conveyance, and judicial records also yield racial identifications for family members. Caution must be exercised in relying upon census data alone for racial classification since instances of misclassification occur. For example, later governor of Alabama Braxton Bragg Comer appears as a child on the 1860 Federal Census, Population Schedule, of Barbour County, whereupon he and his entire family, despite their prominence in the county, were clearly identified as *black*. They have been treated as such in Morris Raymond Boucher, "The Free Negro in Alabama Prior to 1860" (Ph.D. diss., State University of Iowa, 1950). Yet, an examination of the Comer ancestry yields no indication of remote justification for even designating the family mulatto. In other instances, twentieth-century descendants of antebellum mulattoes have attempted to erase such racial designations by the names of their ancestors.

²² *Conveyances R (O.S.)*, 631, Montgomery County Records

Only two instances can be documented in which white women of Anglo Alabama gave up their mulatto offspring. The first of these, a resident of the Piedmont county of Calhoun, obviously showed no racial discrimination in severing ties of motherhood. She had produced both white and mulatto offspring illegitimately and apprenticed both.²³ The second, by contrast, was a widow with a sizable family of white children at the time she entered an interracial alliance that produced two mulattoes. In 1860 she appeared before the Tuscaloosa County probate judge seeking permission to give these youth to the wife of a Negro druggist. "I, Charity Hunnicutt, . . . a Free White woman do hereby give to Eliza Tyler, a free woman of color . . . my two children . . . both mulattoes."²⁴

White female participants in interracial alliances within Alabama cannot be relegated to the role of prostitutes or reprobates whose promiscuity had already earned them the scorn of society. While the white females most often fell within the lower economic ranks, little evidence exists to classify them as a group of degenerates. Fourteen percent did produce more than one mulatto child outside of a recognized marital alliance, but in all cases the births of their children were closely spaced over a given period of time, after which no other children of any race were born. This circumstance suggests not promiscuity but the existence of an extended relationship that endured for several years before being terminated by death, separation, or other factors. Only 7 percent of all white women involved in interracial relationships bore white illegitimate children also.

An analysis of the nativity of both male and female whites involved in interracial sex also calls into question several stereotyped impressions of southern society. The foreign-born element, which comprised better than 2 percent of the total population of Anglo Alabama in 1860, represented only about 1.5 percent of the participating whites in interracial liaisons. The largest representation of whites thus involved, 24 percent, were from South Carolina, with a noticeably larger percentage of females than males coming from that state (29 percent as compared to 19 percent). Twenty-nine percent of females were also natives of Alabama, although only 11 percent of the white males were born within the state. This percentage variation might be accounted for by the fact that most of the white women studied fell into a younger age bracket than did the white males; the younger Alabamians during this period were far more likely to be natives of the state than were the older generation. The largest representation of males hailed from North Carolina (26 percent) while relatively few of the females (10 percent) were North Carolina born. A closer representation of Georgia natives appeared among the white males and females: 23 percent of the females and 19 percent of the males.

As indicated above, the largest overall representation was from South

²³ "Sally Armstrong," Loose Paper File, Calhoun County Records (Calhoun County Courthouse, Anniston, Ala.); Eighth Census of the United States, 1860, Population Schedule, Calhoun County.

²⁴ *Deed Record 6*, 575, Tuscaloosa County Records.

Carolina, with Georgia running a close second. Between them, these two states accounted for almost half of the whites involved. These are the same groups popularly referred to as Georgia "crackers" and South Carolina "Sand Hillers," whom historians have described as "genuine white Southerners . . . [sharing] the lordly contempt of other whites toward the Negroes."²⁵ These are the same Alabama yeomen who are later credited with introducing the Ku Klux Klan into the state.²⁶ Yet these were the same "plain folk" who showed the most tolerance toward open miscegenation in the antebellum era.

Almost all random examples of open miscegenation cited in historical analyses center within the larger metropolitan areas of the South, and newspapers are the most common source cited for these examples. This apparently stems from the higher rate of survival of large-city newspapers and their greater popularity among researchers. A systematic and comprehensive study of Alabama's long-neglected grassroots material reveals, however, that such relationships were less common in the cities.

In the three larger urban areas, Montgomery, Tuscaloosa, and Huntsville, the 20 percent average of Anglo Alabama for mulattoes with identifiable white mothers fell to 11 percent, and in the populous Black Belt it plummeted to 8 percent. In the more rural and less populous (also less prosperous) wiregrass region of South Alabama and the northern mountain and valley region, a full 26 percent of all mulattoes with identifiable mothers had white mothers.

The wiregrass county of Pike provides an extreme example. Between 1830 and 1860 there were nine women in the county with free mulatto children. Seven of these were white; the eighth had a white mother living with her; and the ninth was married to a white man. Of the thirty-four mulattoes in the county, twenty-four were known to have been born of a stable marital union, and six of the remaining ten were adults married (legally or extralegally) to whites.

Several northern counties displayed noticeably liberal tendencies also. Within the sparsely populated counties of Pickens, Fayette, and Marion, where few free Negroes resided, 90 to 100 percent of all free mulattoes with identifiable mothers had white mothers (nine, two, and one respectively). The Tennessee River Valley county of Limestone also scored 100 percent (three), while Morgan County, across the river to the south, tallied 75 percent (three). In neighboring Lawrence, 39 percent (thirteen) of all mulattoes with identifiable mothers had white mothers; 73 percent (twenty-five) of all Alabama-born free Negroes in Lawrence were the product of stable, two-parent households;

²⁵ Francis Butler Simkins and Charles Pierce Roland, *A History of the South* (New York, 1972), 138–39. My analysis of the Eighth Census of the United States, Population Schedule, State of Alabama, confirms the popular view that most Alabama families were migrants of South Carolina and Georgia. Of 193,743 white Alabamians in 1860 who were not natives of the state, 42 percent were from Georgia; 27 percent were from South Carolina; 12 percent were from North Carolina; 16 percent were natives of one of the other Southern states, with the remaining 7 percent being of northern, foreign, or unknown birth. Joseph G. Kennedy, *Population of the United States in 1860* (Washington, 1864), 10–11.

²⁶ Virginia Van der Veer Hamilton, *Alabama: A Bicentennial History* (New York, 1977), 45–46.

and the only legally recorded marriage of a free Negro was a mixed marriage involving a white female. Indeed, in the eight northern counties that surrounded the notorious county of Winston (where, allegedly, "the sun never set on a black man"), an average 43 percent (forty-one) of all mulattoes with identifiable mothers had white mothers.

John Hope Franklin, whose various works take greater note of the prevalence of white mothers than do most studies, has concluded that "the practice of white women mixing with Negro men was fairly widespread during the colonial period and had not entirely ceased by 1865."²⁷ Anglo Alabama could not fit this pattern since it was not until the early 1800s that Anglos entered the state in any significant numbers. Consequently the span of years to which any study of antebellum Anglo-Negro race relations must be confined is brief in comparison to that of the older southern states. Yet this period is the same era in which southern white "hostility" toward free Negroes supposedly reached its climax. If Alabama followed the pattern attributed to the South, then the small number of white mothers who bore mulatto children in the more liberal 1820s should have tapered off to relative extinction by the last decade or so of the antebellum period. This was not the case. The total number of mulatto births to white mothers peaked in Anglo Alabama between 1840 and 1850 and exhibited only a minimal drop in the last decade before the war. Even when the percentages are compared to the population at large, the pattern varies only slightly. The percentage of white women within the total population who bore mulatto children still peaked in the decade of the 1840s, and while it dropped considerably in the 1850s (as a result of large-scale white migration into Alabama), there still remained a slightly greater percentage of the white female population bearing mulatto children in the last decade before the war than in the liberal early 1800s.

It has been suggested that the relationship between the proximity to the frontier and the shortage of women caused a softer attitude toward miscegenation. This is a popular explanation, and to some extent it appears that it could be validly applied to Alabama. Less than a half century elapsed between the first sizable Anglo migration into Alabama and the Civil War. Moreover, much of Anglo Alabama was not officially open to white settlement until the 1830s, scarcely a quarter-century before the war. There is no doubt that much of Alabama displayed a frontier character throughout this period.

Yet the frontier thesis and the shortage of white women theme do not explain miscegenation patterns in Alabama. Between the earliest federal census of Anglo Alabama, taken in 1820, and the last one before the war, taken in 1860, the white female population fluctuated between 47 and 49 percent of the total white population. This hardly qualifies as a "shortage of white women." Moreover, it totally fails to explain the number of white women involved in interracial alliances. The fact that 29 percent of the white women were migrants into Alabama from South Carolina could be cited as proof that the miscegenous population was moving westward in search of more tolerant

²⁷ John Hope Franklin, *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans* (New York, 1969), 215, 217.

frontiers, but this cannot explain the facts that an equal portion of these women were Alabama natives or that most of the miscegenous activity involving Alabamians occurred in the last two decades of the antebellum era, by which time some of the frontier characteristics should have given way to the more dogmatic stance of civilization.

Despite the frequent citations of newspaper items as proof that southerners despised miscegenation,²⁸ no instance has yet been found within Anglo Alabama of any community action, overt or covert, taken against whites who became sexually involved with free Negroes. Moreover, the length of time which many of these relationships lasted further contradicts the assumption of community pressure or retaliation. Fifty-nine percent of the open relationships can be traced through various records over a period of years. The minimum length that can be established for 37.5 percent of these relationships was seven to ten years; 25 percent are known to have endured for at least ten to twenty years; and 37.5 percent were sustained for more than twenty years. Numerous records indicate public tolerance and respect for the individuals involved, as appears in the following "free paper" sworn by three whites in Madison County:

[We] do hereby certify that [we] have been well acquainted with William Riley Jacobs, since he was a child, he is a man of colour, born of a white woman . . . a man of good moral character and [we] do recommend him to the protection of every honest, respectable, and civil citizen. . . . Any other information respecting him, his Father and the family can be obtained by writing and directing to any of the permanent residents in the Southeastern part of the aforesaid county.

Jacobs's "free paper" further contained the oath of the local justice of the peace who swore that the three whites who drafted the paper were all "reliable and of high standing."²⁹

²⁸ Caution must also be used in accepting newspaper items as barometers of public opinion. Fiery editorials and sensational copy have always been good for circulation, and eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editors were prone to view themselves as political and moral torchbearers. An excellent example of the unreliability of newspaper editorials as a barometer of Alabama race relations is provided by the 1836 issues of the rarely cited Alabama journal, *Voice of Sumter*, in which the Black Belt editor published rampant tirades in every issue against "nigger lovers Van Buren and Johnson" and sneered at the "handful" of Sumter countians who supported them. Yet the November 8 issue reported with far less arrogance that those "nigger lovers" actually carried Alabama, 19,068 to 15,627, in that year's presidential election. Clearly, the opinions of this newspaper's editor were not shared by most adult male voters. This same Sumter County journalist also reprinted an item from the *Louisiana Journal* which reported the northern wedding of a white girl to a Negro and opined that "all such miscreants ought to be driven out of decent and civilized society." *Voice of Sumter*, June 6, 1837. Yet, when such a miscegenous relationship occurred a decade later in Sumter County, no notice of the situation was taken by the journal, and the 1850 federal census indicates that the mulatto husband was employed by an open-minded local white as a farm manager. In using newspaper items as racial gauges, it is also important to note whether they carried the byline of the editor or that of a local citizen. If the latter was the case, as it often was, an investigation of that citizen's community standing is mandated, since many letters to the editor have been submitted traditionally by community malcontents in search of a public forum for a variety of complaints. The mere existence of such an item in a given newspaper does not qualify it to be cited as prevailing public opinion, and their authors cannot be classified as public leaders unless additional investigation of their community activities establishes their leadership.

²⁹ *Deed Record W*, 80, Madison County Records.

Admittedly, it is difficult for statistics to clothe themselves in the three-dimensional, red-blooded characteristics of human emotions. Merely stating that interracial alliances were tolerated, or that white women participated extensively, does not reveal the private sentiments of family members who did not create these situations but were still affected. Few testimonies have been found; in most instances one can only judge by recorded action.

In some cases, elderly parents accepted and helped to raise the mulatto children their daughters produced, but for many of the white females no ties have yet been found to the family of their birth. Almost 20 percent of the white women who bore mulatto children had white husbands at the time or later, husbands who permitted the wives to keep their mulatto offspring. No instance has been found in which a white husband filed suit for divorce on the grounds that his wife had borne a mulatto child, nor has there been found any record of a rape charge being filed by a wife who bore a child obviously too dark to be her husband's (although other rape cases do appear among local court records and newspaper reports). No account of rape, in fact, has been found for any of the white females, married or single, who bore a mulatto child. Forty-nine percent of the white females in Alabama who bore a child of color or married a mulatto man also had white children who were raised in the same household, and a large number of these white children attended school (hand-in-hand with their mulatto siblings in some cases) where they would have been exposed to the racist taunts of the other white children—if such occurred.

How did these white siblings feel toward their brown ones? Only two instances can be documented, but in both cases a white adult risked public censure to help a free mulatto sister. In the mountain county of Morgan a long-time white resident died leaving a white widow and white children, as well as his wife's mulatto daughter whom he had helped to raise. At least one of the white siblings tried to include his mulatto half-sister in his father's estate, listing her as an "heir at law" and noting that she was "married to Ben Mosley, Col'd . . . living in [neighboring] Lawrence County."³⁰ In the southern Alabama county of Russell there was filed in 1844 a "free paper" drafted by a white male for his half-sister Avy. The deponent swore that he was white and their mother was white, but his 36-year old sister was "a brown woman" married to a mulatto man and the mother of several free Negro children. Such an acknowledgment on his part would call into question his own claim to be of pure-white stock, but the brother took the risk to fill Avy's need. He then treated the issue of his own racial purity by filing supporting affidavits by eleven respectable citizens of his acquaintance, including two justices of the peace, a state representative, and a senator.³¹

Perhaps no aspect of miscegenation has been so sensitive and so controversial as the issue of "racial purity." Nor is there any aspect of race relations in Anglo Alabama that so clearly contradicts popular platitudes. Almost any

³⁰ Estate of Peterson Grizzard, *Final Record 30*, Morgan County Records (Morgan County Courthouse, Decatur, Ala.).

³¹ *Deed Record E, 1842-44*, 411-12, Russell County Records (Russell County Courthouse, Phenix City, Ala.).

American on any street corner can swear that in the Old South "one drop of Negro blood" made a man or woman a Negro. Antebellum travel accounts abound with stories of slaves who bore no discernible trace of African ancestry, yet were held in slavery because their mulatto mother had been in bondage. Professional historians often perpetuate this same belief.

Within the state of Alabama, numerous free mulattoes were permitted to cross the color line into white society in spite of obvious Negro physical features and a well-remembered ancestry that they made no attempt to shake. As did most southern states, Alabama defined Negroes or mulattoes as any "person of mixed blood, descended on the part of the father or mother from negro ancestors, to the third generation inclusive, though one ancestor of each generation may have been a white person."³² Such a definition included not only those who were genetically mulatto (that is, half-black and half-white) but also quadroons and octoroons. In actual practice, both the Alabama judiciary and popular custom were far less discriminatory.

When John Thurmond was convicted of raping a white female in 1860 and given the death sentence as the law decreed for the commission of such a crime by a "free negro or mulatto," the Supreme Court overturned his conviction. Its majority opinion, written by an Anglo Alabamian, noted that Thurmond had both "yellow skin and kinky hair" and was well known as a free Negro or mulatto in his community. Yet by actual definition, the court decreed, "a mulatto is the offspring of a negress by a white man or of a white woman by a negro." Since Thurmond was the offspring of a white woman by a mulatto, the court adjudged that he was not "within the meaning of the statute prescribing the punishment for rape, &c when committed by a 'slave, free negro or mulatto.'" The court then declared, "If the statute against mulattoes is by construction to include quadroons, then where are we to stop? . . . are we not bound to pursue the line of descendants, as long as there is a drop of negro blood remaining?" The case was thereby remanded to the lower court for reconsideration under the laws applicable to whites.³³

In a similar case on the eve of the Civil War, when white hostility toward free blacks supposedly had reached its zenith, the Alabama courts again ruled against efforts to remand a proven Negro descendant into the free Negro class. A central Alabama white, Seaborn Heath, sought to defend himself on a charge of resisting arrest on the grounds that the arresting officer was legally a free Negro and unqualified to serve as constable. The court did not dispute the validity of the proof offered by Heath, but it did refuse to strip the officer of the legal rights and civil authority he already enjoyed. The decision handed down by the Supreme Court of Alabama ruled, "the mischief would be intolerable if [it were necessary] to enter into an inquiry into the pedigree of individuals holding the office."³⁴

³² *Code of Alabama*, 58.

³³ *Thurmond v. State*, 18 Alabama 276, June 1850.

³⁴ *Heath v. State*, 34 Alabama 250; and *Heath v. State*, 36 Alabama 273. This case is reported imprecisely by Johnston, who states that "the court sustained the contention of Seaborn Heath, reversed the decision of the lower court that had considered Chavis a white man, and the former

In the Montgomery County case *Elmore v. Harris & Pickett*, which came before the courts during a number of terms in the late 1830s, the defense sought to discredit the plaintiff's principal witness, Patrick Davis, on the basis that the witness was a free Negro and thereby unqualified to testify against whites under law.³⁵ Numerous white citizens from a five-county area, all of whose backgrounds qualified them to be considered either local leaders or else "respectable citizens" and all natives of the same South Carolina community in which Davis had been born, were called by the defense to submit testimony as to their knowledge of his ancestry. Each testified that he was personally acquainted with the man's family and that Davis descended from a South Carolina black or Negro-Indian who had "a number of white wives." Various citizens swore that Davis's uncles were "colored" and that his mother and other antecedents were "persons having the appearance of mixed blooded and are very dark, of a mulatto cast." Yet when each was questioned as to the racial status of Davis himself, none would label the man a Negro, and more than one hedged by saying they did not know the man personally, or had not seen him in a number of years, or concluded "from his appearance I should judge him to be a white man." Clearly the white witnesses did not personally feel that Davis's modicum of Negro blood was sufficient to deny him the rights and privileges enjoyed by free whites—although it also appears that the witnesses were reluctant to openly say as much.³⁶

A further examination of records in that five-county area, to which Davis's uncles had also moved, reveals that even though they had been described as having "the appearance of mulattoes" they were identified on all censuses as white. Their marriages were recorded in "white" registers with no notation that they were "colored." No "free papers" were ever filed by any of them. No conveyances or probate settlements identify them as free Negroes, as was more customarily the case with free Negroes, and their offspring intermarried with whites. Thereafter the family never appeared on any known record as anything but white. Similar instances appear in a number of other counties.

Further indication of the ease with which Anglo Alabama permitted an in-constable was now classified as a person of color." As his source, Johnston cited only the 1859 appearance of this case before the court, at which time it was remanded to the lower courts for reconsideration. The case came before the superior court again in 1860 at which time the final decision stated that Chavis was indeed "an officer *de facto*" and excluded the evidence by Heath in support of his claim that Chavis was not qualified to arrest him. Moreover, several county records show that Chavis's family continued to label themselves "Indian," rather than "mulatto" as Heath claimed, and that as Indians they passed into white society. Johnston, *Race Relations in Virginia*, 203.

³⁵ The law to which Pickett referred held that "Negroes, mulattoes, Indians, and all persons of mixed blood, descended from Negro or Indian ancestors, to the third generation inclusive, though one ancestor of each generation may have been a white person, whether bond or free, must not be witness in any cause, civil or criminal, except for or against each other." The law was subsequently modified to permit free Negro testimony against whites in civil suits involving amounts of \$20 or less. See *Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme Court of Alabama* (St. Paul, 1910), Book 6, p. 550.

³⁶ *Records of the Chancery Court, 1830-1839*, 668-754, Montgomery County Records. After extensive litigation, this case was settled out of court, and no ruling was required upon the racial status of the witness or his right to testify in court.

dividual to cross the color line is provided by the population schedules of the federal censuses and by the state censuses as well. In no less than 78 cases on the 1850 and 1860 federal returns, the Alabama enumerators identified a child as white while simultaneously recording one of his parents as a free mulatto. Similarly, on both the state and federal censuses, numerous mulatto households, including those who had resided in a given area for a number of decades and were therefore known within their community, moved in and out of white ranks with considerable frequency, indicating an extremely careless attitude toward white racial purity on the part of the enumerators.³⁷

An overall analysis of quantifiable incidences of miscegenation presents an interesting paradox. Numerically, incidences showed almost consistent increase throughout the antebellum period, but, viewed in comparison to the population at risk, the incidences decreased proportionately. This may well suggest another nuance in the psyche of white antebellum Alabamians.

Obviously, free Negroes were tolerated in this society; it is difficult to apply here the generalization that "onrushing sectional conflict pushed the free Negro caste to the edge of extinction."³⁸ Although they represented a smaller percentage of Alabama's rapidly growing population in 1860 than they did in 1820, there were five times as many Negroes on the eve of the war as on the eve of statehood. Proportionately, the free Negro never represented more than one percent of the total black population, indicating that Alabama was a closed society in which few blacks could realistically anticipate a day of manumission. Yet it is clear that those free Negroes who did exist in the state were not considered a threat to society or to the slave system. Several explanations suggest themselves.

It may be assumed from the records uncovered to date that the free Negro in Alabama, to use traditional terminology, knew his place. He did not offend the system by demanding the full acceptance and equality that white America could never have given him in that era. While such demeanor runs counter to

³⁷ The basis used for racial identification on the federal censuses is a frequently debated point. The 1850 instructions, for example, do not specify criteria for determining race, although they do caution enumerators to be careful: "in all cases where the person is white, leave the space blank; in all cases where the person is black, insert the letter B, if mulatto, insert M. It is very desirable that these particulars be carefully regarded." Ronald Vern Jackson and Gary Ronald Teeple, eds., *Indiana 1850 Census Index* (Bountiful, Utah, 1977), preface. The frequent discrepancies from one census to the next indicate appearance alone—or perhaps the statement of the individual concerned—may have been the only criterion. The number of incidences in which a parent was identified as mulatto while the child was identified as white also supports the hypothesis that an individual could be white in that society as long as he looked white. It is also worth noting that 67 percent of the "free people of color" who moved in and out of white ranks in Anglo Alabama possessed some degree of Indian as well as Negro ancestry, and many who sought to escape racial discrimination (like the previously cited Chavis and Patrick Davis) admitted only their Indian heritage. Correlations might be drawn between this situation in the Anglo South and the Latin American "escape hatch" explored in Carl N. Degler, *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States* (New York, 1971). While Latin American society contained an intermediary caste (free people of color) into which Negroes could move to escape some discrimination, Anglo America accorded no recognized privileges to the free Negro with white blood. Only by claiming to be of Indian, rather than Negro, ancestry were many light-skinned free Negroes able to move out of black society.

³⁸ Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters*, 343.

modern social ideals, it reflected an important facet of nineteenth-century society, where each group, child and adult, woman and man, poor and rich, black and white, had its place and where one's acceptance by society was often contingent upon one's acceptance of the place that society assigned.

It would appear, also, that because the free Negro's relative proportion of the population was so small, he may have been considered numerically powerless. Indeed, the issue of numbers takes on an even greater significance and may offer one key to the understanding of race relations in antebellum society. Wherever whites and free blacks met each other on a one-to-one basis, toleration and often friendship resulted. Nothing has emerged thus far to support the theory that whites in Alabama hated or feared free blacks; they did not fear the widow next door who was a founding member of their church or hate the barber with whom they hunted. Instead, it was the vague and theoretical mass of black freedmen that troubled them—the one popularized by political demagogues who built careers by swaying the emotions of voters, the one condemned by social malcontents who habitually penned the hate-filled and often anonymous "letters to the editor" that are quoted today as measures of public sentiment.

While the late antebellum period is frequently cited as a period of increasing racial oppression because of "onrushing sectional conflict," it appears equally plausible that the proportionate decrease in numbers of free Negroes and incidences of miscegenation may be attributable to the rapid growth and profitability of slavery itself in Alabama. As a man's slaveholdings increased, he lost his original one-to-one relationship with each slave; the Negro became less a person to him and more an economic tool by which he could amass fortunes. Manumission became economically unjustifiable.

This economic dehumanization of the slave may also have had sexual overtones that affected the free Negro population as well. As he became less a person and as society produced more upward-bound whites and, simultaneously, more black field hands, the Negro would have become a less acceptable object of affection or desire. Open cohabitation may well have become less socially permissible, and this may well explain the proportionate decrease in apparent miscegenous activity.

The Alabama study presents several questions with which historians of the Old South and black America must deal. The most urgent, since it affects the validity of conclusions that have been reached in other states and drawn for the South, indeed for America as a whole, is this: was antebellum Alabama representative of attitudes elsewhere in the Anglo South or was it a rare exception to the rule? If, indeed, Alabama is atypical, then a valid explanation of the question why still remains to be found. As the Alabama study progresses, perhaps other explanations may emerge—if Alabama is actually atypical. Yet the validity of any answer to this question would depend upon the validity of the conclusions drawn for other states to which this one is compared. In view of the degree to which this study suggests a reinterpretation of southern race relations, a similar reevaluation of other southern states on an unprecedented, comprehensive, grassroots basis is also mandated.

TABLE 1
Racial Composition of Free Negroes in Anglo Alabama
(Cumulative Total to 1865)

Racial Composition	Total Number	Percentage of Total
Mulatto	1,859	60.4
Black	795	25.8
Uncertain racial composition	426	13.8
	3,080	100.0

Source: Author's compilations.

TABLE 2
Free Negro Growth-Decline in Population
(Comparative Tables, 1820-1860)

ALABAMA AT LARGE			
Year	Total Free Negro Population	Percentage of Total Negro Population	Percentage of Total Free Population
1820	571	1.35	.66
1830	1,572	1.32	.82
1840	2,039	.80	.61
1850	2,265	.66	.53
1860	2,690	.61	.51

Anglo Alabama			
Year	Total Free Negro Population	Percentage of Total Negro Population	Percentage of Total Free Population
1820	327	.81	.41
1830	930	.81	.50
1840	1,169	.47	.36
1850	1,228	.37	.30
1860	1,355	.32	.27

Latin Alabama*			
Year	Total Free Negro Population	Percentage of Total Negro Population	Percentage of Total Free Population
1820	244	11.7	10.8
1830	642	15.3	14.0
1840	870	9.9	6.3
1850	1,037	8.2	5.0
1860	1,335	8.1	4.0

* The free Negro population of Latin Alabama was high because it contained the largest urban area in the state, Mobile, to which many free Negroes of Anglo Alabama were attracted.

Source: Francis A. Walker, *Ninth Census*, Vol. I: *The Statistics of the Population of the United States* (Washington, 1872).

TABLE 3
Free Mulatto Births to White Parents in Anglo Alabama
In Comparison with White Population at Risk

Time Span	Total White Population	Mulatto Infants Born to Identifiable White Mothers		Mulatto Infants Born to Identifiable White Fathers	
		Total #	Per 10,000 at Risk	Total #	Per 10,000 at Risk
Pre-1820	83,147	6	1.55	7	1.69
1821-1830	186,001	21	2.39	15	1.53
1831-1840	322,261	43	2.13	15	.80
1841-1850	407,111	52	2.62	40	1.92
1851-1860	494,195	45	1.86	44	1.75

Source: Walker, *Ninth Census*, and author's compilations.

TABLE 4
Free Mulatto Births in Anglo Alabama
In Comparison with Total Free Negro Population

Time Frame	Total Free Negro Population	Mulattoes Born of Two Identifiable Mulatto Parents	Mulattoes Born of Identifiable White Fathers	Mulattoes Born of Identifiable White Mothers
		Percentage of Total Free Negro Population	Percentage of Total Free Negro Population	Percentage of Total Free Negro Population
1790-1820	327	5.19	2.14	1.83
1821-1830	930	5.16	1.61	2.69
1831-1840	1,169	6.33	1.28	3.68
1841-1850	1,234	12.48	3.24	3.89
1851-1860	1,355	7.90	3.25	3.32
Cumulative	3,080	14.00	3.20	5.50

Source: Author's compilations.

TABLE 5
Manumissions in Anglo Alabama

Time Span	Total Manu-missions	Total Manu-missions for Sexual Reasons	Incidences per 10,000 Slaves at Risk		
			Total Manu-missions	Mulattoes Freed by White Fathers	Concubines Freed by White Owners
1790-1820	23	10	5.72	2.25	.70
1821-1830	76	23	6.65	1.50	1.70
1831-1840	68	13	2.75	.40	.10
1841-1850	137	33	4.15	.70	.40
1851-1860	57	38	1.35	.60	.60

Source: Walker, *Ninth Census*, and author's compilations.