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ABSTRACT

This research examines the social construction of a Virginia Indian reservation community during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Between 1824 and 1877 the Iroquoian-speaking Nottoway divided their reservation lands into individual partible allotments and developed family farm ventures that mirrored their landholding White neighbors. In Southampton's slave-based society, labor relationships with White landowners and "Free People of Color" impacted Nottoway exogamy and shaped community notions of peoplehood. Through property ownership and a variety of labor practices, Nottoway's kin-based farms produced agricultural crops, orchard goods and hogs for export and sale in an emerging agro-industrial economy. However, shifts in Nottoway subsistence, land tenure and marriage practices undermined their matrilineal social organization, descent reckoning and community solidarity. With the asymmetrical processes of kin-group incorporation into a capitalist economy, questions emerge about the ways in which the Nottoway resituated themselves as a social group during the allotment process and after the devastation of the Civil War. Using an historical approach emphasizing world-systems theory, this dissertation investigates the transformation of the Nottoway community through an exploration and analysis of their nineteenth-century political economy and notions of peoplehood.
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INTRODUCTION

As an Iroquoian-speaking community within the modern boundaries of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Nottoway experience represents a counter-narrative to Virginia's historical memory of Native people. It is a storyline that does not include Pocahontas or Jamestown in any substantive way, a people not connected to the origin stories of Virginia's founding, nor associated with the political reemergence of Virginia Indians during the twentieth century. The Old Dominion's history has a nostalgic place for the descendants of Pocahontas's people. Thus, the seventeenth-century colonial encounter between Jamestown's Englishmen and the Algonquian-speaking Powhatan has dominated the public and scholarly discourse about Virginia's indigenous past. A community, the Nottoway represent an historical group whose experience in Virginia is divergent from their Powhatan-descended neighbors and a counterpoint to the Powhatan / Jamestown narrative that singularly domiinates perceptions of Virginia's indigenous past.

The present research is an attempt to correct this deficit. By means of anthropological fieldwork, archival research, and the theoretical perspective of political economy, this dissertation examines the social construction of the Nottoway community from the time of the American Revolution until the decade following the Civil War. This era roughly coincides with the end of the Nottoway's Reservation Period (1705-1824) from the time of the American Revolution until the decade following the Civil War. This period comprised the social and political construction of the Nottoway community, whose history has all but faded from Virginia's historical memory. However, the Nottoway Indians, like their Powhatan-descended neighbors, have been completely marginalized in Virginia's historical consciousness. As a community, the Nottoway represent an historical group whose experience in Virginia is dominated by the public and scholarly discourse about Virginia's indigenous past. For the descendants of Powhatans, people, the seventeenth-century colonial encounter between Jamestown's Englishmen and the Algonquian-speaking Powhatan has no place in Virginia's history. The Old Dominion's history has no role for stories of Virginia's founding, nor associated with the political reemergence of Virginia Indians. As an Iroquoian-speaking community within the modern boundaries of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Nottoway experience represents a counter-narrative to Virginia's indigenous past.
Antebellum, the Commonwealth of Virginia permitted the allotment of the tribe's Southampton County reservation, and in so doing, concluded its trust relationship with the community's land holdings. The shift of Nottoway land tenure from a corporate body to individual ownership impacted their political solidarity, the organization of descent groups and contributed to transformative socio-economic processes already in motion.

As the only Iroquoian community remaining in Virginia, the transformation of Nottoway's Indian Town represents an understudied narrative in indigenous Chesapeake historiography and anthropology. This dissertation research provides a new historical and ethnographic perspective to an otherwise Algonquian-centered Mid-Atlantic.

Questions emerge about the ways in which the Nottoway adapted to changed economic circumstances after the conclusion of Virginia's colonial wars and the decline of the deerskin trade. Following the nineteenth-century allotment of their reservation lands, what bound Nottoway people together and through what mechanisms did the Nottoway maintain themselves as a social group? To address these questions, the present research focuses on three interrelated themes operating within Nottoway political economy:

1) The Iroquoian kinship system, marriage practices and changes within those structures;
2) The social organization of reservation households and the mobilization of labor;
3) Nottoway peoplehood and the social construction of community.

Utilizing an historical perspective within political economy (e.g., Ferguson and Whitehead 1992; Siler 2003; Wallerstein 2004; Wolfe 1997), the study explores these themes in relation to the Nottoway realization of community.
Nottoway’s engagement with capitalism and historical changes in Indian Town’s kinship system, household organization and conceptions of peoplehood.

Historical Overview

To provide an introduction to who the historical Nottoway are, it is instructive to illustrate who they are not. Today, the Nottoway are not residents of an Indian reservation that bears their name, nor is there any longer a corporate Indian Town in Southampton County. Until recently, the Nottoway have not publicly confronted issues of racial purity or historical and cultural continuity that problematized other ethnic communities’ efforts for state and federal recognition as sovereign nations. (see Moretti-Langholtz 1998, Lowery 2010; Oakley 2005; Parades 1992; Waugaman and Waugaman 2006). The Nottoway were neither visited by representatives from the Bureau of American Ethnology, nor the focus of significant anthropological or historical research. The expression of this absence, what might be called historical amnesia, separates the Nottoway from Virginia’s memory. Long after the bloody wars of the seventeenth century regulated the Powhatan to the edges of Virginia society, the Nottoway continued to be key players in the colonial chess board. Their proximity to Williamsburg and their central role in the Native politics and trade networks of the Chesapeake Bay region has been evident throughout the colonial period. The omission of the Nottoway’s history is all the more ironic, given their significant role in the Native politics and trade networks of the Chesapeake Bay region.

To provide an introduction to who the historical Nottoway are, it is instructive to illustrate who they are not. Today, the Nottoway are not residents of an Indian reservation that bears their name, nor is there any longer a corporate Indian Town in Southampton County. Until recently, the Nottoway have not publicly confronted issues of racial purity or historical and cultural continuity that problematized other ethnic communities’ efforts for state and federal recognition as sovereign nations. (see Moretti-Langholtz 1998, Lowery 2010; Oakley 2005; Parades 1992; Waugaman and Waugaman 2006). The Nottoway were neither visited by representatives from the Bureau of American Ethnology, nor the focus of significant anthropological or historical research. The expression of this absence, what might be called historical amnesia, separates the Nottoway from Virginia’s memory. Long after the bloody wars of the seventeenth century regulated the Powhatan to the edges of Virginia society, the Nottoway continued to be key players in the colonial chess board. Their proximity to Williamsburg and their central role in the Native politics and trade networks of the Chesapeake Bay region has been evident throughout the colonial period. The omission of the Nottoway’s history is all the more ironic, given their significant role in the Native politics and trade networks of the Chesapeake Bay region.
Following Virginia's 1676 Civil War known as Bacon's Rebellion, the Nottoway were vital agents in the backwoods diplomacy of the eighteenth century. During the Seven Years War and received accolades from the House of Burgesses for their valor against the French in the siege of Ft. Duquesne. Nottoway students attended the Brafferton Indian School at the College of William & Mary during the tenure ofGovernor Robert Dinwiddie, the Nottoway fought under Lt. Colonel George Washington and danced down the Duke of Gloucester Street to the fife and drum. At the request of Lt. Governor Alexander Spotswood, the Nottoway peace delegations met with North Carolina. A generation later, Cherokee and Nottoway peace delegations met with at their "Great Town," while Byrd surveyed the colonial boundary between Virginia and North Carolina. A generation later, Cherokee and Nottoway peace delegations met with the Brafferton Indian School at the College of William & Mary. Nottoway students attended the Brafferton Indian School at the College of William & Mary because Virginia's frontier, the Nottoway hosted William Byrd's "dividing line" party.

Following Virginia's 1676 Civil War known as Bacon's Rebellion, the Nottoway were vital agents in the backwoods diplomacy of the eighteenth century. During the Seven Years War and received accolades from the House of Burgesses for their valor against the French in the siege of Ft. Duquesne. Nottoway students attended the Brafferton Indian School at the College of William & Mary during the tenure ofGovernor Robert Dinwiddie, the Nottoway fought under Lt. Colonel George Washington and danced down the Duke of Gloucester Street to the fife and drum. At the request of Lt. Governor Alexander Spotswood, the Nottoway peace delegations met with North Carolina. A generation later, Cherokee and Nottoway peace delegations met with at their "Great Town," while Byrd surveyed the colonial boundary between Virginia and North Carolina. A generation later, Cherokee and Nottoway peace delegations met with the Brafferton Indian School at the College of William & Mary. Nottoway students attended the Brafferton Indian School at the College of William & Mary because Virginia's frontier, the Nottoway hosted William Byrd's "dividing line" party.
Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe, and joined Virginia’s patriot forces in the
American Revolution. It was remarked during the eighteenth century that the Nottoway
were, “the only Indians of any consequence now remaining within...Virginia” (Byrd
Historians indicate the Nottoway continued residence on their Southampton
County lands until the end of the nineteenth century. The antebellum community was
politically active: they petitioned the Virginia legislature, governors and county courts for
intercedes on matters related to mismanagement of their funds, distribution of property,
illegal seizure and treaty obligations. In contrast, at the beginning of the twentieth century
the Nottoway were described by contemporaries as “very few left in the county,” “mixed
bloods” and “remnants.” Families continued to live on the “Indian Town Road” that cut
through their rural settlement, but all reservation lands had been allotted and their
“Trustees” dismissed. The families were “very poor,” mostly working as farm laborers
and at “public work.” Court records indicate some Nottoway sold their reservation
allotments, while others used their allotments and personal property as security for loans
and debt repayment; property taxes and foreclosure wrestled most remaining reservation
lands away from Nottoway interests.
By the twentieth century, the “Nottaway descendants,” were described as “all
married other races and moved away to Norfolk and other cities,” “uneducated”
“surrounded by people of alien stock,” “members of the black community,” “identified
with the Negroes,” of “Indian descent…with Negroid features,” “their descendants still
survive as part of the Black population,” of “mixed ancestry,” “whose identity was black
but looked decidedly Indian,” with “claims openly to be descended from the Indians,” but
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encouragement of Southampton County residents into the Meherrin Indian Tribe. Along with
organization in 1977 and received state recognition as a tribe in 1986 (Davydow 1994:5). The
in adjacent Bertie County, North Carolina, Meherrin descendants formally

urban family networks suggested the maintenance of an informal social organization (Field
associations with other midcentury reservation reservation-tract lands and extended rural-
and Davidson 1997:202). However, mid-midcentury reservation Meherrin descendants
produce influence by a "White anthropologist" (Rountree 1973:6-8; and see Rountree
pre-integration racism experienced by Southampton community members prohibited
action; one researcher indicated the presence of reservation descendants, but found the
1980s, White / Black racial divisions problematized the potential for Nottoway political
identities until the end of Segregation and decades thereafter. Through the 1970s and
racial climate of Jim Crow Virginia continued to the midline of Public Nottoway
first half of the twentieth century was unmet by Nottoway kindred. The political and
James Mooney (1907), Frank Speck (1928) and others (e.g. Weslager 1943) during the
The formalized community organization of mid-Atlantic Indians encouraged by

during the Jim Crow era awaits further attention.
American South. While outside the scope of this research, Nottoway people's experience
community and community cohesion became submerged in an increasingly racialized
from public view. While the sale of reservation lands, outward perceptions of cultural
encouragement of Nottoway reservation allottees and their descendants is largely obscured.
1972; Painter 1961; Rountree 1973, 1979a). Thus, I argue the Meherrin and Meherrin-
"Black in identity" among "Indian ancestry" (Davydow 1994; Mooney 1907; Paramount
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The historic relationship between the Nottowa, Meherrin and Tuscarora, prompted a renewed interest in the "old Indian Town reservation." During the 1990s, questions about Iroquoian treaty lands in North Carolina and Virginia encouraged visits from Canadian Six Nations tribal members. Combined, these activities eventually led to the 1997-2003 formations of several Nottoway-focused political groups (Field notes 2006). In 2010, the Virginia General Assembly recognized two organizations as "Nottoway tribes." As one of these remaining groups, they "rebaptized Indians" extract from "mulatto laws." As one of the mismanaged, received tax exemptions as Indians and had the Commonwealth's request for tax-exempt status go unheeded. The transformation of the Nottoway reservation community is a narrative of contradictions. Nineteenth-century Nottoway leaders petitioned the General Assembly in Iroquoian, sued their Trustees for violations of treaty status and financial mismanagement, received tax exemptions as Indians and had the Commonwealth's Attorney General rule them "tributary Indians" exempt from "mulatto laws." As one of the three remaining groups to hold Indian treaty lands in Virginia, their disappearance from public view in the twentieth century stands in stark contrast to the political activism of these remaining groups. "rebaptized Indians" extract from "mulatto laws." As one of the mismanaged, received tax exemptions as Indians and had the Commonwealth's request for tax-exempt status go unheeded. The transformation of the Nottoway reservation community is a narrative of contradictions. Nineteenth-century Nottoway leaders petitioned the General Assembly in Iroquoian, sued their Trustees for violations of treaty status and financial mismanagement, received tax exemptions as Indians and had the Commonwealth's Attorney General rule them "tributary Indians" exempt from "mulatto laws." As one of the three remaining groups to hold Indian treaty lands in Virginia, their disappearance from public view in the twentieth century stands in stark contrast to the political activism of Virginia's "citizen Indians." The twentieth-century rise of Powhatan's descendants and the termination and dispersal of the Nottoway (Rountree 1987) prompted a renewed interest in the "old Indian Town reservation." During the 1990s, questions about Iroquoian treaty lands in North Carolina and Virginia encouraged visits from Canadian Six Nations tribal members. Combined, these activities eventually led to the 1997-2003 formations of several Nottoway-focused political groups (Field notes 2006). In 2010, the Virginia General Assembly recognized two organizations as "Nottoway tribes." As one of the three remaining groups to hold Indian treaty lands in Virginia, their disappearance from public view in the twentieth century stands in stark contrast to the political activism of Virginia's "citizen Indians." The twentieth-century rise of Powhatan's descendants and the termination and dispersal of the Nottoway (Rountree 1987) prompted a renewed interest in the "old Indian Town reservation." During the 1990s, questions about Iroquoian treaty lands in North Carolina and Virginia encouraged visits from Canadian Six Nations tribal members. Combined, these activities eventually led to the 1997-2003 formations of several Nottoway-focused political groups (Field notes 2006). In 2010, the Virginia General Assembly recognized two organizations as "Nottoway tribes." As one of the three remaining groups to hold Indian treaty lands in Virginia, their disappearance from public view in the twentieth century stands in stark contrast to the political activism of Virginia's "citizen Indians." The twentieth-century rise of Powhatan's descendants and the termination and dispersal of the Nottoway (Rountree 1987) prompted a renewed interest in the "old Indian Town reservation." During the 1990s, questions about Iroquoian treaty lands in North Carolina and Virginia encouraged visits from Canadian Six Nations tribal members. Combined, these activities eventually led to the 1997-2003 formations of several Nottoway-focused political groups (Field notes 2006). In 2010, the Virginia General Assembly recognized two organizations as "Nottoway tribes." As one of the three remaining groups to hold Indian treaty lands in Virginia, their disappearance from public view in the twentieth century stands in stark contrast to the political activism of Virginia's "citizen Indians." The twentieth-century rise of Powhatan's descendants and the termination and dispersal of the Nottoway (Rountree 1987) prompted a renewed interest in the "old Indian Town reservation." During the 1990s, questions about Iroquoian treaty lands in North Carolina and Virginia encouraged visits from Canadian Six Nations tribal members. Combined, these activities eventually led to the 1997-2003 formations of several Nottoway-focused political groups (Field notes 2006). In 2010, the Virginia General Assembly recognized two organizations as "Nottoway tribes." As one of the three remaining groups to hold Indian treaty lands in Virginia, their disappearance from public view in the twentieth century stands in stark contrast to the political activism of Virginia's "citizen Indians."
nineteenth-century dissolution of the Nottoway reservation was a process linked to wider socio-historical forces in Virginia and the South's development within the capitalist world-system. In order to understand the mechanisms and processes by which the transformations of the Nottoway community took place, and to explore the impacts of socio-economic asymmetries on Nottoway social organization, this historical inquiry focuses on the end of the Reservation Period (c. 1775-1875) and the Reservation Allotment Period (c. 1824-1878).

This research examines the social construction of the Nottoway community from roughly the time of the American Revolution until the decade after the Civil War. It explores how the end of the Reservation Period impacted the community's political solidarity and through the state's imposed legal framework, the shift of Nottoway land from a corporate body to individual ownership impacted the community's political solidarity and the internal organization since the seventeenth century. The shift of colonial state and the internal organization since the seventeenth century and the establishment of a quasi-paternalism that had existed between the state and the Nottoway Iroquoians in the Reservation Period created tension within a community already reduced by demographic collapse, political isolation and tribal exogamy. Increased participation in capitalist wage-labor and an intensified agrarian plantation-system added to these impacts.

Introduction to the Research Questions
reservation employment, while other reservation residents were non-Indian affines. The presence of non-Nottoway contractual laborers, Indian-owned enslaved peoples and seasonal slave hires also altered the strictly "Indian" characteristic of Southampton's Nottoway Town. Tribal exogamy led to the rise of three forms of Nottoway reservation households: 1) Nottoway men and their non-Nottoway wives, and thus non-matriarchal Nottoway children (2) Nottoway women and their non-Nottoway husbands, but with Nottoway children, and (3) non-Nottoway Nottoway households with non-Nottoway children. Hence, questions emerge about the ways in which the Nottoway resettled themselves as a social group after the allotment process separated matrilineal lands in severalty.

At the meta-level, Virginia's eighteenth-century agricultural society began to shift towards an agro-industrial economy. With the rise of mechanized transportation, improved agricultural processing, and an increased import and export efficiency, Southampton became more fully connected to the wider capitalist-system. The export of massive amounts of raw agricultural products characterized the antebellum Southern position within the world-system's axial division of labor, as a periphery of the global-economy. With the rise in mechanized agriculture, Southampton became an agro-industrial economy. During the antebellum period, an axial division of labor emerged, characterized by the export of raw agricultural products.

The shifting of the world-system's center from Great Britain to China benefitted from the production and resale of cotton textiles, manufacturing and exporting "workshop of the world" goods as a core state in the world-system [1815-1873]. During the period of inquiry [c.1775-1873], Great Britain became the workshop of the world with the rise of the capitalist-system. The efficiency of Southampton became more fully connected to the wider capitalist-system, with an increased import and export of raw agricultural products.
Moreover, the majority of previous investigations in the Chesapeake region have been
processes of cultural change for an understudied Mid-Atlantic Iroquoian community.

examination of the Nottoway's Indian Town adds new comparative data on the historical

This dissertation research is significant in several ways. First, an anthropological

Significance of the Research

mobilized by consanguinity, socio-economies or cultural difference?

integrated with the capitalist world-system, was Nottoway relatedness of "our people"

were kin ties maintained after the allotment process? Finally, in a local economy

the deep structures of kinship and political economy? In what ways and to what extent

allotment of Nottoway communal lands in several ways is the result of changes to

and reproduction, what was the structure of family, kinship and social networks? Was the

and reproduction, what was the structure of family, kinship and social networks? In what ways and to what extent

faces, economically expressed itself organizationally, socio-politically and

in which Nottoway domesticity expressed itself organizationally, socio-politically and

process of kin-group incorporation into an industrializing economy, what were the ways

mobility of Nottoway resources and production, with the uneven and asymmetrical

did interaction with Europe's mercantile economy, and then industrialism, shift the

where formerly organized around a kin-based subsistence of horticulture and hunting, how

what changes occurred as a result of the historical processes of their entanglement? As a

Nottoway incorporated within the capitalist world-economy – interface with this system and

Therefore, one may ask in what ways did the Nottoway community – a tribal

receptions of capitalism's unequal exchange and they responded to both accommodation
II

underway. The analysis of this progression relies on cultural theory to interpret their
of domestic spaces are but two areas that illuminate the structural modifications
underlying those processes. Shifts in Nottoway descent reckoning and the reconfiguration
group affiliation, coalescence, transformation and maintenance – and the system that
nations (Kohl 1998), thus the inquiry explores the historical forces that lead to
imbedded communities (Anderson 1992); pan-identity indigeneity (Pfister 1999);
phenomena (e.g., descendant communities (Heyman 1993); La Roche and Blakey 1997);
progressively transformed toward examining the forces that sustain peoplehood
and motivations for group formation and change: the discipline’s attention to causation
1972; Fried 1967; Service 1969). Eventually encouraged immunity into the reasons
anthropology’s earlier interest in neo-evolutionary classificatory schemes (e.g., Flannery
community, as it relates to Nottoway peoplehood (Jackson 2012; Potter 2004).
Second, the research focuses considers the social sciences’ changing definition of
the post-colonial Chesapeake.

methodology and theoretical approach of cultural anthropology in an historical inquiry of
work is a departure from most previous Virginia Indian research and brings the
group solidarity were expressed in the community’s social constructs. In this way, the
about the ways in which modifications to household organization, kinship structure and
research focus is on the understanding that propel socio-cultural change and includes
superseded and more fully incorporated within the expanding capitalist world-system. The
Nottoway and non-Nottoway communities, a period when Virginia Indians were increasingly
archaeological, with a pre-historic or contact-era focus (e.g., Brindley 1991; Callihan 2003;

archaeological, with a pre-historic or contact-era focus (e.g., Brindley 1991; Callihan 2003;
archaeological, with a pre-historic or contact-era focus (e.g., Brindley 1991; Callihan 2003;
12

The settlement of early Jamestown (C.F. Runounce and Turner 2007), the exploration. The Nottoway have come to prominence within the histories of frontier colonial encounters, save for limited discussions within the context of the Nottoway-Meherrin community (Binford 1971; Heath and Swindell 2011; Mudder et al. 1998; and anthropological research on the Nottoway-Meherrin has been archaeologically, with a pre-
prehistoric component). Over the past few decades, a focus on Virginia’s Native peoples has received less attention. The majority of Virginia’s Algonquian-speakers, like the Nottoway, have been historically marginalized within Virginia’s historical narrative, through explicit exclusion by archaeology (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007; Gallivan, Moretti-Langholtz, and Woodard 2011), over their historical narratives through explicit exclusion within anthropology (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 1998), their efforts in national commemorative cycles (Gallivan 2003; Harniman 2008) and their efforts to reassert control over their own historical narratives through civic engagement with archaeology (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007; Gallivan, Moretti-Langholtz, and Woodard 2011). Other works have addressed twelfth-century Powhatan and Monacan political English colony at Jamestown (Gallivan 2007; Gallivan 1997; Runounce 1997; Williamson 1997), continuing discussions of Virginia’s Native peoples have dominantly focused on the construction of the Nottoway community. Therefore, a political economy and social construction analysis is needed to explore the historical transformation and social

This dissertation contributes new research to a wider conversation in anthropology by

Within the capitalist world-system (C.F. Dunaway 1994; 1996; Hopkins, et al. 1982; Wiltshire 1971), the Nottoway have come to prominence within the histories of frontier colonial encounters, save for limited discussions within the context of the Nottoway-Meherrin community (Binford 1971; Heath and Swindell 2011; Mudder et al. 1998; and anthropological research on the Nottoway-Meherrin has been archaeologically, with a pre-
prehistoric component). Over the past few decades, a focus on Virginia’s Native peoples has received less attention. The majority of Virginia’s Algonquian-speakers, like the Nottoway, have been historically marginalized within Virginia’s historical narrative, through explicit exclusion by archaeology (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007; Gallivan, Moretti-Langholtz, and Woodard 2011), over their historical narratives through explicit exclusion within anthropology (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 1998), their efforts in national commemorative cycles (Gallivan 2003; Harniman 2008) and their efforts to reassert control over their own historical narratives through civic engagement with archaeology (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007; Gallivan, Moretti-Langholtz, and Woodard 2011). Other works have addressed twelfth-century Powhatan and Monacan political English colony at Jamestown (Gallivan 2007; Gallivan, Moretti-Langholtz, and Woodard 2011). Other works have addressed twelfth-century Powhatan and Monacan political
opening of the Virginia fur trade (e.g., Briceland 1987) and Byrd's survey of the dividing line between Virginia and North Carolina (e.g., Calcaterra 2011). Other publications have addressed Algonquian-Iroquoian comparative culture change (Binford 1967; Dawdy 1995) and nineteenth-century land loss (Rountree 1987). The overview of previous publications, and the only one Rountree's 1987 article "The Termination and Dispersal of the Nottoway Indians" (Boyce 1978), of the Smithsonian's Handbook of North American Indians, is relatively brief.

Archaeologists Lewis Binford (1964) and Gerald Smith (1971) can be credited for developing most of what is known in the modern era about pre-contact Nottoway social and political organization and culture history. Binford's 1967 article in Ethnohistory traced Nottoway, Meherrin and Weanoke culture change through the colonial era, until about the time of the American Revolution. Economic and political development in the environs of the Mid-Atlantic coastal plain, a part of her dissertation, is part of her comparative study of Indian policy and land loss in Virginia. Linguist Blair Rudes (1981a) offered an historical-comparative sketch of the Nottoway language, drawing on his (1987) and Marianne Mithun's (1989) work with Tuscarora phonology and grammar. Archaeologist Lewis Binford's (1964) and Gerald Smith's (1971) can be credited for archaeological research and the field's relative breadth in the 1980s. The overview of previous work is relatively brief.
to significantly address the nineteenth century. Regrettably, her portrait of Nottoway society is bleak: the colonial encounter led the Indians into debt, which they continually could not escape for 200 years. Rountree argues that as a result of their despondency, through alcoholism, they drank themselves into further debt and eventual destruction. The men refused to farm, based on Nottoway gendered notions about the sexual division of labor. Acculturated and indigent, the Nottoway consciously decided to detribalize and sell their remaining reservation lands. Quietly, the community disappeared through intermarriage with African Americans. During the 2006-2010 Nottoway state-recognition hearings, this article was publicly scrutinized and the subject of ethical debate at the national-level, particularly evidence for transformations in deeper structures, Rountree reveals a lack of awareness of change. By misunderstanding the event-level as the main causal feature, rather than as documentary event-level at face value, which she sees as the prime mover of social change, her analysis involves her acceptance of the event to protect her own scholarship (Schilling 2009).

A key criticism of Rountree's Nottoway analysis involves her acceptance of the documentary event-level at face value, which she sees as the prime mover of social change. By misunderstanding the event-level as the main causal feature, rather than as evidence for transformations in deeper structures, Rountree reveals a lack of awareness of wider conversations and debates in anthropological circles during the 1970s and 1980s, particularly with regard to anthropological theory (e.g. Asad 1973; Braudel 1981, 1982, 1984; Clifford 1988; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Denige 1980; Douglas 1970; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Price 1983; Taussig 1980, 1987; Wolf 1997). Equally,
Rountree's unsophisticated construction of the event-level, with critical attention to the processes underlying colonialism, produced an unsatisfying and thin social narrative: "The Nottoway were caught in a vise...instead of facing reality they chose to escape it through liquor. Even a compromise with the dominant society, such as adopting some new practices while maintaining limited social isolation, would have helped...the Nottoway chose not to compromise, so that their days as a tribal people were numbered...Refusing to adopt intensive European economic practices...they consigned themselves to a viscous cycle of poverty, dependence...and escapism through drinking that brought on more poverty...It was all over and once the 'Indian problem' had disappeared..." (1987:198-199, 213).

Rountree's handling of Nottoway agency and her conception of social-political development can also be questioned. In other writings (1990:10), she indicates indigenous communities "deliberately" remained at a tribal level of organization, rather than becoming chiefdoms, and that individual chiefs actively pursued creating "ethnic groups" (1990:12-13). For the Nottoway, Rountree suggests disclaiming kinship and "detribalization may have...indeed seemed the only solution to those Indians willing to support themselves in an Anglicized way...The Indians themselves acted for themselves..." (1987: 207-208). Such statements call into question the definitions of "tribe" and "ethnic group," as well as the models of socio-political development. Following Etienne Balibar (1991) and others, one may argue that in order to understand the concepts of "nation," "state," and "people," one should contextualize them to avoid making reified categories and thus create a false reality.

This research is not a rejoinder to Rountree's "The Termination and Dispersal of the Nottoway Indians of Virginia," but rather a contrasting approach. Despite this, the process underpinning colonialism, produced an unsatisfying and thin social narrative.
visits and the collection of oral histories in Southampton County, and, the development of
networks and the routines of daily life. Semi-structured and informal interviews, the
assisted in data triangulation, through the reconstruction of past relationships, social
Fieldwork among Nottoway descendants and Southampton County residents.

Research Methodology

In order to develop an historical ethnographic view of the Nottoway, the research

Research Methodology

Community

process of change and transformation within a Virginia Iroquoian reservation
political economy and world-systems theory, this dissertation analyzes the historical
reconstruction and deconstruction and an approach grounded in the anthropology of
comparisons with other indigenous communities, ethnohistorical fieldwork with
examination of archival and historical sources pertaining to the Nottoway, cross-cultural
This research methodology consists of five qualitative approaches: 1) Documentary analysis; 2) Conducting informal interviews; 3) Direct observation; 4) Gathering life histories; 5) Collecting kinship schedules (genealogical analysis). The Southampton County documentary record is encouragingly complete. Unlike other Virginia localities, Southampton is not a “burned county,” meaning that both government and agricultural occupation were spared since Union occupation and destruction was mostly north and east of the county. Thus, tax records and land deeds for Jerusalem, Southampton’s seat of government, were spared since Union occupation and other Virginia localities. Southampton is not a “burned county.”

The Southampton County documentary record is encouragingly complete. Unlike other Virginia localities, Southampton is not a “burned county.”

Primary Documents:

1. Collecting kinship schedules (genealogical analysis)
2. Conducting informal interviews
3. Direct observation
4. Gathering life histories
5. Documentary analysis

This research methodology consists of five qualitative approaches: 1) Documentary analysis; 2) Conducting informal interviews; 3) Direct observation; 4) Gathering life histories; 5) Collecting kinship schedules (genealogical analysis). The Southampton County documentary record is encouragingly complete. Unlike other Virginia localities, Southampton is not a “burned county.”
Papers of Nottoway descendents mostly date to the Post-Reservation Era [1878-]..

Select photographic collections, church records and personal

occasional periodicals [The Gentleman's Magazine] and local newspapers [e.g.

correspondences of the members of the county [e.g. doctors, lawyers, tribal elders],

descriptions of the Nottoway, not mentioned in the body of documents above, include the

timelines]. These documents were used to triangulate data from other primary records. 

Like much of rural Virginia, literacy among Nottoway peoples was minimal until

among heirs [1878-1880, 1940-1951, 1953-1953].

Before 1850, Nottoway descendents conducted oral history interviews with their

the beginning of the twentieth century. As a consequence, few personal papers or

correspondences of Nottoway individuals survive from an earlier period. In 1977 and

the Nottoway, elite members of the county [e.g. doctors, lawyers, tribal trustees],

occasional periodicals [e.g.

Petersburg Intelligencer] and local newspapers [e.g.

such as mismanagement of funds [1878, 1890, 1901, 1838, 1840-1850, 1844-1851], court-certifications of Indian 

blood [1837, 1853, 1860, 1864], criminal suits [1820, 1830, 1835, 1840-1841, 1847-1855, 1868, 1870, 1875, 1877], an

ethnic descriptions of the Nottoway, not mentioned in the body of documents above, include the

attorneys. Most of the petitions concern the allotment process [1824, 1830, 1833, 1838, 

nulities provide a window into Nottoway politics, community interests and financial 

Assembly and civil suits in Southampton County court. These documents, responses and 

The Nottoway filed multiple legislative petitions to the Virginia General 

Relief.

more detailed, allowing for a fuller portrait of household compositions and kinship

mortality, education, settlement patterns and occupations. After 1850, the census data are 

1810-1880 and 1900-1940 provide a wealth of information about family units, marriages,
Other documentary materials for Southampton County provide contextual illustrations of the reservation's allotment, regional military maps from the Civil War and state maps of settlements, road systems, railroads and municipalities. County survey maps from the physical space of the Nottoway Reservation and its relationship to surrounding lands. The cartographic record of Southampton assists in conceptualizing the

Local economy, Crofts, *Old Southampton* is a southern agricultural companion to other Southampton political and economic history, c.1830-1870. An historical narrative of a historical narrative of a combination of documentary

Published sources concerning Southampton County include two extensive volumes of

Historical Research (e.g. Drewry 1900; Oates 1975; Styron 1967; Tragle 1971), an event that has made Southampton the subject of previous

Information about Nottoway historical settings and wider antebellum Virginia society,

Other documentary materials for Southampton County provide contextual
A portion of the study draws on my anthropological fieldwork in Southampton County and surrounding areas. Informal interviews and direct observation were conducted during 2006-2012. Through several Nottoway interlocutors, senior members of the community were identified, including the last living individuals with continuous connections to Nottoway reservation allotment lands, in addition to Nottoway descendant-allottee community members and other county residents. Interviews took the form of formal and informal conversations with open- and closed-ended questions, enabling a mostly implicit research agenda. From senior community members, oral histories of parents and grandparents stretched back into the Reservation Allotment Period (pre-1878), allowing for the collection of narratives concerning individual families' home and social life, seasonal cycles of agricultural labor, and descriptions of Southampton society. Interviews included questions enabling a mostly implicit research agenda. From senior community members, oral histories of parents and grandparents stretched back into the Reservation Allotment Period (pre-1878), allowing for the collection of narratives concerning individual families' home and social life, seasonal cycles of agricultural labor, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.1953. Families residing on these properties were forced to relocate into adjacent areas, and descriptions of Southampton society. Two Nottoway reservation-allottee families lost control of their reservation lands after the Second World War; one as the result of tax delinquency c.1945, the other by lawsuit over property division in an inheritance case c.19
although others remained as lessees on their old allotments until the late 1950s. Interviews with these community members allowed for the recording of kinship schedules, tracking settlement patterns of Nottoway households and documenting meaningful reservation locations from the end of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries.

The goal of informal interviews was to generate comparative and representative data, identify common themes in local historical knowledge and capture ethnographic content of the Nottoway environs in time and space. Fieldwork with the target population was crosscut by general inquiries with other Southampton residents and the families of plantation residents, selecting Southampton churches, historic homes and archaeological sites.

Informal interviews were aspects of the fieldwork conducted through this approach. Photographs and descriptive field notes of the visits, meetings and direct observation consisted of guided and independent site visits to former reservation lands, selected Southampton churches, historic homes and archaeological sites. The goal of informal interviews was to generate comparative and representative data, identify common themes in local historical knowledge and capture ethnographic content. Meaningful reservation locations from the end of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, including settlement patterns of Nottoway households and documenting interviews with these community members allowed for the recording of kinship schedules, tracking settlement patterns of Nottoway households and documenting relationships among former allotment holders, even though others remained as lessees on their old allotments until the late 1950s.
The reconstruction of Nottoway allottee genealogies traced the community’s household composition, kinship network, marriage partners and settlement patterns. To understand the transformation and social organization of the Nottoway community, it was necessary to investigate the familial histories of select group members. Descendants of the two remaining antebellum Nottoway matrilineages were identified, which allowed an analysis and comparison of family composition, organization and marriage-mate selection. The recording of Nottoway kinship and marriage schedules permitted an

perspective that can be situated into the meta-level political economy. Education and the socio-economic conditions of Southampton provided a local

interviewers, grand-relatives, social networks, family and home life, work history, the last residential configurations of Nottoway Indian Town. The oral histories of Reservation Era [1878-]. These interviewers were key in providing detailed information on development of representative life histories of the Nottoway experience during the post-

interviews with older informants assisted in data triangulation and the

great-grandchildren, grandchildren and grandparents of Nottoway allottees. In particular, senior members of the community born c.1915-1940 who were grandchildren, participants, senior members of the community born c.1915-1940 who were grandchildren, reservation allies. These individuals linked the inquiry to wider kin-networks, in

My primary interlocutors for this research were descendants of Nottoway

Key Interlocutors: 4) Life Histories and 5) The Genealogical Method

entrepreneurs, which aided a more complete investigation of the Nottoway Town calendar year. Reservation observations were conducted from both a riverview and

reservation.
evaluation of the descent reckoning system, its changes over time and an opportunity for cross-Iroquoian comparison [e.g. Tuscarora]. Interviews with key interlocutors allowed for the crosschecking of sources and gathered data, as well as provided other insights.

Tracking mate selection and marriage alliance relied on the triangulating sources in the documentary record [census schedules, chancery cases, marriage bonds, etc.] and oral histories of Nottoway descendants. The data suggest a relationship between marriage partner selection and community social organization, as well as an affiliation between economic opportunity and social mobility. The record indicates an uneven course in descent-system change, with multiple forms of kin reckoning emerging during a narrow period of time. This irregularity speaks to the transformative process of Nottoway integration into a single political economy.

Chapter 1 outlines the project’s theoretical perspective. It situates the research within other anthropologies and histories of the Eastern Woodlands, reservation-era studies and other post-colonial Native inquiries. The discussion argues that political economy within other anthropologies and histories of the Eastern Woodlands, and within other political systems of the world-system, is best suited to theoretically address historical processes, social and political forces, and is best suited to theoretically address historical processes, social and political forces, and other post-colonial Native inquiries. World-systems theory’s analytical framework is broadly described and selected intellectual arguments of the approach are rehearsed, Immanuel Wallerstein and Eric Wolf, world-systems theory’s approaches and economic frameworks operating within the capitalist world-system. Following two

Organization of the Study

The incorporation process of Nottoway integration into a single political economy is observable in surname inventories, court records of property transfer and residence, oral histories of Nottoway descendants, and in the documentary record [census schedules, chancery cases, marriage bonds, etc.]. The data suggest a relationship between marriage partner selection and community social organization, as well as an affiliation between economic opportunity and social mobility. The record indicates an uneven course in descent-system change, with multiple forms of kin reckoning emerging during a narrow period of time. This irregularity speaks to the transformative process of Nottoway integration into a single political economy.
Chapter II explores the historical characteristics of the Nottoway community's political economy, which allows for a more critical analysis of the community's matricentric organization, which addresses for more critical analysis of the community's structures and leadership roles and provides an understanding of Indian Town's decision-making, leadership roles and for issues of viability and community longevity. The framework of matrilineality of Nottoway-Tuscarora removal and the demographics of Nottoway Town are considered. The cultural content presented in this chapter is a significant aspect of Nottoway Reservation Period [1705-1824] community solidarity and a contributing factor to their human experience. Attraction for the structure and function of Nottoway Town's matrilineages are examined, historical sources, and ethnological data from the Nottoway and the closely related Tuscarora language. Kinship system and indigenous social organization. Utilizing Nottoway land sales, allotment and the tribe's Trustee system are overviewed in Chapter III. Through the previous chapter's operational view of Nottoway Kinship, the Nottoway land sales, allotment and the tribe's Trustee system are overviewed in Chapter III.
interdependence and mechanization. This section investigates nineteenth-century
explored between Chapters IV-VI: polonization, commodification, contractualization,
away from the Trustees’ Five Interrelated processes of the economic property and
system, particularly as tribal members wrested control of their real and personal property
of market structures encountered Nottoway participation in the capitalist economic-
with the nineteenth-century world-economy is the subject of Chapter VI. The decaying
The intertwining of the American South, Southampton County and Nottoway Town
Nottoway’s real estate and monetary resources.
makes linkages between Southampton’s affluent families of wealth and influence and the
exemplify the Tribe’s legal and economic strategies prior to the Civil War. The chapter
hulls and financial trusts are investigated in Chapter V. One goal of the section is to
Civil suits and court orders relating to the division of the Nottoway’s reservation
legal codes.
emigration to Liberia, Africa and 1830s changes to Virginia’s Slave and Free Negro
is examined in the context of Nat Turner’s slave insurrection, “Free Persons of Color”
neighboring property owners, slaveholders and landless laborers. Nottoway peoplehood
petitions and tax papers, the socioeconomic position of Nottoway Town is evaluated again.
Free Persons.” Through a careful review of census records, court documents, legislative
Southampton, and analyzes the county’s demography of “Whites,” “Slaves” and “Other
Chapter V examines the physical environs and civic infrastructure of
by state-appointed Trustees.
community’s collective and individual resistance – and accommodation – to manipulation
advancements in transportation and the opening of new hemispheric markets, alongside the development of Southampton's production of cash crops for export.

The concluding discussion overviews changes in Southampton's political economy as a result of the Civil War and examines push-pull factors impacting the Nottoway community. The chapter includes select data from field interviews and oral histories, and follows the collapse of the Nottoway's traditional social organization at the end of the Reservation Allotment Period. The section highlights key aspects of the study's findings.

Appendix C examines select post-reservation family residence configurations and cooperation among matrilineal Nottoway males, affines and other male relatives. Nottoway matrilineages, their sub-lineages and marriage patterns are overviewed in a narrative format. Indian Town kinship schedules and family residence configurations are overviewsed in a narrative format. Appendix B examines one Nottoway kinship matrix is a discussion of the term "Nottoway" and its historical linguistic background. Appendices provide additional research data, including data on select Post-Reservation Era marriages and cooperation among matrilineally descended Nottoway males, affines and other male relatives.

Within Virginia's historical development, previously overlooked and obscured Nottoway community is more fully considered through a world-systems analysis. This dissertation allows for a reassessment of the Nottoway community's historical experiences and societal organization at the end of the Reservation Allotment Period. The chapter includes select data from field interviews and oral histories, and follows the collapse of the Nottoway's traditional social organization at the end of the Reservation Allotment Period. The section highlights key aspects of the study's findings.

The Nottoway of Virginia: A Study of Peoplehood and Political Economy, c.1775-1875 is a needed contribution to the historical anthropology of Virginia Indians and adds to our understanding of these people.

The Nottoway of Virginia: A Study of Peoplehood and Political Economy, c.1775-1875

Three appendices provide additional research data. Appendix A is a discussion of the term "Nottoway" and its historical linguistic background. Appendix B examines one Nottoway kinship matrix. Appendix C examines select Post-Reservation Era marriages and cooperation among matrilineally descended Nottoway males, affines and other male relatives. Nottoway matrilineages, their sub-lineages and marriage patterns are overviewed in a narrative format. Indian Town kinship schedules and family residence configurations are overviewed in a narrative format. Appendix B examines one Nottoway kinship matrix is a discussion of the term "Nottoway" and its historical linguistic background. Appendices provide additional research data, including data on select Post-Reservation Era marriages and cooperation among matrilineally descended Nottoway males, affines and other male relatives.

The Nottoway of Virginia: A Study of Peoplehood and Political Economy, c.1775-1875 is a needed contribution to the historical anthropology of Virginia Indians and adds to our understanding of these people.
CHAPTER I

Theoretical Approach

In an effort to describe the phenomena of Euro-Indian contact and the effects of colonialism, historians have examined Europe's entry into the Eastern Woodlands of North America utilizing rubrics of culture contact and frontier models (e.g. Aquila 1997; Axtell 2001; Braund 1993; Calloway 1995; Cayton and Teute 1998; Horn 2008; Jennings 1984; Kupperman 2000, 2007; Richter 1992, 2001). The "New Indian" school of history has dominated much of the literature on the region (see Deloria 2004; Hagan 1997; Krech 1991; Schoenfeld 2002; Shoemaker 2002; Thrasher 1998; Trigger 1982, 1986) despite increased recognition for the need to address anthropological topics of change and transformation in colonial-era Native labor and subsistence, political organization, and economic strategies (e.g. Gallay 2002, 2010; Merrell 1989; Richter 2002; Rushforth 2012). Samuel, the methodological shift from the New Indian History is not adequately equipped to predict the long-term process of cultural change (see Hudson 2002:91-127 for a discussion), in particular, for indigenous groups that remained in the Eastern Woodlands after the frontier moved west. These approaches set the groundwork for interpreting the transformational process, but do not provide the theoretical tools needed to discuss post-colonial settings, where the "subsequent relations are of ethnicity and class within a single society, not between different societies" (Lamar and Thompson 1984:10).

While effective at organizing and describing the events of the contact and colonial period, the methodology of the New Indian History is not adequately equipped to address long-term processes of cultural change (see Hudson 2002:91-127; and see Jackson 2012:xxi-xxxiv). Samuel's socio-linguistics (e.g. Gallay 2002, 2010; Merrell 1989a, 1994, 2012; Rushforth 2012) set the groundwork for describing and transformation in colonial-era Native labor and subsistence, political organization, and increased recognition for the need to address anthropological topics of change and transformation. Despite this, much of the literature on the region (see DeLoria 2002; Hagan 1997; Krech 1991; Kuperman 2000; 2007; Richter 1992, 2002; Thrasher 1998) has focused on the New Indian, school of history as a product of the Euro-American narrative of culture contact and frontier models (e.g. Gallay 1997; Axell 2001; Brainard 1993; Calloway 1995; Cayton and Teule 1998; Horn 2008; Jernigan 1997). Colonial historians have examined Europe's influence into the Eastern Woodlands of North America utilizing rubrics of culture contact and the effects of colonialism to describe the phenomena of Euro-Indian contact and the effects of...
Once the frontier "closes" in a given context, the framework necessary to explore the continuing processes of socio-cultural adaptation and transformation needs to be considerate of the antagonisms, contradictions and inequalities present in the "post-colonial capitalist order characterized by [these] marked asymmetries" (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992:65). Moreover, the culture-clash of integrating American Indian communities into Europe's colonial economy is often portrayed from a historical perspective that does not consistently factor indigenous peoples as agents with their own motivations and worldviews (see Merrell 1996b, 2012 for a critique). Some historians continue to accept notions of Native assimilation and acculturation (see Merrell 1996b, 2012 for a critique) rather than to challenge old ideas as "colonialist" and deterministic (Deloria and Salisbury 2004, 2005; Dunaway 1996a, 1997; Fowler 1987; Green and Plane 2010; Jackson 2003; O'Brien 1994; O'Brenn 1997; Sider 2003). These studies have attempted to mediate the local experience – drawing on Native responses to global forces – through exploring changes in physical environments, shifts in political structure, market participation, kinship relations, identity, and symbolic and ceremonial life and material culture. A key component to these works' analysis, despite variation in topic, methodology and theoretical perspective, is the examination of the multiple colonial economies that have emerged from or co-existed with one another. Moreover, the culture-clash of integrating American Indian communities into Europe's colonial economy is often portrayed from a historical perspective characterized by colonization and conflicts over resources, power, and cultural values. (Comaroff 1992:65).
theoretical emphasis, is providing a wider historical context for interpreting or explaining Native peoples' transformation over the last four centuries, a period which coincides with Europe's political and economic colonization of the Americas. Therefore, an approach that considers historical processes, social and political forces, and economic frameworks is arguably best suited to address issues of cultural continuity and change, and the forces associated with the transformation of post-colonial Native peoples. A perspective that utilizes political economy provides such a structure for empirical research, situating culture, politics and economics as embedded in historical circumstances, whereby the relationships among these variables play out in specific geographic spaces. Indeed some thinkers have attempted to provide a wider historical context for interpreting or explaining Native peoples' transformation over the last four centuries, a period which coincides with political economy has the theoretical flexibility to be inclusive of political economy and cultural continuities within the capitalist world-system and idealism (Rosecrans 1988, 1989:30-54). Indeed some thinkers have attempted to provide a wider historical context for interpreting or explaining Native peoples' transformation over the last four centuries, a period which coincides with political economy can be an intersection for the epistemological divide of materialism 1988: Verdery 2003; Wesler 1977; Wolf 1997; Ziegler-Otero 2004). Some suggested class, capitalism and power (e.g. Breman that historical processes, social and political forces, and economic frameworks are embedded in historical circumstances, whereby the relationships among these variables play out in specific geographic spaces. Indeed some thinkers have attempted to provide a wider historical context for interpreting or explaining Native peoples' transformation over the last four centuries, a period which coincides with political economy can be an intersection for the epistemological divide of materialism and idealism (Rosecrans 1988, 1989:30-54). Indeed some thinkers have attempted to provide a wider historical context for interpreting or explaining Native peoples' transformation over the last four centuries, a period which coincides with political economy can be an intersection for the epistemological divide of materialism and idealism (Rosecrans 1988, 1989:30-54). Indeed some thinkers have attempted to provide a wider historical context for interpreting or explaining Native peoples' transformation over the last four centuries, a period which coincides with
and the production and reproduction of power and hegemony (Kurtz 1996; Kurtz and Nunley 1993). In its broadest form, political economy can be utilized to make linkages between the "power of material forces in Marx's economic base" with the "power of ideas in the political-ideological superstructure." This is an attempt by some researchers to traverse the Marxist "dictum that [equates] culture with ideology" (Kurtz 2001:118-119, brackets added). Political economy has also influenced inquiries into the relationship between the "global" and the "local" (Taussig 1980, 1987; Donham 1999).

The present research follows two meta-level theories within the paradigm of political economy: Immanuel Wallerstein, a sociologist, and Eric Wolf, an anthropologist. Both individuals have a unique perspective on the historical development of the political economy. Wallerstein provides the framework for a centuries-long development, while Wolf's writings form a basis for a local-global divide. Wallerstein's framework for a centurial-long development, while Wolf's writings form a basis for a local-global divide. In the late 1940s and 1950s, the former with C. Wright Mills the latter with Julian Benda's influence, which emerged from graduate education at Columbia University and cross-political theoretical viewpoints. Both men's academics have Marxian and modern world, but I argue their approaches are not mutually exclusive and are often complementary. Both individuals have significant perspectives on the historical development of the political economy. Immanuel Wallerstein, a sociologist, and Eric Wolf, an anthropologist.
communities. This perspective helps situate the Nottoway historically within the development of the capitalist world system. Moreover, Wolf's (1997:88-99) definition of structural relations within his "kin-ordered mode of production" and Wallerstein's analysis of households as the basic structural units of the capitalist world-economy (1984:17), provide productive avenues for discussing changes in Nottoway household composition and community organization. The configuration of the Nottoway economy, "Wallerstein 1984:17," provide productive avenues for discussing changes in income-production and "Wallerstein's analysis of households as the basic ordered mode of production" and Wallerstein's definition of structural relations within his "kin-ordered mode of production" helps situate the Nottoway historically within the development of the capitalist world system.
generates "cores" and "peripheries" of commerce and production. Wallerstein provides a detailed historical evolution of the capitalist "world-system" and develops a theoretical vocabulary for his framework, built in part from models generated by dependency theorists of "cores" and "peripheries" of commerce and production. Wallerstein provides a

In brief, Wallerstein's World-Systems Theory [WST] concludes that modern world-systems are a result of the five hundred-year political and economic expansion of Europe's hegemony over the planet. This system was [and still is] institutionally based on Europe's political and economic superiority of other societies and their economic dependence on the developed cores. Composed of core states and dominated peripheral regions, the modern world-system of "peripheral" societies and their economic dependence on the developed cores, peripheral of their zones of influence. This relationship resulted in the underdevelopment of the world's economic centers and their economic dependence on other societies on the developed and less-developed nations were structurally linked historically, and in the sixteenth-century Nottoway territory represented an "external arena".

Nottoway were a type of "traditional" or "kin-ordered" society (Wolf 1997:88-99) whose territory was "incorporated" within the capitalist world-system. Therefore, this theoretical perspective is useful at the meta-level because it outlines the constituent roles and characteristics of the larger system. With this historical framework in-hand, one may analyze change in the system's deep structures that locally influenced Nottoway Indian Town, c.1775-1875.

Wallerstein's "external zone" transformation into a "peripheral zone" [which he calls the process of "peripheralization"] has affiliation with a popular and recently appropriated term in ethnohistory: Robbie Ethridge's "shatter zone" (2006, 2009). Ethridge uses this phrase to characterize the collapsed indigenous Mississippian world's integration with Europe's expanding capitalist global-system. Intellectually, it is important to note Ethridge borrows the "shatter zone" terminology from Eric Wolf's discussion of the seventeenth-century Iroquois expansion. Along with these strong influences [Wallerstein, White and Wolf, Ethridge (2009:42)] credits the world-systems explanation of the seventeenth-century Iroquois expansion, alone with these strong influences [Wallerstein, White and Wolf, Ethridge (2009:42)], the social history paradigm of Fernand Braudel and Immanuel Wallerstein which Hudson found particularly

...
influential" and "quite powerful" (15). Recent Southern scholars of ethnohistory have explicitly disclosed the influence of Braudel, Wallerstein and Wolf on their conceptual frames (Bowne 2005:9; Ethridge 2003:2, 253-254; Kelton 2007:227; Marcoux 2010:20-21). Thus, the trend-setting concept of the "shatter zone" is based on theoretical models proposed by Braudel and Wallerstein brought to the local-level analysis of the fur trade of the Americas by White and Wolf (but see White 1991:xxvii, 95, 483; Wolf 1997:22-23, 85-88).

Wolf overviews the experiences of colonized peoples worldwide in important works. As Wolf overviews the experiences of colonized peoples worldwide in important works.

Eric Wolf's significant and important work *Europe and the People Without History* (1982 [1997]) was deeply influenced by Braudel, Frank and Wallerstein. Wolf shows how the growth of European capitalism impacted non-Western societies that relied on pre-capitalist modes of production, producing immense wealth in the system's center while also chaos and great suffering in colonial settings. He demonstrates how the mercantile capitalist expansion affected and undermined indigenous cultural systems throughout the world and regulated them to positions of inferiority. Wolf encourages a reexamination of the historical narratives, reminding researchers that the underclasses, downtrodden and oppressed have rarely contributed to the dominant histories of the time.

**History (1982 [1997]) was deeply influenced by Braudel, Frank and Wallerstein. Wolf**

of the Americas by White and Wolf (but see White 1991:xxvii, 95, 483; Wolf 1997:22-23). Thus, the trend-setting concept of the "shatter zone" is based on theoretical models proposed by Braudel and Wallerstein, brought to the local-level analysis of the fur trade explicitly disclosed the influence of Braudel, Wallerstein and Wolf on their conceptual models. Recent Southern scholars of ethnohistory have
and 3) Kin-ordered, the first and last of which are relevant for envisaging the Nottoway during the period of inquiry. Following Meillasoux (1960, 1972, 1973) among others (Fried 1957; Kirchhoff 1955; Sahlin 1972; Schneider 1972; Siskind 1978), Wolf argues understanding an "operational" view of kinship relations and patterns of interaction within pre-capitalist communities [e.g. residence configurations, social and marriage regulations, political or ritual commitments], provides a context and framework for kinship studies within political economy. This consideration situates kinship as a means of understanding the mobilization of pre-capitalist social labor, the ways in which people claim rights to others and thus labor shares, and the understanding of both open and bounded forms of access to kin-resources (1978:88-91). For the Nottoway, as with so many groups in the Americas, the intersection of kin-ordered modes of production with capitalism shaped the strategic and agentic relationships of community actors, internally and externally. Understanding the organization of both capitalism and kin-ordered forms of production allows for thinking about the crucial connections built up among the Europeans and other inhabitants of the globe, so we may grasp the consequences of these connections" (1977:100).

Following these perspectives, this dissertation research utilizes political economy and WST to analyze the Iroquoian-speaking Nottoway – formerly outside of the world-system – and their political, cultural and economic integration into a single global-system of trade, production and exchange. The following section outlines the major structures of the world-system.
An Overview of World-Systems Analysis

Wallerstein (2000) conceptualizes the world-system as a unit of analysis, and argues that all social science must be simultaneously historic and systemic. He focuses on the historical functioning and major institutional structures of the modern capitalist world-economy, and provides analytical descriptions of the major institutional structures of the modern capitalist world-system. His emphasis is on a single, worldwide division of labor that unifies multiple cultural systems of the world's people into a single, integrated economic system (Wallerstein 1979:5; Shannon 1989:24). As a theoretical model, it posits several main ideas concerning the structure of this world-system:

1. Over the last six centuries there has been one expanding economy, the capitalist economy.
2. An interstate system exists, whereby states continuously form and collapse through interaction of rivalry and alliance; they are constrained and affected by interaction relationships of trade and alliance; they are continuously and affected by interaction relationships of trade and alliance.
3. There is a capital-labor relation, which throughout the modernization process increases the power of core and decreases the power of peripheral areas of the globe; and

World-systems theory is a framework for understanding and explaining long-run, large-scale social change (Chase-Dunn 1984; Hopkins et al. 1982a). It emphasizes is on a single, worldwide division of labor that unifies multiple cultural systems of the world's people into a single, integrated economic system (Wallerstein 1979:5; Shannon 1989:24). As a theoretical model, it posits several main ideas concerning the structure of this world-system: long-wave historical economic patterns (sometimes called Kondratieff cycles), commodity chains, income-pooling households, and the inter-state system and its Hegemonic cycles.
The modern world-system has its origins in sixteenth-century Europe, a "long sixteenth century" [1450-1640] as Fernand Braudel defines it (2012:251-252). This was a period in which nascent nation states shifted from conquest-centered and exploitation-based economies of taxation and tribute toward structures based on trade, far-flung interdependence and an international division of labor. This economic form was unlike previous similar world-economies, such as the world-empires of China and Rome, whose wealth was accumulated at the political center by those [usually hereditary elites] who controlled the state machinery (Lewellen 1992:158; Shannon 1989:22).

Under the emerging capitalist system, economic power was held by the owners of production, rather than in the hands of state-ruling aristocracy. The state's role shifted to enforcing the social relations of production between workers and owners, providing property Rights and administering terms of exchange. The state also encouraged favorable conditions to develop economic enterprises (Wallerstein 1974:15-16, 347-348). Without political constraints on economic growth, the singular feature of this emerging world-economy was a "discontinuity between economic and political institutions" (Wallerstein 1979:37, 157-158). In this system, owners of the means of production seek to obtain the maximum price and profit for market sales, and extract as much surplus value from the results of labor as a means to accumulate capital. The surplus remained in the possession of the owners and thereby led to an economic inequality in the world-economy. No single political state has ever obtained exclusive control over the geography encompassed by the world-system.

The world-system is an historically unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization. No political center of production is unique form of political organization.
accumulated capital, control over technology, etc. (Wallerstein 1979:162).

In decisions about the nature and quantity of the production of goods, via property rights, production, or through weapons of force [as with world-empires], but through access.

The system includes both the periphery and the core. and it is routine for multiple strong states to politically destroy or seize territorial control of all the weaker states.

Historically however, there have been politically and economically dominant states, and unity from politically destroying or seizing territorial control of all the weaker states.

The system operates under two basic dichotomies. The first is class, bourgeois versus proletariat. Here, the control of the economy becomes an ever-increasing need to expand the boundaries of production. The system expands because core nations strive to protect their dominant position and resources, as the semiperipheral states seek to join the core. The periphery's struggle to improve their economic standing by attempting to engage in core-like activities and practices, and thus become more capable of competing in core-like activities and practices, and thus become an intrinsic part of the system. Each zone has characteristics integral to the overall system (Arrighi 1980).

Through complex cycles of expansion and contraction, the world-system becomes divided into economic zones of interaction: cores, peripheries, and semiperipheries.
The second dichotomy is the hierarchy of the core vs. the periphery, "in which there was an appropriation of surplus from the producers of low-wage (but high supervision), low-profit, low-capital intensive goods by the producers of high-wage (but low supervision), high-profit, high-capital intensive, so called 'unequal exchange'" (ibid). Therefore, the capitalist system involves not only the owners' appropriation of value [e.g. surplus from laborers] but also an appropriation of surplus of the whole world-economy by core areas.

In the modern world-system, multinational corporations are quickly replacing the core nation-states as the center of economic and political power. Unattached to single national economies, multinational corporations protect the interests of shareholders – global capitalists – who as a whole, have no singular affiliation or allegiance to specific national economies. National-states continue production, extraction and exchange in the global market, with only multinational corporations siphon off the capital and labor. Multinational corporations maintain the appearance of contributing to the development of national economies through job creation, increasing shareholders’ stock and localized lax economic policies. Thus dynamic masks the hegemony of the global corporations and revenues and profits. To conceptualize the system’s "broadening," or the historical world-system's core, periphery and semi-periphery, the following section overviews the characteristics of economic mechanisms of the inter-state system.

To conceptualize the system's "broadening," or the historical spread of capitalist activities into new geographic areas, the following section overviews the characteristics of economic mechanisms of the inter-state system.
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The core countries, whose capitalist owners controlled matters of production, were: Great Britain as the system's center [1815-1873], the American North as a semiperiphery and the South as a periphery of the world-economy. Below, select historical relationships among these structures are provided, and in the context of the American South, an overview of some of the system's dynamics that impacted the Nottoway people during the late sixteenth through mid-eighteenth centuries.
system, and thus, core areas were [and are] capital intensive. During the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries the cores' investments were in “agricultural capitalism,” whereby various modes of labor [wage, encomienda, slavery, “coerced” cash-crop, sharecropping, etc.] were commodified to produce agricultural goods for sale and profit. By 1640, northwestern European states secured their position as core zones in the agricultural produce [such as the colonial American South; Great Britain peaked in England and France exchanged their manufactured goods against the periphery’s labor of reallocation labor toward manufacturing. All first, core countries [such as capitalization, core areas diversified themselves of all subsistence agricultural endeavor in the leading exporter of both, 1700-1740] to purely industrial concerns. Under industrial capitalism, core areas diversified themselves from a combination of agricultural and mercantile interests. England was "the leading exporter of both, 1700-1740." In the eighteenth century, the internal structure of core Wallerstein (1974:1980:38-39). In the eighteenth century, the internal structure of core_Holland] was the hegemonic center of this world-system (Braudel 1982:175-276; Wallerstein 1974:1982:1-52.3).

By 1640, northwestern European states secured their position as core zones in the agricultural produce [such as the colonial American South; Great Britain peaked in England and France exchanged their manufactured goods against the periphery’s labor of reallocation labor toward manufacturing. All first, core countries [such as capitalization, core areas diversified themselves of all subsistence agricultural endeavor in the leading exporter of both, 1700-1740] to purely industrial concerns. Under industrial capitalism, core areas diversified themselves from a combination of agricultural and mercantile interests. England was "the leading exporter of both, 1700-1740." In the eighteenth century, the internal structure of core Wallerstein (1974:1980:38-39). In the eighteenth century, the internal structure of core_Holland] was the hegemonic center of this world-system (Braudel 1982:175-276; Wallerstein 1974:1982:1-52.3).
of profit through innovation in industry, which in turn also leads to an intensification of import of raw materials for manufacture. Cores increasingly strive to capture new sources of economic advantage within the historical world system, a key characteristic of core states included the provision of infrastructure, such as railroads and steam engines (Braudel 1982:556-588; Hopkins, et al. 1982a:62-64, 107; Wallerstein 1979:29-30; Wolf 1997:290-294).

Other characteristics of core states include the “cornering” of market profits and economic activities from competition that would otherwise depress prices and profits. William Thompson writes that in general terms, the core “consists of those states in which the agro-industrial production is the most efficient and where the complexity of economic activities and the level of capital accumulation is the greatest” (1983:12). Arrighi and Drangel (1986) argue that another traditional aspect of core countries is their ability to receive a higher rate of return from production because of their ability to protect their economic activities and the level of capital accumulation is the greatest].

Arrighi and Drangel (1986) argue that another traditional aspect of core countries is their ability to receive a higher rate of return from production because of their ability to protect economic activities and the level of capital accumulation is the greatest]. William Thompson writes that in general terms, the core “consists of those states in which the agro-industrial production is the most efficient and where the complexity of economic activities and the level of capital accumulation is the greatest”. (1983:12). The provision of infrastructure, such as railroads and steam engines (Braudel 1982:556-588; Hopkins, et al. 1982a:62-64, 107; Wallerstein 1979:29-30; Wolf 1997:290-294).

Within the historical world system, a key characteristic of core states included the provision of infrastructure, such as railroads and steam engines (Braudel 1982:556-588; Hopkins, et al. 1982a:62-64, 107; Wallerstein 1979:29-30; Wolf 1997:290-294).

During this era, the core’s competitive production emphasized cyclical away from the Hegemony as the system’s center, 1815-1873 (Hopkins, Wallerstein, et al. 1982a:62-64, 107; Wallerstein 1979:29-30; Wolf 1997:290-294).
From the beginning of the world-economy, the Nottoway and other Native communities began to incorporate external arenas in North America (Cox 1972; Dunaway 1996a:23-30; Krech 1981; Ethridge 2003:22-31). The process began with the establishment of economic relations with inhabitants of external arenas, this exchange of commodities and agricultural products. The Nottoway and other Native communities, this exchange of commodities and agricultural products, was initiated by European traders who supplied the core with raw materials, such as unprocessed minerals. This process and small profits (Arrighi and Dreze 1986). The periphery also includes those areas that historically supplied the core with raw materials, such as unprocessed minerals. These activities and labor are subject to intense competition, low commodity demand, and limited labor and little machinery. Because of low-skill requirements and raw, manual labor and little machinery, the periphery is at the other end of the world-system's economic spectrum. Originally, Eastern Europe, and then the Western Hemisphere, were peripheral areas of the system's center. Economic activities of the peripheral zones were (and are) more labor intensive and of a lower technological development, usually requiring workers from the core, the periphery is at the other end of the world-system's economic spectrum.
Incorporation has several features (Hopkins and Wallerstein 1982:126-129), which can illustrate the Nottoway’s position within the world-system during the first century of interaction. In the initial phase, a sector of the economy begins to produce goods in demand by the market. This occurred in a limited way for the Nottoway during the end of sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries [c.1540-c.1650], as European explorers investigated the resource potential of Nottoway country and the surrounding Mid-Atlantic. Figure 1 (see Rudes 2002 for early Spanish exploration of the Iroquoian-speaking Nottoway-Tuscarora region) shows the arrival of English colonists to coastal Virginia and Carolina, the search for valued commodities such as furs, pearls and Spanish goods in demand by the market. This occurred in a limited way for the Nottoway during the end of sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries [c.1540-c.1650], as European explorers investigated the resource potential of Nottoway country and the surrounding Mid-Atlantic. Figure 1 (see Rudes 2002 for early Spanish exploration of the Iroquoian-speaking Nottoway-Tuscarora region) shows the arrival of English colonists to coastal Virginia and Carolina, the search for valued commodities such as furs, pearls and
over the Nottoway more fully engaged the capitalist system [post-1650], hedging their hunting labor-exchange began in canoes, deerkins, furs and Indian slaves entered the market as in to "labor in relation to capital." Through English colonization of Virginia, the Indian

With incorporation's second feature, "workers" of the new zone are transformed within the world-economy [Figure 2]. This changed the Nottoway status from being outside to being included in the European world-system.
and trapping activities against received manufactured "trade" goods (see Binford 1967; Briceland 1987; Boyce 1978; Salley 1911). The Nottoway produced some luxury furs, such as beaver, mink and otter, but raw deerskins formed the majority of their trade (Palmer 1875:65; Traunter 1698:10). European shortages in leather fueled this exchange, as Nottoway and other indigenous peoples' trade skins supplied the raw materials for leather manufacture.

Wilma Dunaway argues Southern deerskins were important to England and the other European cores in five ways. First, this commodity exchange reinforced Euro-Indian political relations in colonial areas [peripheries]. Second, the hides provided Europe with essential raw materials for leather manufacture. Third, the deerskin trade provided Europe a valuable "peripheral outlet" for core-manufactured goods, particularly England's woolens and iron. Fourth, taxation of deerskin exports was an important revenue producer for the colonial governments, and thereby offset funding-streams needed for infrastructure development. In Virginia, this revenue was funneled to support revenue producers for the colonial governments, and thereby offset funding-streams. Fifth, deerskins helped England maintain trade balances with other areas of the world market via an elaborated chain of commodity exchange that circled the globe (1996a:33-34). Through this articulation with the commodity chains with other areas of the world market via an elaborated chain of commodity exchange that circled the globe, the College of William & Mary, Fitch's deerskins helped England maintain trade balances needed for infrastructure development. In Virginia, this revenue was funneled to support revenue producers for the colonial governments, and thereby offset funding-streams.

Wilma Dunaway argues Southern deerskins were important to England and the other European cores in five ways. First, this commodity exchange reinforced Euro-Indian political relations in colonial areas [peripheries]. Second, the deerskins provided Europe with essential raw materials for leather manufacture. Third, the deerskin trade provided Europe a valuable "peripheral outlet" for core-manufactured goods, particularly England's woolens and iron. Fourth, taxation of deerskin exports was an important revenue producer for the colonial governments, and thereby offset funding-streams. Fifth, deerskins helped England maintain trade balances with other areas of the world market via an elaborate chain of commodity exchange that circled the globe (1996a:33-34). Through this articulation with the commodity chains with other areas of the world market via an elaborate chain of commodity exchange that circled the globe, the College of William & Mary, Fitch's deerskins helped England maintain trade balances needed for infrastructure development. In Virginia, this revenue was funneled to support revenue producers for the colonial governments, and thereby offset funding-streams.

Wilma Dunaway argues Southern deerskins were important to England and the other European cores in five ways. First, this commodity exchange reinforced Euro-Indian political relations in colonial areas [peripheries]. Second, the deerskins provided Europe with essential raw materials for leather manufacture. Third, the deerskin trade provided Europe a valuable "peripheral outlet" for core-manufactured goods, particularly England's woolens and iron. Fourth, taxation of deerskin exports was an important revenue producer for the colonial governments, and thereby offset funding-streams. Fifth, deerskins helped England maintain trade balances with other areas of the world market via an elaborate chain of commodity exchange that circled the globe (1996a:33-34). Through this articulation with the commodity chains with other areas of the world market via an elaborate chain of commodity exchange that circled the globe, the College of William & Mary, Fitch's deerskins helped England maintain trade balances needed for infrastructure development. In Virginia, this revenue was funneled to support revenue producers for the colonial governments, and thereby offset funding-streams.
Figure 3. Close-up of Lederer’s Territory Traversed, 1672. The map is orientated with north to the right side of the image, with the “Powhatan fl.” or James River as the starting point of the Indian trading path. The dotted line runs southwest from Fort Henry on the “Apamatuck fl.” through Nottoway and Meherrin territory, beyond the “Rorenock” or Roanoke River, to “Toskiroro” or Tuscarora towns. The late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century deerskin trade initially transformed the Nottoway economy into a “putting out” system that destroyed the traditional subsistence activities, generated dependency on European manufactured goods and encouraged debt (see Gallay 2002; Ethridge 2003; White 1983). The Nottoway were linked to the commodity chain via the local Indian traders [Figure 3]. These speculators and entrepreneurs dealt (see Gallay 2002; Ethridge 2003; White 1983). The Nottoway were indebted to financial backers and London trading houses. Thus the control of Nottoway labor passed into the hands of European traders and merchants, as the Nottoway became caught in the web of debt and labor.
processes of incorporation: the surplus generated by the deerskin trade was not received by the Nottoway, but siphoned away by the core mercantilists. Thus, no capital remained to invest in a long-term balanced development of the Nottoway's new economic circumstance. Nottoway labor was exploited as warriors, guides, porters, translators and procurers of deerskins, with the surplus of those efforts accumulating with capitalist investment in colonial Virginia as well as Great Britain (see Dunaway 1996b: Hopkins and Wallerstein 1992:126-129; Wolfram 1997:158-194).

Incorporation models suggest labor recruitment and control involve some manner of coercion. For the Nottoway, this took the form of political alliance due to the threat of warfare, enslavement and displacement, which can best be represented at the event-level. In the Nottoway political sphere, incorporation involved the creation of institutional structures that paralleled basic administrative features of the core state [Great Britain] and her colonial managerial apparatus [the government of Virginia]. These structures were utilized to exert territorial control and to assure the unhindered extraction of economic surplus. The Euro-Indian wars of the late seventeenth century [e.g. Bacon's Rebellion, 1676-1677; Yamassee War 1715-1717] and early eighteenth century [e.g. Tuscarora War 1711-1712; Westo War 1679-1680] by the Euro-American wars of the late eighteenth century [e.g. American Revolutionary War, 1775-1783]. These wars were fought either within or adjacent to Nottoway and other Iroquoian territory.

Incorporation models suggest labor recruitment and control involve some manner of coercion. For the Nottoway, this took the form of political alliance due to the threat of warfare, enslavement and displacement, which can best be represented at the event-level. In the Nottoway political sphere, incorporation involved the creation of institutional structures that paralleled basic administrative features of the core state [Great Britain] and her colonial managerial apparatus [the government of Virginia]. These structures were utilized to exert territorial control and to assure the unhindered extraction of economic surplus. The event-level diplomacy and bureaucracy of the colonial period illustrate this aspect of Nottoway territorial and community incorporation as part of the colonial period.
Table 1: Event-level evidence of Nottoway territorial and community incorporation within the periphery of the world-system, over a 100 hundred-year period from 1634 [external arena] to 1734 [incorporated zone].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>English interpreter for the Nottoway dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Colonial Truce agreed for Nottoway land management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Special reserved Nottoway lands opened for sale to planters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Nottoway Parish formed for West of the Blackwater River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Brunswick County organized west of Nottoway Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>New London formed west of Nottoway Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Treaty with Virginia at the conclusion of the Tecumseh War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Gazetteer published by colonial Planters at Nottoway Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Indian Land surveyed by colonial government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Boundary the Removed Predicting English Settlement west of the Blackwater River (Nottoway territory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Royal Charter for the College of William &amp; Mary offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Isle of Wight County assented marks for Nottoway Pines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Nottoway signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation; 2nd 1677/1680, 1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Colonial census of Nottoway warranted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>City where founded south of the James River on the Nottoway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
summarize the process of incorporation: 

Hopkins and Wallerstein suggest that in general, it takes approximately fifty to seventy-five years for an external territory to be incorporated within the world-economy. As North American regions transitioned from an external zone to domestic, the formation of colonial legal jurisdictions within the English bounds enclosed the Nottoway Indian Towns within the English legal system, while the Anglican Church adjusted its parish boundaries to provide service for the growing British settlements. Just as the Anglican Church administered the Nottoway territory, the formation of colonial legal jurisdictions in Nottoway territory (e.g., the first gristmill built on the Nottoway River, 1711; Surry 1652; Isle of Wight 1637), the conclusion of treaties and subservient position to the English Crown (1677/1713) and the bureaucratic oversight and managerial role of the colonial government (1720/1734), the next phase of incorporation would be the further articulation of Nottoway resources with the world-system and the transformation of local structures in ways that are sometimes called "peripheralization." "It is a period of constituting a definite break in the area's history, a period of extensive, basic structural changes, most apparent in two of the interwoven fundamental relational networks: the compounding and shaping by its processes of production and that comprising and shaping by its processes of governance or rule (1982:128-129).

The Nottoway territory's process of incorporation as part of the periphery may thus be defined by three initial periods of concentrated trade relations (post 1650), the conclusion of treaties and subservient position to the English Crown (1677/1713) and the bureaucratic oversight and managerial role of the colonial government (1720/1734). The next phase of integration would be the further articulation of Nottoway resources with the world-system and the transformation of local structures in ways that are sometimes called "peripheralization" or the "deepening of capitalist development" (Wallerstein 1989:130)."
1) Establishing political control over the indigenous population and their territory
2) Securing American markets for British commodities [Figures 5 and 6]
Figure 5. Cartouche detail from Homann’s *Virginia Marylandia et Carolina in America Septentrionali*, 1715. The image depicts English trade in mercantile products, represented by the trunk of manufactured goods, textiles and barrels of rum. Stylized Native peoples offer the skins and flesh of wild game. Great Britain’s royal coat of arms overlooks the commercial scene.

Figure 6. Cartouche detail from *A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia* by Joshua Fry and Peter Jefferson, 1751. The wharf scene portrays Virginia merchants, ship captains and planters negotiating over tobacco exports, surrounded by enslaved Africans, hogsheads of tobacco, and maritime vessels. The cartouche illustrates the shift in raw material exports from the Native deerskin trade to cash crops, emphasizing the deepening of Virginia’s capitalist activities within the periphery of the world-system.
network of production (see Dunaway 1996a:23-50). At the end of the eighteenth
As Virginia’s mercantile capitalist structures deepened, agricultural produce such
lost political and economic autonomy and, becoming dependent upon the worldwide
into a subservient position; the Nottoway, along with all Native peoples in the Americas,
supplies away from the periphery for the benefit of the expanding core. Once locked
represent a typical core-periphery relationship of “unequal exchange,” that drained
The Nottoway territory’s incorporation into the periphery of the world-system

The further development of capitalist structures within the Nottoway colony (Braudel
were combined into an emerging “planation” system. These characteristics were part of
enclosed and divided among “smallholders,” and through land tenure, other large tracts
further explores the alterations of the Nottoway territory, as private property was
permitted the sale and ownership of Nottoway land within the marketplace. Chapter III
rights to European planters [Englishmen, Scotsmen, French Huguenots, etc.]; the transfer
their indigenous territory could be achieved through the survey and extension of property
organization. With the Nottoway confined to a discrete tract of land, the remainder of
effectively subjected the landscape to its own rules, completely reshaping its
production. After Nottoway territory was colonized, mercantile capitalism took over and
then, once new frontiers were incorporated, through hither and yon, and agricultural
articulated with global networks; first through the Indian trade, fur and deerskin trade and
traditional lands, as the land itself served the market and its natural resources became
[Figure 6]. This shift can be linked to the dispossession of Native peoples from their
as tobacco, cotton and wheat replaced earlier Native commodities as prime exports
As Virginia’s mercantile capitalist structures deepened, agricultural produce such
in the 18th century, the American South was peripheral to the world-system. By the mid-19th century, large parts of the world were not part of this division of labor, but remained external to it and hence subject to the system's expansion and their consequent peripheralization. One may thus speak of states being in the core or in the periphery toward the end of the 19th century. Wallerstein (1980:107-108) argues that peripheral processes are constantly relocated in the course of the world-system's development, so that the processes of production and accumulation of capital that define capitalism as an historical system. The core and periphery are constantly redefined in the context of the world-system, and the fundamental division of labor that bounds the world-economy and drives its development. Wallerstein (1991c:172) argues that the processes of production are redefined in the course of the world-system's development, with the core-periphery relationship central to its operation. Since then, peripheral theorists have continued to make similar points, and West Africa, for example, has played an important role as a peripheral region in the world-system. The American Southwest and Pacific Coast, the Caribbean, and the South American countries, most of which were peripheral to the world-system at the beginning of the century, have moved from an external arena into the periphery of the world-economy. The American Southwest and Pacific Coast, the Caribbean, South America, most of Eastern Europe and Russia, and portions of India, Indonesia, the Middle East and North Africa, represent similar peripheral components of the era (Wallerstein, 1980:129-175, 1989:129-189).
The Semiperiphery: Historical World-System: The Semiperiphery

Thus, the state political machinery of a semiperiphery strives to control the internal and
profit margins by capturing larger portions of its "home market" for its "home products." Is often in the interest of semiperipheries to reduce external trade in order to increase
the core and in other directions with the periphery in contrast to an core of periphery. If
comprehensively looks at seeks economic advantage in both directions in one mode with
profit margins, wage levels and kinds of exports are all on a continuum. As this zone
innovative industry is somewhere in between the core and peripheries. Thus, the development of capital-
styles and some more comparable to peripheries. Thus, the development of capital-
form an intermediary economic category: some activities similar to those of the core
between the two extreme zones of core / periphery interaction, semiperipheries.

The Semiperiphery:

Noteworthy analogy, the orthodox view of the periphery is accepted, but with recognition
information exchange and prestige-good networks (1996:14-17). For purposes of the
exploring core / periphery relations are not always exploitative,
colleague Thomas D. Hall suggested core / periphery relations are not always exploitative,
exploring core / periphery relations (Chase-Dunn and Mann 1998:14-15). He and
and important instances of reversal (diminishing zone) are key areas for
zone [and important instances of reversal (diminishing zone) are key areas for
core / periphery hierarchy]. Chase-Dunn identified movement (the upward stairs change of a
divided into two analytically separate aspects: core / periphery "differentiation" and core
Through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000), the development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000). The development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000). The development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000). The development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000). The development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000). The development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000). The development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000). The development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000). The development of Northern Europe, as with other industrial-era semi-peripheries, the North increased its power through a rapid manufacturing strategy (see Wallerstein 2000).
industry contrasted the strong agrarian South, but both remained consumers of the products and luxury goods of Europe. Hence, the mixed nature of the roles and characteristics of states in the semiperiphery zone; the new United States was actually divided during the Antebellum as a periphery [the South] and a semiperiphery [the North], and South's and North's structural changes to the South's political economy.

At times, the meta-level relationship between the American North as a semiperiphery and the South as a periphery took on the core-periphery characteristic of uneven exchange. The "cotton lords" of the North purchased, imported and processed the South's raw agricultural produce, turned profits on textile production and competed with England's manufactory (Wallace 2005:16-22; 117-122, 118-119); At other intervals, both zones competed for Great Britain's market attention in imports, exports and the development of industry. Ultimately, the North's attempts to break loose from its semiperiphery role of exploiting [the South] and exploited [by Great Britain], resulted in the snapping the economic umbilical cord of the South to Great Britain. The South's use of state structures to advance and defend its labor and production interests had the consequence of the American Civil War (Wallerstein 1979:222-224; and see 2011:182-183). This meta-zone struggle had great impact on the antebellum Nottoway as agrarian settlers and producers within the system's periphery. The Nottoway, as all people in North America, were deeply affected by the catalyzing war between the North and South, and its corollary structural changes to the South's political economy.

Through the latter half of the eighteenth century, the effects of peripheralization deepened capitalist structures within the Nottoway community. Indian Town's changing relationship to land, labor and capital accumulation would continue to undermine deepened capitalist structures within the Nottoway community. Indian Town's changing relationship to land, labor and capital accumulation would continue to undermine deepened capitalist structures within the Nottoway community.

Through the latter half of the eighteenth century, the effects of peripheralization deepened capitalist structures within the Nottoway community. Indian Town's changing relationship to land, labor and capital accumulation would continue to undermine deepened capitalist structures within the Nottoway community.
traditional" modes of production, transform kin-ordered community organization and shape conceptions of Nottoway peoplehood. The following discussion outlines select features of this developing antebellum economy, and overviews two kinds of "mini-structures" which operated in and around Southampton's Nottoway Indian Town.

During the late colonial period and early Republic era, Virginia was the dominant Southern commercial agricultural exporter to Western Europe. Southern tobacco constituted half of all commodity exports from mainland British colonies and remained the dominant export through the American Revolution. Alongside Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia exported deerskins, rice, indigo and naval stores in commercial exchange for workshops.

Pl commonly refer to these "mini-structures" as plantations and households, which operated in and around Southampton's Nottoway Indian Town. Features of this developing antebellum economy and overviews two kinds of "mini-structures", which are referred to as "plantations" and "households". The following discussion outlines outlines the role of production, transformation, community organization, and production, transformation, community organization, and production, transformation, community organization.
The historical process of creating the plantation system in Virginia, and the 


plantation owners in the Western Hemisphere (Wallerstein 1980: Nash 2006:134-161; Phillips 1987/1982). Once exported, African slaves were sold at high profit to mostly European-descended and other trade goods to sell to West African Kingdoms in turn for captured slaves.

In the triangle Atlantic exchange, European traders sold southern African textiles, rum, guns, enslaved labor and a steady supply of land and slaves to increase profit and productivity to increase
corresponding increase labor requirements, were contributing factors to the transformation

Thus, the American plantation system relied on the extreme exploitation of

production (Wallerstein 1987). Wallerstein defines the "plantation system" of the property as 

exchanging raw materials and producing agricultural goods for export to the core states

extracting raw materials and producing agricultural goods for export to the core states

exchanging raw materials and producing agricultural goods for export to the core states.

Phillips 1987) defines the "plantation system" as a property system that grouped relatively large areas of land together with enslaved labor and a steady supply of land and slaves to increase production. Such forms of social organization were low-cost, in that low real wages compensated for the costs of supervision and lack of skill of the work force. They also minimized interruptions of production.
export to the core, thereby shifting the profits to the producer and the entrepreneur who controlled the total quantity of production, responding (however imperfectly) to the world market. In particular, if further expansion were called for, it was relatively easy to involve a larger area, as there tended to be land surplus (Wallerstein 1979:123-124).

Nottoway "surplus" land entered the market with regularity during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with European-origin owners developing those lands into agricultural-producing tracts. By the nineteenth century, Nottoway labor intensified within the plantation system, and in some cases, Nottoway households replaced agricultural-producing tenants. By the mid-nineteenth century, Nottoway labor-intensive agricultural centers, with European-origin owners developing those lands into cotton-growing communities, were called for. Indeed, a landlord could control the total quantity of production, thereby increasing the surplus value and shifting it to the landlord.
Economically dependent on Europe for export destinations and import consumption, the turn of the nineteenth century South [and thus Southampton, Virginia] remained a periphery to the world-system, even as the Northern United States improved its economic standing. Through mobilizing financiers and shipping agents, the North's merchants acted as buffers to the Southern agriculturalists' engagement with the old "mother country" of Great Britain, whereby Northern merchants took on roles that assisted their region's movement into the semiperiphery of the world-economy. As Christopher Chase-Dunn observes:

"Most typically, the peripheries' industrial-style plantation system specialized in small-scale marketing and transport. The Southern peripheral economy was constructed around slave-based plantations, but also alongside smallholding farms producing one or just a few commodities for export. The Southern peripheral economy has not benefited from the expansion of regional banks or the extension of regional banking systems. But there were exceptions to this pattern, such as the port cities of the South." (Chase-Dunn 1980:100-101)

The axial division of labor prevailed, and the support activities of marketing, transporting and marketing the produce for export, was constructed around slave-based plantations, but also alongside smallholding farms producing one or just a few commodities for export. The Southern peripheral economy has not benefited from the expansion of regional banks or the extension of regional banking systems. But there were exceptions to this pattern, such as the port cities of the South. Therefore, as with the core / periphery hierarchy, it should be noted that Southern merchants, like their Northern counterparts, were deeply involved in the mobilization of capital and the development of new market opportunities. As Chase-Dunn observes, the Southern peripheral economy was constructed around slave-based plantations, but also alongside smallholding farms producing one or just a few commodities for export.
be understood there was a bourgeois versus proletarian dynamic to Virginia’s plantation system. In the Nottoway’s Southampton County, antebellum market crops diversified significantly as the plantation system expanded in development. In contrast to the Commonwealth’s traditional staples of tobacco and wheat, Southampton dominated the market output in swine, peas and cotton in the decades prior to the Civil War. "Half of all cotton produced by Virginia in the 1850s was Southampton-grown. Economic historian Daniel Crofts confirms the unusual productivity of Southampton."
Nottoway land, capital, labor and households assisted the development of Virginia’s antebellum plantation structures and contributed to the deepening of the capitalist economy within Southampton. Chapters III and V examine Nottoway interaction with adjacent plantation owners and the syphoning of Nottoway resources to further develop Southampton plantation structures. Nottoway use of hired and enslaved labor and the replication of plantation structures at Nottoway Town is examined in Chapters IV and VI.

In summary, the antebellum American South was a peripheral plantation-based export-oriented economy. Southampton plantations, were organized around the unique production of staple agricultural products for sale on the world market. The inability to transform production of staple agricultural products for sale on the world market into local capital formation, during the period of incorporation, Nottoway resources [e.g. land, capital and labor] were extracted from Indian Town’s control toward owners, hire and intensive human labor. As during the period of incorporation, Nottoway resources [e.g. slaves] and the form of production they required are central to the hierarchical and hierarchical form of labor relations on the plantation derived from its centralist and hierarchical form of capital.

In summary, the antebellum American South was a peripheral plantation-based economy. Nottoway Town is examined in Chapters IV and VI.
Households and Labor Organization

**Figure 8.** Iroquoian communities and homes: a single 1711 Tuscarora Neuse River dwelling, a Meherrin settlement 1737 on the Chowan River, Indian Woods Tuscarora Reservation Town on the Roanoke River, 1770; Nottoway Indian Town allotments around uterine farmsteads.

Sources: Burgerbibliothek: Mül. 466:1; Collet Map, 1770; Mosely Map, 1737; Lydia Bozeman, Commissioner’s Report, Jan. 1871.

In former pre-capitalist times, the Nottoway community was the unit of social reproduction. Members’ motivations and methods of pooling resources were also in relation to capital (Hopkins and Wallerstein 1982:126). Fundamental to this shift, political bonds, they were no longer framed solely by a kinship construction buttressed by labor. Whether consanguine, symbiotic or socio-economic, incorporation of Nottoway territory within the capitalist world-economy transformed the symbolic or historical deformed kinship (Wolf 1997:19). The Nottoway community was "locked up" or "embedded" within the particular relations between people. As with all groups in a kin-ordered mode of production, the social labor of the community also defined its residence configuration (see Brinton 1967; Boyce 1978), one that was matrcentric and organized around matrilineal kin groups (Figure 8). The historical subsistence pattern of the Nottoway community. Symphonic connectedness was expressed through forms of political, economic, and ritual relations. The mobility of social labor and to define consanguinity and affinity, within the Nottoway community was the unit of social reproduction. Kinship around the political and economic bonds needed to regulate these relations. Whether consanguine, symbolic or socio-economic bonds, they were no longer framed solely by a kinship construction buttressed by labor.
altered. At the meta-level, shifts in residential and social configuration were connected to the processes by which the Nottoway community became dominated by larger historical forces, penetrated and wrought by the expanding capitalist economy (see Krech 1984; and also Albers 1993; Bateman 1991; Langdon 1986; Roark-Calneck 1996).

Hans-Dieter Evers et al. (1984) identify the destructive processes for kin-ordered modes of production to be an interrelated set of mechanisms:

- Interventions of the colonial state;
- The internal monetization of traditional social relations;
- An increasing dependency on industrial products substituting traditional self-produced goods;
- The destruction of the ecological equilibrium;
- The development of new needs;
- The disintegration of the domestic economy, social obligations and traditional forms of reciprocal and collective labor (also see Elwert and Wong 1980).

These mechanisms do not always operate at the same time or in the same way, owing to the differing and specific characteristics of distinct incorporated communities. Some of the shifts identified above are related to the processes of incorporation, or are crosscut by other dimensions of capitalist growth, such as peripheralization (Hopkins and Wallerstein 1982) and processes by which the Nottoway community became dominated by larger historical forces, penetrated and wrought by the expanding capitalist economy (see Krech 1984; Albers 1993; Bateman 1991; Langdon 1986; Roark-Calneck 1996).

Kathleen Gough agrees the primary cause of "modern" kinship change to be the gradual incorporation of the society in a unitary market system, which brings about the disruption of traditional social relations and the disintegration of the ecological equilibrium. This leads to the modification of kin labor organization, kin inheritance or succession and residential configurations. These are important inquiries for a community transformation as they form the basic building blocks of human organization and reproduction.

Hans-Dieter Evers et al. (1984) identify the destructive processes for kin-ordered modes of production to be an interrelated set of mechanisms:

- The destruction of the ecological equilibrium;
- The development of new needs;
- The internal monetization of traditional social relations;
- An increasing dependency on industrial products substituting traditional self-produced goods;
- The disintegration of the domestic economy, social obligations and traditional forms of reciprocal and collective labor (also see Elwert and Wong 1980).

Hans-Dieter Evers et al. (1984) identify the destructive processes for kin-ordered modes of production to be an interrelated set of mechanisms:

- The destruction of the ecological equilibrium;
- The development of new needs;
- The internal monetization of traditional social relations;
- An increasing dependency on industrial products substituting traditional self-produced goods;
- The disintegration of the domestic economy, social obligations and traditional forms of reciprocal and collective labor (also see Elwert and Wong 1980).
ultimately as a consequence of labor change and residence-shift (1974:640). The emergence of modified forms of relatedness and domestic configurations are thus interrelated to the political economy in which they function: a set of structures neither isolated from the overarching system nor small units of idiosyncratic social organization, but rather, basic units of the emerging world-system. World-systems theorists identify this unit as the "household" (Smith, Wallerstein and Evers 1984) and define it as the "social unit that effectively over long periods of time enables individuals... to pool income coming from various sources in order to ensure their individual and collective reproduction and well-being... the household is thus a central object of empirical research" (Wallerstein and Smith 1992a:13). Therefore, an analysis of change in residential organization can be linked to other institutional structures within a historical system (Wallerstein 1984:17), such as the political economy of plantations and cash-crop production and ever-rising social unit efficiency over long periods of time enable individuals... to pool income coming from various sources in order to ensure their individual and collective reproduction and well-being... the household is thus a central object of empirical research (Wallerstein 1992a:13).
Hence, the Nottoway of 1730 and 1808 evidence dwellings of different sizes and constituents, some indication of change in residency and composition—but not necessarily configuration—and a shift in community economic provisioning. For the Nottoway, there is more historical documentary material than can be synthesized for the present project, an ironic positive outcome from the rise of Virginia bureaucracy. For the Nottoway, colonial era can thus be a productive strategy for tracking community change over time. The Nottoway can be seen as a modern phenomenon, that is, part of the internal structure of the world-system rather than a response to the system (Smith et al. 1984:7). Whether there is a correlation to the “household” of the world-system and the deeper past and correlates of an earlier period when the effects of capitalism were shallower. Studying Indian Town households of the colonial and post-indenture periods is establishing a baseline comparison of an earlier period when the effects of incorporation are examined. One challenge in studying households whose zones have undergone transformation elsewhere is that households were underwriting historical transformation processes that occurred of 1775, 1808 or 1830 were undergoing historical transformation processes that occurred of 1775, 1808 or 1830. Similarly, the Nottoway households they are part of a larger set of institutions that constitute the operational structures of a given historical system and are fundamentally unique to that system and that institutional structure of a given historical system is a base in analogy. He suggests that “institutional households” is that conception rather than the use of such terms. Wallerstein and Evans (1984), Wallerstein argues that conception, the use of “such terms” matter of debate (Alexander 1999a, 1999b, Smith, 1999a, Small, and Tannenbaum 1999). Smith, and Tannenbaum 1999; Smith, a syntax and the residual conceptualizations / deeper reproduction of the deeper past is a residual structure of the world-system rather than an adaptive response to the system. The Nottoway households can be seen as a modern phenomenon, that is, part of the necessary configuration—and a shift in community economic provisioning. Hence, the Nottoway of 1730 and 1808 evidence dwellings of different sizes and
compared against accepted scholarly understandings of Iroquoian structures compiled elsewhere (Binford 1967, 1974; Dawdy 1994; Fenton 1978; Foster, Campisi and Mithun 1984; Hewitt MS 3598 1896-1916; Hoffman 1959; Hutchinson 2002; Landy 1978; Landy 1990; Law 1984; Mithun 1976; Mudar et al. 1998; Rudes 1976, 1981, 1999; Rudes and Crouse 1987; Smith 1971; Smith and Waliser 1992; Smith and Waliser 1992; Smith and Waliser 1992; Smith and Wallerstein 1992; Snow 2007a, 2007b; Trigger 1990). These writings form a lens through which to analyze the articulation of Nottoway kin-groups with the deepening processes in Southampton. The historical development of Nottoway "households" was one component of the system's growth. Nottoway kin-groups with the decapitalizing processes in Southampton. The historical development of Nottoway "households" was one component of the system's growth.
Historical development of Nottoway household structures can be linked to their flexibility of the modern era. As with other households in the world-system (Figures 9 and 10), the Creek log cabin, Georgia, 1791, illustrating Muscogee hunters reclining and smoking while a woman works a cornfield in the background; Choctaw settlement, near Chefuncte, Louisiana, 1869, depicting women cooperating in food preparation, weaving mats and dying cane for baskets. In the foreground domestic animals surround the cloth-clad matrilines while in the background, men recline and drink. These comparative images demonstrate a progressive erosion of social roles and modified labor practices while retaining traditional sexual divisions of labor following incorporation into the periphery.

When tracking change, it is important to consider function. When a "household..."
stratification itself is flexible, accommodating the boundaries of peoplehood economy are structured in terms of peoplehood and gender. However, the system’s contribute to household maintenance. Third, the households’ forms of participation in the members are always partially wage-labourers, meaning that other forms of subsistence production has been predicated on “partial” labour requirements — that is, household attachment to territorial land, as well as a pressure to diminish [but never entirely there is a steady pressure to break the link between household organization and an households have remained fluid, which reflect characteristics of Nottoway Town. First, households’ forms of participation in the economy are stratified, in terms of peoplehood and gender. However, the system’s

Wallerstein (1991:109) suggests there are three ways in which the boundaries of peoplehood"
Indian Town was an agregate of matrilineal household farms, clustered in groups of
matrilineal Nottoway residences. The nineteenth-century documentary record indicates
The matrilineage, as a corporate group, presents some challenges for evaluating
in the division of surplus and labor (Bhumpire 1991).

Wong 1984) A transgressive kinship, social solidarity, and community ethos can play a factor
directed his or her time between houses (Angell 1984: Small and Lamontagne 1999;
forms of networking and resource sharing are complex, such as domestic service that
coreidence groups cannot be universally equated with household units, as historical
kinship, but the role of some other form of religiosity [e.g. a feudal contract] as well,
by the new forms of households [e.g. income pooling], may not have been the work of
This, in contrast to the previous Nottoway social reproduction, the functions satisfied
kinship was not always a component of household organization (Smith et al. 1984:9).
context of Nottoway integration into the world system, much within this system,
These relationships organize and structurally developed within the historical

(Teilerstein 2005:110) Asymmetry, polarity and unevenness lie at the heart of the
same time as allow the laborers to make economically within themselves socially and politically
inequities enable the system’s accumulations to manipulate the labor force at the
"intermediate" enable the system’s accumulations to manipulate the labor force at the
conflicts of stratification but one moderated by "progressive" ideology. These conflicts of
co-residence, a wage labor system but within a part of an governmental, ethnic / gender
The above aspects all hinge on retention: a break from inequality but a place for
ideology and equally rhetoric [e.g. "modern" men as nurses, women as doctors]
utero-sib-sets. In the modern analysis of households, Friedman (1984:51) indicates "that the debates over the distinctiveness between 'household' and 'family' has not yet been conclusively resolved," but that each is a component of the base-level organization of labor and the mechanism by which income is pooled within the capitalist world-economy. Woodford-Berger (1981:26) summarizes the efforts to refine family/household conceptions as "attempts to describe where the people are who somehow form a cohesive group, as well as vaguely how we are to place or spread out these people and resources within these groups and communities..." The separation of the household from territorial obligations in favor of household mobility, a more active participation in the accumulation of capital and the creation of de facto, non-kinship-based households, has led to the collapse of kinship and co-residence as the bases for pooling resources and defining community boundaries. The separation of households from kin networks that cross-cut affinal and consanguineal ties and incorporate fictive kin (e.g. Fixico 2000; Lobo 2002; Stack 1975; Weibel-Orlando 1999) produces a set of changing relationships within Nottoway households during the Reservation Allotment Period, c.1824-1878. The Nottoway households of the nineteenth century are viewed as a set of changing relationships that participate in the accumulation of capital and the creation of de facto, non-kinship-based households, as with many communities, either kin-connected households and community residence or analis dedicated to the nature of these relationships can be seen through the lens of household conceptions. Therefore, a component of the Nottoway research focuses on the "households" of Indian Town during the Reservation Allotment Period, c.1824-1878. The Nottoway Indian Town, as with many communities embedded in a colonized periphery, incorporated existing kinship patterns and networks that cross-cut affinal and consanguineal ties and owed their identity and cohesion to kinship obligations. To rally people and marshal resources will often draw on extended family networks that cross-cut affinal and consanguineal ties and define community boundaries within households and kinship-based households. The transformation of household conceptions as "attempts to describe where the people are who somehow form a cohesive group, as well as vaguely how we are to place these people and resources within these groups and communities..." the separation of the household from territorial obligations in favor of household mobility, a more active participation in the accumulation of capital and the creation of debt associated with credit encourages households to respond proportionately by increasing reliance on wage-earned income (e.g. Fixico 2000; Lobo 2002; Stack 1975; Weibel-Orlando 1999). For the Nottoway, as with many communities, the specific specifics of these transformations and the restructuring of Nottoway socio-economic relations can be examined at the local level through an analysis of their kin-connected households and community residence.
1) Continually impose mutual obligations based on relatedness, subsistence and reproduction.

2) Include co-residences and non-kin in that reciprocity.

3) Have a structure for internal decision-making.

4) Occupy one or more interrelated or conjoined physical dwellings.

The plantation and household are two mini-structures of the capitalist world-system. They operate within the hierarchy of the interstate-system, and in some respects, reflect the axial division of labor. The production structure for Southampton cash crops and the subsistence units of laborers are also interrelated to the organization: the production and reproduction of people. "Producing the People" of the world-economy is itself an historical process built on the asymmetry of relations and the role of peoplehood. In their analysis, pastness is a central element in how individuals are socialized, group solidarity is established and challenged; social legitimacy are persuaded to act. In their analysis, pastness is a central element in how individuals are persuaded to act. In their analysis, pastness is a central element in how individuals are persuaded to act.
social construction of community? Was there division and reconciliation associated with Southhampton? To what extent did non-Nottoway definitions of Indian-Town residents impact the economic standing in the slave-based political economy of neighboring African- and European-descended peoples? In what ways did Nottoway individuals' social position relate to their as Iroquoians, and thus culturally different from neighboring African- and European-come from? Of "our kind of people" (Field notes 2006-2011) was peoplehood framed solely by consanguinity and affinity, a sense of shared community "pansess," "where we conceivings of Nottoway people"? Was Nottoway relatedness of "our people" modified in ways did these alignments and configurations impact Indian-Town's Increasingly slave-based Southampton society. Nottoway were without a majilin, but created social status as free peoples in a Nottoway were compounded by incest prohibitions within a few generations. A nascent maternal community caused cultural conflict. Imbalanced sex ratios and unequal sib-set followed as the result of uneven clanship sizes, non-Iroquoian female spouses in a disintegrated, Iroquoian removal depressed community numbers and internal exchange soon eroded; their relationship to labor and capital changed, the community's economic, social obligations and traditional forms of reciprocal and collective labor system. As their relationship to labor and capital changed, the community's domestic relations during the decades following their territory's incorporation into the world-Questions emerge about the ways in which Nottoway people conceptualized their Nottoway or "our kind of people" (Field notes 2006-2011) was peoplehood framed solely by consanguinity and affinity, a sense of shared community "pansess," "where we conceivings of Nottoway people"? Was Nottoway relatedness of "our people" modified in what ways did these alignments and configurations impact Indian-Town's In what ways did these alignments and configurations impact Indian-Town's In what ways did these alignments and configurations impact Indian-Town's
Some of the answers to these questions are ones of social identity and groupness, a belonging to a people through an orienting sense of shared socio-political, biological and cultural past. These understandings are however, historically particular and intensely subjective, inconsistent and situational in character. The key characteristic to the construction of peoplehood is indeed, a shared experience – "a pastness" – one that is preeminently, "a moral phenomenon, therefore a political phenomenon, always a contemporary phenomenon. That is of course why it is so inconsistent. Since the real world is constantly changing, the content of pastness necessarily constantly changes." (Wallerstein 1991a:78)

Wallerstein questions why three modal terms have developed in the modern world-system, when one term [peoplehood] would have served. He argues the answer to this query lay in the historical and basic structural features of the capitalist world-system, which one term [peoplehood] would have served. He argues the answer to Wallerstein and Balibar (1991) suggest that it makes little difference whether the past is defined in terms of races ["genetically continuous groups"], nations ["historical communities"] or ethnic groups ["cultural groups"] – all ambiguous identities – because they are all "peoplehood constructs, all inventions of pastness, all contempornary political groups" or ethnic groups ["cultural groups"] – all ambiguous identities – defined in terms of races ["genetically continuous groups"], nations ["historical communities"] and experiences.

The acceptance or rejection of these understandings? Some of the answers to these questions are ones of social identity and groupness, a belonging to a people through an orienting sense of shared socio-political, biological and cultural past.
The last modality [ethnicity] is an important consideration for Nottoway household structures, as child socialization of the work force within the boundaries of a given state (Wallerstein, 1991). Among other communities, the enculturation of young people begins within the domicile: modeling the normative behaviors of the adults and children within the same household structures. Individuals are taught to relate to the state, whether to be "upward" oriented or to accept one's "place" in society; taught how to be submissive or rebellious to the state apparatus. Human enculturation is broad and ever changing, but rather it is perceived as "inertial", and "external", not influenced by "external" structures, but ethically or racially in common conception is not influenced by "external" structures. Moreover, one's ethnicity or race, in common conception, is not influenced by "external" structures, but rather by the household structure and the ways in which household members relate to the type of household structure. The consequences of which with regard to peoplehood phenomena, are that wherever there are wage-workers in different kinds of household overall economy (Wallerstein, 1991). The consequences of which with regard to peoplehood phenomena, are that wherever there are wage-workers in different kinds of household structures (and the ways in which household members relate to the type of household structure) on which there is a strong correlation between "ethnicity, Wallerstein and Smith argue that there is a strong correlation between "ethnicity, Wallerstein and Smith 1992a:19-20).
With the emergence of structures of inequality, "ethnicity becomes the dominant medium through which the social order is...interpreted and navigated." As well, cultural dissimilarities can "rationalize" the political economy's structures of inequality. However, because the social position is rationalized as socio-cultural difference, identities between individuals within the system perceive the hierarchy as navigable (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992:59-65). To affect upward mobility, modifications of identity and cultural affiliation inevitably lead to internal stratification within ethnic groups (Blakey 1988; Comaroff 1992:59-65). To affect upward mobility, modifications of identity and cultural affiliation inevitably lead to internal stratification within ethnic groups (Blakey 1988; Comaroff 1992:59-65).
economic issues of inequality and inequality related to class (and see Shirkland and Sherry).

A key concept of Southhampton is that racial ambiguities and single-gendered have masked socio-economic differences in economic contexts (see Comaroff and Comaroff 1992:59, 67). A key characteristic of experience-based reality, but other structural factors contribute significantly to social divisions and a sense of historical social division and stratification in America. This "priority" may be seen as the dominant mechanism proposed by Audrey Smedley (1966:219) argues for a "priority of race over class" as the dominant mechanism for understanding the formation of peoplehood. Audrey Smedley (1966:219) argues for a "priority of race over class" as the dominant mechanism for understanding the formation of peoplehood.

The above examples are congruent with the theorizing of Wallerstein and Balibar (1991) and also John and Jean Comaroff (1992:49-67), who consider ethnicity and other forms of peoplehood to be produced by the asymmetrical incorporation of dissimilar forms of peoplehood into a single economic system. In a contrasting study of peoplehood, Audrey Smedley (1966:219) argues for a "priority of race over class" as the dominant mechanism for understanding the formation of peoplehood. Audrey Smedley (1966:219) argues for a "priority of race over class" as the dominant mechanism for understanding the formation of peoplehood. Audrey Smedley (1966:219) argues for a "priority of race over class" as the dominant mechanism for understanding the formation of peoplehood.

Community's political economy:

With regard to the relationship between class and race, Wallerstein (1991a:80) reminds researchers that the axial division of labor within the world-economy has
generated a spatial division as well, one that historically took a political form – European-centered capitalism. As the economy expanded and production processes of the interstate system became more geographically disparate, "racial categories began to crystalize around certain labels…coded as falling into three, five or fifteen reified groupings we call 'races'…as the polarization increased, the number of categories became fewer and fewer. Race, and therefore racism, is the expression, the promoter and the consequence of the geographical concentrations with the axial division of labor…nation derives from the political structuring of the world-system." Classes correlate heavily with peoplehood constructions, but imperfectly. The imprecise nature of race, nation and ethnicity obscures inequality, in part because a high proportion of "class-based political activity" has taken the form of "people-based" action. Classes, however, are a different construct from peoplehood. Class is an objective category, a statement about the contradictions within the historical capitalist world-system, not a description of a social community (Ollman 1993; Wallerstein 1991a:84; Weber 1922:631-640).

Agency: Resistance and Criticisms

People-based activity conjures the image of protest or a social movement or...
imperialist nationalist struggle" or a "separatist movement" is in fact a mode of expressing class interest or that of a "nation class" within the system's axial division of labor. The system's internal contradictions, however, prevent a complete class-based unity and repress inter-class conflict. Indeed, if class conflict were the major labor. The system's internal contradictions, however, prevent a complete class-based expression of class interest or that of a "nation class" within the system's axial division of imperialist nationalist struggle or a "separatist movement" is in fact a mode of

Researchers disagree on the role of agency and autonomy within the world-system (Hall 1979:96-97; Wallerstein and Smith 1992a:20-21). Would not long survive in its present form? (Chabal 1983:167; Sider 1986:3-11; Wallerstein 1979:185-186). The whole issue of who is autonomous is a non-issue. The system produces actors, both households and actors, and households filled with actors, "as autonomous or as little autonomous as the "state," the firm, the class, the household have.

Whether material or ideological domains influence the system's structure would not long survive in its present form? (Chabal 1983:167; Sider 1986:3-11; Wallerstein 1979:185-186). The whole issue of who is autonomous is a non-issue. The system produces actors, both households and actors, and households filled with actors, "as autonomous or as little autonomous as the "state," the firm, the class, the household have.

Whether material or ideological domains influence the system's structure would not long survive in its present form? (Chabal 1983:167; Sider 1986:3-11; Wallerstein 1979:185-186). The whole issue of who is autonomous is a non-issue. The system produces actors, both households and actors, and households filled with actors, "as autonomous or as little autonomous as the "state," the firm, the class, the household have.

Whether material or ideological domains influence the system's structure would not long survive in its present form? (Chabal 1983:167; Sider 1986:3-11; Wallerstein 1979:185-186). The whole issue of who is autonomous is a non-issue. The system produces actors, both households and actors, and households filled with actors, "as autonomous or as little autonomous as the "state," the firm, the class, the household have.
Thus, the major criticisms of WST involve not just the lack of provision for individual agency, but also a denial of periphery agency [e.g. resistance] against core domination (Nash 1981:398; Sahlins 2000:416-420; Schortman and Urban 1994:402; Stein 1999:155; and see Wolf 1997:23).

As reflective of the wider intellectual divide, Marshall Sahlins’s criticisms can be used to demonstrate the critique of WST. Sahlins (1988) criticizes Wallerstein and Wolf’s theoretical approach concerning the issue of autonomy and the lack of agency individuals and cultural groups retain after their engagement with capitalism. Sahlins sees this anthropology as akin to “manifest destiny” or a predetermined outcome. The function of their material circumstances is to shape the people’s conceptions and social action. While on the other hand, Sahlins argues that “people’s active historic role, which must mean the way they shape the material circumstances of their own experience, is logically and ontologically more inclusive: their own system of the world, the World System is something that is logically and ontologically more inclusive: their own system of the world, the World System is not a physics of proportionate relationships between economic ‘impacts’ and cultural ‘reactions’. The specific effects of the global material forces depend on the various ways they are mediated in the local cultural schemes” (2000:416-417, brackets added).

Yet Sahlins argues capitalism “has loosed on the world enormous forces of production, coercion, and destruction…they cannot be resisted, the relations and goods of life are part of the larger system; like on meaningful places in local schemes of things.” He encourages an examination of indigenous peoples’ lives. “Sahlins argues capitalism’s ‘loss’ loosed on the world enormous forces of production, coercion, and destruction…” (2000:416-417).

Wolf’s theoretical approach concerning the issue of autonomy and the lack of agency individuals and cultural groups retain after their engagement with capitalism needs to demonstrate the critique of WST. Sahlins (1988) criticizes Wolf’s conception of the world-system divide. As reflective of the wider intellectual divide, Marshall Sahlins’s criticisms can be seen (see Wolf 1997:23).

Thus, the major criticisms of WST involve not just the lack of provision for individual agency, but also a denial of periphery agency’s role in challenging core domination.
Peripheries are arguably the best areas to study local actors, such as the Nottoway, and how their actions influenced the process of incorporation and peripheralization, and to what degree they controlled, shaped and resisted the encroaching world-system (Hall 1999:10; and see Dunaway 1994, 1996a, 1996b; Harris 1990; Kardulias 1990; Meyer 1990, 1991, 1994). Thus, under political economy, WST has the flexibility to examine the contradictions and resistances of local peoples; the ways in which they accommodated and organized against the system, and how they interpreted events in their own cultural terms. WST may consider the role of individuals and allow them to develop their relations to capitalism through their own cosmological conceptions – act on desires and personal agendas. Sahlins (2000:274) remarks that each people have a culturally relative way – but it does little to provide effective resistance against incorporation. The counter-response to Sahlins may be that which is undoubtable true in a culturally relative way – that people can do, even as individuals, what is possible – as mandates, as resistance, as identity and symbolism – in the external world. Thus, under political economy, WST has the flexibility to examine the contradictions and resistances of local peoples; the ways in which they accommodated and organized against the system, and how they interpreted events in their own cultural terms. WST may consider the role of individuals and allow them to develop their relations to capitalism through their own cosmological conceptions – act on desires and personal agendas. Sahlins (2000:274) remarks that each people have a culturally relative way – but it does little to provide effective resistance against incorporation. The counter-response to Sahlins may be that which is undoubtable true in a culturally relative way – that people can do, even as individuals, what is possible – as mandates, as resistance, as identity and symbolism – in the external world.
refashioning and culture change go forward continually under variable, but also highly determinate, circumstances. These may further creativity or inhibit it, prompt resistance or dissipate it. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples, in their particular varied circumstances, shape, adapt, or jettison their cultural understandings – or, alternatively, find themselves blocked in doing so. It remains to be discovered why and how some cohorts of people adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not” (1997:xiii).

Wolf shares Frank’s theoretical perspective and suggests the former approach is counterintuitive, “Sahlins holds that such [incorporating] systems maintain themselves precisely through reconstruction and accommodation; the structure itself is said to be generated by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…[thus] the reproduction of a structure [becomes] the maintenance itself by changing…” (1997:xi-xii; 1999:62-63).

Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not. Wolf’s approach is thus relevant for considering Nottoway peoplehood, community, social formation, and culture itself. Only empirical inquiry can tell us how different peoples adapt cultural understandings to capitalism and prosper as a result of doing so, while others do not.
larger context. In reading the general critique, there does not appear to be a disagreement concerning capitalism's expansion, nor the imposition of material relations between disparate groups, but rather how the specifics of that encounter shaped and continues to shape the local in culturally and historically particular ways.

This dissertation examines Nottoway agency and their community's collective and individual resistance [and accommodation] to their integration into the world-system. Tribal leaders' culturally constructed responses to colonialism and individuals' active participation in the capitalist economy are explored. Borrowing from Wallerstein, Balibar and Wolf, an argument is made for kinship and peoplehood as modalities the Nottoway employed [and modified] to resist the imposition of the world-system, and were ultimately, the frames through which they negotiated their new political economy.

Kinship and Peoplehood

In a 2011 two-part article published in the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, Marshall Sahlins encourages re-examining kinship's role in the structuring and reproduction of Indian town. If one accepts households, plantations, and peoplehood as encoun-terments in relation to examining kinship's role in the structuring and reproduction of Indian town, what is kinship all about? (1968, 1972, 1977, 1980). In some forty years ago: "What is kinship all about?" In considering the peoplehood of the nineteenth-century Nottoway, Sahlins's

In this dissertation examines Nottoway agency and their community's collective and individual resistance [and accommodation] to colonialism and individuals' active participation in the capitalist economy are explored. Borrowing from Wallerstein, Balibar and Wolf, it is argued that culturally constructed responses to colonialism and individuals' active and individual resistance [and accommodation] to their integration into the world-system, and tribe leaders' culturally constructed responses to colonialism and individuals' active participation in the capitalist economy are explored. Borrowing from Wallerstein, Balibar and Wolf, an argument is made for kinship and peoplehood as modalities the Nottoway employed [and modified] to resist the imposition of the world-system, and were ultimately, the frames through which they negotiated their new political economy.

This dissertation examines Nottoway agency and their community's collective and individual resistance [and accommodation] to colonialism and individuals' active participation in the capitalist economy are explored. Borrowing from Wallerstein, Balibar and Wolf, it is argued that culturally constructed responses to colonialism and individuals' active participation in the capitalist economy are explored. Borrowing from Wallerstein, Balibar and Wolf, an argument is made for kinship and peoplehood as modalities the Nottoway employed [and modified] to resist the imposition of the world-system, and were ultimately, the frames through which they negotiated their new political economy.
capitalist development impact the structure of family, marriage and social networks, and provide a translation can inform the previous discussion of peoplehood and agency, and provide a framework, in this instance to engage Sahlins's presentation of "what kinship is," as his approach in Notaway
Schwöctzer, 2000; Syasch, 2009; Before further outlining the approach to Notaway
Bamford and Leach, 2009; Carss, 2000; Jamison, 2000; Cow, 1991;
and as an empirical exercise, but as ideas supported by ethnographic observations (see Sahlins, 2014), stays true to this latter course, offering his view of "what kinship is," not
primarily in the realm of "symbols, gender, power, and difference" (Collier and Rosaldo
and long post-Schneiderian kinship conversation, which relegated kinship studies
Although influenced by symbolisms, this perspective is a departure from the approach
Following Wolf (1997:91), this approach is an operational view of kinship.
become clear, as do the community's mid-stage transformations. economic and community legal actions, the pattern of Notaway Iroquoian structures
forms, combined with a documentary investigation of residential configurations, household
Iroquoian matricentered / matrilineal frames versus enmeshed patricentered / bilateral
hand, one may decode the documentary evidence through a comparative analysis of the embedded cultural meanings of Notaway residences. Next, with this framework in
structure and function of the Notaway's Iroquoian kinship-system, and to some degree, the questions posed above may be answered through first examining the
capitalist development impact the structure of family, marriage and social networks, and
Sahlins (2011a:2) describes a kinship system as a "manifold of intersubjective participations...who are co-present in each other, whose lives are joined and interdependent." He draws on the phrase "mutuality of being" to describe kinship by social construction as well as by procreation, "persons...who participate intrinsically in each other's existence." Drawing on the writings of Roger Bastide (1973), McKim Marriott (1976) and Marilyn斯特拉瑟恩 (1988), Sahlins explores the "dividual person" — a sense of "personhood" — that coexists both as "divisible" and also "'not distinct' in the sense that aspects of the self are variously distributed among others, as are others in one's social construction as well as by procreation," persons...who participate intrinsically in each other's existence. Drawing on the writings of Roger Basilie (1973), McKim Marriott (1976) and Marilyn斯特拉瑟恩 (1988), Sahlins explores the "dividual person" — a "manifold of intersubjective participations...who are co-present in each other, whose lives are joined and interdependent." He draws on the phrase "mutuality of being" to describe kinship by social construction as well as by procreation."
as a product of modernity or the outgrowth of capitalism's expansion, Sahlins's interpretations of ethnographic and ethnohistorical kinship examples need contextualization in time and space. One could suggest his translation of the "common descent, kinship and personhood" of the historic or pre-modern Maori may also be explicated as the "common descent, kinship and peoplehood" of the Nottoway. If individual cultural constructions of attachment and belonging are interwoven with the same mental templates of descent groups, kindred and those deemed with "mutuality" but not partibility, then one wonders what hermeneutical construct would argue against personhood's ontological "groupness" as a "peoplehood" phenomena?

For purposes here, it is not possible to combine Sahlins's perspective on "what kinship is" and Balibar's production of "people," but as William Roseberry (1989:33) reminds us, that is not the exercise. Rather, it is the recognition of similar concerns in anthropology's understanding of questions concerning agency, historical identities of race, nation and other historical forms of peoplehood are accepted, as is the Wallerstein and Balibar's (1961) ambiguous cultural context.

Therefore, for the present research, Wallerstein and Balibar's production of a "peoplehood" phenomena that not partibility? then one wonders what hermeneutical construct would argue against examples of descent groups, kindred and those deemed with "mutuality" ([dividuality](?)) constructions of attachment and belonging are interwoven with the same mental here, the common descent, kinship and peoplehood of the Nottoway, of the Maori, or for purposes of descent, kinship and peoplehood of the historic or pre-modern Maori may also be explicated as the common descent, kinship and peoplehood of the "common interculturalization in time and space. One could suggest his translation of the "common interpretations of ethnohistoric and ethnohistorical kinship examples need a product of modernity or the outgrowth of capitalism's expansion, Sahlins's...
Through this line of thinking, there is a juncture between existentialism, kinship, pastness, peoplehood and the historical system in which they operate. It is worthwhile to consider the bonding of people, the social construction of community and "what kinship is," as Schneider and so many after him explored and debated (e.g. Appadurai 1986; Geertz and Geertz 1978; Hannerz 1986; Needham 1971; Ortner 1984; Yengoyan 1986). For the Nottoway inquiry, it is also relevant to consider community and "what kinship is" as Schneider, and so many after him explored and debated (see Kronenfeld 2006; Read 2007). As Peter Schneider indicates, "The perspective pays attention to the agentic dimension of individual strategies, without ignoring their social or symbolic definitions of kinsmen and affines" (1999:79). This perspective pays attention to what Wolf suggests, "What is done unlocks social labor; how it is done through kinship is thus, reinforced by what is done through kinship. The entailment of what kinship is, this, reinforced by, what is done through kinship." What kinship does or how it functions in relation to social construction of community as Wolf outlines an operational perspective of kinship in order to see kinship in the context of political economy. The approach to Nottoway kinship thus involves:

a. symbolic constructs ("filiation / marriage; consanguinity / affinity") that continually place actors, born and recruited, into social relations with one another; these social relations order in variable ways to call on the share of social labor carried by each, in order to effect the necessary transformation of nature [resources] (Wolf 1997:1).
Chapter II provides new research on the Nottoway's kin-ordered social organization. It outlines the structure and function of the Nottoway's kinship and community language.

The following chapter outlines the Nottoway's relationship to the neighboring Tuscarora and Meherrin, as well as select aspects of the Nottoway-Tuscarora interaction. The investigation is supplemented by kinship terms and semantics from Tuscarora linguistics (Williams 1976; Rudes 1987, 1999, 2002; Rudes and Course 1987). The Tuscarora kinship (Crane 1819; Barbara 1917; Hale 1883; Hewitt MS 3598; Morgan 1961; Binford 1967; Boyce 1978) and Tuscarora-Tuscarora comparative linguistics (Hewitt MS 3844, MS 3603; Hoffman 1959; Mithun 1984). The investigation is based on kinship and linguistics. Previous analyses have been ethnological and archaeological (Binford 1967; Boyce 1978; Mithun et al. 1999; Rountree 1998; Smithe 1984), not has there been a synthesis of Nottoway historical social organization. There has been no previous evaluation of the extinct Nottoway kinship.

The primary goal is to structurally organize and examine selected functions of the Nottoway kinship. While some indigenous meanings are illustrated, following Schweitzer and Wolf, the period of their incorporation and peripheralization into the capitalist world-system, their relationship to Tuscarora and the community's socio-political organization during their relationship to Tuscarora and the community's socio-political organization during
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CHAPTER II

Nottoway Kinship, Language and Socio-political Organization

“Among the Iroquoian tribes kinship is traced through the blood of the woman only. And kinship means membership, and membership constitutes citizenship in the tribe, conferring certain social, political and religious privileges, duties and rights…”

~ J.N.B. Hewitt MS 3598 NAA

This chapter examines the historical characteristics of the Nottoway community’s Iroquoian language, matrilineal kinship system and socio-political organization. An understanding of Indian Town’s leadership roles and matricentric family structure allows for a more critical analysis of the community’s engagement with Southampton’s political economy. Cross-cultural comparatives and mechanisms for Nottoway decision-making are presented, especially with regard to civil action and population shift during periods of Nottoway-Tuscarora removal. The Iroquoian matrilineage and clan are examined in order to demonstrate the role of crosscutting social institutions for Nottoway marriage and leadership positions and the operational framework from which related sub-lineages initiated political action.

The Nottoway are compared to their neighbors, the Tuscarora, in order to demonstrate a parallel socio-political organization, kinship system and linguistic affiliation. Following previous researchers (Boyce 1973; Hewitt MS 3844; Mithun 1984; Rudes 2000, 2002b), the Nottoway-Tuscarora are analyzed as closely-related Iroquoian peoples, who shared almost identical cultural and political structures before segments of people, who shared almost identical cultural and political structures before segments of
documents from the colonial period suggest the Virginia-Carolina Iroquoians shared all 1998; Phelps and Heath 1998; Smith 1984: Wared and Davis 1999;22-428). Historical Virginia-Carolina interior coastal plain (Heath 2003; Hutchison 2002;17-47; Muder et Nottoway, Meherrin, and Tuscarora were culturally related Iroquoian groups in the Nottoway, Meherrin, and Tuscarora were culturally related Iroquoian groups of the The archaeological record of the Late Woodland [A.D. 800-1650] indicates the

The Matrilineal Society

marriage practices and descent system still

reservation's allocation and considers the impact of Iroquoian removal on the Nottoway's a discussion of the Nottoway community's demographic viability on the eve of their Nottoway would navigate Southampton's political economy. The chapter concludes with Nottoway would increasingly become the modaliy through which the of them as a people – would increasingly become the modaliy through which the community members' conceptions of themselves as a people – and outsiders' perceptions Nottoway Town became incorporated within the periphery of the world-system, Nottoway Town as a form of peopleship, the people of (x) as a localized Iroquoian identity – as one form of peopleship, the people of (x) as indigenous lands. The "Indian Town" is examined as an organizing principal for Nottoway Town was eventually the last remaining Iroquoian policy in control of and early nineteenth-century Virginia-Carolina Iroquoia Indian Towns, as Southampton's

This chapter also considers the Nottoway in a regional context of the eighteenth-

Nottoway that remained.

groups that removed northward, in search of parallel structures with the Nottoway- explorers historical, ethnohistoric and ethnological materials related to the coalescent both groups removed to New York and Canada from Virginia-Carolina. The inquiry
similar language, material culture and socio-political organization, despite not always being politically allied (Binford 1967; Boyce 1978, 1987; Dawdy 1994; Feeley 2007:320-331; Rudes 1981a).

North Carolina’s surveyor general traveled among the Iroquoians during the early eighteenth century and provided an account of their communities. John Lawson was familiar with the Nottoway, Meherrin and Tuscarora, as well as the many Algonquian- and Siouan-speaking peoples of the region. A passage from his New Voyage to Carolina (1709:185) indicates matrilineal organization Iroquoian families, provided the mechanism for inheritance and was an underlying principle of Iroquoian social structure:

"...so I have heard several Children: if they part, and another Man possess her, all the Children happen, that two Indians have lived together, as Man and Wife, in which time they are united as well, for the Child comes always full to the Woman's Loins, for if often happens that the Child comes later, he, the Woman, always nourishes all the Savages of America, that I was ever (1709:185)."

Nineteenth-century writers confirmed Tuscarora kin groups were matrilineally organized, though specific information on Meherrin descent is limited (Dawdy 1994:57). Unlike the Tuscarora, the nineteenth-century Nottoway were matrilineal (LP Dec. 13, 1823). Nineteenth-century writers confirm Tuscarora kin groups were matrilineally organized, provided the mechanism for inheritance and was an underlying principle of Iroquoian social structure:

"...so I have heard several Children: if they part, and another Man possess her, all the Children happen, that two Indians have lived together, as Man and Wife, in which time they are united as well, for the Child comes always full to the Woman's Loins, for if often happens that the Child comes later, he, the Woman, always nourishes all the Savages of America, that I was ever (1709:185)."
The family was traced through the descent of the female only and was joined in kinship to other families of close lineage in the matriline. These relationships were central to the organization of late Reservation Period [c.1775-1824] Nottoway Town and defined group membership, influenced residence patterns and conjoined kindred in political and legal action.

During the nineteenth century, Tuscarora ethnologist J.N.B. Hewitt described the smallest unit of Iroquoian kinship and society as the "fireside," or nuclear family. The extended matrilineal family was termed the "ohwachira" (MS 3598 1896-1916). As will be demonstrated below, the limited Nottoway data conform to the Tuscarora terminology, both in linguistics and kin relationships. Combined with the substantial amount of documentary descriptions of matrilineal Nottoway descent (e.g. LP Dec. 13, 1823), the evidence supports a reasonable hypothesis that the Nottoway's linguistic terminology, kinship roles and descent system mirrored that of Tuscarora.

Nottoway-Tuscarora Language and Kinship Terminology

The extant nineteenth-century Nottoway kinship terminology resembles other Northern Iroquoian matrilineal systems and specifically, the terms closely follow Tuscarora linguistic and kin descriptions. Combined with the substantial amount of documentary data, the evidence supports a reasonable hypothesis that the Nottoway's linguistic terminology, kinship roles and descent system mirrored that of Tuscarora.

In 1820, William & Mary professor John Wood collected a partial Nottoway word list, followed by supplements given to Southampton official James Trezvant c.1830. Albert Gallatin published both lists in 1836 (Mithun 2001:420; Crawford 1975:18). Additional linguistic evidence comes from the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Tuscarora living on reservations near Maysville, Kentucky, and in the higher Susquehannock region of Pennsylvania. Tuscarora ethnologists have recorded the "ohwachira" (MS 3598 1896-1916) as the "fireside" or nuclear family. The extended matrilineal family was termed the "ohwachira" (MS 3598 1896-1916). As will be demonstrated below, the limited Nottoway data conform to the Tuscarora terminology, both in linguistics and kin relationships. Combined with the substantial amount of documentary data, the evidence supports a reasonable hypothesis that the Nottoway's linguistic terminology, kinship roles and descent system mirrored that of Tuscarora.
Linguistically, the Nottoway and Tuscarora are more closely related to each other than any other branch of Iroquois (Hewitt MS 3844; Hoffman 1959; Julian 2010) and represent a fission away from other Northern Iroquoians about 2000-1500 years ago (Foster 1987; Lounsbury 1978: 1984; Julian 1984). Based on an inventory of less than 250 items, Nottoway shares the greatest number of cognates with Tuscarora (138), nearly twice as many than the nearest related languages (Onondaga, 75 and Mohawk, 70). Nottoway-Tuscarora belong dialects of "polar extremes" rather than separate languages (Blair Rudes, pers. comm., 2006; Feeley 2007:130, 324; contra Rudes 1981a:44-45).

Within Northern Iroquoian (Julian 2010:155-156; Rudes 1981a) Nottoway-Tuscarora supports the theory of Proto-Nottoway-Tuscarora [PNT] as a linguistic subgrouping. The lexical similarity, in conjunction with a significant number of shared sound changes, twice as many than the nearest related languages (Onondaga, 75 and Mohawk, 70), strongly suggests that Nottoway shares the greatest number of cognates with Tuscarora (138), nearly 20% of the total vocabulary. Nottoway-Tuscarora represent a fusion away from other Northern Iroquoians about 2000-1500 years ago and are more closely related to each other than any other branch of Iroquois (Heewi Wi 3844; Hewitt MS 3844; Speck Papers’ APS; Wallace 2012).
differences existed among the Tuscarora. Some variances were observable into the late 1880s [Rudes 1983-1884 MS 372-b], but some interference had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013).

Kinship terms (1871) with those from the time of Hewitt (cf. Rudes and Crouse 1987) document post-removal differences between New York and Carolina dialects. Gatschet noted in the 1880s, the southern Tuscarora "spoke a dialect considerably different from the north [New York]; that after Northern [immigration] Tuskarora had changed, not theirs; only one delegate could understand them" (Gatschet 1883-1884 MS 372-b). Different complained over several centuries (Daryl Baldwin, pers. com., 2008; see Rudes 2002 for a discussion on Tuscarora). It is clear from an evaluation of Morgan's Tuscarora materials collected over several centuries (Boyece 1978:28-289; Landy 1978:518-524) that language change had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013; Anthony Wallace, pers. com., 2013).

Five Nations Iroquois cannot be ruled out for later-period Tuscarora linguistic shifts, but documentary evidence points toward continuity from Virginia-Carolina rather than adaptation and interference from the other five nations. Gatschet noted in the 1880s, the southern Tuscarora "spoke a dialect considerably different from the north [New York]; that after Northern [immigration] Tuskarora had changed, not theirs; only one delegate could understand them" (Gatschet 1883-1884 MS 372-b). Different complained over several centuries (Daryl Baldwin, pers. com., 2008; see Rudes 2002 for a discussion on Tuscarora). It is clear from an evaluation of Morgan's Tuscarora materials collected over several centuries (Boyece 1978:28-289; Landy 1978:518-524) that language change had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013; Anthony Wallace, pers. com., 2013).

The perceived phonological and vocabulary shifts in Tuscarora prompted Gatschet to document post-removal differences between New York and Carolina dialects. Gatschet noted in the 1880s, the southern Tuscarora "spoke a dialect considerably different from the north [New York]; that after Northern [immigration] Tuskarora had changed, not theirs; only one delegate could understand them" (Gatschet 1883-1884 MS 372-b). Different complained over several centuries (Daryl Baldwin, pers. com., 2008; see Rudes 2002 for a discussion on Tuscarora). It is clear from an evaluation of Morgan's Tuscarora materials collected over several centuries (Boyece 1978:28-289; Landy 1978:518-524) that language change had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013; Anthony Wallace, pers. com., 2013).

A perceived phonological and vocabulary shift in Tuscarora prompted Gatschet to document post-removal differences between New York and Carolina dialects. Gatschet noted in the 1880s, the southern Tuscarora "spoke a dialect considerably different from the north [New York]; that after Northern [immigration] Tuskarora had changed, not theirs; only one delegate could understand them" (Gatschet 1883-1884 MS 372-b). Different complained over several centuries (Daryl Baldwin, pers. com., 2008; see Rudes 2002 for a discussion on Tuscarora). It is clear from an evaluation of Morgan's Tuscarora materials collected over several centuries (Boyece 1978:28-289; Landy 1978:518-524) that language change had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013; Anthony Wallace, pers. com., 2013).

The perceived phonological and vocabulary shifts in Tuscarora prompted Gatschet to document post-removal differences between New York and Carolina dialects. Gatschet noted in the 1880s, the southern Tuscarora "spoke a dialect considerably different from the north [New York]; that after Northern [immigration] Tuskarora had changed, not theirs; only one delegate could understand them" (Gatschet 1883-1884 MS 372-b). Different complained over several centuries (Daryl Baldwin, pers. com., 2008; see Rudes 2002 for a discussion on Tuscarora). It is clear from an evaluation of Morgan's Tuscarora materials collected over several centuries (Boyece 1978:28-289; Landy 1978:518-524) that language change had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013; Anthony Wallace, pers. com., 2013).

The perceived phonological and vocabulary shifts in Tuscarora prompted Gatschet to document post-removal differences between New York and Carolina dialects. Gatschet noted in the 1880s, the southern Tuscarora "spoke a dialect considerably different from the north [New York]; that after Northern [immigration] Tuskarora had changed, not theirs; only one delegate could understand them" (Gatschet 1883-1884 MS 372-b). Different complained over several centuries (Daryl Baldwin, pers. com., 2008; see Rudes 2002 for a discussion on Tuscarora). It is clear from an evaluation of Morgan's Tuscarora materials collected over several centuries (Boyece 1978:28-289; Landy 1978:518-524) that language change had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013; Anthony Wallace, pers. com., 2013).

The perceived phonological and vocabulary shifts in Tuscarora prompted Gatschet to document post-removal differences between New York and Carolina dialects. Gatschet noted in the 1880s, the southern Tuscarora "spoke a dialect considerably different from the north [New York]; that after Northern [immigration] Tuskarora had changed, not theirs; only one delegate could understand them" (Gatschet 1883-1884 MS 372-b). Different complained over several centuries (Daryl Baldwin, pers. com., 2008; see Rudes 2002 for a discussion on Tuscarora). It is clear from an evaluation of Morgan's Tuscarora materials collected over several centuries (Boyece 1978:28-289; Landy 1978:518-524) that language change had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013; Anthony Wallace, pers. com., 2013).

The perceived phonological and vocabulary shifts in Tuscarora prompted Gatschet to document post-removal differences between New York and Carolina dialects. Gatschet noted in the 1880s, the southern Tuscarora "spoke a dialect considerably different from the north [New York]; that after Northern [immigration] Tuskarora had changed, not theirs; only one delegate could understand them" (Gatschet 1883-1884 MS 372-b). Different complained over several centuries (Daryl Baldwin, pers. com., 2008; see Rudes 2002 for a discussion on Tuscarora). It is clear from an evaluation of Morgan's Tuscarora materials collected over several centuries (Boyece 1978:28-289; Landy 1978:518-524) that language change had taken place (Marianne Mithun, pers. com., 2013; Anthony Wallace, pers. com., 2013).
The Tuscarora terms are fully bifurcated, whereas some other Iroquoian groups' terms
are only partially bifurcated. The kinship system shown in Figure 11 demonstrates bifurcation.

Figure 11. Iroquois kinship diagram: Ego's matrilineal relations are shaded blue, affinal and collateral relations green [not all abbreviations provided]. The Iroquoian Nottoway-Tuscarora kinship system is bifurcated merging with a balanced terminology, but an imbalanced descent.

Sources: Morgan 1871; Myers 2006; Eggan 1972.
systems, where parallel cousins are identified by terms for B and Z, Morgan

Bifurcate merging is a system that groups father [F] and father's brother [FB], and mother [M] and mother's sister [MZ], but the mother's brother [MB] and father's sister [FZ] are distinguished by separate terms of address (Lowie 1968:45-46; Schusky 1965:73). In Table 2, the Tuscarora term for FB is a diminutive of F and the term for MZ is a diminutive of M. The Tuscarora also recognize a sex and generational dimension to kinship, modifying some terms of address by male or female speaker and then the second-or-higher ascending generations, the first ascending generation, the first descending generation and the second-or-lower descending generations (Lounsbury 1968). The linguistic kinship data in Table 2 suggest a generational dimension to the Nottoway terminological scheme as well.

Unfortunately, a more complete kin-termin set for the Nottoway cannot be constructed. However, given the similarities in language and conservatism several points can be made, as the material in Table 2 is notable for what it contains and what it does not contain. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway can be bifurcated. Unfortunately, the Tuscarora utilized specific terms for older and younger siblings. This is not rare. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway terms for FB and MZ can be made, as the material in Table 2 is notable for what it contains and what it does not contain. Given the similarities in language and conservatism several points can be made. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway can be bifurcated. Unfortunately, the Tuscarora utilized specific terms for older and younger siblings. This is not rare. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway terms for FB and MZ can be made, as the material in Table 2 is notable for what it contains and what it does not contain. Given the similarities in language and conservatism several points can be made. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway can be bifurcated. Unfortunately, the Tuscarora utilized specific terms for older and younger siblings. This is not rare. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway terms for FB and MZ can be made, as the material in Table 2 is notable for what it contains and what it does not contain. Given the similarities in language and conservatism several points can be made. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway can be bifurcated. Unfortunately, the Tuscarora utilized specific terms for older and younger siblings. This is not rare. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway terms for FB and MZ can be made, as the material in Table 2 is notable for what it contains and what it does not contain. Given the similarities in language and conservatism several points can be made. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generationally, indicating that Nottoway can be bifurcated. Unfortunately, the Tuscarora utilized specific terms for older and younger siblings. This is not rare. The Nottoway term for sister [Z] is marked generational...
Table 2. Comparison of Nottoway and Tuscarora kinship terms collected in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Terms are gender neutral, which is feminine in Nottoway-Tuscarora, unless otherwise noted. Sources: Hewitt MS 3844, MS 3603; Rudes 1999; Rudes and Crouse 1987; Wallace 2012; brackets added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nottoway Term</th>
<th>Tuscarora Term</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The same clan, maternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sister</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same clan, maternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cousin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same clan, maternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The same clan, maternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>His cross cousin, maternal, MB/FS child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottoway cousin, [cross] cousin, MB/FS child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aunt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottoway cousin, [cross] cousin, MB/FS child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Niece/nephew</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel male cousin / parallel female cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grandmother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottoway cousin, [cross] cousin, MB/FS child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grandfather</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottoway cousin, [cross] cousin, MB/FS child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grandchild</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottoway cousin, [cross] cousin, MB/FS child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The absence of Nottoway cousin terms may reflect the kinship of Indian Town at the time of collection [1820], a period after the last Nottoway-Tuscarora removal [1803]. During this time, there were no Nottoway-Nottoway marriages, meaning few, if any, cross-cousin relations existed. The two remaining extended Nottoway kin groups were not intermarried c.1820, as all adults had non-Nottoway spouses. Thus, the cross-cousin terminology used to identify Nottoway children of MB or FS were not in regular use, as the children of these unions were without lineage or clan.

Blair Rudes identifies the modern Tuscarora cousin kinship term root /-araʔ/ as a more recent or contemporary influence from other Northern Iroquoian languages (pers. comm., 2006). Hewitt records an "archaic" Tuscarora form for "cousin" ruráʔθeʔ or /-araθeθ/ although it only appears in one sample (Knudse 1999:47). Wallace confirms the modern shift in Tuscarora cousin terminology at Niagara: adopting Northern /s/ for /θ/ which is not uncommon, but noteworthy (Knudse 1999:xx), and also a shift toward the American kinship conception of "cousin" for the children of MZ and FP during the twentieth century. Wallace posits in-marriage of non-Iroquoians as the source of this change (Wallace 2012:167-169).
Possessive terms (Rudes 1981a:38-39). With this disclosure, it becomes clear that Wood's Nottoway informants referentially identified kinship terms. The terms for F and M are first person and may have been framed as a question of paternity / maternity of the speaker. The lack of FF, FM, MF, MM, MB and FS suggests Wood's elderly informants had no relatives of these categories living or an absence of inquiry. The presence of the age distinction of the Z term in the first person likely indicates one of the speakers made reference to an older female sibling in the community. Wood's speakers were Edith "Edy" Turner (age 66), Littleton Scholar (age 63+), and an unidentified individual. The exact genealogical relationship to the speaker is confused beyond the "same clan, i.e. mother's side of the family" (1999:100). Everywhere, Rudes discusses the modern diminutive within kinship terms. "To denote certain distinctions", but the clarity of these distinctions with the Nottoway term for "son" was recorded as *wakatonta* from the Iroquoian stem /–aʔnęʔ/ "to have as one's child" (Rudes 1999:99-100). Rudes identifies this stem as a maternal relation, whereas the "archaic" /–aráθeʔ/ is cross (1999:47-48). Therefore the Nottoway term for daughter [D], niece and nephew are reflected within the stem of the Nottoway diminutive. The exact generalization is confused beyond the "same clan, i.e. mother's side of the family" (1999:100). Rudes identifies this stem as a diminutive /#áh/, reflected in the secondary Tuscaror noun /kaʔnęʔáh/. The exact genealogical relationship to the speaker is confused beyond the "same clan, i.e. mother's side of the family" (1999:100). Elsewhere, Rudes discusses the modern diminutive's use with kinship terms "to denote certain distinctions", but the clarity of those distinctions with descending-generation terminology has faded over time (Evans 2000:127-130; Mithun [Williams] 1976:222, 232-233; Rudes and Crouse 1987:56-57, 222).
The Nottoway word recorded for D is not a kinship term, but instead a noun root for "self" or "oneself." The word also includes the diminutive /#áh/ and likely reflects /-ę ruh-/ [i.e. "raw ruháh" "he is alone""] (Rudes 1999:165). While limited, the Nottoway data conform to the Tuscarora terminology, both in linguistics and kin relationships. Combined with documentary descriptions of multi-generational households, kinship terms and relationships assist in understanding the association of household members. The significance of the foregoing section is that it frames the internal operations of kinship terminology, both in literal and metaphorical terms. The hypothesis that the Nottoway’s descent system, kinship roles and linguistic terms bear witness to their descent during the immersion-centric allotment process, the evidence supports the assertion that the Nottoway kinship terminology, both in Tuscarora kinship and relational terms, conforms to the Tuscarora system. Combined with documentary descriptions of multi-generational households and kinship terms, the Nottoway data refine the Tuscarora terminology, both in literal and metaphorical terms. The deferential status to senior siblings, matriarchs and aunts is also recognized in the Nottoway documentary record. The Nottoway word recorded for D is not a kinship term, but instead a noun root for "self" or "oneself."
A preference for matrilinear residences [in spite of emerging male-centered labor] are also linked to the kinship system. Lastly, understanding the generational aspect of the Nottoway vernacular allows for an explanation of later nineteenth century kinship preferences for matrilinear residences (in spite of emerging male-centered labor). Chapter IV explores or kinship systems residing within a shared residential compound. Chapter IV explores / kinship systems residing within a shared residential compound. Chapter IV explores the physical manifestation of this social configuration at Nottoway Town, so that only a begins of the nineteenth century. It manifested itself in multi-generational housing and Tuscarora removal and thus hypothetically in-place at Nottoway Town near the Tuscarora removal (Field notes 2006, 2011). The kinship to other fires of close lineage in the matriline (Hevitt MS 3998 1896-1916). The metaphor is Northern, but a similar construction was likely present before Nottoway-Tuscarora ethnology, the concept of the Nottoway family as a "fire" is Iroquoian kinship and society as the "fireside" or nuclear family. Given the correlations Iroquoian kinship and society as the "fireside" or nuclear family. Given the correlations Toyohiso: Nottoway-Tuscarora Families (Field notes 2006, 2011).
Figure 12. Nottoway matrilineal organization, c.1800-1860. The figure illustrates five generations of Nottoway Town residences, based on the segmentation of one matrilineage or ohwachira. Each female matrilineal descendant has the potential to form a new "fire" or family unit of the ohwachira. Males are members of the ohwachira but through exogamy form families outside the lineage membership.

The Nottoway domicile grouping includes an adult woman (as a wife and mother), her siblings, her mother and father's siblings, the woman's children, and her daughter's children, and the descendants of the preceding women in the matriline (Figure 12). The eldest living woman is considered the matriarch and "presides over the household of fact and legal fiction" (Fenton 1978:309). This lineage traces their descent from a common ancestress and forms an extended exogamic matrilineal family, recorded as an auteur "fire" in Nottoway and as an ohwachira "extended family" in Tuscarora (compare Tuscarora kčęhěh "my family," uhwačíreh "extended family" and uhwačíreh "fire"). It is the Iroquoian "uterine" or "maternal family." Hypothetically, the group might also occupy multiple dwellings in a common ancestor's domicile group.

Source: C1830-1880, Field notes 2011.
several settlements, which in the distant past eventually led to the formation of clan segments (Hewitt and Fenton 1944:82; Goldenweiser 1914:467).

On the eve of the reservation’s allotment, two main matrilineal leaders, Turner and Woodson, remained at Indian Town. In the north, Iroquoian matrilineages are not named (Myers 2006:144-149; Wallace 2012:158), but have a set of names associated with the clan. This may or may not have been the case in the south. For purposes here, English surnames will be used to designate the two prime Southampton Nottoway matrilineages: Turner and Woodson. These two corporate matrilineal groups formed the political, social, and ritual body of Nottoway Indian Town at the beginning of the Reservation Allotment Period, 1824.

Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora removal and exogamic marriage to non-Nottoway significantly depressed Indian Town’s Iroquoian demography, obliterated whatever was left of clan structures and made the ohwachira the dominant organizing principle for civil action (Fox 1967:84, 160; Cowan 1974:638-640). Matrilineal succession and strong matrilineal ties to agricultural lands eventually forced matrilineal groups to divide between matrilineal and non-matrilineal descendants. Some matrilineal lands were sold and matrilineal ties were broken. Regardless of a clan’s size, influence, or wealth, it was Nottoway lands and community activity during the intercalary and early twentieth centuries that mattered.

Ohwachira segments (Hewitt and Fenton 1944:82; Goldenweiser 1914:467)
A similar pattern can be seen at the Bertie County, North Carolina Tuscarora Town, where entire familial lineages removed northward, resulting in a surname shift and population decline from 200 individuals, c.1730 (Byrd 1967:116), to approximately forty-five in the 1770s, reflecting more than natural attrition; it infers the removal of lineages from the Tuscarora community. A comparison of official tribal documents from 1773 and 1808 confirms a shift in Tuscarora surnames during the interim, whereby through exogamy or removal the community lost family segments. "Wineoak" or "Weyanoke" and possibly "Rogers" and "Bartlett" were of Algonquian origin, relating to the refugee Nansemond and Weyanoke Algonquian-speakers that merged with the Tuscarora. "Wineoak" or "Weyanoke", and possibly Rogers and Bartlett were of Algonquian origin,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nottoway Surnames 1773</th>
<th>Nottoway Surnames 1808</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookrouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pears</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wineoak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Nottoway Town surname shift, 1773-1808. "Cookrouse" or "Cockarouse," "Wineoak" or "Weyanoke,"...
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The Extended Family: the Nottoway, Meherrin and Tuscarora Clan
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2007:23-728). For additional comparison, a review of documents from other New York
Iroquoian clan structures, among all of the Northern Iroquois, have changed over time. However, the persistence of the clan system is an enduring component of modern-day Iroquoian kinship relationships. Morgan's outline of Iroquoian clans (1877) can be used as a general analogy for Virginia-Carolina Iroquoian interrelatedness (Fenton 1978:309-314; Wallace 2012:155-177). Virginia-Carolina Iroquoian structures were probably based both in descent and residence and were united by an assumed special ancestor (Mintz 1994:66-68; Myers 2006:146).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hereditary positions</td>
<td>Lineage kinship between leaders; Successive matrilineal males taking leadership roles</td>
<td>Binford 1967:139, Lawson 1709:195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders represent kin organization</td>
<td>Division of leadership compatible with clan or dual irrigation: 3-7 leaders for 200+100 tribesmen</td>
<td>Rountree 1987, Bertie Co. NC DB L 2:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders as spokesmen</td>
<td>Headmen request council with the colony concerning the clan, leaders as spokesmen:</td>
<td>Stanard 1911:274, Gatschet, NAA Ms.372-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders as advocates</td>
<td>Request redress of Trustee mismanagement in Nottoway Trustee</td>
<td>1808 Cabell Papers, CO1832-309, DB20:91-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lineage council / clan council</td>
<td>Leaders meet to discuss clan council</td>
<td>LP Dec. 11, 1821, 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrilineal usufruct</td>
<td>Access to agricultural lands regulated by matriline</td>
<td>LP Dec. 13, 1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosscutting obligation / support</td>
<td>Separate matrilineage members act as security on debt and purchase tribal allotments from each other</td>
<td>DB23:699, DB20:91-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious observations</td>
<td>Nottoway cosmos and afterlife narrative consistent with aspects of Northern Iroquoian worldview</td>
<td>Gentleman's Magazine 91:1, no. 129:505-506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuary reciprocity</td>
<td>Nottoway burial ground maintained by kinsmen</td>
<td>Barham to Stanard, 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bestow names</td>
<td>&quot;New&quot; Iroquoian names used in political discourse</td>
<td>LP Dec. 11, 1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>&quot;New&quot; Iroquoian names used in political discourse</td>
<td>Binford 1967, Lawson 1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Table 4. Aspects of Nottoway socio-political organization compatible with Morgan's (1877) Iroquoian generalizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nottoway kin-driven organization: the clan conferred and imposed a series of rights, privileges and obligations upon its members – including the right to establish and depose leaders and form a council to address clan concerns. These rights and obligations were essential to the clan's responsibility to enforce exogamy, regulate inheritance and provide reciprocity. The clan's leaders had common religious observances, mortuary practices, places of internment and the right to bestow names and adopt members. Despite cultural differences, the Nottoway and Meherrin likely possessed similar political organization.

A careful review of Iroquoian ethnological material indicates the Tuscarora had some form of crosscutting social organization before migrating from North Carolina (Morgan 1877:71-85). The Tuscarora clan system is hampered by the inexact quality of early colonial Virginia-Carolina documents and the adoption of Northern Iroquoian political structures after migration to New York also muddles the inquiry. As the ethnological materials and other documentary evidence are limited, a careful review of Iroquoian ethnological material indicates the Tuscarora had some form of crosscutting social organization, which may have been clan divisions. Additionally, the Tuscarora clan system before migration from North Carolina (Johnson 1881; Schoolcraft 1846:219; Lounsbury 1947; Morgan 1877; Rudes and Crouse 1987; Wallace 2012; Wallace and Reyburn 1991; Documentation of the Tuscarora clan system [2007]: Lounsbury 1947; Morgan 1877; Rudes and Crouse 1987; Schoolcraft 1846:219; Johnson 1881; Hewitt 1910:849) may have been clan divisions.
change, echoes of these earlier kinship divisions continued in Southampton County until

Table 5. Tuscarora Clan divisions, post removal. Sources: Cusick 1828:30; Fenton 1978:849; Landy 1988:179; Morgan 1877:10; Rudes 1999:320, 416-421.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuscarora Clan</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eel</td>
<td>Eel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>Hawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>Crane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>Snipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>Deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>Bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The configuration of Nottoway, Meherrin and Tuscarora kinship divisions likely shifted after migration north. It is unclear how many modifications represent fissions, intermarriage with other Iroquois and lineage extinction (Penton 1951:47), such as

the Nineteenth Century.
however, cannot be confidently correlated to their Virginia-Carolina eighteenth-century counterparts. Eighteenth-century colonial documents and ethnological materials collected during the following century indicate early Tuscarora clans included the Bear, Wolf, Turtle, Deer and possibly several others – some with minor sub-divisions (Boyce 1973:68-71, 160-161; Cusick 1828; Hewitt 1910; Kirkland 1789; Morgan 1877:70; Schoolcraft 1846:219; Swanton 1946:654; Todd and Godel 1920:274). Boyce noted the title of Sekwaríʔθę:ʔ [Sacarusa, Sakwarithra, Sacharissa] or Spear Carrier, as the earliest recorded Tuscarora clan chief “raised up” among the Tuscarora after their 1722 adoption into the Iroquois Confederacy. It is one of the few clan titles with continuity to the nineteenth-century chiefly names documented by Hewitt and others (Boyce 1973:68-69; Rudes 1999:271). By 1789, Samuel Kirkland recorded Wolf, Bear and Deer clans in North Carolina reference ritual gatherings at the Tuscarora town of Catechna (Kirkland 1789:24). So too, colonial accounts in North Carolina (Wallace and Reyburn 1951:44), among the New York Tuscarora. Wallence and Reyburn (1951) and Lounsbury (1947) documented Bear clan affiliations that dated to the period of Tuscarora removal. As well, Wallence’s fieldwork at Niagara and Spook’s research at Grand River provided evidence for pre-removal Bear clan affiliations that dated to the period of Tuscarora removal. However, colonial documents bear clan affiliation to the New York Tuscarora. 69: Rudes 1999:271). By 1789, Samuel Kirkland recorded Wolf, Bear and Deer clans in North Carolina. Samuel Kirkland documented by Hewitt and others (Boyce 1973:68-69; Rudes 1999:271). Boyce noted the title of Sekwaríʔθę:ʔ [Sacarusa, Sakwarithra, Sacharissa] or Spear Carrier, as the earliest recorded Tuscarora clan chief “raised up” among the Tuscarora after their 1722 adoption into the Iroquois Confederacy. It is one of the few clan titles with continuity to the nineteenth-century chiefly names documented by Hewitt and others (Boyce 1973:68-69; Rudes 1999:271). By 1789, Samuel Kirkland recorded Wolf, Bear and Deer clans in North Carolina reference ritual gatherings at the Tuscarora town of Catechna (Kirkland 1789:24). So too, colonial accounts in North Carolina (Wallace and Reyburn 1951:44), among the New York Tuscarora. Wallence and Reyburn (1951) and Lounsbury (1947) documented Bear clan affiliations that dated to the period of Tuscarora removal. As well, Wallence’s fieldwork at Niagara and Spook’s research at Grand River provided evidence for pre-removal Bear clan affiliations that dated to the period of Tuscarora removal. However, colonial documents bear clan affiliation to the New York Tuscarora. 69: Rudes 1999:271). By 1789, Samuel Kirkland recorded Wolf, Bear and Deer clans in North Carolina reference ritual gatherings at the Tuscarora town of Catechna (Kirkland 1789:24). So too, colonial accounts in North Carolina (Wallace and Reyburn 1951:44), among the New York Tuscarora. Wallence and Reyburn (1951) and Lounsbury (1947) documented Bear clan affiliations that dated to the period of Tuscarora removal. As well, Wallence’s fieldwork at Niagara and Spook’s research at Grand River provided evidence for pre-removal Bear clan affiliations that dated to the period of Tuscarora removal. However, colonial documents bear clan affiliation to the New York Tuscarora.
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The latter half of the eighteenth century. With a 1773 tribal population of less than fifty
practical aspects of clan functions likely collapsed into the orhachira sometime during
When multilinear Nottoway numbers became sufficiently depressed, the
is well documented and ethnologically comparable to other clan systems.
Further totemic specifics may be speculative and unnecessary as Iroquoian clan function
time and replacement complicated the reconstruction of "clanships" in the southern region.
Figure 13. Iroquoian religious effigies of the Wolf and Deer (right of central figure) during
1773 tribal population of less than fifty

Tuscarora religious practices in the eighteenth century (Barbeau 1917:401; Landy 1978:523;}
Tuscarora phratric organizations quickly fell into disuse with the decline of traditional
money division and primary relationships are not well understood as post-removal
matrilineal individuals, the dwindling number of Nottoway’s observations on Iroquoian clan functions, Hewitt detailed some of Morgan’s observations on Nottoway Clan leadership.

Beyond Indian Town’s multi-lineages, ohwachira / clan exogamy. Other nineteenth-century Nottoway multi-lineages were exogamic Williams and Edwin D. Turner = Beesy Turner, Parsons Turner = Mary Woodson. Nottoway marriages (see Appendix B, Figure 47, Parsons Turner = Mary Woodson-ohwachira, or both, remained in operation. Only two Allotment Period Nottoway-ohwachira marriages at the time of their reservation’s allotment suggested features of either a clan organization at the time of their reservation’s allotment suggested features of either a clan and Tonawanda Reservations recorded eight classes with 326 individuals, and Tonawanda Reservations recorded eight classes with 326 individuals, and Tonawanda Reservations recorded eight classes with 326 individuals. In comparison, Fenton’s survey of Seneca clanships at New York’s Allegheny also represents the remains of two Iroquoian clans.

Kings, Queens and Chiefs: Nottoway Indian Town Leadership

Hewitt clarified some of Morgan’s observations on Iroquoian clan functions, namely in regards to the lineage’s role in clan suffrage, succession and ownership of

In comparison, Fenton’s survey of Seneca clanships at New York’s Allegheny also represents the remains of two Iroquoian clans.

Thus eventually, two dwindling ohwachira and their sub-lineages may have leaving only a few shallow sub-lineages and the two main Turner and Woodson families by 1803, devastated the community’s formal socio-political organization, maintaining clan reciprocity in ritual and political obligations. The removal of almost half of matrilineal individuals, the dwindling number of Nottoway ohwachira likely suggested to
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The evidence requires an understanding of Nottoway-Tuscarora history, but also an interpretation of the Tuscarora Political Organization, Ethnic Identity and Socio-historical Development. Douglas Boyce (1973) researched leadership succession in the Tuscarora political structures, focusing on the influence of Iroquoian terms of address and the communities' underlying kin-driven socio-political systems of status grading (1964:463). In his dissertation, Tuscarora Headman matrilineally inherited their positions from within the community, with the chairman of council meetings where decisions were made.

Douglas Boyce (1973) researched leadership succession in the Tuscarora political structures, focusing on the influence of Iroquoian terms of address and the communities' underlying kin-driven socio-political systems of status grading (1964:463). In his dissertation, Tuscarora Headman matrilineally inherited their positions from within the community, with the chairman of council meetings where decisions were made.
Demography, 1711-1825

While working on Tuscarora materials, Boyce sought historical comparisons with Nottoway data as a means to analyze shared Iroquoian institutions, social constructions and political organization. Boyce argues chiefly clan "titles" [Table 6] were installed after the Tuscarora War 1711-1714, to allow immigrant Tuscarora a more effective means of participating in the Northern Iroquois Confederacy and more broadly, engender socio-political integration (1973:160).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Civil Chiefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Sekwaríθ, Nihawę́ną́ʔaháʔkę́, &quot;The spear trailer&quot; (Speck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hutyuhkwawáʔkę́, &quot;His voice is small&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Nayuhkawéʔah, Neyučháʔktę́, &quot;Paddling Canoe&quot; (Speck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>Nekayę́:tę́ʔ, Utekwahtę́ʔáh, Ionę́:ntchānę́:n, &quot;The Bear Cub&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Its forepaw pressed against its breast&quot; (Hewitt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Karihę́:tye, Nihnuhká:we, Nekahę́:waθ, &quot;It goes along teaching&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;He anoints the hide&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Twenty Canoes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snipe</td>
<td>Karę́:tawáʔkę́, Thanetáhkwaháʔ, &quot;One is holding the tree&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Literal meaning uncertain&quot; /-kayę́-/ willing, permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newataekot, &quot;Wearing Sandals / Ready for Warpath&quot; (Speck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Two moccasins standing together&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarehwetyeha, Sakokaryah, Kayennehson Kaweaneahaf, Sukuhę́:thę́, &quot;Entering a complaint, Ambassador&quot; (Boyce / Speck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanticoke</td>
<td>Nanticoke-Conoy title from Grand River, &quot;Devourer of People&quot; (Boyce / Speck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nanticoke-Conoy title from Grand River, &quot;Person who carries on shoulder&quot; (Speck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nanticoke-Conoy title from Grand River, &quot;She holds a word&quot; (Speck)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Beauchamp 1905; Boyce 1973:262-265; Hewitt 1910:849; Speck Papers APS.

*Note*:
- "Table 6. Post-removal Tuscarora chiefly clan names after Rudes 1999; muses otherwise noted."
In the 1880s Tuscarora Elias Johnson [b.1837] remembered these new titles were initially bestowed upon lineage chiefs "which they had as hereditary from their nation in the south" (2007:49). The titles were "raised up" when the Tuscarora became incorporated as the sixth nation of the Confederacy, but were not given full membership into the ancient Great League of Peace (see Boyce 2007; Feeley 2007; Wallace 2012). As evidenced by the adoption of the Tuscarora, the Confederacy allowed for innovation within traditional forms, so that while the old Tuscarora chiefs were not full members of the League's Grand Council, the new titles provided leaders avenues for participating in other aspects of Iroquois political discourse. Political adaptation was not limited to the Confederacy, as Tuscarora chiefs took on new social, political and ceremonial responsibilities, and Tuscarora town councils coordinated civil action and debated matters of trade, alliance and war (Feeley 2007:405-414; Landy 1958:266-270). While a previous chiefly system clearly existed, formalized hereditary "titles" may not have. Boyce is quick to recognize that, "there is absolutely no way of determining with certainty whether the Tuscarora had chiefly titles associated with certain lineages of each clan in North Carolina" (1973:160). In support of his argument, Boyce compares Nottoway leadership terms to Tuscarora ones in order to demonstrate certain similarities, whether the Tuscarora had chiefly titles associated with certain lineages of each clan in North Carolina. He illustrates a linguistic shift for words used for chiefs in New York [rakuwà:n] versus ones maintained in the south [teerheer]. His illustration of a linguistic shift for words used for chiefs in New York versus ones maintained in the south [teerheer] is summarized in Table 7. He illustrates a linguistic shift for words used for chiefs in New York [rakuwà:n] versus ones maintained in the south [teerheer]. His illustration of a linguistic shift for words used for chiefs in New York versus ones maintained in the south [teerheer] is summarized in Table 7. He illustrates a linguistic shift for words used for chiefs in New York versus ones maintained in the south [teerheer].
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The chief or chiefs of the clan...there are clans having at least three chief titles inherited in

...data, which do not possess a title of name of a chiefship, but are represented only by

...positions of name of descent and the own chief or title. But there are found many

...property of some woman...and it must be noted that the hierarchical organization of

...counterparts of several streams of descent, each composed of the

...evidence that the clan was organized by the union of

"There is some vestigial evidence that the hereditary

...positions of sovereignty:

...chief titles were conferred provided some insight into the hereditary

...Carolina-Iroquois relatives, until removal, north. Hewitt's explanation of how

...Hoover and Boyce discuss may not have been in-place among the

...chief titles were conferred. As Brinton notes (1967:196), the lineages were likely ranked and as

...were matrilineages. A. Brinton notes (1967:196), the lineages were likely ranked and as

...Tuscarora, Meherrin and Nottoway were clan-like forms, but the recipients of these titles

...the Tuscarora, including the linguistic inventory, and argues that it was to this organization

...recognized the Nottoway as having a similar socio-political structure to the

...recognized the Nottoway as having a similar socio-political structure to the

...leadership positions of sovereignty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuscarora</th>
<th>Nottoway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Queen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Chief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.

Council, to which the Teerheer / Teetha carried seniority.
Binford’s study of the Nottoway-Meherrin specified that there was great emphasis on village autonomy and consensus building at the community level: “the Nottoway and Meherrin were societies politically organized into territorial units not exceeding the local community. There were no customary mechanisms for the ultimate settlement of dispute that transcended the organization at the community level. Leadership was at the community level and status was weakly developed with respect to high status access to goods and services” (1967:140).

Christoph Von Graffenried recorded some of the structures and functions of Iroquois councils while he and John Lawson were captive at the Tuscarora town Catechna ["submerged loblolly pine"] in 1711 (Rudes 2000, 2004). Each Iroquoian community was autonomous, but loosely linked through alliance and kinship ties. As Boyce (1973) and Feeley (2007) have argued, these autonomous towns could also coordinate larger political activities that crossed local councils. The authority of the Teerheer and the councils, however, remained at the town level (Boyce 2007). Locally, senior women of the matrilines controlled access to leadership positions of the council or headmen. The Teerheer was drawn from a particular clan that held the hereditary lineage headmanship. Hewitt described the “ancient” title rights of the Ohwachira as such:

The members of an ohwachira have the right to the clan name of which the chief matron is a member, (q) to the title to the clan name of which the chief matron is a member, (r) the right of the child-bearing women to hold a council to which the chiefs and sub-chiefs, (s) the right of the child-bearing women to hold a council to which the chiefs and sub-chiefs...

In the Tuscarora town Catechna, while the Tuscarora were captive, local Tuscarora council controlled the candidacy of distinguished men to offices of leadership, whereas the

high status access to goods and services. Leadership was at the community level and status was weakly developed with respect to settlement of dispute. There were no customary mechanisms for the ultimate settlement of dispute that transcended the organization at the community level. Tuscarora were societies politically organized into territorial units not

on village autonomy and consensus building at the community level.
The historical grouping of “three” Iroquoian leaders as a reoccurring division may have represented a Virginia-Carolina political structure or a leadership framework for Iroquoian foreign diplomacy. Equally, the configuration may have been an outgrowth of the Teerheer and other great men that appeared in the eighteenth-century Virginia Council records, Southampton County land deeds and legislative petitions. "Great men" ruled more through persuasion and generosity than by domination or monarchy. The Nottoway and other great men of the Nottoway represented the kin-based governing body of the Nottoway. It was a segmentary structure linked to family units and clan-like forms, their civil actions made through consensus at the local level. Consensus building was a major component of Iroquoian governance—a linked to family units and clan-like forms, their civil actions made through consensus at the local level. Consensus building was a major component of Iroquoian governance—a segmentary structure focused on familial, clan or territorial divisions. Woodard and Moreell-Tanfath 2009, Reedy notes that, generally, individual towns attempted to coordinate their actions, but final decision-making remained in the hands of town leaders, whose ideals represented a consensus of their townspeople. (2007-342).

Eighteenth-century documents pertaining to Nottoway land sales indicate that seven to fifteen individuals represented the community’s interests in formal dealings with the colonial government (Beverly 1947:232; Lawson 1709:234; Byrd 1697:116). Seven to fifteen individuals represented the community’s interests in formal dealings with the colonial government (Beverly 1947:232; Lawson 1709:234; Byrd 1697:116).

The numbers conform to a pattern consistent with other regional communities. For example, the Tuscarora (Krouner n.d.) drew from a population of 150-400 residents from one or two Tuscarora towns (Beverly 1947:232; Lawson 1709:234; Byrd 1697:116). From one or two Tuscarora towns (Beverly 1947:232; Lawson 1709:234; Byrd 1697:116). From one or two Tuscarora towns (Beverly 1947:232; Lawson 1709:234; Byrd 1697:116). Seven to fifteen individuals represented the community’s interests in formal dealings with the colonial government (Beverly 1947:232; Lawson 1709:234; Byrd 1697:116). Seven to fifteen individuals represented the community’s interests in formal dealings with the colonial government (Beverly 1947:232; Lawson 1709:234; Byrd 1697:116).

We are sent by the Town to hear what the Gov’r says or has to propose & upon their return, their Great men will come in to conclude…They cannot answer it without consulting their Town— they may tell lies and their people may be offended with them & not stand to their offers” (Stanard 1911:274). Feeley notes that, “generally individual towns attempted to coordinate their actions, but final decision-making remained in the hands of town leaders, whose ideals represented a consensus of their townspeople.” (2007-342).

"Great men” ruled more through persuasion and generosity than by domination or
It is unclear the exact mechanism triggering Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora multi-town representation, the reoccurrence of the three headmen at official negotiations may have been significant in some way [Table 8].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Iroquoian Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Treaty of Middle Plantation</td>
<td>Serrahoque, Ununtequero and Harehannah [N, M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Conestoga peace negotiations</td>
<td>Iwaagenst, Terrutawanaren and Teonnottein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Virginia peace negotiations</td>
<td>Chongkerarise, Rouiatthie and Rouiattatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Virginia peace negotiations</td>
<td>Three delegates for Taughairouhha [Teyuherú:k]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Treaty of Williamsburg</td>
<td>Naccouiaighwha, Nyasaughkee and Narrouiaukhas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Treaty of Albany</td>
<td>Suwyntax, Adories and Sketowas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Treaty of Lancaster</td>
<td>Sidowax, Attiusgu and Tuwaiadachquha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Treaty of Middle Plantation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Select examples of Nottoway, Meherrin and Tuscarora triadic headmen configurations: the 1680 example is Nottoway-Meherrin [N, M], 1710-1713 entries are Upper Tuscarora, 1722 and 1744 are post-removal Tuscarora.

Sources: Byrd 1733:256; Feeley 2007:426; Hazard II:511; McIlwaine III:294, 320; Rudes 2000:4; McIlwaine III:294; Byrdsbury 1926:310; Sasser 1978.
became the most visible community leader between the two ohwachira, 1800-1830. During this transitional era, but it is unclear the exact means by which authority was

suggested several ways of innovation, 1775-1803, Nottoway civil leaders controlled

some Nottoway removed at the time of the American Revolution (Mead 1832:127),

of Indian Town's families removed to New York. One contemporary report indicated

the community. This may have been due to the political restructuring required when half

of Indian Town's families removed to New York. One contemporary report indicated

remained with the one Sub-chieftains. Littleton Scholar may have been a headman, but

a multi-ethnic community demographic collapse at Indian Town. Leadership roles fell to the

continued Nottoway orientation and exogamic marriage preferences resulted in

1810, the Turner ohwachira. It would appear the Turner ohwachira controlled a political position, but may not

have had suitable males to fill the role during the late 1790s. The Trustees also called

Jemmy Wineoak, 38, and Tom Step, 18, were the next oldest males at Indian Town. The older men were

complained he was a drunkard and that he had "left his farm." The Trustees also called

Nottoway Tribe issued "Tom Turner, 36," as the senior ohwachira male in 1808, but

have had suitable males to fill the role during the late 1790s. The Trustees of the

Littleton Scholar may have been a headman, but

Turner and Woodson ohwachira females outnumbered his diminished

Turner and Woodson ohwachira females outnumbered his diminished
appropria, the hereditary matrilineal males could be appointed. In the 1820s a young Southampon's Indian Town, Eich 's Turner became the head of the "chieftain." A "simply borrowed" he necessary person (Proctor 1951:7, brackets added). At existing Tuscarora cultural practices to accommodate a lack of "proper personnel" and The Nanticoke-Conoy example demonstrates the flexibility of the Iroquoian political structure. As adopted Algonquin-speakers, the Nanticoke-Conoy utilized the Nanticoke-Conoy, became of age, he took the place of chief as "his mother before him." (Speck Papers APS, brackets added). When her son Cornelius Anderson, "became of age," she took the place of chief in the Tuscarora's "by courtesy as the 50 original (League) Chiefs" and the Tuscarora in council in place. A resolution, a Nanticoke female, Mary Anderson, "in council in place;" the Indian reform of 1870, the Nanticoke-Conoy had four chiefs, but had decreased to three by the time of Frank Speck's fieldwork in 1914. Prior to 1870, the Nanticoke-Conoy had four chiefs, but had decreased to three by the time of Frank Speck's fieldwork in 1914. Prior to 1870, the Nanticoke-Conoy had four chiefs, but had decreased to three by the time of Frank Speck's fieldwork in 1914. Prior to 1870, the Nanticoke-Conoy had four chiefs, but had decreased to three by the time of Frank Speck's fieldwork in 1914. Prior to 1870, the Nanticoke-Conoy had four chiefs, but had decreased to three by the time of Frank Speck's fieldwork in 1914. Prior to 1870, the Nanticoke-Conoy had four chiefs, but had decreased to three by the time of Frank Speck's fieldwork in 1914. Prior to 1870, the Nanticoke-Conoy had four chiefs, but had decreased to three by the time of Frank Speck's fieldwork in 1914.
of Nottoway, provided some explanation for Virginia Iroquoian community.

The mission of Nottoway families along ohwachira lines, as well as the interactions

Road families remained scattered on small farms along Southampton County's Indian Town
and ceased to exist as a communally held tribal estate; only a few matrilineal allotment
and were known by the sobriquet of "King" or "Boss" and were widely recalled by matrilineal
leaders one matrilineal male active in the community during the early twentieth century
Virginia's Governor General Assembly and Southampton County Courts. Moreover, all
formal leadership role and represented Nottoway Town in political discourse with
political relationships among these individuals is vague. Although each clearly carried a
local recognition of other prominent Nottoway men (Mooney 1889 MS 2190). The
Edy Turner was remembered c. 1890 as the "Last Queen of the Tribe," despite
legal affairs with Southampton County officials (CO1832-1858:309).

Edy Turner’s son [see page 101]. These adult ohwachera males led Indian Town during the
dau>

Turner Edw<br>

Taylo<br>

Bonzon’s children [see Table 2] – became headmen, Robert and William [Beglini]
1830). A generation later, Bonzon’s children, his younger sister’s sons – and thus
affairs of the Tribal Remains (LP Dec. 1819, Dec. 11, 1821, Dec. 13, 1823, March 16,
matrilineal Nottoway named William Bonzon became increasingly active in political
organization during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The extant documentary record indicates matrilineal decent remained an organizing principal for Nottoway households and leadership positions. The decisions of families to remove with the Tuscarora were likely made by these smaller divisions, yet the "Indian Town" remained the largest decision-making body and social grouping (Boyce 1971:43; Feeley 2007:127). Wider group affiliation, whether by northern immigrant families or those that remained in Virginia, was recognized around the "town" as a conception of peoplehood. Evidence suggests some Meherrin relocated to a settlement of privately owned farms on Pocosin Creek, from their reserve lands during the last half of the eighteenth century. Evidence suggests Virginia Iroquoian communities with tribal landholdings, the Meherrin were displaced by the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the Nottoway were the only Carolina Tuscarora, along with some residents from the surrounding Virginian-Carolina (Kappler 1913:70; Reeves 1983:330-331). It was during this period the North Carolina Tuscarora, in 1803 and sold after expiring leases in 1828. Further south, the remaining Tuscarora leased their lands to North Carolina, but no tribal lands remained (Fouts 1983:6). The Meherrin settlement in Hertford County, built on tribal lands, was divided and sold during the same era, with a small number of families remaining at a certain piece of parcel of land at a place called the Indian Town until the 1820s. Some of these individuals migrated to the Chowan River, the Chowanoke reservation was divided and sold during the same era. By the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the Nottoway were the only"
Indian Towns, migrated to New York (Hewitt 1910:848-849; Landes 1978:521). Thus, the Nottoway c.1830 were the only Iroquoian Indian community in the region to maintain continuous control over a portion of their indigenous territory – 3,100 acres in Southampton County. The linkages among these Indian groups persisted despite the migration of some Nottoway-Meherrin people.

The northern Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora amalgamation process occurred in intervals over the eighteenth century, as Nottoway and Meherrin joined the New York Tuscarora in several waves of immigration prior to 1803 (see Boyce 1973; Feeley 2007; Rudes 1981b; Parish Family Papers). Nottoway removal near the time of the American Revolution (Mead 1832:127) may have been an outcome of Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora service in the French and Indian War. The northern Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora remained near the land sales and the removal of half of North Carolina's Meherrin-Cherokee population (Mead 1832:127). At least one Nottoway, Melbury Turner, immigrated in 1828 from York to New York from Virginia. The northern Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora amalgamation process occurred in intervals cultural organization, and re-shaped or modified it to fit political and community needs. The northern Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora amalgamation process occurred in intervals cultural organization, an re-shaped or modified it to fit political and community needs. The northern Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora amalgamation process occurred in intervals cultural organization, and re-shaped or modified it to fit political and community needs. The northern Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora amalgamation process occurred in intervals cultural organization, and re-shaped or modified it to fit political and community needs.
With regard to northern-southern Nottoway linkages, an intriguing correspondence emerges during the turn of the nineteenth century from the office of Virginia's Governor. A Tuscarora chief visited the Governor, and future U.S. President James Monroe, in the fall of 1802 with the intent of "undertaking to collect the scattered remains of my people" and with the "hope it will be convenient for you [Monroe] to have your [Virginia's] Indian removal and land leases cannot be determined. However, the Tuscarora Tuscarora Removal and and Virginia's Nottoway claims presented (Palmer 1890:332-333).

The number of Nottoway who left Virginia-Carolina during the 1802-1803 Tuscarora removal and land leases cannot be determined. However, the Tuscarora Tuscarora Removal and and Virginia's Nottoway claims presented (Palmer 1890:332-333).

The number of Nottoway who left Virginia-Carolina during the 1802-1803 Tuscarora removal and land leases cannot be determined. However, the Tuscarora Tuscarora Removal and and Virginia's Nottoway claims presented (Palmer 1890:332-333).
Boyle's [1981] argues that Cusick's Kauwetseka, Hewitt's Akawętsę, and

acknowledged as paramount to every other— the aboriginal right to their soil before the rights of either the King or colony...or of the Commonwealth" (Palmer 1892:69). Despite these acknowledgements, some Nottoway removed without resolving land claims, leaving the future of the tribal preserve to their Virginia kinsmen who remained.

The 1802-1803 Nottoway-Meherrin-Tuscarora removal was the last exodus from Virginia-Carolina to New York, completing an effort started nearly ninety years earlier at the conclusion of the Tuscarora War. The migration reconnected related Iroquoians and through some formal process, socio-politically integrated Virginia-Carolina refugees with the conclusion of the Tuscarora War. The migration recognized related Iroquoians and Virginia-Carolina peoples, and Hewitt's [1910] as Kauhawąnkan, Kauwetseka and Tuscarora units in a league (1828:33). Cusick's interpretation is assumed to be a complete Tuscarora tradition and repeated by David Cuskak, "People of the Submerged Pine Tree," and Hewitt's [1910] Kauwetseka and Tuscarora alliances after relocation suggested the three "ancestral Virginia-Carolina alliances that continued the Tuscarora communities. Oral traditions recorded by Tuscarora David Cuskak suggested that Virginia-Carolina peoples were the Kauhawąnkan, Kauwetseka and Tuscarora units in a league (1828:33).而

While Douglas Boyle (2007) concluded that no confederacy of Tuscarora existed prior to their removal, he conceded the northern Tuscarora division of akawętsę was a recognized non-Tuscarora element living on the New York Tuscarora reservation, apparently without equal political rights (1973:283). Further, Boyle recognized this division may have been "political allies from North Carolina," a position supported by Boyce (1981) who concluded that no confederacy of Tuscarora existed prior to their removal. He conceded that no confederacy of Tuscarora existed.

Rudes (1981b) argues that Cusick's Kauwetseka, Hewitt's Akawętsę, and

akawętsę [kah-wah'-tsuu] "Hemp Gatherers." While Douglas Boyle (2007) concluded that no confederacy of Tuscarora existed prior to their removal, he conceded that no confederacy of Tuscarora existed.
Narrative, Conoy and Chowan. These diasporic groups of Nottoway- 
Nanomeoke, Conoy and Chowan. These diasporic groups of the Algonquian-speaking 
suscepted under the Tuscarora, along with an element of the Algonquian-speaking 
tribes, the Nottoway were 

contribute to a few families that relocated to Grand River. These, the Nottoway were 
Indians and residence in New York (e.g., Casement MS 372-p). This group also 

New York. Scan as they are, the BAE records reveal source materials on Nottoway 
the kawęčʔá:ka: were likely a division of Nottoway-Meherrin-Algonquian migrants to 
Rowe (1987:1999), Casement and Hewitt, 1880-1890; Tuscarora Helldorfer, Nebraska 
and Tuscarora towns were coalitional communities of Iroquoians, but also Algonquian 
supported by other research. Prior to removal, the Virgina-Carolina Nottoway, Meherrin 
Rudes argue for the group being a "Meherrin" community in New York is 

previously referred to as "Indian Town."

intercultural contact and their conceptions of peopleshood were centered at a level that 
around the New York Tuscarora for a considerable period of time at least until the late 
people of [x]. It is significant that Virgina, Iroquoian languages maintained a separate identity 
people of [B] (Ruder Rudes, pers. comm., 2004; Wittenham 1992; Wittenham 1992: 
the root stem -/wás/; present: possible) [wás/+-wás/ unknown noun transformed in this 
heather of Wittenham 2004:421) Neiter Rudes nor Wittenham consider an etymology for 
relocation and social organization (1981b:33-34), an interpretation confirmed, but with 
Northern Group was quite similar in language and culture to the Tuscarora with similar 
the historic Meherrin town of Conochachawkan in Virgina. Further, Rudes notes this
Meherrin/Algonquians eventually became linguistically and culturally homogenized within the Six Nations. At the turn of the twentieth century, they had their own hereditary chiefs' titles [see Table 6] and maintained a genealogical identity (Boyce 1973:127; Speck Papers APS; Wallace and Reyburn 1951).

Northern migration and coalescence also led Nottoway to intermarry beyond their Iroquoian kin. During the mid 1830s, American painter George Catlin captured the image of an Iroquois man "Not-to-way, the Thinker" who was settled with his wife "Chee-a-ka-tchee" among the Ojibway of Sault Sainte Marie. Catlin indications that he had considerable conversation with him, and became very much attached to him. "The Thinker" was the "chief" of a western Great Lakes Band. The husband-and-wife subjects are dressed in a Western Creel manner, by George Catlin 1832-1836. (Smithsonian American Art Museum, Gift of George Catlin, 1933; 1934.127.1-2)

Speck Papers APS; Wallace and Reyburn 1951; Boyce 1973:127; Speck Tables 6 and maintained a genealogical identity (Boyce 1973:127; within the Six Nations. At the turn of the twentieth century, they had their own hereditary Meherrin/Algonquians eventually became linguistically and culturally homogenized.
the only known images of Nottoway peoples prior to the Civil War. County Virginia” (Heyer and Smith 1909:115). If so, Catlin’s “Iroquois” portraits are
historians suggested from one of the Iroquois tribes of the South in Southampton
Iroquois troops from Saint Simons were likely as some nineteenth-century Catlin
otherwise. Combined with documentary record and Catlin’s remarks, the identity of the
groups, such as the Hidatsa, but the linguistic evidence and kinship terminology suggests
Alternatively, he could have been linked to the remnants of other Northern Iroquoian
complicated family, and the disruption of removal the cause of his lack of tribal knowledge.
It is interesting to suspect that “The Thinker” was the descendant of a Virginia
conceivably. Chee-a-ha-tchee was the sister of the “young warrior.”

Table 2, which here refers the Nottoway kinship term for older female siblings,
but does show a definite linguistic affiliation with Iroquoian. As demonstrated above in
(Catlin 1830: pl.59). As well, Chee-a-ha-tchee’s title may not reflect her personal name,
as “Nox-to-ye” without translation, indicating a portion of Catlin’s transcription suspect
distinguished as a warrior (Catlin Papers, Huntington Library). “Nox-to-ye” also appeared
“Nox-a-way,” the Thinker (was one of the secondary titles of the tribe, and said to be
“Nox-a-way, the Thinker” to the Iroquois group, commenting that he was a “young warrior” and that
In a second series of sketches and paintings [Figure 15], Catlin added a third male

When he was found to acknowledge to me: “he wished it to be expressly understood that he
of his few scattered remnants, who are yet in existence, thought he was an Iroquois,
be able to inform me of the early history of this tribe, as well as the condition and position and condition
“This was an excellent man, and was handsomely dressed for his picture:” He seemed to

nearby. Starred.”

important remnant, not part of the Six Nations Iroquois, but a branch of the family.”

"...he seemed to be quite ignorant of the early history of his tribe, as well as the position and condition..."
Figure 15. Iroquois by George Catlin, 1835-1836. The subjects represent the "scattered remains" of an Iroquoian people: a woman [right], her husband [center] and her younger brother [left]. All are likely descendants of the Nottoway immigrants of the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. Nearly sixty years after their arrival, the subjects are depicted in their traditional attire. The artist, George Catlin, captured the essence of the Iroquois people through his detailed portrayal. Source: Catlin Papers, Huntington Library.

Migration and coalescence no doubt obscured Nottoway links to tribal history and familial origins, as community members attempted to explain their present lives among the Northern Iroquoians, an historical rupture caused by detachment and removal. Gatschet's BAE informant linked the Nottoway immigrants in Canada to the Nottoway in New York. Elias BAE informant linked the Nottoway immigrants to Grand River, but acknowledged another division was maintained at Niagara, New York. The Northern Iroquoians, in historical rupture caused by detachment and removal, familial origins, as community members attempted to explain their present lives among the Iroquois, no doubt obscured Nottoway links to tribal history and
moniker was likely conflated with the historic Shawnee of Pennsylvania. Informants in the 1940s posited a relationship between the Tuscarora and the "Shawnee" while the groups were still in North Carolina, strongly suggesting the "Chowan," a group of Algonquian speakers allied with the Tuscarora, as the likely source of the reference. As early as 1836, Gallatin reported a portion of the Chowan had moved with the Tuscarora to Illinois, thus establishing a relationship between the Tuscarora and the "Shawnee" while the moniker was likely conflated with the historic Shawnee of Pennsylvania. Informants in the 1940s posited a relationship between the Tuscarora and the "Chowan"...

Through intermarriage and adoption, Iroquoian clans absorbed the immigrant Chowan/Nottoway groups and their origins were conflated with other groups; the narratives of Northern Iroquoian peoples subsumed their linkages to the deeper past. This process took place over long periods of time, as colonization incorporated Mid-Atlantic indigenous peoples into the expanding world-system. In response, removal and remigration were strategies employed by some Native communities, in an effort to adapt to the colonial encounter and strengthen their position within a new political economy.

Support for this argument (Wallace and Reyburn 1951:44)...

 Cherokee informants at Grand River revealed in 1926 that the "Chowans," from whom the Tuscarora removed, were Caddoan speakers allied with the Tuscarora. As early as 1836, Gallatin reported a portion of the Chowan had moved with the Tuscarora to Illinois, thus establishing a relationship between the Tuscarora and the "Shawnee." Opposition to the Tuscarora's removal was likely strengthened by the Tuscarora's alliance with the Chowan, a group of Algonquian speakers allied with the Tuscarora.

Informants in the 1940s posited a relationship between the Tuscarora and the "Shawnee," while the moniker was likely conflated with the historic Shawnee of Pennsylvania. Informants in the 1940s posited a relationship between the Tuscarora and the "Chowan," a group of Algonquian speakers allied with the Tuscarora. As early as 1836, Gallatin reported a portion of the Chowan had moved with the Tuscarora to Illinois, thus establishing a relationship between the Tuscarora and the "Shawnee." Opposition to the Tuscarora's removal was likely strengthened by the Tuscarora's alliance with the Chowan, a group of Algonquian speakers allied with the Tuscarora.
Through extant clans and intermarriage or under monikers such as "Not-to-way," "Shawnee" [Sawanuʔá:kaʔ] or kawęčʔá:ka:ʔ as terms for peoplehood, or all of the above.

In nineteenth-century Southampton, the Nottoway's Iroquoian term for themselves was "Cherohakah" (Gallatin 1836:82), a designation potentially translated as čiruʔęhá:ka:ʔ "People of the Tobacco" (Rudes 1981a:41-42) [see Introduction, page 7].

From a New York informant, Gatschet provided the name "Tchirûěhá:ka" for a southern Tuscarora term, which he thought the word carried a negative connotation (1883-1884 MS 372-b). Hewitt (1910:87) obtained the term "tcherohakaʔ" from one of his 1889 northern interlocutors, who suggested the Nottoway name meant "possibly 'fork of a stream'."

The two etymologies provided are uncertain, although Rudes allowed the possibility of a stream.

The Nottoway term's nineteenth-century semantic modification, Gatschet's Niágara Tuscarora term's meaning - characterized by people of or is significant because it

"turtle" modified by "brown" /čirőhr-ʔ/ (pers. comm., 2006). The semantic association of "brown" or "brown" /čirőhr-ʔ/ and "turtle" /čirőhr-ʔ/ with "aggressive" or "intimidating" or "characterized by" /čirőhr-ʔ/

The two etymologies provided are uncertain, although Rudes allowed the possibility of a stream.

From one of his 1889 northern interlocutors, who suggested the Nottoway name meant "Cherohakah" (1883-1884 MS 372-b), Hewitt (1910:87) obtained the term "Cherohakah" unclear to Gatschet, but clearly the information through the word carried a negative

group — directly below a Nottoway entry in his Tuscarora notebook. The association was from a New York informant, Gatschet provided the name "Cherohakah" for a southern Tuscarora term, the Nottoway's designation for "people of the Tobacco" [Gallatin 1836:82], a designation potentially translated as

In nineteenth-century Southampton, the Nottoway's term for "Shawnee" [Sawanuʔá:ka] or for "peoplehood, or all of the above.

through extant clans and intermarriage of or under monikers such as "Nol-10-Way;"
in a demographically caucasian Southhampton Indian town, adhering to Iroquoian

The decision of some Nottoway ohwachira to relocate with the Tuscarora resulted

County, Virginia, the Nottoway were the people of Indian Town.

other minor divisions of Chowan, Meherrin, Nanicoke and others, in Southampton
York and Canada, the Nottoway were “adopted” segments of the Tuscarora, alongside

characterized by the people of “people of” – a people separate from other kinds of people. In New
York and Virginia during the nineteenth century, despite the divergent connotations
the layers of Tuscarora / Six Nations social politics, the reception of a community name
in each locale, while surrounded by the dominant White American society and beneath
New York and Virginia during the nineteenth century, it is noteworthy that

čiruʔęhá:ʔ was maintained as an identifying label for Nottoway people in Canada,
people of Nottoway Town near the county seat of Jerusalem. It is noteworthy that
The term čiruʔęhá:ʔ continued to be used in Southampton as a normative
In contrast, čiruʔęhá:ʔ was maintained as an identifying label for Nottoway people in Canada,
shortened form, “cynu”, was still used as a teasing moniker for some Tuscarora during
abusive, scornful and mockery (Patrick Kehl, pers. comm., 2008; Kings, 1999:130). A
early twentieth century in New York, to call someone čiruʔęhá:ʔ was considered
the term čiruʔęhá:ʔ was considered to be derogatory and a term of derision, during the
experience amongst the Northern Iroquois. At Gran River in the Iroquoian

These references were the likely source of prejudice Nottoway descendants

much longer face. No other root in their language has the same sound. They...lost their
descendants of a clan that joined the Tuscarora, proving their Tuscarora
real Indians (they) have broader faces & noses slightly flattened. It is claimed they are
were in conflict with the descent system's ushurial and the lack of Nottoway marriage partners created a situation where most of these males and females were divided into matrilineal Nottoway and agnatic sons. Young adult Nottoway males resided near their mothers and fathers, while those more productive aged grades on their compensation were divided into matrilineal blocks, occupying Nottoway lands passed through the matriline. This tension would play out in a number of ways, as remaining tribal members more fully participated in the plantation-based capitalist economy and engaged in wage-labor, divided marital property, and continued to inherit resources. This tension would play out in a number of ways, as sons and daughters of Nottoway men did not have rights within the Ochawhira or any Nottoway retained access to the tribe's communal land and base, while the agnatic Nottoway and non-matriarchal Nottoway descendants, Matriarchal and Matrilineal marriage practices, Indian Town's reduced population would become divided Demography and descent-system shift.
Nottoway men and their non-lineage affines were without use-rights to tribal lands (LP Dec. 13, 1823). With a shrinking demographic, this dilemma was resolved by the allowance of Nottoway men and their spouses limited access to their mother's and sister's agricultural tracts. Discussed further in the following chapters, the Nottoway rented cleared farmland to free Southampton residents, as well as hired slaves and other labor for agricultural work. Agnatic-descended Nottoway and their families gained access to some tribal lands through this avenue. Increasingly however, Nottoway descendants without ohwachira membership sought opportunities away from Indian Town, whether through private property purchases, tenant farming or various forms of wage labor. The allotment of tribal lands exacerbated this pattern, as matrilineal males sold lands and their descendants were outside of Nottoway inheritance. The c.1803 Nottoway-Tuscarora removal ended a period in which the Nottoway were demographically large remnants of a once more numerous Iroquoian matrilineal society. The residents of Southampton's allotment-era Indian Town were the remnants of a once more numerous Iroquoian matrilineal society. This demographic shift is critical to understanding the transformation of the Nottoway community with Free Colored Persons and Whites. Labor contracts, property ownership, and processes of socio-economic polarization continued to shape Nottoway community composition and ohwachira membership. This demographic transformation of the Nottoway community continued to support continued intermarriage with non-Iroquoian neighbors without ohwachira membership. The residents of Southampton's allotment-era Indian Town were the descendants of Nottoway men and their non-lineage affines who were without use-rights to tribal lands (LP Dec. 13, 1823). With a shrinking demographic, this dilemma was resolved by
communal incest. Even if the band is cohesive, and therefore less likely to be relativistic, the
and by exclusion in the Nottoway, is to (1) recruit spouses from outside the band or (2)
[Classificatory siblings]. As Moore suggested, the only solution for the Cheyenne example,
children can marry one another because they are all classified as siblings or first cousins
individuals of approximately the recorded number of matrilineal Nottoway at the time of
total of eighteen children, making them an economically viable group of about twenty-five
Cheyenne family sisters. Hypothetically, this band core of four couples is middle-aged with a
arranged around four male brothers [classificatory] who are married to four
For comparison, Moore provides a classic example of the Cheyenne, in which a
appear to have been the most detrimental factor in Nottoway matrilineality.
matrilineal and clans (pers. comm., 2007). Of these variables, sibship size and sex ratio
overcome simulated extinctions. The same probabilistic factors are also applicable to
models of human colonization in order to understand the requirements needed to
more human colonization. John Moore’s discussion of population sustainability focuses on hypothetical
Viability includes marriage practices, sibship size, sex ratio and fertility [primates and
Moore and Mosely (2007) argue important variables in long-term population
By default, matrilineal, and therefore, matrilineal men and their descendants become disadvantaged
only matrilineal Nottoway women’s children were able to have rights within the
mean non-Kiowa marriage. Non-Kiowa marriage resulted in a situation where
so few matrilineages and the probability of an imbalanced sex ratio, Inheritance, exogamy
selection. Inheritance / clan exogamy required marriage outside of the familial unit, but with
The problem of suitable marriage partners can quickly develop within a few generations. All community notions of membership. The demographic situation outlined above was not change toward bilateral reckoning. The shift in demography also impacted and shaped transformation and significantly contributed to the demise of the matrilineal system and with non-matrilineal, non-Iroquoian mates was the source of the community’s biological continued to only the children of women who were members of the lineage. Inheritance of the lineage and required non-Iroquoian marriage mates with FPCs or Whites. Matrilineal descent was impacted on two fronts: the small population density meant exogamy of the lineage. Thus, Nottoway viability was unsustainable situation for the lineage’s membership. Thus, Nottoway viability was of the matrilineages. Large sibship size and an unequal sex ratio compounded an already could not inherit rights to land of the extended ohwachira, unless they remarried in one of color. Children of matrilineal men with non-Iroquoian mates with non-Iroquoian – meaning with “Free People of Color” [FPC] or Whites. Children of matrilineal men with non-Iroquoian spouses prohibitions many of those marriages were non-Iroquoian – meaning with “Free People of Color”. Children of matrilineal men with non-Iroquoian mates from outside the matrilineages, and because of incest prohibitions on Indian Town’s matrilineal descent system, Nottoway viability required Within a few generations, population removal and continued exogamy had uneven sex ratios (Moore 2001:397; Moore and Mosely 2001).
Along with tribal exogamy, changes in Nottoway residency pushed the matrilineal system into a state of collapse. If the community had been larger, the descent system might have survived the introduction of cash-crop farming or even the removal of some residents to urban centers under an avunculocal or duolocal form. However, like many other communities, the "positive selective pressure for residential change" encouraged a shift toward male-controlled labor, with the single household as the primary economic provider. In general, shift to bilateral descent occurs rapidly under these conditions, while traditional, matrilineal forms of production and kinship are replaced by more individualistic, cash-based economies. While many of these communities have demographic critical mass, the political economy of male-centered labor and cash-crop farming impacts the division of labor and residence. Among horticulturists, matrilineal kinship and matrilocal residence shift take place as cash-crop farming and migration work to impact the division of labor and place as cash-crop farming and migration work to impact the division of labor and place...
relationships framed by labor and familial experience. Differences social roles were rooted in enduring kinship structures, and reciprocal elements of Iroquoian kinship roles and descent were retained. Evidence suggests Tuscarora language loss led to a steady increased use of English, yet some traditional construction of community and the political economy of Indian Town, Nottoway.

Following chapters will focus on tribal and individual property ownership, the social In order to evaluate the push-pull factors impacting the Nottoway people, the
Incorporation into the capitalist world-economy was never at the initiative of those being incorporated. The process derived rather from the need of the world-economy to expand its boundaries and assimilate the peoples, not the other way around. The world-economy's need was thus the driving force behind social processes and the assimilation of the world's peoples into its system. The changes that occurred were the result of this need and the response of the world-economy to it. Ultimately, the world-economy was never at the initiative of those being incorporated, but rather forced them to adopt its system and boundaries.

At the beginning of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the long process of Nottoway transformation was in mid-stead. Two centuries of colonization transformed the Nottoway kinship system, Iroquoian language and community social organization illustrated in the previous chapter underwent significant changes. The transformation community social organization illustrated in the previous chapter underwent significant changes. Indian land sales, Tribal Trustees and Nottoway Allotment.

CHAPTER III
Indian Land Sales, Tribal Trustees and Nottoway Allotment
The Commonwealth as early as 1809 (Palmer 1893 X: 66; Rountree 1987: 196),
colonial surveys of these reservation tracts do not survive and were unaccounted for by
termination of the Tuscarora War (Spofford 1885 II: 196-200); however, the earliest
colonial government again recognized the Nottoway’s land rights by treaty in 1713, at the
acres (Bill or all. 1677: Briggs and Plimmon 1997:134). Almost forty years later, the
surrounding the Nottoway “Indian Towns” totaling sixty-four square miles of 41,000
two large tracts of land for the Nottoway. Surveyed c. 1705, the Iroquoian nearby lands
English-Indian war of seventeenth-century Virginia – the colonial government reserved
in the 1677 Articles of Peace negotiated after Bacon’s Rebellion – the last great

Early Nottoway Land Sales

fully engaged in the cash-crop economy of the region. 
Hogdowns siphoned with their truces for control of Indian resources and became more
of the Reservation Period (1705-1824). During the Allotment Period, Southhampton’s
permission to divide communal land (1824) and initial allotment (1830) marked the end
place within deeper structures of the Nottoway’s political economy. Legislative
in indicator of peripheralization processes. It also provides evidence of alienations taking
The beginning of tribal land division among community members can be characterized as
Southhampton competition for control of Indian land, timber and monetary capital
from within the structure of a larger system. 
transition. The prime mover of this change was economic, reflecting the Nottoway’s
represents a process of long duration; it was not a static switch from one to the other.
such as guns, powder, shot, steel tools, press kettles and wool blankets. Nottoway growing meant the needs of the community: the settlement of debt from traders' goods and the Nottoway headmen. The monies derived from land sales were used to supplement the forty-five pounds, depending on the size of the parcels and relationships of the buyers to residents. The sale price of individual plots ranged widely — from fourteen shillings to 16 pounds. With the permission of Virginia's House of Burgesses, these tracts of trust lands were intermittently surveyed and sold for the „support and maintenance” of Indian Town polygons. After called the „Circle Tract,” was sold during the eighteenth century [Figure 16] the majority of land north of the Nottoway River, a twenty-eight square mile known as Nottoway Quarter. Source: Map by author.

The quitrents from „10,000 acres” of Nottoway land were used to support the College of William & Mary. From these lands, the College acquired and developed a substantial tobacco plantation. The quitrents from „10,000 acres” of Nottoway land were used to support the College of William & Mary. From these lands, the College acquired and developed a substantial tobacco plantation. The quitrents from „10,000 acres” of Nottoway land were used to support the College of William & Mary.
reliance on merchant capital intensified as they further consumed finished goods, adopted animal husbandry and acquired farming implements (Binford 1967; Rountree 1987:196-201; and see Biolsi 1992:1-33; Meyer 1994:9-67; O'Brien 1997).

The need to settle debts contributed to some of the eighteenth-century Nottoway land transactions. Local merchant Samuel Blow cleared outstanding tribal accounts with the paltry sum of £0.14s.3d. Other planters in Southampton, Surry and Isle of Wight contracted business with the Nottoway, and through close association with leading Indian Town men were given opportunities to purchase uninhabited tribal lands, with most sales below fair market price. Elizabeth Lucas Briggs, the widow of the old Nottoway interpreter Henry Briggs, received a bargain price of £1.19s. for 130 acres east of the Assamoosick Swamp. The documents indicate only one woman purchased land directly from the Nottoway. Briggs's property straddled the border of what is now Sussex County (Briggs and Pittman 1997:140, 143).

Nottoway lands south of the river, known as the “Square Tract,” continued to be sold. (DB5:433; DB8:17, Isle of Wight, VA). The relationship of the Nottoway to non-Indian planters William Hines and William Hinde, and Walter Bailey must have contributed as insider-traders, as both men purchased Circle Tract lands and lands within the Circle, as did immediate members of their families. Elizabeth Hinde, a member of the Nottoway Trustees Etheldred Taylor, John Simmons and Thomas Cocke all surveyed lands within the Circle, as did immediate members of their families. Elizabeth and Thomas Cocke purchased uninhabited tribal lands, with most sales below fair market price. Etheldred Taylor, who was a close associate of leading Indian Town men, were given opportunities to purchase tribal lands. Other transactions, Local merchant Samuel Blow cleared outstanding tribal accounts with the Nottoway.
At the national level, Nottoway land sales and allotment may be situated within

Eastern U.S. Indian Land Loss and Removal

century, approximately 4200 acres of Nottoway land remained in tribal hands. At the end of the American Revolution (Briggs 1967:168; Parramore 1992:6), Nottoway land sales preceded the settlement of the region, through the period of the Nottoway century, hundreds of non-Native farmers surrounded the Nottoway lands. By the end of the first quarter of the colonial expansion and occupation of the region. By the end of the first quarter of the formal survey of Nottoway towns and sales of their lands correspond with English purchases of nearly 1600 acres by 1750 (Briggs and Plimpton 1997:140).

Over a century, Trustees disbursed a purchase of nearly 1600 acres of Square Tract lands in 1745—three years before the House approved the transactions south of the Nottoway River. Close association with the Nottoway no doubt encouraged this additional tract, land at Buckhorn Swamp and surveyed several additional tracts along the Indian land at Buckhorn Swamp and surveyed several additional tracts along the apparent concern of the Nottoway, in 1711 Simmons arranged to build a gristmill on land...formerly assigned to the Nottoway Indians” (Standard 1923:21). Simmons

land...formerly assigned to the Nottoway Indians” (Standard 1923:21). Simmons
Jacksonian-era market expansion opened Indian lands southwest of Virginia, transforming the Deep South into a Euro-American populated, cash-crop producing region. Andrew Jackson, as Indian fighter in the 1810s and U.S. President in the 1820s and 1830s, personally spearheaded the opening of large portions of Choctaw and Creek lands for cotton cultivation. His effort to remove the remaining Indian nations from their territory was driven by land speculation, commercial enterprise and expansionist politics.

Removal of Virginia’s Indian peoples was not an official policy of the state, as far as the documentary evidence reveals. Removal of Virginians’ Indian peoples was not an official policy of the state, as far as the documentary evidence reveals. Removal of Virginians’ Indian peoples was not an official policy of the state, as far as the documentary evidence reveals. Removal of Virginians’ Indian peoples was not an official policy of the state, as far as the documentary evidence reveals.

Government’s effort was Southerners’ Indian relocation. The Indian Removal Act was made law in 1830 by Andrew Jackson and a like-minded American planter class. The specter of the “specter of Indian atrocities” would combine with the lure of materialism and capital accumulation to drive Native peoples from the Old South – creating the southwestern cotton kingdom around which the market revolution took place. The Cherokee, Chickasaws, Choctaws, Creek and a lesser degree Seminoles, stood in the way of bringing this southern land into market speedily. Andrew Jackson argued in 1830, personally spearheaded the opening of large portions of Chocoway and Creek territories and in 1835. President Andrew Jackson was an Indian fighter in the 1810s and U.S. President in the 1820s. He transformed the Deep South into a Euro-American populated, cash-crop producing region.
The motivation for forced Indian removal was multi-faceted and linked to the South's emerging political economy, a system in which access and control of agricultural lands was the prime mover. As evidence of the broadening and deepening of this economic system, the "Five Civilized Tribes," once entangled and settled in Indian Territory, reproduced the very market structures they were expelled from (see Bateman 1991; Muller 2007; Zellar 2007).

In the East, White colonization of Indian lands had taken place over the preceding two centuries, leaving only small islands of tribal occupancy by the time the United States became a nation within the periphery of the world-economy. Indian lands of the Eastern Seaboard were sold, allotted and leased with state governments overseeing the transactions (see O'Brien 1997). Like the Nottoway Trustees, "overseers" and "guardians" assimilated the state and private parties in sympathizing with the removal of the Nottoway reservation. Instead make them cease claiming to be Indians and merge them with another group, preferably blacks (1897:207).

Rountree's analysis of the Virginia situation c.1830 is essentially correct, although her account misplaces the emphasis on conscious racial assimilation and the "credibility" of "real Indians", noting that the removal of the Nottoway was not a threat because their credibility as "real Indians" was too slight for an expensive removal to be considered worthwhile.
even level by the 1887 Dawes Act and the 1898 Curtis Act (see Carter 1999); Debo

remaining in the East falls inline with the period [1824-1877] of Nottoway allotment and

Community | State | Year | Action | Source
---|---|---|---|---
Chappaquiddick | Massachusetts | 1810 | Allotted all but 692 acres | Conkey, Boissevain and Goddard 1978:179-184
Gingaksin | Virginia | 1812 | Allotment; complete by c.1860 | Rountree 1990:182-186, 194-196
Nottoway | Virginia | 1824 | Allotment; complete by c.1877 | Routines
Natick | Massachusetts | 1828 | Land sold; trust kept by guardian | Routines
Punkapog | Massachusetts | 1840 | Land sold and proceeds distributed | Routines
Catawba | South Carolina | 1840 | 144,000 acres conveyed to the state | Routines
Pequot | Connecticut | 1848 | Pequot reservation under lease | Routines
Paugusset | Connecticut | 1848 | 989 acres – most leased or wooded | Routines
Herring Pond | Massachusetts | 1850 | Land allotment complete | Routines
Dudley / Webster | Massachusetts | 1857 | State moved remnants to an urban tenement | Routines
Mohegan | Connecticut | 1860 | Allotment and land leases | Routines
Narragansett | Rhode Island | 1880 | Allotment of 1,500 acres among 324 people | Routines
Christiantown | Massachusetts | 1888 | Remaining 10 acres „deserted“ | Routines

When the Nottoway event-level is compared against other Eastern American

Indian communities’ land loss, the data confirm a wider Indian experience linked to an emerging economic

system centered on individual materialism, capital accumulation and private property

transformation was part of a wider Indian experience linked to an emerging economic

world-system. Viewed from this context, Nottoway land loss and community

transformation of remaining external zones and the peripheralization of Indian lands into

Table 9 Select nineteenth-century Indian land allotments, sales and leases within the

Eastern United States. Source: Conkey, Boissevain and Goddard 1978:179-184; Routines.
These laws, along with other legislation and tribal negotiations allowed for the dismantling of Indian Territory through the allotment, distribution and leasing of tribally owned land and the termination of tribal tenure through severalty (Parman 1994:1-10).

In colonial Virginia, to assist the Nottoway and other tribes [e.g. the Pamunkey and Gingaskin] with surveying and selling of Indian lands, four to six “Trustees of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians” were appointed by the House of Burgesses or General Assembly. These men facilitated the commodification of Nottoway land through surveys, estimating market values, overseeing transactions and disbursing monetary funds to the headmen of Indian Town. The appointment system eventually shifted to include appointments by the Trustees themselves. Hypothetically, Virginia’s Executive Branch, the Governor’s Office, oversaw the Trustees themselves. The Trustees were White men, Southampton County landowners and usually of considerable political and economic standing in the Southside; they were not Nottoway Indians. Prior to allotment and severalty, “Trustees of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians” lobbied the Legislature for permission to sell tracts of the Nottoway Reserve. Once the sales were concluded, Trustees oversaw the disbursement of funds and distribution of provisions to the Nottoway community. Most acts passed by the House of Burgesses or General Assembly present the Nottoway as continually decreasing in population and increasing in their want for material goods:

Whereas the nation is of late reduced by wars, sickness and other casualties, to a small number, and among those that remain, many are old and unable to labor or hunt, so that

The Trustees of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians

owed land and the termination of tribal tenure through severalty (Parman 1994:1-10). These laws, along with other legislation and tribal negotiations allowed for the dismantling of Indian Territory through the allotment, distribution and leasing of tribally owned land, among other tribes (e.g. the Pamunkey and Gingaskin) [with surveying and selling of Indian lands, four to six “Trustees” were appointed by the Trustees of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians].
crop failure, the Trustees would allocate monies to supplement individual subsistence or
disbursement of Nottoway annuities. Annually, or as occasion directed (such as death or
insult and injury) (Jefferson 1787:155) therefore also managed a tribal trust fund and the
The Trustees, "whose duty was to watch over their interests, and guard them from
at this time considered and noted not one can in hand to pay it" (LP Dec. 1818).
from year to year, as deaths, new appointments and changing economic conditions
The Nottoway's relationship with their Trustees underwent structural changes
The Trustees were charged with investing the tribe's assets and settling individual debts
market price when tracts were sold by permission of the General Assembly. Importantly,
Trustee became the manager of property rents of Nottoway lands and selling a fair
influenced the tribe's needs and demand of their Guardians. Eventually, the role of the
improvement of their health, one of their greatest needs. We are well disposed to
support and initiative to them and their posterity" (Hening V:286 [1756]).
"Many evil disposed persons under pretence of said Indians being indebted to them do
"To see the money paid fairly, truly and equally distributed between us and the women of
"It shall be the duty of the said trustees to take bonds and sufficient security...for the
"That some of them are old and many of them are invalid and incapable of supporting
With the interest
the Trustees were charged with investing the tribe's assets and settling individual debts
market price when tracts were sold by permission of the General Assembly. Importantly,
Trustee became the manager of property rents of Nottoway lands and selling a fair
influenced the tribe's needs and demand of their Guardians. Eventually, the role of the
from year to year, as deaths, new appointments and changing economic conditions
additional earned income. Only matrilineal descendants of the Nottoway, and thus lineage members with rights to tribal lands and resources, could access the Nottoway estate. As well, during the latter years of the eighteenth century, only adult Nottoway were provided annuities from the interest or principal of land sales.

By controlling the monetary and material resources of the tribe, the Trustee system undermined traditional Nottoway leadership roles and restricted the economic maneuverability of the Nottoway community. By the third quarter of the eighteenth century, Nottoway headmen had to navigate two layers of colonial management: legislative permission to relinquish title to Native lands and Trustee advocacy on the Nottoway’s behalf to seek fair market value and sale. Moreover, the capital accrued from land sales and rentals remained in the control of the Trustees and under Trustee management. The bureaucracy created by the colonial apparatus weakened the Nottoway’s ability to affect desired outcomes, as Trustee oversight competed with indigenous leaders’ traditional roles as community negotiators and representatives. The Nottoway were thus at the mercy of Trustee discretion for doling out resources: capital outlay for finished goods, resolution to trading debts and continued access to a market for Nottoway were thus, at the mercy of Trustee discretion for doling out resources: capital.
The linkage of matrilineal rights to tribal funds served several purposes for the Trustees. First, it limited the number of adults who could participate in the Trustee-controlled revenue and thereby gave the Trustees greater flexibility in the management of the estate. After the last migration of Nottoway north with the Tuscarora (c. 1803), the Trustees distributed the annuity due each Nottoway at £9 annually, for a total of £153. An 1808 document fixed the provisions for all seventeen remaining matrilineal Nottoway, regardless of age. The Trustees distributed the annuity to those who inherited, or descended through the matrilineal line (Cobb to Bowers Dec. 31, 1821).

Over the next decade, however, the Trustees adjusted this allowance. During a financial review in 1821, the Trustees indicated the estate's annual interest of $239.40 was insufficient to support thirty matrilineal heirs, appealing to the General Assembly for some relief at $7.98 per capita. The Trustees suggested the effort of maintaining the Nottoway arrangement was not worth their time, possibly signaling that without a larger monetary amount in the estate, the Trustees were unwilling to manage the Nottoway lands.

The Trustees calculated the effort of maintaining the Nottoway arrangement was not worth their time, possibly signaling that without a larger monetary amount in the estate, the Trustees were unwilling to manage the Nottoway lands. The Trustees generally enforced the matrilineal usufruct and descent of the community, through the disbursement of tribal funds to those who descended the community, through the distribution of tribal funds to those who descended through the matrilineal line, regardless of age. The Trustees informed the Tuscarora that the Trustees would distribute provisions for all seventeen remaining matrilineal Nottoway, regardless of age. The Trustees distributed the annuity due each Nottoway at £9 annually, for a total of £153. After the last migration of Nottoway north with the Tuscarora (c. 1803), the Trustees distributed the annuity due each Nottoway at £9 annually, for a total of £153.
were not inclined to play banker for the Nottoway. Moreover, the Trustees complained they were owed nearly $170 in “necessary provisions [provided] to prevent their [the Nottoway’s] actual suffering” (LP Dec. 10, 1821). Trustee Jeremiah Cobb suggested to Legislator Carr Bowers that selling all of the Nottoway land except for 1000 acres and placing the proceeds, along with the remains of the estate, in trust would earn $20 interest per capita annually – a realistic annuity amount for each Nottoway. A year later, the future interest payments were estimated “between eight or nine dollars to each per annum” which was still insufficient for tribal members “in the most indigent circumstances” (LP Dec. 14, 1822).

The change in financial needs of the community between c.1808-1820 indicates a shift in resource allocations at Indian Town. The population size of those “who inherit” and the recommended per capita annuity had more than doubled. The Nottoway needed more capital. This need motivated a petition to sell additional trust lands in the 1820s and the recommended per capita annuity had more than doubled. The Nottoway needed more capital to allocate the proceeds, along with the remains of the estate, in trust would earn $20 interest per capita annually – a realistic annuity amount for each Nottoway. A year later, the future interest payments were estimated “between eight or nine dollars to each per annum” which was still insufficient for tribal members “in the most indigent circumstances”.

Repealed entirely the image of the vanishing Indian:
"Of the Nottoway, not a male is left. A few women constitute the remains of that tribe…they usually had trustees appointed" (Jefferson 1787:157).

"Littleton Scholar, no Indian but himself in his family, his wife being a White woman…Tom Turner, no Indian in his family but himself when at home, his wife being a mulatto…Jemmy Wineoak, no Indian in his family but himself, has no wife, a mulatto woman lives with him…Nancy Turner and her son Henry Turner compose the Indian part of her family" (Cabell Papers July 18, 1808).

"The only remains in the state of Virginia are the Nottoway…in number about twenty-seven, including men, women and children. The Nottoway tribe, if we may judge from the looks of the few now remaining, were originally of good appearance and stature" (Anonymous 1820, cited in Gentleman's Magazine 1821: 505-506).

"The sale of Nottoway lands served the Trustees' personal interest in Nottoway lands was a third reason for their closely managing the eligible recipients of Nottoway funds."
Norotoway headmen and Trustees partitioned the General Assembly to sell the leased lands cultivate the land is unmisquantifiable. When the twenty-one year leases expired, the interests of those who could manipulate the situation. This strategy was recognized by an earlier generation of Trustees:

"And forasmuch as the appropriation of two such large tracts [the Circle and Square], for so small a number of [Norotoway] people, appears the increase of improvements in that parish more ruinous than half of the timber...and will leave in the said land...and shall not cut down more than half of the timber...and will...trees in the said land...and shall moreover plant Increase with good fences and cultivate Hydro apple [shingles] and shall moreover plant increase with good fences and cultivate Hydro apple [shingles] covered with feathered...plank & Shingles with good Plue or Cypress Shingles...right to 12 feet the Frame to be saved."

Thus the debt owed to the tribe and the annuity disbursements made by the Trustees were sourced one and the same. Further, the twenty-one year leases, or lease, of twenty-five acres stipulated that the occupants:

- build & completely finish a Dwelling House 12 by 16 feet long & 10 feet the frame to be saved,
As demonstrated in Table 10, the bulk of the principal from the 1790s land sales was never fully attained, which meant the interest never completely accrued or matured. This strategy depleted the principle amount in order to support Nottoway needs for capital outlay. In turn, additional Nottoway lands would need to be sold to replenish a capital outlay. In sum, additional Nottoway lands would need to be sold to replenish a principle that never fully stabilized. Being a Trustee could be a successful economic venture, and if capital was managed strategically, lucrative. The funds arising from the land sales were to be neutral, as the interest should prove insufficient, so much of the principle may be drawn from the lands of Trustees, or placed in some fund, where the interest may be drawn annually if the interest should prove insufficient, so much of the principal may be drawn.

<table>
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<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thomas Blowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ridley</td>
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</table>
Over time, the Nottoway's Trustees purchased large tracts of reserved land, which were made available for sale by petitions to the General Assembly. One cannot help but see the correlation between the land sales orchestrated by the Trustees and the purchasing of the same lands by the caretakers of Nottoway affairs (e.g., DB11:57-104; Turner, 1856). After twenty-one years of leasing, the Trustees transferred the land to another family member. Twenty-five years after confirming his deed to Nottoway land, Miles Cary's son George sold his parcel and tract "No. 2" (surveyed at 643 acres) to Trustee Thomas Ridley for $3,000 (DB19:495), a handsome profit on the initial £465 investment.

No doubt the Carys benefited from the sale of timber, agricultural endeavors, and land sales. The Thompson Home (1919), a handsome profile on the initial £465 investment, was sold by the Carys to Trustee Thomas Ridley for $3,000 (DB19:495). Miles Cary's son George sold his parcel and tract "No. 2" (surveyed at 643 acres) to Trustee Thomas Ridley in 1841 for $3,000 (DB19:495). The Thompson Home was built by the Blowe family and was later occupied by the Thompson/Bryant families. The Thompson Home was sold to the Kello family, who occupied it from 1876 until the present (Binford 1967:157, 204; Francis Kello, pers. comm., 2006; Russell Darden, pers. comm., 2009; Tauchiray MS). The Rose Hill plantation was situated on the centerline of the old Nottoway Square Tract, atop previous Nottoway village sites (Binford 1967:157, 204; Francis Kello, pers. comm., 2006; Russell Darden, pers. comm., 2009; Tauchiray MS). The Rose Hill plantation was located on the centerline of the old Nottoway Square Tract, atop previous Nottoway village sites (Binford 1967:157, 204; Francis Kello, pers. comm., 2006; Russell Darden, pers. comm., 2009; Tauchiray MS).

Sources: Gilmer Map, 1863; WPA 1937, Richard Kello Home [293]; Rose Hill plantation. The clapboard house [picture left] was built by the Thompson family.
Samuel Blow built a manor house on the tract c.1805-1815 and named it Rose Hill. His brother John Thomas Blow followed his father and established the plantation. The property included in the trust was the nursery planted in the 1770s. The trust was to transfer the property to the Blow family, with hopes of dissuading the Trustees from the sale of the land to someone else without their consent. The Trustees refused to make a deed for the 1794 transaction, and Harriett Bendall requested the Trustees' settlement of the matter, providing both a plat and a receipt for the 293½ acres. The Trustees stated that they had purchased Nottoway land, not the land purchased by the Trustees. Harriett Bendall petitioned the General Assembly, and a bill was passed in her favor, requiring the Trustees to honor the almost thirty-year-old deal. The Trustees sold the land to someone else, and Harriett Bendall petitioned the General Assembly again, and a resolution was quietly reached, allowing the Trustees to honor the almost thirty-year-old deal.
No money was exchanged in the 1823 Bendall resolution and the private account books of the Trustees remain silent on the topic. The land given to Bendall, was however, "low ground" and the least desirable land for farming. Possibly it was meant to be timbered, but clearly portions of it were not the farmlands her father Thomas Westbrook began renting in 1773 or later purchased in 1794. The boundaries of the recorded deed indicate the Buckhorn Swamp was the dominant topographic feature deeded to Harriett Bendall:

"down the meandering run…to Oreaky branch thence…to its junction with Buckhorn Swamp…across the run of the Buckhorn Swamp to…Samuel Blunt’s line thence along the edge of the low grounds down the Buckhorn…to the mouth of the Cabin Branch thence down the main run of the said swamp to where the beginning line extended" (DB19:130).

Bendall’s reaction to her receipt of Trustee swampland was not recorded, but one gets the sense the Trustees did not appreciate the impatience or implications, particularly since they had assumed ownership of the tract.

Like Bendall, the Nottoway were not passive recipients of the Trustees’ strategies. A telling document from the first decade of the nineteenth century hints at the cloaked or antagonistic relationship the community had with its Trustees:

"We, the Trustees, cannot forbear to express our regret that complaints have been made against us of the manner in which we have conducted the affairs of the Indians; though we much acknowledge, that we should have been more peculiarly fortunate than any other men to whom the management of their affairs has been intrusted, to have escaped the complaints of the manner in which we have conducted the affairs of the Indians; though the grievances of the manner in which we have conducted the affairs of the Indians have been made public...

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Edith Turner was the most vocal of the Nottoway leaders against Trustee dysfunction. Receiving the complaints of the community had with the Trustees:

A telling document from the first decade of the nineteenth century hints at the cloaked or antagonistic relationship the community had with its Trustees:

Like Bendall, the Nottoway were not passive recipients of the Trustees’ strategies.

Like Bendall, the Nottoway were not passive recipients of the Trustees’ strategies. Bendall’s reaction to her receipt of Trustee swampland was not recorded, but one gets the sense the Trustees did not appreciate the impatience or implications, particularly since they had assumed ownership of the tract.

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Edith Turner was the most vocal of the Nottoway leaders against Trustee dysfunction. Regarding the complaints of the headwoman, the Trustees broke from their usual polite business commentary to remark, "We, the Trustees, cannot forbear to express our regret that complaints have been made against us of the manner in which we have conducted the affairs of the Indians; though we much acknowledge, that we should have been more peculiarly fortunate than any other men to whom the management of their affairs has been intrusted, to have escaped the complaints of the manner in which we have conducted the affairs of the Indians; though the grievances of the manner in which we have conducted the affairs of the Indians have been made public.

Bendall’s reaction to her receipt of Trustee swampland was the dominant topographic feature deeded to Harriett Bendall. The boundaries of the recorded deed begin running in 1773 and later purchased in 1794. The boundaries of the recorded deed indicate the Buckhorn Swamp was the dominant topographic feature deeded to Harriett Bendall. The Trustees’ resolution and the private account books of the Trustees remain silent on the topic. The land given to Bendall was however, "low ground" and the least desirable land for farming. Possibly it was meant to be timbered, but clearly portions of it were not the farmlands her father Thomas Westbrook began renting in 1773 or later purchased in 1794. The boundaries of the recorded deed indicate the Buckhorn Swamp was the dominant topographic feature deeded to Harriett Bendall.

No money was exchanged in the 1823 Bendall resolution and the private account books of the Trustees remain silent on the topic. The land given to Bendall was however, "low ground" and the least desirable land for farming. Possibly it was meant to be timbered, but clearly portions of it were not the farmlands her father Thomas Westbrook began renting in 1773 or later purchased in 1794. The boundaries of the recorded deed indicate the Buckhorn Swamp was the dominant topographic feature deeded to Harriett Bendall.

No money was exchanged in the 1823 Bendall resolution and the private account books of the Trustees remain silent on the topic. The land given to Bendall was however, "low ground" and the least desirable land for farming. Possibly it was meant to be timbered, but clearly portions of it were not the farmlands her father Thomas Westbrook began renting in 1773 or later purchased in 1794. The boundaries of the recorded deed indicate the Buckhorn Swamp was the dominant topographic feature deeded to Harriett Bendall.

No money was exchanged in the 1823 Bendall resolution and the private account books of the Trustees remain silent on the topic. The land given to Bendall was however, "low ground" and the least desirable land for farming. Possibly it was meant to be timbered, but clearly portions of it were not the farmlands her father Thomas Westbrook began renting in 1773 or later purchased in 1794. The boundaries of the recorded deed indicate the Buckhorn Swamp was the dominant topographic feature deeded to Harriett Bendall.
We doubt much whether it would be possible for her to be satisfied long with the united attentions of every man in Virginia" (Cabell Papers, July 18, 1808).

A portion of the Trustees' response may be attributed to their expectation of deferential relations between men and women of Southampton. Both Bendall's and Turner's public refusal and open challenge to the elite male Trustees were counter to social norms of nineteenth-century Southern society. Turner, as a matrilineal headwoman, ran completely outside of Virginia's standards of social intercourse, a conflict of cultures noted by British colonial officials and Euro-Americans repeatedly in the eighteenth century (Hatley 1993:52-63; Perdue 1999).

Despite the Trustees' disdain for headwoman Edith Turner, Nottoway complaints continued and signaled a level of on-going impropriety. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the General Assembly for the first time removed all of the Nottoway Trustees continued and signaled a level of on-going impropriety. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the General Assembly for the first time removed all of the Nottoway Trustees from office and ordered an audit of the tribal accounts. The implications for Nottoway action

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Debt and credit of the Nottoway Tribe on the first day of January 1809.}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Of the above, the sum of three hundred and ninety pounds and 9½ is due from the Trustees. & \\
\hline
\hline
Credit & Debit \\
\hline
\hline
Amount of Interest & 742 0 8¼ \\
\hline
Ridley's Debt supposed & 48 0 5 \\
\hline
Amount of allowances this year & 742 0 8 \\
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

(Readly 1993:52-63; Perdue 1999)

Of the above, the sum of three hundred and ninety pounds and 9½ is due from the Trustees.

Despite the Trustees' disdain for headwoman Edith Turner, Nottoway complaints continued and signaled a level of on-going impropriety. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the General Assembly for the first time removed all of the Nottoway Trustees from office and ordered an audit of the tribal accounts. The impetus for Nottoway action may have been the effort to get their affairs in order, in order to facilitate relocation to New York. The language of the act signifies the Nottoway complained of abuse and may have been the effort to get their affairs in order, in order to facilitate relocation to

A portion of the Trustees' response may be attributed to their expectation of deferential male attention. Of every man in Virginia" (Cabell Papers, July 18, 1808).
The covering of Nottoway land appears as a recurring theme in the extant

Wealth Building of the Nottoway Trustees


Upon a settlement with their former Trustee, a balance of five hundred & two dollars 28/100 was all that remained of the proceeds of land sales, land leases and personal loans ten years earlier. A similar Trustee turnover again occurred in the 1810s, when Nottoway complaints again required the Commonwealth to regulate Trustee oversight of tribal affairs. The Trustees were found to be siphoning off Nottoway money and mismanaging local lands, loans and rentals to the advantage of White landowners. The documentary record of the specific outcomes of this Nottoway complaint remains unclear. By the late 1810s, a new set of Trustees was recently appointed to manage their affairs. Newfoundland and Nottoway money and mismanagement were found to be symptomatic of Nottoway complaints that required the Commonwealth to regulate Trustee oversight of tribal affairs. The Trustees had local-level repercussions for Indian Town as well. Asimilar Trustee turnover again occurred in the 1810s, when Nottoway complaints again asserted those Virginia Iroquoian-speaking Indian speakers who joined the Tuscarora migration northward; the State's admonishment of

The successes of Nottoway intervention likely assisted those Virginia Iroquoians

sum or sums of money or lands they may be justly due from them.
they, along with the Southampton Court, should be given the local authority to manage Nottoway affairs of finance and land. This arrangement would “prevent the necessary recurrence to your honorable body whenever any new state of things presents itself” and allow the Trustees and Court “to be vested with the authority to direct & superintend the management of the whole matter” (LP Dec. 10, 1821). The close relationship of the County Court officials [Clerks, Judges], the Nottoway Trustees, lawyers and the land-owning elite of Southampton reflected the conjoined interests of the upper socio-economic class. Freeing the Nottoway manager’s from legislative oversight lessened the burdensome bureaucracy of liquidating tribal assets. When reading the Nottoway documentary record it becomes clear that the Trustees, County administrators and local men of finance were in regular communication with one another. They consistently engaged the Nottoway on economic terms, with their primary attention focused on land where they are permitted to reap any benefit that the whole should remain an uncultivated wilderness” (LP Dec. 10, 1821).

“Yet the best land which belongs to them is extensively valuable, and much more extensive than can be required for purposes of husbandry by your petitioners” (LP Dec., 16, 1818).

“with these resources are to be the only access of their very valuable landed possessions” (LP Dec., 1821).

“they occupy all high land, the greater part is cornerback, and much more extensive than can be required for purposes of husbandry by your petitioners” (LP Dec., 1821).

“if these resources are to be the only access of their very valuable landed possessions” (LP Dec., 1821).

Here, the asymmetry of Nottoway territory’s peripheralization may be seen, the deepening economic class. Preceding the Nottoway managers from legislative oversight lessened the economic closure of Southampton retracted the confined interests of the upper socio-economic class. County Court officials [Clerks, Judges], the Nottoway Trustees, lawyers and the land-mangement of the whole matter” (LP Dec. 10, 1821). The close relationship of the Trustees and Court “to be vested with the authority to direct & superintend the affairs of finance and land, this arrangement would “prevent the necessary recurrence to your honorable body whenever any new state of things presents itself” and they, along with the Southampton Court, should be given the local authority to manage...

The Trustees' continued maladministration and nepotism is exemplified in financial dealings of two men: Thomas Ridley II and Jeremiah Cobb. The Trustees, who served decades apart—both because of the county's political economy, were interested in linking timber and agricultural lands. Southern Rowan's produced covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands. South Carolina's producers covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands.

The Trustees' continued maladministration and nepotism is exemplified in financial dealings of two men: Thomas Ridley II and Jeremiah Cobb. The Trustees, who served decades apart—both because of the county's political economy, were interested in linking timber and agricultural lands. Southern Rowan's produced covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands. South Carolina's producers covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands. South Carolina's producers covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands. South Carolina's producers covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands.

The Trustees' continued maladministration and nepotism is exemplified in financial dealings of two men: Thomas Ridley II and Jeremiah Cobb. The Trustees, who served decades apart—both because of the county's political economy, were interested in linking timber and agricultural lands. Southern Rowan's produced covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands. South Carolina's producers covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands. South Carolina's producers covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands.

The Trustees' continued maladministration and nepotism is exemplified in financial dealings of two men: Thomas Ridley II and Jeremiah Cobb. The Trustees, who served decades apart—both because of the county's political economy, were interested in linking timber and agricultural lands. Southern Rowan's produced covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands. South Carolina's producers covered Nottoway territory's unutilized agricultural lands.


provides context for the tribe’s land sales, ever-depleted capital and eventual reservation allotment.

Thomas Ridley was one of the Trustees engaged in the 1790s land transactions and removed from office by the General Assembly in 1805 (LP Dec. 9, 1803). Despite his removal from managing Nottoway affairs, he remained apprised of events, commerce and happenings at the fort. The son of a Virginia delegate and state senator, his removal from managing Nottoway affairs, he remained apprised of events, commerce and removed from office by the General Assembly in 1805 (LP Dec. 9, 1803). Despite

Albemarle,

provides context for the tribe’s land sales, ever-depleted capital and eventual reservation...
The relationship of the Trustees to the Nottoway remained remarkably consistent for almost 150 years, regardless of generation or length of appointment. Thomas Ridley, Henry Blow, William Blow, Samuel Blunt and James Wilkerson, among others, were all Trustees who used the Nottoway trust for personal profit and gain, were indebted to the Nottoway estate and employed those resources for familial wealth-building to the disadvantage of the Nottoway people.

Thus it is not surprising that some records of the Trustees' personal indentures and Indian accounting remained in the possession of individuals or the Trustee Board and in public records. This tradition of irregularity, what we would today call a conflict of interest or misappropriation, would later be revealed through court proceedings, as financial discrepancies between the Trustees and the Nottoway people were uncovered through legal action.

As Trustees of the Nottoway, Virginia's esteemed Blow family built portions of their wealth from Iroquoian peoples' holdings. The Blows were colonial and antebellum plantation owners, real estate investors, and manufacturers of William & Mary's institutional development. Consequently, the College can be counted among the benefactors of siphoned-off Indian lands and trust funds. The family's impressive body of correspondence, ledgers, journals, and financial papers are housed in Swem Library's Special Collections - including rare private documents accounting for the Nottoway tribe's wealth and Indian accounting records in the possession of individuals or the Trustees of the Nottoway trust.

The Trustees of the Nottoway, Virginia's esteemed Blow family, built portions of their wealth from Iroquoian peoples' holdings. The Blows were colonial and antebellum plantation owners, real estate investors, and manufacturers of William & Mary's institutional development. Consequently, the College can be counted among the benefactors of siphoned-off Indian lands and trust funds. The family's impressive body of correspondence, ledgers, journals, and financial papers are housed in Swem Library's Special Collections - including rare private documents accounting for the Nottoway tribe's wealth and Indian accounting records in the possession of individuals or the Trustees of the Nottoway trust.

Thus it is not surprising that some records of the Trustees' personal indentures and Indian accounting remained in the possession of individuals or the Trustee Board and in public records. This tradition of irregularity, what we would today call a conflict of interest or misappropriation, would later be revealed through court proceedings, as financial discrepancies between the Trustees and the Nottoway people were uncovered through legal action.
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Trustees' accounting led to a civil suit. The Trustee accused of mismanagement was Jeremiah Cobb – the Nottoway's acting Treasure 1821-1846. His tenure coincides with the period of the reservation's final land sales, the Legislative allotment of tribal lands and growing debt and financial security (LP Dec. 16, 1818; LP Dec. 8, 1819; LP Dec. 10, 1821; LP Dec. 14, 1822). Though thwarted from selling as much of the Nottoway land as views from the Nottoway, their Trustees and Cobb about how best to stabilize the tribe’s financial situation, the legislation petitions filed during this period suggest competing powers in Richmond. The legislative petitions filed during this period suggested competing views from the Nottoway, their Trustees and Cobb about how best to stabilize the tribe’s financial situation.

Cobb was a part of the rising Democratic machine in Southampton; he was a long time member of the county court and a state legislator in the 1830s (Crofts 1992:130). Historian Stephen Oates notes that Cobb was “an eminent citizen of the county...had a large family and possessed an impressive home and some thirty-two slaves.” Jeremiah Cobb was also the presiding judge over the Nat Turner trial in 1831 (1975:124).

However, despite his eminence, Cobb like Thomas Ridley was removed as a Nottoway Trustee by the State’s executive branch in 1846 (CC Jan. 10, 1849). During the years of 1818-1821, a group of recently appointed Trustees petitioned the Legislature to sell Nottoway land needed for furnishing them [the Nottoway] with the necessaries of life (LP Dec. 16, 1818). Jeremiah Cobb was one of the Trustees who spearheaded the effort and kept regular correspondence with the County’s Legislator Carpenters the effort and kept regular correspondence with the County’s Legislator. Cobb was a part of the rising Democratic machine in Southampton; he was a large family and possessed an impressive home and some thirty-two slaves.” Jeremiah Cobb was also the presiding judge over the Nat Turner trial in 1831 (1975:124).

During the years of 1818-1821, a group of recently appointed Trustees petitioned the Legislature to sell Nottoway land needed for furnishing them [the Nottoway] with the necessaries of life (LP Dec. 16, 1818). Jeremiah Cobb was one of the Trustees who spearheaded the effort and kept regular correspondence with the County’s Legislator. Cobb was a part of the rising Democratic machine in Southampton; he was a large family and possessed an impressive home and some thirty-two slaves.” Jeremiah Cobb was also the presiding judge over the Nat Turner trial in 1831 (1975:124).

And the first series of allotments requested by eligible matrilineal Nottoway (CC Jan. 10, 1849) and the period of the Reservation’s final land sales, the Legislative allotment of tribal lands

Jeremiah Cobb – the Nottoway’s acting Treasure 1821-1846. His tenure coincides with Trustees' accounting led to a civil suit. The Trustee accused of mismanagement was
Former Trustee Thomas Ridley, then affiliated with the tribe, purchased three of the four tracts offered—843 acres of the approximately 1126 auctioned. Ridley paid $4 per acre for 562 acres and $5.93 per acre for another 281-acre tract, or a total of $3914.33. Ridley's newly purchased land was southwest of Indian Town along the Belfield Road and joined land already owned through the family's earlier Nottoway transactions, the core of the Indian lands' timber. Completed after the 1819-1820 transactions, the core of the
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Figure 18. Major Thomas Ridley's Bonnie Doone plantation, c.1930. The home was described as a "fortified refuge for women and children during the Nat Turner insurrection of 1831." Ridley's antebellum plantation was the largest to border Nottoway lands, adjacent to the Indian Woods south of Indian Town. Source: WPA 1937, Thomas Ridley Home [588]; photo courtesy of William Cole.

Thomas Ridley built a substantial home [Figure 18] in this corridor from the

Cary, son of Nottoway land speculator Miles Cary (William Cole, pers. comm., 2013). While already substantial landowners, the woodland and opening new agricultural fields, while already substantial landowners,

[590] and Rockwood [554]). There, he continued to build his family's estate by clearing

purchases (plan in LP Dec. 14, 1819; also see WPA 1937, Land Survey [146], Rock Springs). Belfield Road and joined land already owned through the family's earlier Nottoway

$539.43. Ridley's newly purchased land was southwest of Indian Town along the

per acre. For another 281-acre tract, or a total of
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former Trustee Thomas Ridley, then affiliated with the tribe, purchased three

The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The dwelling had a shingled gabled roof, three chimneys and was covered in beaded featheredge weatherboarding. The façade was typical for the "T" shaped manor house: a full-length front porch with Doric columns, eighteen-pane windows – twenty-six all total, with double revolving slat shutters. Six-panel pine doors opened to a large nine-room plastered interior with eleven-foot high ceilings and thick eight-inch wide floorboards. The home had ornately carved mantels and a hand-carved staircase with ornate balusters. The home had a novel post elevator, a second-story dumbwaiter, and a second-floor elevator. The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout." The new house was built with "very heavy framing, and the best materials used throughout."
contemporary planter neighbors more fully invested and developed plantation structures during the Antebellum, a period that coincided with the rise of America's Southern agricultural economy. The era also corresponded to the allotment of Southampton Nottoway lands in severalty. As individual farms became more tightly organized, with attention to increased profit of agricultural pursuits, the Nottoway would also engage in cycles of commerce in such a way that it virtually can no longer escape (Wallerstein 1987:205) and more fully explains the "hooking" of the community into the process makes the Nottoway experience seem less like the "pathetic history" as described in capitalist activities as Southampton continued to peripheralize. Understanding this transition from the broadening processes of incorporation toward the deepening of Southampton territory much, the Nottoway were impacted by the system's growth. Nottoway territory and the Nottoway operated within was the developing capitalist world-system. In as much as the community's transactional moment can be justified from the community's transformation, the motivations of the Trustees can be separated and the tribe's engagement with the county's capitalist headmen cannot be separated from this relationship. The Nottoway were completely ensnared with Southampton's political economy, governance, control over Indian land, its resources and the flow of capital.

The Nottoway lands in severalty. As individual farms became more highly organized, with agricultural economy. The era also corresponded to the allotment of Southampton during the Antebellum, a period that coincided with the rise of America's Southern contemporary planter neighbors more fully invested and developed plantation structures.
The Nottoway recognized the Trustees' mismanagement of their lands and financial trust. It is clear from the tribe's c.1800-1825 legislative petitions and the Trustee discourse with the Governor's office that disenfranchisement and financial misappropriation were central Nottoway complaints against their guardians through the 1820s. An accounting of the land sold and the finances documented by the Trustees also reveals that the Trustees used Nottoway capital to fund their own financial enterprise, stretching some deposits into the Nottoway trust over long periods of time, and in turn, drawing down the principal annuities and the interest income to their own benefit. Nottoway annuities depleted existing deposits and the income generated from them. The Trustees' actions resulted in the Trustees using the Nottoway estate as a mechanism to control and build wealth within Southampton. Today, the principle investments into the Nottoway trust never reached full capacity or maturity because the Trustees lengthened their payments or defaulted the Nottoway annuities drawn off principle, which diminished more investments in the Nottoway trust over time, and in turn, reduced the Trustee's capital. The Trustees used Nottoway capital to fund their own financial enterprises, revealing the Trustees' actions as the investment vehicle for the Trustees' personal wealth. Official documents from Commonwealth inquiries do not reveal if there were any state-enforced sanctions made against the Trustees, nor if any redress was made for financial impropriety. Trustee removal was the only penalty documented in the statehouse records, aside from balancing the Nottoway books once new Trustees were appointed. As new Trustees were often closely related to the previous appointments, the inner circle of Nottoway Trustees, even with executive-ordered replacements, remained linked through marriage, kinship, and the economics of Southampton County's elite families.
The audit process was likely superficial. Eventually, one set of Trustees, brothers Jeremiah and Benjamin Cobb were held accountable in Southampton Court for embezzling Nottoway funds. It was one of the few instances where Nottoway Trustees were officially sanctioned for mismanagement and impropriety (CO1832-1858:289).

Before the reservation's allotment, scandals such as these removed several sets of Nottoway Trustees. Since Trustees could appoint new Nottoway guardians, nepotism was one means by which the Trustees retained control of the tribal estate. Removed Trustees were replaced by their sons, brothers, cousins, in-laws or neighbors. These deceased account holders never fully realized their intended contributions to the estate and Trustees replaced them via the deaths of some tribal managers. The state supplements such accounts, replacing removed Trustees with the tribal's new Nottoway leaders. Second, the Nottoway utilized strategic presentations to convince legislators and other southern outside legal representation to counter Trustees political and economic domination. First, the Turner and Woodson owhachira leaders, from the extended matrilineages, Nottoway push back took several forms during the late 1810s and early 1820s.
The Trustees petitioned the Legislature to sell the remaining Nottoway lands. The petition, dated Dec. 18, 1818, emphasized the need to sell off the remaining trust lands "to direct the proceeds to be invested in some profitable stock in such a manner that your petitioners will certainly enjoy the benefit thereof." The petition further suggested that the lands be sold in an extensive credit, the amount being made payable in annual installments, thereby increasing the proceeds to be invested. The Trustees recommended selling the balance of their land and directing the proceeds to be invested in a manner that would fulfill the community's subsistence needs.

The Trustees petitioned the Legislature to sell more lands in December 1818. The petition addressed the need to sell off the remaining trust lands "to direct the proceeds to be invested in some profitable stock in such a manner that your petitioners will certainly enjoy the benefit thereof." The Trustees recommended selling the balance of their land and directing the proceeds to be invested in a manner that would fulfill the community's subsistence needs.

The petition highlighted the need to sell off the remaining trust lands "to direct the proceeds to be invested in some profitable stock in such a manner that your petitioners will certainly enjoy the benefit thereof." The Trustees recommended selling the balance of their land and directing the proceeds to be invested in a manner that would fulfill the community's subsistence needs.

The petition emphasized the need to sell off the remaining trust lands "to direct the proceeds to be invested in some profitable stock in such a manner that your petitioners will certainly enjoy the benefit thereof." The Trustees recommended selling the balance of their land and directing the proceeds to be invested in a manner that would fulfill the community's subsistence needs.

The petition highlighted the need to sell off the remaining trust lands "to direct the proceeds to be invested in some profitable stock in such a manner that your petitioners will certainly enjoy the benefit thereof." The Trustees recommended selling the balance of their land and directing the proceeds to be invested in a manner that would fulfill the community's subsistence needs.

The petition emphasized the need to sell off the remaining trust lands "to direct the proceeds to be invested in some profitable stock in such a manner that your petitioners will certainly enjoy the benefit thereof." The Trustees recommended selling the balance of their land and directing the proceeds to be invested in a manner that would fulfill the community's subsistence needs.

The petition highlighted the need to sell off the remaining trust lands "to direct the proceeds to be invested in some profitable stock in such a manner that your petitioners will certainly enjoy the benefit thereof." The Trustees recommended selling the balance of their land and directing the proceeds to be invested in a manner that would fulfill the community's subsistence needs.
The 1819 rearrangement within the Nottoway ranks likely reflects differences new in the Trustee Circle. While the same name and local magnificence Jeremiah Cobb led the newly formed plantation overseers over Nottoway affairs, John T. Blow, son of a former Nottoway 1819 Nottoway Trustee roster shows a realignment of Democrat, large slave-holding Plantation owners over Nottoway affairs. John T. Blow, Henry Welsh, and Blunt with more association as elite slaveholders among the former Trustees, Ridley and Blunt theocratic. The Cobbs and Blows were Democrats, from the lower county planter-class, political faction with liberal tendencies - rallied around emancipation and equality in the 1830-1840 Southampton elections. The Kitchens and Rochelles voted for the Whig party - a semi-egalitarian plantation owners of Fitzhugh, Blow and the Cobbs. According to the 1830-1840 Southampton and smallholding farms reflected this position contested with the large slave-holding Riddley's family wasdominantly from the upper county whose policies of emancipation appointed Colin Kitchen and John Rochelle and with the other Trustees. Meanwhile, Colin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1816</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Blow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Cobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Welsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1818</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John T. Blow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rochelle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1819</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fitzhugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Cobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Welsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the ousted Trustee Kitchen as their witness, the adult Nottoway majority opposed to the particulars submitted by their attorney Thomas M. Jeffries and the Trustees confirming the tribe's endorsement of the previous request, the Nottoway Trustees confirmed the 1818 Trustee land-sale petition, stating that despite the endorsement of the

The 1819 rearrangement within the Trustee ranks likely reflects differences new in the Trustee Circle. While the same name and local magnificence Jeremiah Cobb led the newly formed plantation overseers over Nottoway affairs, John T. Blow, son of a former Nottoway 1819 Nottoway Trustee roster shows a realignment of Democrat, large slave-holding Plantation owners over Nottoway affairs. John T. Blow, Henry Welsh, and Blunt with more association as elite slaveholders among the former Trustees, Ridley and Blunt theocratic. The Cobbs and Blows were Democrats, from the lower county planter-class, political faction with liberal tendencies - rallied around emancipation and equality in the 1830-1840 Southampton elections. The Kitchens and Rochelles voted for the Whig party - a semi-egalitarian plantation owners of Fitzhugh, Blow and the Cobbs. According to the 1830-1840 Southampton and smallholding farms reflected this position contested with the large slave-holding Riddley's family wasdominantly from the upper county whose policies of emancipation appointed Colin Kitchen and John Rochelle and with the other Trustees. Meanwhile, Colin
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<th>1819</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fitzhugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Cobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Welsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the ousted Trustee Kitchen as their witness, the adult Nottoway majority opposed to the particulars submitted by their attorney Thomas M. Jeffries and the Trustees confirming the tribe's endorsement of the previous request, the Nottoway Trustees confirmed the 1818 Trustee land-sale petition, stating that despite the endorsement of the
The Nottoway refused the sale of all of their remaining lands [estimated at 4200 acres], as it would "completely dispossess several of your petitioners of their plantations and settlements on which they have resided for several years." Acknowledging the reduced state of their fund, the Nottoway requested that the General Assembly amend the former law and authorize the "sale of the land contained in the described tract of their land" and "authorizing the Nottoway to sell their land containing the acreage on which they have resided for several years." Acknowledging the need for "provision for the compensation to the Commissioners for their trouble & responsibility," the Nottoway were acting as a corporate body in requiring compensation for the sale of their lands. Moreover, the Nottoway were resisting the Trustee system and the Assembly's control over their affairs.

In the new request, the Nottoway outlined their preferred terms for the sale of their remaining lands. They proposed that the sale "be divided into two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit." The Nottoway suggested that the state apparatus be used to resituate themselves more in control of their own affairs. Moreover, the Nottoway were acting as a corporate body in requiring compensation for the sale of their lands. They proposed that the sale be divided into two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit; from one to two thousand dollars in cash and the balance upon one or two years credit.
In this way, the Nottoway could settle all debts and any unforeseen fees before the capital amount began to accrue interest, and thereby protect the principal balance. Indian Town would also only release lands not then occupied by the residents along the main Indian path and thus continue to reserve lands for use as needed. Based on the Nottoway’s sense of their Trustees’ previous misappropriations and scandals, the tribe’s lawyer requested the enabling act oblige the Trustees to merely require a “lien upon the land as the only security” of the said purchasers and thus open the bidding to a wider body of potential buyers, rather than just former Trustees and other wealthy landowners.

The 1819 document was endorsed by the marks of twelve adult Nottoway, including Edith Turner at the top of the petition and undersigned by literate William and John Woodson – the two head names of the Woodson ohwachira. The Trustees included a letter with the new petition, which they did not personally endorse, reminding the House that the law of the first session of the legislature shall be carried into effect for the sake of the tribe’s financial situation and that the tribe will never consent letter with the new petition, which they did not personally endorse, reminding the House that the law of the first session of the legislature shall be carried into effect for the tribe’s financial situation and that the tribe will never consent.
petition, the Trustees would not to be outdone in the politics of Southampton finance. By the December 1821 Legislative session, the Trustees appealed to the General Assembly for more direct control over Nottoway affairs. Smarting from the Bendall Act and complaining that the interest of the new funds was insufficient to support the Nottoway material needs, the Trustees requested "reasonably in January of 1822. The Nottoway did not endorse the Trustees' counter-legislative efforts. Ignoring the previous year's Nottoway petition, the Legislature deemed the Trustees' counter-legislative efforts.
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upwards of thirty matrilineal members. Headed by the Woodson ohwachira, the tribe needed monies for new agricultural pursuits and to support growing families, then
petition and instead found new legal representation to propose another arrangement. The Trustees requested, "reasonable in January of 1822. The Nottoway did not endorse the

petition, the Trustees would not to be outdone in the politics of Southampton finance. By the December 1821 Legislative session, the Trustees appealed to the General Assembly for more direct control over Nottoway affairs. Smarting from the Bendall Act and complaining that the interest of the new funds was insufficient to support the Nottoway material needs, the Trustees requested "reasonably in January of 1822. The Nottoway did not endorse the Trustees' counter-legislative efforts. Ignoring the previous year's Nottoway petition, the Legislature deemed the Trustees' counter-legislative efforts.

and thus influence the Nottoway estate's management at the local level (LP Dec. 10, 1821, brackets added). Therefore, the Nottoway's previous victory was overshadowed by 1821, brackets added), the Nottoway's previous victory was overshadowed by
The Nottoway petition of 1821 sought cash to pay for mounting legal fees associated with pursuing the tribal estate and for defense attorneys needed by individual tribal members. Chief magistrate Thomas M. Randolph and two other men [John B. Richardson and Joseph Danforth] witnessed the competing Nottoway tribal petition to the General Assembly.

The document was worded in a similar manner to the earlier Trustee petitions, which appear to have been an attempt on the part of the tribe’s lawyer to style the language after previously successful Trustee legislative requests. In this accommodation, the Nottoway petition contained something very different, however, from any previous community’s benefit. Interchangeably, matrilineal usufruct was singled out in the petition as a detriment. The tribe argued there was "no longer any game worth pursuing" on their lands and that the timber was not being equally divided or properly harvested to the benefit of the community. The tribe argued there was "no longer any game worth pursuing" on their lands, which lent "equal" takes away the main inducement to industry in

"being held in common, which leaves takes away the main inducement to industry in..."
convince the General Assembly that the Nottowa y could deal with their own welfare and remove themselves “from the control of the Trustees and all other restrictions” (LP Dec. 13, 1823). Trustee malpractice and impropriety clearly motivated the Nottoway to suggest they would be better off handling their own affairs. The task, however, was to convince the Assembly that the tribe could participate in the agrarian society that now surrounded them and as landowners, could responsibly manage their business without placing their affairs and manage the finances of land sales and leases. Given the political, economic and legal restrictions colonialism imposed upon the Nottoway, the tribe likely sought alliances where they could. Linguistic evidence suggests Nottoway sympathizers included Quakers as well. William Madison, Colin Kitchen and John Rochele – while men with liberal tendencies, suggest some of their advocacy came from upper Southampton County – from Nottoway, the tribe likely sought alliances where they could. Linguistic evidence suggests Indian Town leaders were strategic and semi-conversant in the judicial council through these legislative processes. Decades of legal representation also endorsed Nottoway documents from this period, indicating the Nottoway had some legal engagement with the bureaucracy of the state. Different sheriffs, magistrates, magistrates and lawyers endorsed the 1819 petition, the Nottoway relied on judicial officials to assist their affairs and manage the finances of land sales and leases. Trustee interference. The Nottoway wanted to assert control over their own community surrounded them and as landowners, could responsibly manage their business without convincing the Assembly that the tribe could participate in the agrarian society that now suggested they would be better off handling their own affairs. The task, however, was to Dec. 13, 1823), Trustee malpractice and impropriety clearly motivated the Nottoway to and remove themselves „from the control of the Trustees and all other restrictions” (LP convince the General Assembly that the Nottoway could deal with their own welfare.
Rountree argues that the Nottoway petition for land allotment was a request by Indian Town "for outright termination," "detribalization" and "the liquidation of the tribe as a legal entity" (1987:205-207). I would argue that the Nottoway allotment request reflected tribal frustration with government corruption, and came after decades of resistance and attempts to redress complaints. Rather than asking for "detribalization", the Nottoway Legislative Petition is the only extant document of its kind in the eighteenth-century. The Nottoway legislative petition is the only extant document of its kind in the eighteenth-century. The Nottoway Legislative Petition is the only extant document of its kind in the eighteenth-century.

To emphasize the Nottoway request, the chief and three other signatories signed the document with Iroquoian titles or personal names: Wane' Roonseraw or Edith Turner, Kare' hout or Polly Woodson, Wm. Woodson, and Te-rees-ke' or Solomon Rogers. The document with Iroquoian titles or personal names: Wane' Roonseraw or Edith Turner, Kare' hout or Polly Woodson, Wm. Woodson, and Te-rees-ke' or Solomon Rogers.

The 1821 Nottoway petition offered an alternative to Trustee "superintendence." Headed by "the female chief" Edith Turner, the community argued they wanted a restriction placed on the potentially divided land, and thereby limit "the power to alienate the land allotted to each." The tribe, in concert with the lineage system, requested the "first, second, third, and forth holders [generations] in succession" be prevented "from selling more than one fourth part, each, of the quantity actually confirmed each individual." In this way, the growing Woodson Ohwachira would see the grandchildren of the 1810s newborns secure in their inheritance. For this consideration, the tribe requested "an extension of the time [for allotment] of minority and grandchild, and children of the 1810s newborns secure in their inheritance. For this individual." In this way, the growing Woodson Ohwachira would see the grandchildren being able to benefit from the land allotted to each. The tribe, in concert with the lineage system, requested the restriction placed on the potentially divided land, and thereby limit "the power to alienate the land allotted to each." The tribe, in concert with the lineage system, requested the restriction placed on the potentially divided land, and thereby limit "the power to alienate the land allotted to each." The tribe, in concert with the lineage system, requested the restriction placed on the potentially divided land, and thereby limit "the power to alienate the land allotted to each." The tribe, in concert with the lineage system, requested the restriction placed on the potentially divided land, and thereby limit "the power to alienate the land allotted to each." Thus the Nottoway petition offered an alternative to Trustee "superintendence."
demonstrated their solidarity as Iroquoians and culturally articulated their self-direction. The counter-petition was an attempt by the Nottoway to remove themselves from the Trustee system – a state installed apparatus that had manipulated Indian resources for almost a century and largely benefitted White landowners. Simply put, the Nottoway wanted to determine how much land was sold in the future, have full control over the proceeds, and manage the distribution of those resources. In my view, the Nottoway request was about control of land and capital resources, and less about socio-political organization or status as a tribal or legal entity.

The counter-petition was an attempt by the Nottoway to remove themselves from the Trustee system – a state installed apparatus that had manipulated Indian resources for almost a century and largely benefitted White landowners. Simply put, the Nottoway wanted to determine how much land was sold in the future, have full control over the proceeds, and manage the distribution of those resources. In my view, the Nottoway request was about control of land and capital resources, and less about socio-political organization or status as a tribal or legal entity.
A generation after the allotment act was eventually passed, the Commonwealth’s Attorney General confirmed the status of the Nottoway as “tributary” to Virginia, with “the individuals of the tribe having all the privileges of Indians.” As the Attorney General’s legal opinion concerned a tribal member who had already had portions of his land allotted, I further argue that allotment did not change a Nottoway individual’s legal status and had little or no bearing on whether lineage members applied for allotments.

Future Nottoway applied for land allotments, received them and continued to operate within Southampton County as “descendants of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians,” and even led civil suits against Trustees of females of the same perspective, as female tribal members who claimed allotments from their ancestors. Allotment and access to the tribal land was by matrilineal descent, further strengthening this perspective. As female tribal members who claimed allotments from their ancestors.

One of the signatories of the 1821 petition was William Woodson Woodson, also known as Billy Woodson and William C. Bozeman. William Woodson-Bozeman was a matrilineal member of the Woodson ohwachira, the son of Nancy Woodson [Indian] and Micajah “Mike” Bozeman, a White smallholding farmer. Young Bozeman’s Quaker education and experience with his father’s land dealing likely influenced his early Nottoway endeavors. As William Woodson-Bozeman was a matrilineal member of the Woodson ohwachira, the son of Nancy Woodson [Indian] and Micajah “Mike” Bozeman, a White smallholding farmer. Young Bozeman’s Quaker education and experience with his father’s land dealing likely influenced his early Nottoway endeavors.

One of the signatories of the 1821 petition was William Woodson Woodson, also known as Billy Woodson and William C. Bozeman. William Woodson-Bozeman was a matrilineal member of the Woodson ohwachira, the son of Nancy Woodson [Indian] and Micajah “Mike” Bozeman, a White smallholding farmer. Young Bozeman’s Quaker education and experience with his father’s land dealing likely influenced his early Nottoway endeavors.
purposes here, they cast the community as "desolate of both economy, prudence or
Trustees repeatedly described the Nottoway as "decreasing", but more importantly for
the habits of sobriety, industry, frugality, but without effect (Palmer X:46). The
people in a "miserable state" arising every attempt was made "to induce them to use
In contrast, the Trustees consistently portrayed the Nottoway as "unfortunate
and poor" (Gentlemen's Magazine 1821:305-306; Cabell Papers 1808; Morse 1822:31;
and others remarked Indian Town "lacking and other business was managed "with discretion
and patience", and kept "in a good state of cultivation" until 1819-1820 land
furnished", and keep "in a good state of cultivation. We were "comfortable", well
Nottoway Town described headwoman Edith Turner as "excellent and intelligent...although
Nottoway agricultural lands and accumulated personal property. An 1820 visitor to
worked as day laborers for monetary remuneration, purchased and hired slaves to work
years, selling crops, livestock and home-manufactures in Southern markets. They
As well, the Nottoway had engaged in agriculture and animal husbandry for many
farms on matrilineal land.
these marriage partners worked the Nottoway land for profit and managed their own
also provided some consultation on the Trustee issue and tribal financial situation as
Colored" allies of Nottoway women, such as James Taylor and Burwell Williams, likely
DB191:136, Northampton County, NC; OB1819-1822:433; PTL1807-1821; The "Free
own farm until, first as a laborer and then as a landowner (C1820, Halifax County, NC;
The 1821 tribal petition expressed their wish to more fully manage their own affairs, is reasonable to argue that the Nottoway were conversant in property ownership and their Euro-American seventeenth- and eighteenth-century confederacy conflicts. From these experiences, it was expected that Nottoways would be literate and knowledgeable in the world economic system. The community was literate for over 100 years, educated by Anglicans at the College of William & Mary and in Quaker Meetinghouses in Southampton, Virginia-Carolina. They were fur traders, guides for Quaker Meetinghouses in Southampton, Virginia-Carolina. They were fur traders, guides for 18th-century Carolina. Members of the Nottoway community were literate U.S. citizens, a beneficiary of the world economic system. The frontier had closed in South Carolina nearly a century earlier. The Nottoway were literate, educated, and experienced in property ownership and the world economic system. The Nottoway were literate, educated, and experienced in property ownership and the world economic system. They presented the tribe in a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state, presenting the tribe as a reduced state.
including market participation. The removal of economic barriers to capital contributed to
the community's transformation as they more fully engaged the agro-industrial economy.
As well, the tension created by Nottoway political action against the state-regulated
Trustee system likely had other, unintended consequences (see Sider 1986:34-38; Wolf
1997:354-361, 379-384). I agree the entrance of the community into the market created a
"viscous" cycle for the tribe economically (Rountree 1979a, 1987:200), but I disagree
tribal members were passive recipients of capitalism who "refused to adopt new ways of
participating within the world economy. The Nottoway petition for allotment was a unified attempt of the
community to control the amount of capital available to them. This situation amounted to block and counter the
control the tribal elite. The Nottoway wanted access to their own resources and the full
benefits of the capitalist economy. Thus there was a competition between the two,
Trustees controlled of the same resources, which until that time had overwhelmingly
benefited the Bouquetic Trustee Circle. This situation amounted to block and counter the
Trustees control of the same resources, which until that time had overwhelmingly
benefited the Bouquetic Trustee Circle. Thus there was a competition between the two,
Trustees controlled of the same resources, which until that time had overwhelmingly
benefited the Bouquetic Trustee Circle. Thus there was a competition between the two,
Trustees controlled of the same resources, which until that time had overwhelmingly
benefited the Bouquetic Trustee Circle. Thus there was a competition between the two,
An Act Concerning William G. Bozeman, 1824

The Nottoway tribal petition for allotment was rejected by the General Assembly in January of 1822. The House approved the Trustees' petition from the same year, but did not enable them to access any of the principal from the land sales—a sum of $4,000. The Trustees claimed the available interest for annuities only amounted to about three dollars (

$239.73 from which sum $2397.39 on the 4th March 1823 --- $1,998.26 on the 4th March 1824 --- $79.91 on the 4th March 1825 --- $79.91 on the 4th March 1827.

March 1822 --- $79.91 on the 4th March 1823 --- $1,998.26 on the 4th March 1824 --- $79.91 on the 4th March 1825.

The Nottoway recognized the arrangements as long as the General Assembly maintained the Trustees system, the elites of Southampton could manipulate the financial trust. Former Trustee Thomas Ridley had purchased nearly 850 Nottoway acres, the instalments due within three years. The accounting of the $4000 was in the hands of Jeremiah Cobb. In all probability Ridley's full amount due the Nottoway tribe never actually exchanged hands, but rather by the 1822 act of the General Assembly he was allowed to merely pay the interest owed the tribe.

The Nottoway recognized the arrangements as long as the General Assembly maintained the Trustees system, the elites of Southampton could manipulate the financial trust. Former Trustee Thomas Ridley had purchased nearly 850 Nottoway acres, the instalments due within three years. The accounting of the $4000 was in the hands of Jeremiah Cobb. In all probability Ridley's full amount due the Nottoway tribe never actually exchanged hands, but rather by the 1822 act of the General Assembly he was allowed to merely pay the interest owed the tribe.

The Nottoway recognized the arrangements as long as the General Assembly maintained the Trustees system, the elites of Southampton could manipulate the financial trust. Former Trustee Thomas Ridley had purchased nearly 850 Nottoway acres, the instalments due within three years. The accounting of the $4000 was in the hands of Jeremiah Cobb. In all probability Ridley's full amount due the Nottoway tribe never actually exchanged hands, but rather by the 1822 act of the General Assembly he was allowed to merely pay the interest owed the tribe.
The Legislature had considered the Nottoway’s allotment petition. Carr Bowers, then representing Southampton in Richmond, wrote Jeremiah Cobb with not a little suspicion:

"A petition has been presented, purporting to be from the Nottoway tribe of Indians, for certain reasons therein contained, that an equal division of their lands may be made amongst them...what is their general character as to sobriety, industry and economy? Are they capable of taking care of their property? Or are they so much addicted to the use of whiskey as to lose all the benefit of it?" (Bowers to Cobb Dec. 27, 1821, brackets added).

Cobb’s response was damning in all the expected ways – the Indians would sell anything for alcohol and drink all the money. If the lands were divided up, the whole of the town would be penniless in five years, at which point they would become wards of the parish to the detriment of the county. Cobb’s counter recommendation repeated a pattern of logic used by Nottoway Trustees for generations:

we should sell all the land but a small parcel, deposit the money into a fund and use the annual interest to support the parish in the distant future. The annual revenue of the county, Cobb’s counter recommendation repeated a pattern of logic used by Nottoway Trustees for generations.

Unsatisfied with the Trustees’ response and still wanting more control over the estate, the Nottoway considered their position. Another tribal petition went to Richmond in 1823. In this instance, only one tribal member applied for permission to hold in fee simple so much land as he may be considered entitled to hold in fee simple; hence, the petition was made by Bozeman, the tribe’s representative.}

Unsatisfied with the Trustees’ response and still wanting more control over the estate, the Nottoway considered their position. Another tribal petition went to Richmond in 1823. In this instance, only one tribal member applied for permission to hold in fee simple so much land as he may be considered entitled to hold in fee simple; hence, the petition was made by Bozeman, the tribe’s representative. However, based on the previous petition made by Bozeman as an individual, however, based on the previous petition, additional tribal members did not endorse the application, nor did the Trustees; the petition was removed for embezzlement by the Governor’s office in 1846.
Nottoway petition endorsed by four residents of Indian Town on behalf of the whole "Council" that also requested some form of allotment, the origins of the appeal can at least be partially attributed to the tribal community.

The voice of Bozeman’s request can be in some measure attributed to the planter

1823.

Whereas communal ownership; his petition stated he wanted none of either (LP Dec. 13, 1823).

Bozeman argued the paternalism of the Trustees was as odious and oppressive as the

Bozeman argued the paternalism of the Trustees was as odious and oppressive as the

Bible

sentiment for forcing an amendment to the matrilineal divisions of Nottoway property.

men's right to own land, engage in labor and provide his children inheritance as central

sentiment for forcing an amendment to the matrilineal divisions of Nottoway property.

Colonial Assembly address. Quakers had long encouraged sobriety, industry and property

elements of contemporary religious ideology [likely Quaker, but could be any of the county’s

William C. Bozeman’s is not Bozeman’s, nor is the slowness and lengthy prose. Elements

sentience’s hand. As well, the paternalism of Bozeman’s bill drawn for “An Act Concerning

By all accounts he was literal; several extant documents from the era match the unknown

and court records, the handwriting in the document is not Bozeman’s despite the fact that

individual’s handwritten in the text. Based on a comparison of other legislative petitions

language, but there is more than one place in the document where Bozeman, the

The voice of Bozeman’s legal council can be clearly heard throughout the petition

least be partially attributed to the tribal community.

"Council" that also requested some form of allotment, the origins of the appeal can at

Nottoway petition endorsed by four residents of Indian Town on behalf of the whole
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Matric with Bozeman as the petitioner, Nottoway lands would be completely opened for
landowners endorsed a letter of support for Bozeman's petition and praised his character.

September 1823, Pasa's presence and future Nottoway Trustees, as well as prominent county

The Bozeman petition was circulated during Southampton's court week in mid

December 1823. Alderman's affidavit and Petersburg Intelligencer newspaper notice of William G.
Bozeman, also known as Billy Woodson. Bozeman successfully petitioned the General Assembly
for real and personal estate severance from the Nottoway Tribe of Indians, 1823/1824.

Figure 20. Alderman's affidavit and Petersburg Intelligencer newspaper notice of William G.

Bozeman, also known as Billy Woodson. Bozeman successfully petitioned the General Assembly
for real and personal estate severance from the Nottoway Tribe of Indians, 1823/1824.
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December 1823. Alderman's affidavit and Petersburg Intelligencer newspaper notice of William G.
Bozeman, also known as Billy Woodson. Bozeman successfully petitioned the General Assembly
for real and personal estate severance from the Nottoway Tribe of Indians, 1823/1824.
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December 1823. Alderman's affidavit and Petersburg Intelligencer newspaper notice of William G.
Bozeman, also known as Billy Woodson. Bozeman successfully petitioned the General Assembly
for real and personal estate severance from the Nottoway Tribe of Indians, 1823/1824.
individual allotment, free of future legislative petitions. Seventy-eight prominent
landowners in all signed the document, but conspicuously missing from the Assembly
letter were the signatures of Trustee Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb and trust-fund bank roller
Thomas Ridley. Clearly there were guiding hands behind Bozeman’s presentation, but it
is difficult to discern whose, with so many interested parties wanting similar outcomes
(LP Dec. 1823, Letter, Sept. 15, 1823). In general, it can be said that all allotting Nottoway
land was a goal of some residents of Indian Town and a goal of some Southampton
landowners. The exact contribution of the agents orchestrating Bozeman’s appeal is
unknown. However, unknown, there was a goal of some residents of Indian Town and a goal of some Southampton
landowners in all signed the document, but conspicuously missing from the Assembly
individual allotment, free of future legislative petitions. Seventy-eight prominent
lastly, "whenever any descendant of a female of the Nottoway...shall apply" for the same rights provided William G. Bozeman, they may be granted by the Court and Trustees as long as the applicant is "of good moral character...and not likely to become chargeable to any part of the Commonwealth." This last point upheld portions of the Trustees' interests as outlined by Jeremiah Cobb and provided a limited, but continuing measure of Trustee control. And thus, William G. Bozeman successfully lobbied the General Assembly for the allotment of the Nottoway reservation.

Nottoway Allotment, 1830

Helen Rountree argues the Bozeman Act meant detribalization for the allottee and that this legality was the motivation for William G. Bozeman waiting over six years to claim his share (1987:209). I disagree with Rountree's conceptualization of detribalization as the intended goal of the Commonwealth's Act. Moreover, I do not claim this share (1987:209). I disagree with Rountree's conceptualization of detribalization as the intended goal of the Commonwealth's Act. Yet, the first allotments were taken by leadership figures of the Indian Town, the lands surveyed were "the most inferior of reservation and unoccupied in their estate. The first allotments were taken by leadership figures of the Indian Town, the lands surveyed were "the most inferior of reservation and unoccupied..."

1824:101-102)
1835. These actions suggest strategy on behalf of the community and coincide with Nottoway Town's more complete participation in the agricultural economy. Indigenous leaders interfacing with agents of the state or its economic apparatus typically position themselves as the intermediary between the community and outside political or economic forces. Tribal leader/state interaction has a number of consequences and the resulting leadership transformation can take on many forms (e.g. Chiweza 2007:53-76; White 1983:97-146). The first request for a general allotment came from Edith Turner, the "female chief" of the Nottoway, one of the last fluent speakers of the community's Iroquoian language and the senior matriline of the Turner ohwachira. Her authoritative position at Indian Town and her decades-long activism against Trustee mismanagement manifested itself as the first allottee of the Nottoway reservation.

In 1830, Turner requested her division through attorney William C. Parker, who in turn only sought endorsements from the Trustees. Turner's actions have mystified some researchers (Rountree 1979a:23, 41; 1987:203, 210), as the Nottoway headwoman represented the traditional Iroquoian community, yet was progressively more engaged with the rising capitalist economy. Edith Turner's application for allotment may be seen in the context of these incongruent roles, as her untenable position reflects uneven processes of the system's development. Moreover, the Nottoway increasingly had to demonstrate their uniqueness and historically particular relationship to the state [e.g. as tributary Indians, not subject to Negro and Mulatto laws]. Turner [likely recognized the need to present the Nottoway as an Iroquoian people in the eyes of high-ranking officials [thus, William Bozeman's petition: literate, half-White and male]. At a deeper level, these actions speak to the community's Iroquoian language and the senior matriline of the Turner ohwachira. Her authoritative position at Indian Town and her decades-long activism against Trustee mismanagement manifested itself as the first allottee of the Nottoway reservation.

In 1830, Turner requested her division through attorney William C. Parker, who in turn only sought endorsements from the Trustees. Turner's actions have mystified some researchers (Rountree 1979a:23, 41; 1987:203, 210), as the Nottoway headwoman represented the traditional Iroquoian community, yet was progressively more engaged with the rising capitalist economy. Edith Turner's application for allotment may be seen in the context of these incongruent roles, as her untenable position reflects uneven processes of the system's development. Moreover, the Nottoway increasingly had to demonstrate their uniqueness and historically particular relationship to the state [e.g. as tributary Indians, not subject to Negro and Mulatto laws]. Turner [likely recognized the need to present the Nottoway as an Iroquoian people in the eyes of high-ranking officials [thus, William Bozeman's petition: literate, half-White and male]. At a deeper level, these actions speak to the community's Iroquoian language and the senior matriline of the Turner ohwachira. Her authoritative position at Indian Town and her decades-long activism against Trustee mismanagement manifested itself as the first allottee of the Nottoway reservation.
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Peasant societies within the mercantile political economy (1986:35-36). Side identities as a major point of articulation in the embedding process of “tribal” or deal with the state, the Trustees, the capitalist system, Turner was the intermediary imposed by the state, the Trustees, and the capitalist system. Turner was the intermediary, she was caught in the tension between the autonomy of Indian Town and the constraints she was caught in the tension between the autonomy of Indian Town and the constraints the community to acquire a minimal but vital cash income. As a traditional leader, Edith Turner’s position rose as the Nottoway’s lack of economic alternatives movement to acquire cash and control capital derived from the tribal estate. Edith Turner’s position rose as the Nottoway’s lack of economic alternatives movement to acquire cash and control capital derived from the tribal estate. Nottoway’s lack of economic alternatives movement to acquire cash and control capital derived from the tribal estate. Agribusiness organization, yet her power was compromised in and partly generated by the respected and authoritative leader within the traditional framework of Nottoway clan and closely with the matrilineal males, Edith Turner cared for her people and charged as a community and self-directed by kin groups, elders and heads of households. Working mobilized for exterior day-wage activities, but work was also organized within the replaced homesteading and hunting / gathering. Nottoway economy replaced homesteading and hunting / gathering. Nottoway economy largely essential to the community’s economy. Agriculture and animal husbandry had largely essential to the community’s economy. Agriculture and animal husbandry had largely providing needed more cash income, land sales, rentals and annuities became the community continued in isolation when other lineages removed north. With Nottoway Nottoway’s role in Nottoway social-politics was transformed as Nottoway Nottoway’s role in Nottoway social-politics was transformed as a traditional head of an ohwachira and the ranking woman of the remaining land and the polarization of peoples within the capitalistic system. In an indigenous understandings of economic relationships, the commodification of Indian
At times, her position was tenuous, because the community membership did not access the resources for six years—a monetary disbursement. While the act allowed individual allotment and equal shares of land sales and individual annuities, the Nottoway Act of 1824 was a successful community effort to secure more control over the contractual terms and conditions of Nottoway land sales and individual annuities. The Nottoway Act, multiple attempts to counter Trustee management of land sales and petition for more control over tribal assets, Edith Turner’s maneuvers are consistent with a pattern: Indian Town’s multiple attempts to counter Trustee management of land sales and petition for more control over tribal assets, Edith Turner’s maneuvers are consistent with asymmetrical external pressures, imposed “constraints-to-produce” and “collective self-direction” [e.g. mobilized kin groups or households] as critical to understanding the emergence of traditional leadership figures like Edith Turner.

Here, the external forces kin-based leaders are compelled to navigate the external system: kinship and attempts to harness the resources and powers of the external system (Wolf 1997:99-100) to secure more control over tribal assets, Edith Turner’s ascension and actions as a leader parallel the recognition of Turner as an agent of merchant capitalism. The Bozeman Act of 1824 was a community effort to secure more control of Nottoway land sales and monetary disbursements—a critical to understanding the emergence of traditional leadership figures like Edith Turner.
When Turner petitioned the Southampton court for an allotment of reservation land on March 11, 1830; five days later William G. Bozeman made the same request. While the tribe continued to receive meager annuities from the Trustees, the overall trust's principal was dwindling. The last infusion came with the 1820s installments from the 1819-1820 land sales (DB20:171) and new leases were insufficient to replenish the funds. Increased agricultural endeavors and new births at Indian Town required more land for cultivation. The 1819-1820 land sales (DB19:171) and new leases were insufficient to replenish the trust's principal was dwindling. The last infusion came with the 1820s installments from the Trustees, the overall trust's principal was dwindling. Turner and Bozeman, as "two of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians" received a 272 acres of the surveyed land, worth $10 per acre. Averaged, the total valuation of the tribe's real estate was from 5 to 10 acres per tract. Turner petitioned the Southampton for an allotment of reservation land on March 11, 1830; five days later William G. Bozeman made the same request.

1824:2 and 1824:3, Southampton County, NC.

where the community needed resources (DB20:171), Turner for allocations came at a
discourse served his needs. The request by Bozeman and Turner for allocations came at a
intermittently returned to visit his sisters' matrilineal farms and engage in what political
nuclear family in North Carolina, Bozeman was in debt to his White father-in-law. He
married a White woman and was engaged in private farming operations. Raising his own
access to cash. As well, William Bozeman had relocated to North Carolina in the 1820s,
marked the beginning of a White planters who previously purchased Nottoway lands from
Bozeman and Turner made arrangements to sell the combined allotments to Henry
General Fund of $2,500 for three and one-half acres that were lacking from the survey.
division of the surveyed land, 209½ acres in severalty each, plus a cash payment from the
Edith Turner petitioned the Southampton for an allotment of reservation land on March 11, 1830; five days later William G. Bozeman made the same request.

1824:2 and 1824:3, Southampton County, NC.
The Trustees. The newly surveyed tract conveniently bordered Vaughan along the Belfield Road, south of Indian Town, suggesting the survey, the sale and the location of the allotments was coordinated by the community (Figure 21). Vaughan paid $1160 to Bozeman and Turner for 416½ acres in May of 1830 (CC May 1830; DB21:381).

Figure 21. Nottoway Reservation Survey, 1830. The page is oriented with cardinal north to the lower right against the Belfield Road. Source: Clerks Office, Southampton County.
Bozeman returned to North Carolina and became increasingly anchored in Halifax County, returning less and less to Southampton (C1830, 1840, 1850, Halifax County, NC). Edith Turner’s post-1830 farmstead remained surrounded by Nottoway lands along the Indian Path, a mostly central location to the settlement (DB25:62; Rountree 1987:210). From there, Turner managed her affairs with the help of several younger relatives and one male slave (C1830). She continued to be capable of a senior matrilineal role as a traditional leader, allowing her to collect and redistribute monetary resources. Through successfully acquiring at least $600 cash for the community, the Turner family was able to control tribal assets, meeting the market needs of the community. Edith Turner’s role as a traditional leader was modified to meet the market needs of the Nottoway community, allowing her to collect and redistribute monetary resources. Through applying for allotment lands and then selling the lands outright, the Nottoway community benefited directly from the exchange, without Trustee management of the capital. From this vantage, Edith Turner’s allotment request and immediate land sale are compatible with the community’s decades-long rejection of the Trustee system and strategic decisions made by the Iroquoian structures needed to mobilize resources for the community. The monies from Turner’s land sales were invested in the thirteen matrilineal Nottoway farms, and profits from the sale of Indian Town land were distributed to the relatives and other matrilineal heads (C1830). She continued in her capacity as a senior matrilineal head. From this vantage, Edith Turner’s allotment request and the exchange of her lands for cash are compatible with the community’s decades-long rejection of the Trustee system and strategic decisions made by the Iroquoian structures needed to mobilize resources for the community.
Concluding Discussion

The conjoining of two diverse processes 1) communal self-determination of production and 2) the imposed constraints of the capitalist system, impacted the Nottoway community in several ways. First, leadership figures Edith Turner and William G. Bozeman were catapulted to the forefront of Nottoway politics. Demands of the system gave preference to Bozeman as a literate, Anglicized, educated individual and senior Turner as the appropriate etesheh head for Indian Town-Trustee discourse. Turner's position had previously been the domain of male members of matrilineages such as Bozeman, which reveals a transformation of communal demands, especially underlining and incorporating their authority. Turner notes this process occurs in forms of resistance, as his power made them vulnerable to external demands, eventually undermining and incapacitating their authority. Though ironical because of his liminal status, he was the best public advocate for the community; a literate potential landowner with a White father.

These leadership positions typically became untenable as either too much or too little power made them vulnerable to external decisions, eventually undermining and incapacitating their authority. Turner or Bozeman, with a White father, his liminal status, he was the best public advocate for the community: a literate potential landowner with a White father. Though ironical because of reservation residence, his somewhat of a liminal figure, also hints to the community’s reluctant justification of Bozeman’s presence, as his off-reservation residence made him somewhat of a liminal figure. Though ironical because of reservation residence, his somewhat liminal figure, also hints to the community’s reluctant justification of Bozeman’s presence, as his off-reservation residence made him somewhat of a liminal figure. Though ironical because of reservation residence, his somewhat liminal figure, also hints to the community’s reluctant justification of Bozeman’s presence, as his off-reservation residence made him somewhat of a liminal figure.

The 1824 Bozeman Act was a form of self-determination and a resistance to Trustee mismanagement, but also an accommodation to the system in which Southampton was incorporated. The victory at the local level would ultimately have profound implications for the community: a literate potential landowner with a White father. Though ironical because of reservation residence, his somewhat liminal figure, also hints to the community’s reluctant justification of Bozeman’s presence, as his off-reservation residence made him somewhat of a liminal figure. Though ironical because of reservation residence, his somewhat liminal figure, also hints to the community’s reluctant justification of Bozeman’s presence, as his off-reservation residence made him somewhat of a liminal figure.
Secondly, as the processes of peripheralization continued, some aspects of Nottoway culture became "emblemished and elaborate and sometimes much less secularly as the processes of peripheralization continued, some aspects of Nottoway culture became "emblemished and elaborate and sometimes much less autonomous than it appears to be to both its participants and to outside observers. (See p. 1986:36; also see Dobson 1978.) Such changes in the case with the Nottoway, as traditional Nottoway culture became "emblemished and elaborate and sometimes much less autonomous than it appears to be to both its participants and to outside observers. (See p. 1986:36; also see Dobson 1978.) Such changes in the case with the Nottoway, as traditional
The final point of consideration for the Nottoway allotment process is the impact of intensifying market forces on kinship relations. The community's participation in the cash economy, their acquisition and consumption of finished goods, and the increased use of intensified market forces on kinship relations. The community's participation in the market economy, their access to agricultural produce, their household consumption, and their engagement with the community's production of commodified commodities. The commodification of Nottoway land and community's shift in production and the market economy's impact on the community's descent system, and upset an already weakened matrilineal community. Matrilineal inheritance and institution came in direct conflict with Southampton's dominant kinship forms, and upset an already weakened matrilineal community. Impacted their descent system, and upset an already weakened matrilineal community. impacts the commodification of Nottoway land and community's shift in production and the market economy's impact on the community's descent system, and upset an already weakened matrilineal community. Matrilineal inheritance and institution came in direct conflict with Southampton's dominant kinship forms, and upset an already weakened matrilineal community. Impacted their descent system, and upset an already weakened matrilineal community. Impacted their descent system, and upset an already weakened matrilineal community.
CHAPTER IV

Southampton Lands, Peoples, Property Ownership and Labor

“In their character of members of a dependent tribe of Indians the individuals of the [Nottoway] tribe have all the privileges of Indians. The fact that some of them may also be mulattoes should not deprive them of this privilege. The term mulatto may by a liberal construction embrace them. But as the law should be strictly construed I cannot think that they are properly embraced in it.”

~ Sidney S. Baxter, Attorney General of Virginia, Legislative Petition of Parsons Turner, March 29, 1838

Nineteenth-century Indian Town was embedded within the physical geography of Southampton, Virginia, interconnected by the roadways, river systems and markets of “Old Southampton”. The process of Nottoway land commodification resulted in the community’s increased economic relationship to capital, and as demonstrated by the Nottoway’s increased economic relationship to capital, and as demonstrated by the

The deepening of capitalism at Nottoway Town continued to generate bureaucracy for the community: aimed at defining, enforcing and ensuring terms of exchange for Nottoway peoples. Therefore, one theme the chapter addresses is the development of capitalization at Nottoway Town, continued to generate.

Southampton’s demography of Whites, Slaves, and other Free Persons through a careful review of census records, court orders, legislative petitions and tax records, the

Highlights the civic infrastructure and physical environment of the county, and analyzes community within the context of Southampton’s political economy, 1830-1860. In

Nottoway more fully engaged the system. This chapter examines the Nottoway Indians’ struggles with their Trustees, the opportunity for capitalist exploitation. In response, the

commodity increased economic relationship to capital, and as demonstrated by

Southampton’s. The process of Nottoway land commodification resulted in the

Sixteenth-century Indian Town was embedded within the physical geography of


---

Legislative Petition of Parsons Turner, March 29, 1838

~ Sidney S. Baxter, Attorney General of Virginia, Legislative Petition of Parsons Turner, March 29, 1838

In this petition, Parsons Turner argues that the law should be strictly construed, and that members of the Nottoway tribe, who may also be mulattoes, should be considered as honorary members of the tribe. He contends that the law should not deprive them of their privileges as Indians. The petition calls for the recognition of the Nottoway tribe as a distinct nation, with rights and privileges similar to those of other Indian tribes.

CHAPTER IV

Southampton’s Peoples, Property Ownership and Labor
relationships through formal legal agreements. Nottoway petitions to the statehouse, rental contracts for Indian land, individual property sales, contractual hires and loans for other modes of labor are explored in an effort to uncover the correlations between slaves, laborers and owners to one another. The Nottoway's experience with slavery and with adjacent planter owners, economic relationships intersected bound Southampton labor to harvest IndianTown crops or the exchange of Nottoway labor for slave hires appear to the benefit of producers. Whether through Nottoway reliance on enslaved Nottoway slave ownership and slave hires were defined and regulated by the state – the relationships that IndianTown residents developed with slave labor –

economic-system...
During the eighteenth century, the Anglican Church of England divided the Nottoway's territory into two parishes: Nottoway Parish northeast of the river and St. Luke's Parish southwest to the Meherrin River. After the 1749 formation of Southampton, areas considered "upper" and "lower" sections of the county followed the contours of the Nottoway River. The county's civil jurisdictions preserved the Church of England's colonial demarcation: tax lists, agricultural censuses, slave schedules, and U.S. Federal census records all conformed to the Nottoway Parish boundaries (Crofts 1993a:133; Joyner 2003:31-32; Parramore 1992:29, 31-32, 47). Sprawling neighborhoods of family farms featuring clapboard farmhouses and outbuildings dotted the landscape between scattered villages. Agricultural fields of cotton and corn, worked primarily by enslaved laborers, surrounded the plank frame or hewn cabins, tenant houses, barns, livestock sheds, smokehouses and outhouses. Photos and descriptions of the area tell of homesteads with "dwelling houses" for slaves, other millhouse cabins, renten houses, barns, livestock sheds, smokehouses and outhouses. Period observers remarked the county "saw its most prosperous and progressive days between 1830 and 1860." By the mid-nineteenth century, Euro-Americans had completely transformed the landscape of Nottoway territory. After the Southside Virginia frontier closed Indian Town within the periphery, White settlements and mostly White-owned farms redefined the Nottoway country into Southampton County. Individual plantations, along with civic infrastructure, increased during the mid-nineteenth century. Period observers remarked "conform to the Nottoway Parish boundaries [upper] and St. Luke's [lower] parish" for Southampton Parish. The contours of the Nottoway River and Southampton Parish, considered "upper" and "lower" sections of the county, followed the contours of the Nottoway's territory into two parishes: Nottoway Parish northeast of the river and St. Luke's Parish southwest to the Meherrin River.
residents in labor or sustenance (Drewry 1900:103). It was also hereby the source of the

The Nottoway landscape or "Old Southampton," as the county was called during

Figure 22. Late nineteenth-century image of "Ridley's Quarter." Nottoway Trustee Thomas
Ridley purchased this tract from the Indian land sales, 1794-1821. This plantation was constructed from Nottoway reservation


divisions. House gardens and orchards provided the source for family table fare and

 fences – ever-requiring maintenance and repair – outlined the fields and property

residences in labor or sustenance (Figure 22). Completing each compound, ditches and

Jerusalem was referred to as "promiscuous," "a place noted for wickedness," and on court day, "drunken rowdiness...frequently marred the occasion" of business and politics. Indian Town neighbor Daniel Cobb reported an August 1845 court day included "Plenty of brandy drank & quarreling & fighting & some things as court day included." Plenty of brandy drank & quarreling & fighting & some things as court day included.

The county courthouse was constructed in 1834 and was the site of local Nottoway economic, political, and legal engagements. The path to the courthouse from Nottoway Town crossed "Flower's Bridge." The view here is looking west from Jerusalem toward Indian Town Road. The new here is looking west from Jerusalem toward Indian Town Road. The old here is looking west from Jerusalem toward Indian Town Road.

Jerusalem was located on the east side of the Nottoway River, centrally located and on navigable water in the shade of the courthouse (1927:1). Jerusalem was situated at Flower's Bridge. The county courthouse was constructed in 1834 and was the site of local Nottoway economic, political, and legal engagements.

"Smoke cluster of buildings where pigs rooted in the streets and dums spout tobacco...a meaner hole, a miserable hall, and houses of public entertainment. By no means a metropolis, outsiders declined Jerusalem as "smoky, cluster of buildings where pigs rooted in the streets and dums spout tobacco...a meaner hole, a miserable hall, and houses of public entertainment. By no means a metropolis, outsiders declined Jerusalem as a place note..."
water. The community's antecedents originally emerged as a frontier border town.

Nottoway Indian lands began on the west bank of the waterway and ran six miles upriver.

Figure 24. Southampton settlements, roadways and Indian Town environs, c.1860. Nottoway Town was unmarked in the original, northwest of Jerusalem. The red oval identifies the vicinity of Nottoway reservation lands c.1830-1877. The map is oriented to the northwest. The red stars approximately mark the approximate boundaries of the original Square Tract Reservation. Source: Gilmer, 1863.
Across the Nottoway River, nine miles southwest of the county seat, was another settlement of farms named Cross Keys. Here, Dr. Barham's brick plantation manor stood, not far from a brick and clapboard corner tavern that doubled as a general store and post office. The tavern also served as a jail and stockade for the detention of several enslaved suspects from Turner's 1831 insurrection. The Cross Keys settlement was the place of Nathaniel Turner's birth and local tradition suggests the jail was the detention place of Nathaniel Turner himself. The building that stands today, however, is not the original jail, which burned down in 1863. The Cross Keys Church, still standing today, stands as a testament to the perseverance of the community. A tradesman's shop could be found at one of the Barham farms nearby. The Cross Keys settlement was the site of several enslaved suspects from Turner's 1831 insurrection. The Cross Keys settlement was the site of several enslaved suspects from Turner's 1831 insurrection. The Cross Keys settlement was the site of several enslaved suspects from Turner's 1831 insurrection.
Applewhite's Church before again crossing the Nottoway River at Carey's Bridge. Lying two miles east of the river, Barn Tavern was linked to Jerusalem by the wooden "Plank Road" that headed north to Petersburg markets. The settlement of Barn Tavern contained houses, churches and a school, along with a tavern and popular hotel. Figure 26: Barn Tavern and the Nottoway Indian Reservation. Living near the mouth of Buckhorn Swamp, Nottoway farmers and their kindred helped fund the bridge over the Assamoosick Swamp. This central Southampton network of roads, settlements and bridges also encompassed the Nottoway Indian community: between the two wooden bridges on the Nottoway River - Flower's at Jerusalem and Carey's en route to Barn Tavern - the communal lands and settlement of Nottoway matrilineages remained huddled along the western bank of the waterway. These lanes and settlements were the arteries and organs of central Southampton, the means by which information and commerce were exchanged throughout the county. This central Southampton network of roads, settlements and bridges also served the surrounding community of mid-drawing farms (Camp 2010.58-63, Chart 1863). Several general stores and shops of blacksmiths, carpenters and coopers were opened in the tavern. The view from the contemporary bridge looking east down the Nottoway River toward the mouth of Buckhorn Swamp shows the settlement of the Nottoway Reservation border town. A close-up of an 1864 map shows the settlement of the Nottoway. Figure 24:6: Lying two miles east of the river, Barn Tavern was linked to Jerusalem by a wooden "Plank Road" that headed north to Petersburg markets. The settlement of Applewhite's Church before again crossing the Nottoway River at Carey's Bridge.
Indian Town environs: northwest of Courtland [top], the "Indian Road" crosses the 1888 railway line, the Turner Branch and the Joyner Branch. Note the identification of cropland, houses and pathways. Survey of the remaining 3800 acres of Nottoway lands prior to allotment, 1830 [bottom left]. As in the previous image, most the settlement was near the Indian Road, houses and pathways. Survey of the remaining 3800 acres of Nottoway lands prior to allotment, 1888 [left]. The three unnamed compounds indicated by the red arrows were Nottoway matrilineal compounds. Source: Gilmer 1863; PMB1826-1836:24, 53; USGS Boykins 1919.
The Nottoway settlement [Figure 27] stretched along a winding dirt road about two miles in length. Known locally as the "Indian Road," the c.1830 path cut through 3800 acres of tribal land "laying on the west side of the Nottoway River in what is known as Indian Town, Va" (DB27:470; LP March 16, 1830; WB21:613). The community was situated on the landscape in a similar pattern as they were in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Binford 1967:138-137, 162, 179), "in a relatively dispersed manner with houses and clusters of houses not generally aggregated and they probably stretched along a winding dirt road about two miles in length." Known locally as the "Indian Road," the c.1830 path cut through 3800 acres of tribal land. "Trusted Jeremiah Cobb described Indian Town on the eve of the Reservation Allotment:"
generally referred to as the "Indian Woods." The "Edwin Turner settlement" was located south of the Indian path and Jack Woodson’s place was noted as a tract of land surrounding a "small log house situated on the Indian Road" (DB24:116; 25:62). A swath of timber "in the Indian Woods" was cut "on the land of Edwin D. Turner" (DB34:212) not far from the crops of "corn, cotton, peanuts and peas planted on the farm of... Alex Steward" (DB34:176). Families occupied a "small log cabin" or "a well furnished and comfortable cottage" where "horses, cows, and other domestic animals" were housed in pens, sheds or arbor (Brinkley 1961:246). Field notes 2011: Morse 1822:31). Most

Landmarks and geography also acquired the names of individuals associated with Indian Town references and prominent lineage names, and small creeks crisscrossed the "low lying grounds in the Indian Woods (DB33:495). Along the river, several sections were known as "guts", and small creeks dissected the "low lying" swamps in the Indian Woods (DB28:699). Where areas of the Assamooick Swamp joined the Nottoway, a "sain fence" or V-shaped rock weirs were seasonally fished by Indian Town residents and
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and other domestic animals" were housed in pens, sheds or arbors (Brinkley 1961:246). Field notes 2011: Morse 1822:31). Most

increment land transactions or similar early twentieth-century records, which Nottoway

1863: OB1835-1839:153, 270; USGS Boykins 1919). Documents from nineteenth-century land transactions or similar early twentieth-century records, which Nottoway
Settlement, "Turner's field," the Old Edwin Turner tract, "Sheep Lamb's Field," the Old Stuart Place, the Edwin Turner Farm, the old Indian Graveyard, all being "near Indian Town it being a part of the Edwin Turner tract." (CC, Nov. 1877; DB25:60, 62; DB41:222-223; DB44:475; Public Notice Oct. 28, 1908, Southampton County Loose Papers; Death Certificate, Morefield Hurst, July 17, 1918).

The displacement of the Nottoway on to reservation lands during the colonial period redefined the community's relationship to land, one that was increasingly associated with property rights, capital, and a cash economy. Nottoway Town's physical setting provided a context for the deepening processes that transformed the community's relationship to land, one that was increasingly commodified and articulated with the world-economy. The further commodification of Indian land and increased contractualization as Nottoway property was transferred and natural resources were exploited with the world-economy.

Figure 29. "The Indian seine place" and "Sheep Lamb's field." The junction of the Assamoosick's Concord Branch with the Nottoway River was a favored fishing location. William Lamb was a matrilineal member of the Woodson ohwachira who labored at Rose Hill and farmed this tract as a sharecropper during the early twentieth century. Locally known as "Sheep Lamb's Field," the land was adjacent to settlements of Scholar descendants near the corner of S.R. 651 (Indian Town Road) and S.R. 757 (Medicine Springs Road). Sources: Photos by author, Death Certificate, Joseph Hurst, July 17, 1918.

DB41:222-223, DB44:475, Public Notice Oct. 28, 1908, Southampton County Loose Papers, "Old Indian Graveyard", "Old Edwin Turner farm", "Sheep Lamb's Field", "Turner's Field", "the Old Edwin Turner tract", "the old Indian Graveyard", "all being near Indian Town it being a part of the Edwin Turner tract."
Southampton Demographics, Property Ownership and Labor Control

Nottoway peoples were impacted by the unevenness of peripheralization and capitalism's development in Southside Virginia. During the Reservation Allotment Period, the Nottoway negotiated and navigated the state machinery installed to regulate property ownership, social organization and provisioning practices. As a result of their engagement with market forms of commodification, contractualization and polarization, the Nottoway emerged as a particular people within Southampton society.

By the time of their reservation's allotment, the Nottoway were descended from diverse groups brought together by the Colonial Encounter, comprising of free and enslaved peoples of African, European, and Indian descent. While the Nottoway were not enslaved, this population was vulnerable to coerced laborers in various forms and treated as property. These latter individuals represented a continuation of the African former slaves. These labor practices were integrated into the broader social and economic processes of plantation agriculture and the development of the infrastructure of Southside Virginia. During the Reservation Allotment Period, the Nottoway were impacted by the unevenness of peripheralization and capitalism's development in Southside Virginia.
property ownership and personal finance became tied to elementary family interests, rather than communal compounds where resources were equally divided among matrilineage members. Depressed Indian population numbers necessitated exogamous Nottoway marriages – beyond Indian Town – with surrounding Whites and other Free People of Color. Prior to the Civil War, Indian Town economic relationships, business interactions and marriage were drawn from the neighboring population.

The Nottoway River, south of the Nottoway Parish, divides the county into upper and lower Southampton. The upper Nottoway Parish and lower county are only accessible downstream via the Nottoway River, which flows south to join the James.

During the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the lower reaches of the county, on both sides of the Nottoway River, were more White.

Thus, cotton cultivation and large labor-gangs used to harvest plantation crops few days earlier and the fall agricultural season is extended nearly one week longer growing in the region immediately south of the Nottoway River, since warmer soil in the northern county. Broadly, Southampton is also the northern limit for successful cotton below the Nottoway River and smaller middling farms with fewer slaves characterized the economic divide, whereby the majority of large slave-based plantations were aggregated in the county.

During the second quarter of the nineteenth century, there were more Whites than enslaved peoples in the county's northern Nottoway Parish, Upper Southampton Farms.
Whites owned smaller amounts of acreage, and of those landowners with slave-holdings, slave numbers were proportionately smaller. Many of the northern-county families had strong anti-slavery convictions that aligned with their religious beliefs. The Southside frontier had provided a haven for competing religious and ideological views among colonial backwater planters; both Baptists and Methodists movements gained acceptance and converts in Southampton during the post-Revolutionary era (Field notes 2006-2012). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5).

South of the Nottoway River, Methodists dominated St. Luke’s Parish in contrast to the Northern Virginia-neighborhood Nottoway Parish field notes 2006-2012. Linguistic evidence indicates eighteenth-century Nottoway Town was susceptible to Quaker overtures as well. As a Conservative linguistic community, the Nottoway’s nineteenth-century word lists show little interference from English, except in the realm of religion (Parramore 1992:47-48, 50-52, Field notes 2006-2012). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and apparently made many of their followers receptive to antislavery evangelicalism (Crofts 1992:5). Quakers anchored in the upper county initiated opposition to slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteen
neighbors, and in some cases coerced market insiders and out-produced the prosperous
estimates. Subject: Southampton farmers were competitive with their middling planter
values equaling $400-$500 (LP, March 16, 1835). Mid-county crop yields and income
Indian owners ranked better than most, with land divisions and personal estate combined
midssection of this demographic. Tribal lands were valued at $19,547 in 1835. All the
The possession by the Nottoway of communal land placed the tribe within the
Commissioners Allotting Indian Land, 1837.
Sources: Crofts 1992:302; LP, Report of
estimated to be worth nearly $18,000 in 1837. Source: Crofts 1992:302. LP, Report of
placed the Nottoway within the upper tier of Southampton owners. Meanwhile, lands were
Indian Town communal property ownership
Chart 1. Southampton Land Ownership, 1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-landholding</th>
<th>0-999</th>
<th>1,000-2,999</th>
<th>3,000 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

more of the market share and thus, more of the wealth in the county (Crofts 1992:5).
generate more agricultural produce than their northern county neighbors. They controlled
soils. First, it's property owners combined slave labor and large landholdings to
middling farms than the upper county. With a slightly longer growing season and warmer
Although an interior coastal-plain county, the planter society of Southampton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Slaves</th>
<th>Other Free</th>
<th>Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2. Southampton County demographic, 1830-1860

Indian Town residents represented less than 1% of the overall demographic. Approximately 59% of the "Other Free" peoples of the county perennially outnumbered the majority of free peoples, White or Black. When compared to the total mid-century Southampton population of 13,521, Indian Town was 0.4% of the total population. As a Run Group however, the conjoined Indian Farms and matrilineages' communal property placed the Nottoway within the upper tier of Southampton landholders (Chart 1). Economic standing, as most Black were freedmen, was key to the Nottoway's developed
Despite only a few Nottoway owned slaves, but slave hires and labor exchange were other contracted labor during the decades leading up to the Civil War. Extant records Nottoway and other mid-ding farmers relied on slave hires, family members or middle demographic and limited slave ownership c. 1830-1860, Nottoway chawchira were also part of this class, occupying and developing smallholding farms. Based on their property interests neighbors, such as James Gray and Eusia Lamb, were members of this middling planter South (Crafts 1992:13; Oswell 1949). Indian Town, nearest property-owning Southernmost, and more broadly, the primary White socio-economic type of the Old South plantation, and more broadly, the primary White socio-economic type of the “aspiring planters.” These families composed the dominant middling sort of Southernmost White demographic. This segment of the population widely ranged in property ownership from small-acreage farms to larger plantation-size farms owned by landed property owners without enslaved labor, composed the largest block (over half of Southernmost’s White demographic. This segment of the population widely ranged in landed property owners without enslaved labor, composed the largest block (over half of smallholders, defined as families owning between one and nine slaves, as well as 1775-23). Therefore worked the soil alongside hired free and enslaved labor (Dewey 1900:108. Oars smallholdings. Over one-third of Southernmost’s farmers owned no slaves at all, and they owned, leaving the other portion of the population as non-propertied or with 7,750 slaves and 1,475 free colored people. Of the free population, 734 were slave Southernmost society. The 1830 population was grouped into three categories of 6,737 White’s, gleaned from the census data. Providing a portrait of Southernmost’s agricultural slave- in the proportions of the overall population (Chart 2). A generalized pattern can be American South. The 1830-1860 Southernmost census schedules indicate slight changes
common practice. At the beginning of the nineteenth-century, the Nottoway Trustee's managed rental properties and slave hires, and it was "a rule not to pay contracts made by the Indians except done by our [Trustee] permission." This routine subsided as the Nottoway gained more control of their finances from Trustee oversight. Edith Turner's thirty-four acre farmland was partially worked by "2 Negroes hired for her last year by the Trustees, and 2 hired...this year by her husband" (Cabell Papers, July 18, 1808). The Turner ohwachira headwoman paid tax on two slaves in 1812 and the Woodson ohwachira headwoman claimed one slave in 1817 (PPTL1807-1817).

Nottoway matrilineal households continued to own slaves through the 1830s and 1840s [e.g. Edith Turner and Martha Stewart], as did off-reservation Nottoway [e.g. William G. Bozeman], agnatic Nottoway [e.g. Jordan Stewart] and Nottoway affines [e.g. James Taylor]. Significantly, in the 1850 Slave Schedule and Census for Southampton County, only Nottoway-affiliated individuals combined both real estate and slave ownership. James Turner, Martha Stewart, and Nottoway-affiliated Turner and Jordan Stewart claimed six slaves between the households, along with $350 worth of real estate. This farming, slave ownership, and profitable agricultural production elevated some Nottoway-affiliated households to a middling socio-economic status (C1830-1840, C1840, Halifax County, NC; DB26:395, SS1850). Discussed further in the following sections, Nottoway Town increased in "free people of color" resident labor during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. As well, Indian Town residents contributed much of the hired labor to neighboring plantations and plantations.
Of the 1830 slaveholding population in Southampton, ninety-six households claimed more than twenty enslaved laborers or 13% of the total county slaveholders. Far fewer could be counted among the wealthy elite; a little over a dozen Southampton families owned more than fifty slaves. Traditional measurements of the "planter class" have relied on the ownership of twenty or more slaves to define the upper echelons of this social-economic category, with thousands of acres and hundreds or thousands of slaves employed on large plantations in the Indian Woods and neighboring Robert and Thomas Ridley II households. These families were members of the "privileged" planter class (C1820). Examples include former Trustees Thomas Ridley and Indian Town owners. For social analysis, Crofts suggests lowering the prerequisite for the upper class to include all families with ten or more slaves to create a more useful and socio-political outlook established membership in Southampton's "privileged" or "prosperous" planter class. However, the size of one's real and personal estate, farm production, and slave owning, the size of one's real and personal estate, farm production, and social status may be considered in evaluating plantations and the county's class structures. Therefore, when characterizing Southampton plantations and the county's class structures, these "planters" also combined slave ownership with seasonal slave hires. Owners of more than seventeen slaves, as well as large plantations in the hundreds or thousands of acres (Crofts 1992:13; Oats 1975:2). However, those who earned over two hundred slaves or more of the same kind of labor may be considered the upper echelons of the "planter class" families owned more than fifty slaves. Traditional measurements of the "planter class" upper tier could be counted among the wealthy elite, a little over a dozen Southampton families owned more than twenty enslaved laborers or 13% of the total county slaveholders. Par
Table 3. Southampton Property Ownership and Slaveholding, c.1850

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Slaves</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 or More Slaves</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 Slaves</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9 Slaves</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Slaves</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonslaveholding</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Parramore 1992*
In summary, almost half of Southampton's antebellum population was enslaved, but slave ownership varied greatly among middling and privileged planters. The Nottoway were a minority Indian population within a minority demographic of "other free" non-Whites. Yet, because of tribal land holdings and personal property ownership, the Nottoway may be categorized within the upper strata of property owners. From this economic vantage, the Nottoway outranked the majority of free Black and White laborers, and minor property owners. The socio-political connections with this latter affiliation with those similarly oppressed and disadvantaged nearby free Black and White laborers, and minor property owners, the socio-political complications with prosperous White plantation owners and operators, resistance to the paternalism of the state-sponsored Trustee system also encouraged a Nottoway economic interest with prosperous White plantation owners and operators. Resistance to accommodation and resistance to the privileged and elite planters, Nottoway were caught in asymmetrical cycles of manipulation and oppression by and low socio-economic demographic of non-privileged White and Black residents, the low social standing within the middling sort of Southampton farmers. However, like the individual owners within the middling sort of Southampton farmers, Nottoway enjoyed their share of ownership and agricultural productivity, situating the Nottoway as landlords. Explored further below, the size and value their real estate contrasted with their slave ownership and agricultural productivity, the Nottoway owned the majority of free Black and White. From this economic vantage, the Nottoway may be categorized within the upper strata of property owners. From this, "non-Whites. Yet, because of tribal land holdings and personal property ownership, the Nottoway were a minority Indian population within a minority demographic of "other free" non-Whites. Yet, because of tribal land holdings and personal property ownership, their slave ownership varied greatly among middling and privileged planters. The In summary, almost half of Southampton's antebellum population was enslaved,
Free Peoples of Color and Nat Turner's Slave Insurrection

Antebellum Southampton was one of four tidewater counties with a sizeable population of "Free Colored Persons" or "free people of color" sometimes glossed as FPC or FN [free Negro]. As part of the original shires of the seventeenth century, Isle of Wight, Nansemond, Southampton and Surry were home to men and women whose lineages were free since times of the "ancient planters" or early colonial period. In an often-cited seventeenth-century example, Anthony Johnson, the free Black patriarch of Pungoteague Creek, had his Virginia origins in Warraskoyack – later named Isle of Wight and Southampton (Berlin 1998; Brown 1996; Morgan 1998). As free Black landowners and small producers, Anthony Johnson and his family established a middling Alliances between free people of color, African, European, and American. They lived in the face of relentless physical labor and high mortality for all humans. But they were not unusual. It was more unusual that they survived to plant Virginia. Their plantations were called Angola, Freeman, and other names. The presence of non-White populations within Virginia's agrarian society has its origins at the beginning of the Colonial Encounter, not from the rush of manumissions during and slavery movement two centuries later (Russell 1913). The emergence of a free non-White population within Virginia's agrarian society was repeatedly recorded through tax records, land sales and court cases during the first century of colonization (Berlin 1998; Breen and Gallay 2002).
Figure 30. "free negroes, who live in about Chowan and the adjoining counties" engaged in heading eels, herring and other fish. Contractual labor in the fishing, farming and logging industries was the chief antebellum occupation of the Southside's "free colored persons." Source: Harper's Magazine [1857] 14:434.

Broadly in the Virginia tidewater, free African-American communities were widespread (Figure 30) and owed their origins and maintenance to the colonization processes of resource extraction and labor control (see Rucker and Allen 2012). The constituents of these communities tended to have descent from enslaved Africans and Indians, and indentured servants from Europe, Africa and America (Hodes 1999; Miles 1999, 2006; Perdue 2006:288-316; Perdue 2003; Russell 1913). Thus, free mixed-race peoples participating in Virginia’s colonial political economy were integral to the development of class structures. The competitive role of this segment of society within the free colored persons’ occupation of the Southside’s "free colored persons’" Source: heading eels, herring and other fish was competitive labor in the sailing, farming and logging industries was the chief and other high command labor in the sailing, farming and logging industries was the chief..." Free Negroes Who Live in About Chowan and the Adjoining Counties."
the market may also be directly linked to the emergence of racialized notions of social
and biological hierarchy (Feagin 2006; Omi and Winant 1994; Smedley 1999).

In Southampton, the 1790 Census indicates the borough was home to 559 “other
free persons.” Ten years later, the number had increased to 839, likely through an
increase in northern-county manumissions. Post-Reconstruction historian William
Drewry recalled that the “emancipation sentiment” in the county was “very strong…and
fostered by the numerous Quakers” in the area. Upper county Baptists also demonstrated
sympathy for abolition and Nottoway Parish was the locus of local support for the
American Colonization Society, an organization that advocated for Black repatriation to
Africa. The association of Southampton Baptists with emancipation was challenged in the
years following Nathaniel Turner’s 1831 slave insurrection, as Turner was reported to be
a Baptist preacher whose revolt was motivated by an evangelical awakening (Gray 1831;

Notwithstanding the debate, dissent and distancing of Southampton Baptists from
Abolitionists, the emancipatory ideology and religious leanings of Southampton’s upper
county took the form of political factionalism. Daniel Crofts (1992) convincingly argues
antebellum Southampton was socio-politically divided between upper and lower county
political factions who had contrasting views concerning slave owning, states’ property
rights and eventually, whether to secede from the Union. In a similar political divide,
immediately following the Turner rebellion the Virginia General Assembly began major
debates on the institution of slavery, which resulted in the strengthening of existing slave
codes and the tightening of manumissions.
### Table 12. Taxed Indian Town Residents, 1801-1822

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sedda Artis</td>
<td>Charity Artis</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Barham</td>
<td></td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bird</td>
<td></td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bird</td>
<td></td>
<td>1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Bird/Byrd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winny Boasman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Buck</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Buck</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Chavis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jenkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin Nicholson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harch. Nicholson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Nicholson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah Nicholson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickerson Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinchen Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disa Woodson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Woodson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Woodson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoda Woodson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: PPTL 1807-1820; SCLP 1822.
Included in these reforms were laws targeted at limiting the rights and maneuverability of "free Negroes," which in turn had legal ramifications for Southampton's FPC population (Balfour 1988; Guild 1936). The Nottoway were forced to contend with these political factions, emerging ideologies and jural impositions as Indian Town's FPC residency increased in the decades following the last Nottoway-Tuscarora removals. Rentals, labor relations and intermarriage framed the various exchanges between FPCs and Nottoway prior to the Civil War, and were the source of new surnames used by ohwachira lineage segments.

Table 12 demonstrates that while many FPC families were taxed at Indian Town, few individuals were recorded as long-term residents. One nineteenth-century correspondence from the Trustees stated: "Whitemen, Mulattoes or free negroes are not permitted to settle on the Indian land; except claims as husband or wife by someone of the Tribe. A resolution was entered to remove all people whom amounts the Tribe not included in the above exceptions who do not have claim on the land of the Trustees. The Trustees discouraged Indian rental contracts made outside of their purview, which

1808 (Cabell Papers, July 18, 1808)
well as hired tenant or seasonal labor. Indian Town workhand Judah Nicholson and the Artis family were among the FPCs employed at Rose Hill. Therefore one may see a linkage between Nottoway land and resources, the labor opportunity and mobility of propertyless peoples and the Trustees' management of finance, property and labor agreements. A key revelation is that Trustee funds, property and contracted labor were all comingled with Nottoway assets and that these relationships contributed to shaping Indian Town notions of the same.

This system, with the commodification of land and labor, became institutionalized by Nottoway and prohibited marriage of Nottoway labor. Not only was Indian land commodified within alternative forms of income encouraged by the Trustees; the commodification of communal Nottoway land property through allotment, the alienability of Indian land and the elimination of matrilineal insurance with access to productive agricultural lands and eventually, partible rights to their children. Thus, one aspect of the Nottoway's political economy linked of fertile Indian farming Nottoway women controlled their Indian lands and property preference to Nottoway women, whose matrilineages controlled thousands of acres where were not matrilineal-descented Nottoway. Descent through the Iroquoian system contributed to this HPC demographic, usually through the children of Indian men whose instances were of mixed African, European and Indian descent. The Nottoway Indian Town notions of the same.

Nottoway associated with "Free Negroes" and "Juliettes" who in many instances held the same

Commodified with Nottoway assets and their these relationships contributed to shaping agreements. A key revelation is that Trustee funds, property and contracted labor were all propertyless peoples and the Trustees' management of finance, property and labor involvement between Nottoway land and resources, the labor opportunity and mobility of African family were among the FPCs employed at Rose Hill. Therefore one may see a well-assumed tenant of seasonal labor. Indian Town workhand Judah Nicholson and the
laborers and represented the roles of the peripheries. These conceptual divisions were not exclusively binary; there was social negotiation and mobility through a number of variables such as education, employment, income, land tenure, phenotype, kinship, etc. Nottoway affiliation with White landowners, and in several instances as marriage partners, partially linked Indian Town to the one end of the color-caste. Relationships with FPCs were also considered of this antagonism. Records indicate that multiple Nottoway marriages during the Allotment Period were contracted with "Free Negroes and Mulattoes" who also claimed a White parent or grandparent. As controllers of land, Nottoway agency took several forms during the four decades before the Civil War. When arguing against their Trustees, Nottoway counter petitions to the Virginia General Assembly were endorsed by liberal-minded White allies from the upper county, who also likely helped draft the legislative language (LP Dec. 14, 1819). The Nottoway's General Assembly were endorsed by liberal-minded Whigs from the upper county, and the inequality and inequality between different groups of peoples (see Blakey 1988, 1999a:71-85), navigation of this societal division gave rise to various forms of identity phenomena, labor and resources. The Nottoway's mixed-race affected an intermediate position. The laborers and represented the roles of the peripheries. These conceptual divisions were not exclusively binary, there was social negotiation and mobility through a number of variables such as education, employment, income, land tenure, phenotype, kinship, etc.
Nottoway people were also certified by the Southampton County Court as "not a free negro or mulatto," but "persons of mixed blood" and "descendants of a female of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians" (e.g. OB18:320 [1837]; M22:169 [1864]). However, some of the individuals certified as "not a free negro or mulatto" were described in other documents as having one non-Nottoway "free negro" parent (LP Turner 1838). The Nottoway were increasingly forced to navigate a legal code established to restrict FPC social, economic and political mobility. During a period of increased tension between Whites and individuals of African ancestry [post 1831], Indian Town contended with the demographic impact of the 1802-1803 Iroquoian removals and the challenges associated with non-Nottoway intermarriage. In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, there were no matrilineal Nottoway married to other matrilineally-descended Nottoway, but rather their husbands and wives were chiefly free negroes, mulattoes, and whites. However, some of the individuals certified as "not a free negro or mulatto" were described in other documents as having one non-Nottoway "free negro" parent (LP Turner 1838). The Nottoway were increasingly forced to navigate a legal code established to restrict FPC social, economic and political mobility. During a period of increased tension between Whites and individuals of African ancestry [post 1831], Indian Town contended with the demographic impact of the 1802-1803 Iroquoian removals and the challenges associated with non-Nottoway intermarriage. In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, there were no matrilineal Nottoway married to other matrilineally-descended Nottoway, but rather their husbands and wives were chiefly free negroes, mulattoes, and whites. However, some of the individuals certified as "not a free negro or mulatto" were described in other documents as having one non-Nottoway "free negro" parent (LP Turner 1838).
Town marriages maintained clan and lineal exogamy, and demonstrate efforts to support and foster Nottoway solidarity within an increasingly narrow social position and shrinking Iroquoian demographic.

Table 13. Indian Town Households, c.1830

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Ohwachira</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Turner</th>
<th>Woodson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ned Scholar</td>
<td>Agnatic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Scholar</td>
<td>Agnatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Taylor</td>
<td>Affine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell Williams</td>
<td>Affine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Turner</td>
<td>Head female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Turner</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Turner</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Woodson</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamelia Gardner</td>
<td>Woodson (?)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. 1830 Census reconfigured for Nottoway matrilineages: the two remaining ohwachira (Turner and Woodson) and associated lineage-segments.

By 1830 Southampton had 1,745 free non-White residents, or when compared to the 1790 enumeration, an increase of 200% in forty years. Drewry remarked the FPC support and foster Nottoway solidarity within an increasingly narrow social position and shrinking Iroquoian demographic.
The 1860 Indian Town population was counted as

By 1850 eleven households with forty-seven individuals clustered along Indian Town Road, with a similar number of mostly agnatic descendants living in at least

intermarried multiple times with the Nottoway. Source: C.1860.

Table 15. Indian Town households and neighbors, c.1860.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Property and Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Turner</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>Indian Town Headman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1500, Allottee Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizzy Ricks</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>B / M</td>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allottee Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Crocker</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>B / M</td>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$300, Allottee Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wiggins</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B / M</td>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Allottee Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Steward</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allottee Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stewart</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>Agnatic Nottoway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$100 Personal (Agric.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie Turner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Allottee Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedney King</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B / M</td>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Allottee Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>Woodson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Allottee Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bird</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Indian Town Renters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(? Affine / Collateral Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Chavers</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>B / M</td>
<td>Affine Head (Scholar)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agnatic descendants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gray</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Reserve Neighbor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Smallholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gray</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Reserve Neighbor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smallholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not inhabited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Hill</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>Affine family</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collateral Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lamb</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Reserve Neighbor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1500 Real, $500 Pers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Bryant</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Rose Hill</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$4000 Real, $9100 Pers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Hill</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Affine family</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collateral Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Artis</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Affine family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Collateral Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Artis</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Affine family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collateral Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mima Crocker</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Affine family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collateral Kin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any three Indian Town residents (Table 13 and 14).

During this era, the Nottoway community comprised less than 5% of the free non-white population had increased rapidly, with a greater proportion of free negroes than any

other neighboring counties except Nansemond and Isle of Wight (1900:108-109).
seventy-seven individuals living in eight matrilineal households [Table 15], alongside three affine or agnatic-descended compounds. Huddled between Indian Town and the neighboring smallholding farms and plantations, an additional three FPC families of Nottoway collateral kin lived in five laborer households, with twenty-five residents. Thus, a total of nearly 100 individuals were residentially affiliated with Indian Town in 1860, comprising approximately 5% of Southampton's "free people of color." Members of the Nottoway's Owachira were subsumed within this population, equaling a little over one-third or perhaps 3% of the total county FPC demographic.

As demonstrated in Chart 7 and Tables 13, 14 and 15, 1830-1860 Southampton Census schedules indicate a fairly stable FPC population size, while both White and slave numbers decreased during the same period. Manumissions contributed to some reduction in the resident slave labor, but other social and political currents also impacted the county demographics. Antebellum Virginia law required manumitted slaves to leave the Commonwealth within a certain period of months, and indeed records indicate some recently freed Southampton slaves were issued orders to remove (Acts Passed…Commonwealth of Virginia 1830-1831:107-108, TP of Anthony, December 20). As a result, the habituation of freed slaves near their former homes was seen to encourage unrest among those who were forced to remain enslaved. Nevertheless, the continued habitation of freed slaves near African-descended compounds, huddled between Indian Town and the neighboring smallholding farms and plantations, an additional three FPC families of African-descended compounds, huddled between Indian Town and the seventy-seven individuals living in eight matrilinear households [Table 13], alongside

The continued habitation of freed slaves near their former homes was seen to encourage unrest among those who were forced to remain enslaved. Nevertheless, the continued habitation of freed slaves near African-descended compounds, huddled between Indian Town and the neighboring smallholding farms and plantations, an additional three FPC families of African-descended compounds, huddled between Indian Town and the seventy-seven individuals living in eight matrilinear households [Table 13], alongside...
Barbara Fields (1985) argues that Mid-Atlantic White planters found the negotiations with "Free Black" laborers to be a necessary aspect of the agricultural cycle.

A large block of Southampton's landholders [39%] owned no slaves at all, while 20% owned between one and three slaves. An additional 18% owned less than ten slaves [see Chart 3]. Thus nearly 80% of Southampton's slave owners owned between one and three slaves. An additional 18% owned less than ten slaves. A large block of Southampton's landholders [39%] owned no slaves at all, while 20% owned between one and three slaves. Barbara Fields (1985) argues that the Tidewater White planter found the way abolition loomed in national-level discussions or when an FPC population was seen to be too large, removal was encouraged. When abolition loomed in national-level discussions or when an FPC population was seen to be too large, removal was encouraged. When abolition loomed in national-level discussions or when an FPC population was seen to be too large, removal was encouraged.
division of labor, Southamponers and other Mid-Atlantic slaveholders saw a need to
address the labor "shortage," but equally we re problematized by the presence of a too
large a "free black" population that demoralized the enslaved and left many questions
unanswered about the social position of FPC property owners. Divisions over solutions to
Southampton slave owners increased internal slave sales during this period and
Southeastern Indians to Oklahomans
and were opened for agricultural development following the forced removal of
of the South. Large swaths of American plantations came into the commodity market
Southampton's slave numbers between 1830 and 1840 also reflect the peripheralization
of the development of Virginia's plantation economy and are examples of the shift in
the development of Virginia, plantation slavery, and are examples of the shift in
the mid-nineteenth century. "Negro and Mulatto Laws" were directly linked to

The mid-nineteenth century, "Negro and Mulatto Laws" were directly linked to
dependence on and contributed to the FCC labor pool in Southampton County.
Families occupied a somewhat liminal status within this labor market. Their families both
free blacks also provided a necessary source of labor (Fields 1985:71). Thus, Norfolk
society decreed by the legislature to confine such men in need of redemption. But yet
identities, it was that the free colored population was "an anomaly within slave
commitment to labor rested equally upon slaves and FPCs. The problem, as Fields
he perceived the contradiction were the most intense in those areas whose heavily
unanswerable about the social position of FPC property owners. Divisions over solutions to
large a "free black" population that demoralized the enslaved and left many questions
address the labor shortage, but equally were problematicated by the presence of a too
division of labor, Southamproners and other Mid-Atlantic slaveholders saw a need to

the development of this armory industry. As Great Britain's textile industry grew and the
for increased cotton production along the Mississippi plantations and actively pursued
by Old Southampron Family's Virginia. And other White Southamproners saw the potential
removal. Indian slave sales to newly acquired "Deep South" plantations opened developed
Southampton slave owners increased internal slave sales during this period and
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demand for Southern cotton increased, members of Southampton’s Blow, Maget, Mason, Ridley and Trezvant families among others, purchased Deep South lands and transferred their Southampton slaves to the southwest, in order to develop new plantations (Crofts 1992:24-38; Otto 1994:1-17; Wolf 1997:278-285).

During the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the president of the Republic of Liberia (compare Table 12) Anthony W. Gardner became one of those Southampton emigrants. Intriguingly, the earliest emigrants included surnames of FPC laborers, residents, renters and possibly collateral kin of Indian Town: Artis, Brown, Byrd, Gardner, Green, Taylor and Turner among others.

The perennial movement to colonize FPCs in Africa, encouraged by the White landowning community, failed for a number of reasons: internal problems of the American Colonization Society’s organization, an absence of continued financial support and resistance of FPCs to remove their American homelands. The most substantive reason however, regardless of the American Colonization Society’s organization, an absence of continued financial support and resistance of FPCs to remove their American homelands, the perennial movement to colonize FPCs in Africa eventually failed for a number of reasons: internal problems of the American Colonization Society’s organization, an absence of continued financial support and resistance of FPCs to remove their American homelands.
what Virginians and other Southerners argued concerning the dangers of too large an FPC population, was that the political economy of the region could not dispense with their labor (Fields 1985:71).

Despite the challenges associated with African colonization in the region could not dispense with what Virginians and other Southerners argued concerning the dangers of too large an FPC population, was that the political economy of the region could not dispense with their labor (Fields 1985:71).
After 1831, state-imposed legislation increasingly restricted slave and FPC freedoms and curtailed the legal and property rights of Southampton FPCs. It became illegal for slaves or FPCs to congregate, unless Whites conducted the meeting; it was a crime to teach enslaved peoples or FPCs to read and write and non-White ministers could no longer preach sermons at gatherings. Non-Whites were forbidden to purchase slaves, unless they were buying enslaved kin or receiving slaves through inheritance. Firearms and ammunition were prohibited to non-Whites, as was liquor within one mile of any public assembly. Any person responsible for writing or calling for an insurrection by non-Whites was to be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. FPCs were no longer allowed jury trials, but like the enslaved, were to be tried by justices of the peace from Nottoway. The Nottoway successfully resisted some of these imposed sanctions, particularly jury trials, but like the enslaved, were to be tried by justices of the peace from Guild 1936. The Nottoway response to the Nat Turner Insurrection went unrecorded. There are no references to Nottoway participation in the famed slave resistance (Rountree 1987:210), despite the tribe's Trustee involvement in the eventual prosecution of Turner 1838. SS1850.

Four months after Turner's August 1831 slave rebellion, the largest single Southampton migration to Africa occurred: one-sixth of the FPC population left Norfolk aboard the schooner James Perkins in November and the Roanoke set sail for Liberia in July. The Jupiter again carried twenty emigrants in November and the Roanoke set sail for Liberia in May 1832, followed by eleven more aboard the American in July. The Southampton migration to Africa occupied one-sixth of the FPC population in 1832.
Nathaniel Turner. Future Trustee James W. Parker led a party of armed volunteers during the rebellion and his nearby farm was the site of the "battle in Parker's Field" (Drewry 1900:62-64). Parker served as a justice during Turner's trial and made the initial public interrogation of the accused insurgent. Parker's observations may have resulted in several anonymous Richmond newspaper editorials within days of the bloodshed (Oats 1975:118, 123-124). Trustee Thomas R. Gray was a Jerusalem lawyer appointed to defend Turner and his cohorts, and later, Gray published the only interview with Turner as the *Confessions of Nat Turner* (1831). Longtime Nottoway Trustee and Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb was the presiding judge over the trial and eventually delivered the guilty verdict and death sentence against Nathaniel Turner. If there was an opportunity to implicate Nottoway Town's residents in any of the conflict or aftermath, the Trustee lawyers, judges and authors were the most likely to do so, being fully acquainted with the social position of the Nottoway community as slaveholders and slave hires. One may speculate that this silence concerning Indian Town may reflect the dominant White population's perception of the Nottoway were not a factor. Further, given the Nottoway's proximity to the events, the Nottoway response to the FPC emigration to Africa also went unrecorded. The extant documentary record suggests the implication of Nottoway Town's residents in any of the conflict or aftermath, the Trustee's verdict and death sentence against Nathaniel Turner. If there was an opportunity to defame the Nottoway, Trustee and Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb was the presiding judge over the trial and eventually delivered the guilty verdict and death sentence against Nat Turner as the *Confessions of Nat Turner* (1831). However, Trustee Thomas R. Gray was a Jerusalem lawyer appointed to defend Turner and his cohorts, and later, Gray published the only interview with Turner (1975:118, 123-124). Trustee Thomas R. Gray was a Jerusalem lawyer appointed to defend Turner and his cohorts, and later, Gray published the only interview with Turner (1975:118, 123-124).

The Nottoway response to the FPC emigration to Africa also went unrecorded. The evidence for a Nottoway-Liberia connection is inconclusive, yet the lists of emigrant FPC surnames demonstrate that some of the population from which the Nottoway were employing tenant farmers, labor sharing and selecting marriage mates opted for removal, rather than weather an uncertain future in Southampton County. Therefore, the possibility of the Nottoway's removal was a level of protection, or sorts, for Indian Town. Following the insurrection on March 6, 1831, Turner's trial, the Trustee lawyers, judges and authors were the most likely to do so, being fully acquainted with the social position of the Nottoway community as slaveholders and slave hires. One may speculate that this silence concerning Indian Town may reflect the dominant White population's perception of the Nottoway were not a factor. Further, given the Nottoway's proximity to the events, the Nottoway response to the FPC emigration to Africa also went unrecorded. The extant documentary record suggests the implication of Nottoway Town's residents in any of the conflict or aftermath, the Trustee's verdict and death sentence against Nathaniel Turner. If there was an opportunity to defame the Nottoway, Trustee and Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb was the presiding judge over the trial and eventually delivered the guilty verdict and death sentence against Nat Turner as the *Confessions of Nat Turner* (1831). However, Trustee Thomas R. Gray was a Jerusalem lawyer appointed to defend Turner and his cohorts, and later, Gray published the only interview with Turner (1975:118, 123-124). Trustee Thomas R. Gray was a Jerusalem lawyer appointed to defend Turner and his cohorts, and later, Gray published the only interview with Turner (1975:118, 123-124).
that some Nottoway collateral kin, or their descendants, left Southampton for West Africa. Thus, like the previous diasporic waves of Iroquoian removal northward, the emigration of this large block of FPCs in 1831-1832 most likely impacted the Nottoway community in some meaningful way. In the very least, the loss of FPC’s affines one’s parents were not formerly or recently enslaved, some of the Nottoway’s affines strongly associated with “free” or “free issue” descent, meaning marriage and influence personal and household alliances. Notions of community belonging also formed off “like people” kinship connections with Whites and Blacks impacted and descent, whether maternal, paternal or bilateral, was seen as a component of a larger network, but also increasingly referenced multiple forms of navigable identities. Indian peoplehood, but ultimately produced a sense of community that was partially maternal and post-1830 Indian Town narrowed in FPC residency and the Nottoway developed farm operations that more closely resembled their middling and plantation White neighbors. Possibly more than ever, Nottoway Town became the locus for a particular sort of FPC economic development and collaboration within an increasingly fluid and shifting Southampton community in some meaningful way. In the very least, the loss of FPC landowners and skilled artisans shifted resources for segments of the Southampton population and community even more. Notwithstanding the opportunities for cooperation among FPC smallholders, post-1830 Indian residents of this large block of FPCs in 1831-1832 most likely impacted the Nottoway Africans. Thus, like the previous diasporic waves of Iroquoian removal northward, the existence that some Nottoway collateral kin, or their descendants, left Southampton for West
relationships amongst FPC and Nottoway peoples were substantive, Nottoway affiliations and collaborations with White middling sort and plantation owners were also significant. The polarity and asymmetry of the system’s mechanics encouraged the Nottoway to carve out a social, political and economic place for their people—whilst aligned with slave owners and cash crop producers—but was also strained amongst the tensions and contradictions amongst the system’s mechanisms encouraging the Nottoway to collaborate with White middling sort and plantation owners whilst also significant Nottoway affiliations amongst FPC and Nottoway peoples were substantial. The processes of polarization also shaped the Nottoway’s sense of peoplehood.

Concluding Discussion on Nottoway Peoplehood

In 1849-1852, the Nottoway sued their Treasurer and former Trustees for misappropriation of Indian Town assets. During the proceedings, the tribe’s lawyers suggested the community was “exceedingly ignorant of their rights,” regarding real and personal property. As with previous petitions, the tribe’s advocates made overtures to the court’s sense of justice. Yet the nearly seventy years of legal disputes, court cases, pleas to the executive branch and legislative requests suggest the Nottoway were actually quite sophisticated in their navigation and understanding of, and adherence to, the state’s legal code. The tribe’s communal agency provides evidence for their sense of solidarity and community recognition as a particular kind of people, with particular legal rights.

The processes of polarization also shaped the Nottoway’s sense of peoplehood, particularly with regard to the codification and alignment of Virginia law, race and property ownership and labor. Here, it is worth highlighting conflicting exterior perceptions of the Nottoway during this period. The c.1849 Southampton Court exterior perceptions of the Nottoway during this period. The c.1849 Southampton Court
accommodate the system in which they were embedded. Removed, restricted individual and "American" decisions on how to best resist and limited number of options available. Fissures within the Nottoway community, such as Schoolcraft's political economy, but it is clear the Nottoway recognized there were a number of the system's racialization processes and to address the changing structures of construction of community. Aboriginal Nottoway segments employed several strategies. These forces also influenced Nottoway notions of group membership and their social with matrilineal descent, impacted the perceptions of Indian Town's population. These under society's construction of race. The Nottoway's segment African ancestry, crossed with matrilineal descent, impacted the perceptions of Indian Town's population. Thus while these records are only suggestive, one may see a relationship between the Iroquoian's descent system, the state codification of aboriginal property rights and the Nottoway's, descent system, the state codification of aboriginal property rights and the... forces employed several strategies to navigate the system's polarization processes and to address the changing structures of...
Increasingly for the Nottoway, "like people" (Field notes 2006-2011) became associated with land ownership and an economic niche as cash-cropping non-White smallholders. Yet there was also a conflation of racialized peoplehood with socio-economic class, whereby partial White ancestry affiliated Nottoway with the plantation-owning elite and partial African ancestry associated the Nottoway with laborers, some of whom were enslaved. Nottoway efforts to counter the latter association expressed itself through the alignment of Indian Town with the socio-economics of their neighboring middling farmers and plantation owners rather than with the socio-economics of their neighboring smallholders. Yet there was also a contradiction of racialized peoplehoods with socio-economic status, whereby partial White ancestry affiliated Nottoway with the plantation-owned and non-White associations with land ownership and an economic niche as cash-cropping non-White became necessary for the Nottoway, "like people" (Field notes 2006-2011).
Indian Town married to a White woman, Scholar's children were agnate-descended all accounts. Littleton Scholar was the last member of his matrilineage to remain at Ohwachira, Nottoway perceptions concerning community membership and hierarchy. By the later decades, evidence suggests cleaves formed within the Indian community over property ownership, suggesting a careful examination of the following decade's documentary record. Actions against the remnants of the Scholar Ohwachira may be the best example.

There were several factors that contributed to Nottoway notions of peoplehood. Socio-economic class and race issues 1831-1865, the processes of polarization.

The Nat Turner insurrection and the tightened Virginia slave and FPC legal codes impacted Indian Town, particularly the freedoms of non-matrilineal descendants and collateral kin. The 1831-1832 removal of Southampton FPCs to Liberia also reflected choices made by individual families under the restrictive social climate following the slave revolt. A careful examination of the following decades' documentary record suggests cleaves formed within the Indian community over property ownership, contributing to Nottoway notions of peoplehood. Socio-economic class and racial issues 1831-1865, the processes of polarization.

All documented Period (Field notes 2009-2011; Punter 1961, and see Appendix C. Figure 50), one White neighbor fathered a matrilineal Nottoway at the end of the Reservation. Some FPC whites were descendants of neighboring White property owners and at least one White neighbor fathered a matrilineal Nottoway at the end of the Reservation. The scholar and scholar segments, seems to have ceased by the midcentury. However, non-matrilineal Nottoway descendants, the earlier practice of marrying Whites, such as agnate Nottoway Ohwachira were with FPC's identified as Black or Mulatto – some of whom were Scholers descendants from other peoples. By 1860 Indian Town marriages not between the
In as much, they had no use rights to matrilineal lands, but were allowed to settle communal property on the western edge of the reservation. Both sons of Littleton Scholar married FPC wives, and thus further distanced their kinship ties with Indian Town. When allotment initiatives moved forward in the 1830s, Scholar-occupied lands were targeted for division and severalty—though School-occupied lands were targeted for division and severalty—ever enough to distinguish themseleves from other peoples (e.g. M1848-1855:231, OB18:320). The result of allotment was that some Scholar descendants became renters of the farms on which they resided; other agnatic descendants became evicted and were forced to relocate. The impact of Scholar matrilineage extinction was a separation from indigenous land, which precipitated more engagement with the market and became part of the industrial work force. Thus Nottoway maternal descent and property and operated their own smallholding farms, yet others relocated to urban centers and purchased private land, which precipitated more engagement with the market and became mobile wage-workers for agricultural producers, others purchased private land, which precipitated more engagement with the market and became mobile wage-workers for agricultural producers. Some descendants continued to reside on the lands on which they resided, other agnatic descendants became evicted and were forced to relocate. The result of allotment was that some Scholar descendants became renters of the farms on which they resided. The 1837-1864 court certification of multiple Nottoway as "not a free negro or mulatto" and "free persons of mixed blood...not Negroes" indicates the Nottoway sought to distinguish themselves from other peoples (e.g. M1848-1855:231, OB18:320). The oppression of state enforced labor and other disadvantages associated with African American life were subject to the same stratigraphic forces that impacted all peoples within the wider capitalist economy.
ancestry led some Nottoway to seek endorsement as non-subjects to "slave, negro and mulatto laws." Virginia's Attorney General argued the Nottoway, despite partial African descent, maintained their rights as "tributary Indians" and "as a dependent nation of Indians," Nottoway allies as descendants of a female of the Nottoway tribe of Indians.

Moreover, Southampton clerk's were inconsistent with their descriptions of Nottoway, Virginia Iroquoians with some African and European ancestry were hypothetically not subject to the laws created to restrict the economic and social mobility of Free Negroes and Mulattoes. Thus, the Nottoway occupied a narrow socio-political space as non-White, non-Black and non-Mulatto, subject to the laws created to restrict the economic and social mobility of Free Negroes and Mulattoes. Thus, the Nottoway occupied a narrow socio-political space as non-White, non-Black and non-Mulatto, subject to the laws created to restrict the economic and social mobility of Free Negroes and Mulattoes.

Virginia Iroquoians with some African and European ancestry were hypothetically not non-Black and non-Mulatto descendants of Iroquoian-speaking peoples.
Period (DB28:699; 25:60; DB24:116, 520, 553; M1830-1835:381). Thus, the court's varying legal identification also reflected Nottoway individuals' liminal social status: being Indian allottees of partial African descent. This ambiguous position resulted in Nottoway efforts to clarify their legal, personal and real property rights as Indians with treaty lands. The 1837-1838 petition of Parsons Turner, the 1837-1840 Nottoway suit against their Trustees and the 1849-1852 case against their former Treasurer best illustrate Nottoway agency and sense of solidarity as a people during this era. The cases also provide evidence for Indian Town's continual use of the state's legal system to address community grievances, a persistence that dated back to the colonial period. Based on the tribe's relationship with the Commonwealth and the retention of indigenous lands, the Nottoway had a special legal status in Virginia. Southampton’s demography, particularly with regards to property ownership, indicates tribal members occupied a unique social, political and economic position as well. Thus, the court's varying legal identification also reflected Nottoway individuals' liminal social status.
CHAPTER V

The Allotment of Nottoway Real and Personal Property

"Supposedly, respect for private property would replace communal bonds and hasten Indians' progress toward yeoman farmer ideal. Holding allotments in trust...would allow Indians to learn to regard land as real estate and manage their own affairs...these alterations in reservation land tenure were aimed at the ultimate incorporation of reservation land and resources into the American economy."

~ Melissa Meyer 1996:51-52

Free status, property ownership and legal rights as tributary Indians distinguished the Nottoway from other Free Peoples of Color. It was the combination of these characteristics that allowed the Nottoway to carve out an economic niche for Indian Town's matrilineages. As small-producing farmers, they found affinity with people that shared aspects of their socio-economic position. Ultimately, the control of land, labor and finances were central to the transformation of the Nottoway community. This chapter investigates the civil suits and court orders relating to the division and allotment of the Nottoway's reservation lands and financial resources in order to explore the tribe's legal and economic strategies and court orders relating to the division and allotment of the Nottoway's reservation lands and financial resources. The evidence presented demonstrates the interconnectedness of Indian assets and resources with Southampton's most prominent and politically powerful men, and how this influenced the American economy.
despite acknowledged Black and White ancestry. Matrilineal-descended Nottoway distinguished themselves as Indians through a long-term bureaucratic relationship with Virginia's state and local government. Indian Town residents actively pursued partible property and full access and distribution members of sibling sets or parallel cousins leading the allotment initiatives and sales. Families, Land allotments were requested and sold as group efforts, with significant members and developed into smallholding farms managed by confined community. In contrast, the majority of property allotments from 1845-1875 were retained by tribal property were complete, indicating acquiring monetary capital was the primary interest. 

Nottoway land ownership during the Allotment Period may be considered in two blocks of time, each with specific characteristics. Most land divided between 1830 and 1845 was sold immediately by individual allottees; in some cases before surveys of the land were completed by tribal members of sibling sets or parallel cousins leading the allotment initiatives and sales. Resistance to the system's impositions expressed itself through Nottoway requests for partible shares of their real and personal estate. As landowners, the Nottoway developed, sold and mortgaged their assets and hired, shared and exchanged labor with other property owners. Allotment was the means by which the Nottoway more fully integrated into the periphery of the world-system, the "colored" and enslaved laborers, the Nottoway more fully enfraged the market as Southern production as the economic system's mechanisms conscripted the maneuverability of their financial assets and real estate away from state-enforced Trustee management further strengthened their unique social, legal and political position within and beyond Virginia's state and local government. Indian Town's decades-long struggle to capture distinguishing themselves as Indians through a long-term bureaucratic relationship with despite acknowledged Black and White ancestry. Matrilineal-descended Nottoway.
The Nottoway’s Trustees attempted to retain half-shares of the tribal land and financial assets under the direction of Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb. After the Nottoway began their legal, property, and civil initiatives to retain half-shares of the tribal land and distributions, the mid-county Nottoway utilized state structures to aggressively pursue their legal, property, and civil rights.

**Table 16.** Nottoway allotments of real and personal property, 1830-1840. Double lines divide allotment initiatives; [*] identifies individuals who retained lands for residential or agricultural purposes. Most tracts were uninhabited; [§] identifies recipients of half-shares based on the Superior Court case when Nottoway sued the Trustees to receive full allotments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allotment Notes</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sale Amt. / Purchaser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$1083 / James French (and Indian Outlet)</td>
<td>$83.99</td>
<td>James French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Woodson</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$393 / James French</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>James French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Williams</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$240 / James French</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>James French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Turner</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$375 / James French</td>
<td>119 ac.</td>
<td>James French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons Turner</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$216 / James French</td>
<td>120 acs. set aside</td>
<td>James French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Williams</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$345 / James French</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>James French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$345 / James French</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>James French</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Nottoway’s Trustees attempted to retain half-shares of the tribal land and financial assets under the direction of Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb. After the Nottoway began their legal, property, and civil initiatives to retain half-shares of the tribal land and distributions, the mid-county Nottoway utilized state structures to aggressively pursue their legal, property, and civil rights.
Jeremiah Turner, James S. French, and Jeremiah Cobb were appointed alongside James W. Parker to oversee the 1840 land transactions (C. Indian Trustees vs. Cobb et al., 1849-1852; L.P. William Turner, December 1849; L.P. William Turner, January 1850; Newson to Johnson, January 1840; Nottoway Trustees, January 23, 1834). The actual disposition of the Nottoway Trust's liquid assets may have been called into question.

Jeremiah Turner, James S. French, and Jeremiah Cobb entered into a series of loan agreements with merchant resources [see Table 16]. Some accounting arrangements were clearly called in, as motivations for allotting so much land in 1840 and so little direct distribution of monetary resources [see Table 16]. Against Nottoway wishes, in a similar manner as the machinations of the early Trustee regimes, Cobb resisted doling out large portions of cash from the tribal fund and depreciating the account's banking potential. Instead, the Trustees recommended from one-sixth to one-half disbursements. As in the previous decades, the Nottoway resisted the Trustee paternalism and engaged the Commonwealth directly. The Nottoway's 1838 legislative petition requested the General Assembly to reverse the 1840 land transactions and the deeming of the land as already transferred. The Trustees' legal proceedings, which eventually resulted in the tribe's civil suit against the Treasurer, were pursued for many years, a period that coincided with the allotment of reservation lands and the deepening of Nottoway contractualization. Trustees James S. French and Jeremiah Cobb were Treasurer and his former accountholders. Jeremiah Cobb was Treasurer for twenty-five years, a period that coincided with the allotment of reservation lands and the deepening of Nottoway contractualization. Trustees James S. French and Jeremiah Cobb were appointed alongside James W. Parker to oversee the 1840 land transactions (C. Indian Trustees vs. Cobb et al., 1849-1852; L.P. William Turner, December 1849; L.P. William Turner, January 1850; Newson to Johnson, January 1840; Nottoway Trustees, January 23, 1834). The actual disposition of the Nottoway Trust's liquid assets may have been called into question.
Theodore Trezvant to secure the monies necessary to outright purchase the Indian lands. In turn, Trezvant was forced to settle existing debts far and wide, from Portsmouth merchants to Tennessee relatives (DB24:480-484). As recorded in Southampton’s deed books and land commissioners, it seems clear that the connection of Virginia politics, Trustees, and Land Commissioners, French received the rights to Trezvant’s Indian lands as well as purchased the majority of tracts located in the Indian Woods and Indian Outlet. French flipped the properties within the year to Henry B. Vaughan, selling a total of 913 acres for $3476—a figure similar to what French outlayed in cash for the Nottoway lands for $3,479.50. Vaughan, who previously purchased large swaths of Nottoway land in the 1820s and 1830s, acquired the majority of the 500 acre Indian Woods and 360 acres Indian Outlet, French and the merchant Theodore Trezvant can only be hinted. All concerned owed money to one another, and Cobb and French acted in official capacities as Nottoway Trustees and County Judge Jeremiah Cobb, Trustee and lawyer James S. Exequelle Pape’s. The linkage of the Nottoway monetary fund to the personal finances of Attorney General confirmed the Nottoway’s tributary treaty status (David Campbell, Executive Papers). The linkage of the Nottoway monetary fund to the personal finances of Trustee and County Judge Jeremiah Cobb, Trustee and lawyer James S. Exequelle Pape’s. The linkage of the Nottoway monetary fund to the personal finances of Auxiliary General confirmed the Nottoway’s tributary treaty status (David Campbell, Executive Papers). The linkage of the Nottoway monetary fund to the personal finances of Auxiliary General confirmed the Nottoway’s tributary treaty status (David Campbell, Executive Papers). The linkage of the Nottoway monetary fund to the personal finances of Auxiliary General confirmed the Nottoway’s tributary treaty status (David Campbell, Executive Papers). The linkage of the Nottoway monetary fund to the personal finances of Auxiliary General confirmed the Nottoway’s tributary treaty status (David Campbell, Executive Papers). The linkage of the Nottoway monetary fund to the personal finances of Auxiliary General confirmed the Nottoway’s tributary treaty status (David Campbell, Executive Papers).
Trezvant and the less than transparent accounting of Cobb, however, muddles the motivation of actors like French. Notwithstanding French's Nottoway business, he had a "mysterious career" and was an unusual character for an "obscure country lawyer." Unpacking French's relationships may provide an example of the Nottoway guardians' connections to the wider Virginia political economy. Born in Petersburg and raised in Norfolk, James Strange French was a graduate of the College of William & Mary and the University of Virginia, practiced law in Jerusalem, and later Alexandria. In 1831 he represented accused Southampton insurgents in the Nat Turner slave rebellion, alongside Trustees Thomas R. Gray and Presiding Judge Jeremiah Cobb. James S. French also had an unsuccessful career as an Indian-themed fiction writer. French owned the 1833 copyright to frontierman David Crockett's popular biography, *Sketches and Eccentricities of Col. David Crockett of West Tennessee* and wrote the little-known 1836 novel, *Elkswatawa; or the Prophet of the West*, a politically minded work. Both volumes were politically minded towards anti-Washington corruption. Thus, it was not coincidental that French was connected socially to anti-Jacksonian figures, such as Congressman James Trezvant, brother of Jerusalem merchant Theodore Trezvant, and Mathew St. Clair Clarke, clerk of the House of Representatives. The anomalous author of *Sketches and Eccentricities* was also a suitor of Southampton's Martha Rochelle, who later dismissed French's overtures in favor of John Tyler Jr., son of the tenth U.S. President. French was also a brother of Jerusalem merchant Theodore Trezvant, and Mathew S. Clar Clarke, clerk of the House of Representatives. Such as Congressman James Trezvant, French was connected socially to anti-Jacksonian figures, such as Congressman James Trezvant, brother of Jerusalem merchant Theodore Trezvant, and Mathew St. Clair Clarke, clerk of the House of Representatives. The anomalous author of *Sketches and Eccentricities* was also a suitor of Southampton's Martha Rochelle, who later dismissed French's overtures in favor of John Tyler Jr., son of the tenth U.S. President. French was also a brother of Jerusalem merchant Theodore Trezvant, and Mathew S. Clar Clarke, clerk of the House of Representatives. Such as Congressman James Trezvant, French was connected socially to anti-Jacksonian figures, such as Congressman James Trezvant, brother of Jerusalem merchant Theodore Trezvant, and Mathew St. Clair Clarke, clerk of the House of Representatives. The anomalous author of *Sketches and Eccentricities* was also a suitor of Southampton's Martha Rochelle, who later dismissed French's overtures in favor of John Tyler Jr., son of the tenth U.S. President.
As a Jerusalem lawyer, James French lobbied the Governor of Virginia on behalf of the Nottoway’s civil rights in 1838, clarifying possibly unintentionally the tribe’s treaty status within the legal system of the state. Yet, he clearly orchestrated the 1840 financial maneuvers required to liquidate various parties’ assets in order to purchase nearly 1000 acres of Nottoway land. In an 1840 Southampton correspondence of George Henry Thomas, the future U.S. General known during the Civil War as the “Rock of Chickamauga,” James French was described as having “got himself…[into a] scrape” in some Southampton affair. Historian Thomas Parramore indicates this conflict led to French’s departure from Jerusalem “under a cloud.” Nonetheless, French went on to practice law in Alexandria and had an important role in the development of Virginia’s infrastructure. In 1843 French purchased the bankrupt assets of the Portsmouth and Richmond Railroad, a position he retained for many years (Crofts 1992:186-187; DB25:62; Davis 1992:127, 143). This financial maneuver allowed French to bankroll the purchase of the bankrupt railroad. He eventually became the president of the Alexandria, London and Hampshire Railroad. Whatever the configuration of debt and credit that led to the bankrolling of the 1840 Nottoway transactions, it is clear that James S. French provided the cash for the near 1000 acres of Nottoway land. Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb released as little capital as possible and merchant Theodore Trezvant was forced to leverage his personal property to front the money to French. In 1837-1840 period, including selling Nottoway and Cobb’s existing debts among others, completing the purchase of nearly 1000 acres of Nottoway land led to the bankrolling of the 1840 Nottoway transactions. It is clear that James S. French provided the cash for the purchase of nearly 1000 acres of Nottoway land. In an 1840 Southampton correspondence of George Henry Thomas, the future U.S. General known during the Civil War as the “Rock of Chickamauga,” James French was described as having “got himself…[into a] scrape” in some Southampton affair. Historian Thomas Parramore indicates this conflict led to French’s departure from Jerusalem “under a cloud.” Nonetheless, French went on to practice law in Alexandria and had an important role in the development of Virginia’s infrastructure. In 1843 French purchased the bankrupt assets of the Portsmouth and Richmond Railroad, a position he retained for many years (Crofts 1992:186-187; DB25:62; Davis 1992:127, 143). This financial maneuver allowed French to bankroll the purchase of the bankrupt railroad. He eventually became the president of the Alexandria, London and Hampshire Railroad. Whatever the configuration of debt and credit that led to the bankrolling of the 1840 Nottoway transactions, it is clear that James S. French provided the cash for the purchase of nearly 1000 acres of Nottoway land. Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb released as little capital as possible and merchant Theodore Trezvant was forced to leverage his personal property to front the money to French. In 1837-1840 period, including selling Nottoway and Cobb’s existing debts among others, completing the purchase of nearly 1000 acres of Nottoway land led to the bankrolling of the 1840 Nottoway transactions. It is clear that James S. French provided the cash for the purchase of nearly 1000 acres of Nottoway land. In an 1840 Southampton correspondence of George Henry Thomas, the future U.S. General known during the Civil War as the “Rock of Chickamauga,” James French was described as having “got himself…[into a] scrape” in some Southampton affair. Historian Thomas Parramore indicates this conflict led to French’s departure from Jerusalem “under a cloud.” Nonetheless, French went on to practice law in Alexandria and had an important role in the development of Virginia’s infrastructure. In 1843 French purchased the bankrupt assets of the Portsmouth and Richmond Railroad, a position he retained for many years (Crofts 1992:186-187; DB25:62; Davis 1992:127, 143). This financial maneuver allowed French to bankroll the purchase of the bankrupt railroad. He eventually became the president of the Alexandria, London and Hampshire Railroad.
suggest that some of the Turner and Woodson tracts along the Indian Road were
in the vicinity of the Woodson ohwachira lands bordering the Scholars. These actions
(DB22:62). As well, Nancy Turner did not sell her allotment outright, since it was located
the ‘old Eli Turner settlement’ was located on the western edge of the Indian Woods.

Table 16. Nottoway william Turner retained a portion of his allotment land near where
French settled ten acres for lease when she sold the rights to her 1840 allotment (see
Elder Nancy Turner, living on her ohwachira lands, arranged to have James
(DB24:48)).

and in 1840 repurchased the allotment from cash-starved Trezvant, but for twice the price.
Land sales (C1840-1850: Cronis 1997;3-5; Forbes 1993:202). Mason Scholar remained,
(DB24:314). However, some Scholar descendants and their allies removed after the
Scholar’s family then rented the lands from Trezvant for an unknown amount annually.
old lands, a tract that his sons, while Mason Scholar [nee Chavis] still resided on.
half acres to Theodore Trezvant was drawn from deceased headman Lieutenant Scholar’s
descendants of the Scholar ohwachira. Nancy Turner’s 1837 sale of seventeen and one-
allocation adjacent areas occupied by adjacent Nottoway – particularly the non-matrilinial
made through ohwachira agreements with the Tuscaras. However, some of the 1837
reservation land south of the Indian Road [Figure 31]. These arrangements were likely
Most of the 1830-1840 land allotments were selected from unimproved tracts of
previously considered.
Nottoway land deals and cash received to support the 1840 tribal settlements has not been
of the railroad to Southampton (Cronis 1992:44; Parramore 1992:126-127), but the
Meanwhile demise has been attributed to the realignment of businesses with the coming
occupied. If so, the Nottoway allotments of 1840 began to impinge on the settlement areas.

In contrast to the 1830-1845 Allotment Period, most property divisions after

OCR: 1837.

Figure 31. Nottoway Reservation survey, c.1840. Map is inverted to approximate cardinal northeast. The earliest allotments 1830-1835 are at the bottom of the map, followed by the first 1837 allotments on the far left. Additional 1837 allotments were surveyed from the mid-section of the map, followed by the first 1838 allotments on the right side of the map, which were reviewed and revised. James French purchased the Indian Outlet, before it was divided, insuring large amounts of cash into the unmarked Nottoway farms located in the area shown. The outcome of 1840, the decision of those proceedings allocated the 369 acre Chromatic Farm on the right side of the map, locally called the Indian Woods. Most of the parcels were half-allotments, with the second half reserved for the General Assembly and the additional allotments. The centroid of the map, locally called the Indian Woods, was surveyed from the mid-section of the map, followed by the first 1838 allotments on the left, followed by additional 1837 allotments.

Allotment Period, from 1845-1875, differed from that of the earlier era. Allotted land was not sold outright, but occupied and developed as small producing farms. However, some tracts were sold within several years; in some instances, property acquisition was a means to promote other agendas. The entire Taylor lineage segment relocated during this period, opting to timber their tracts, sell their shares and remove to Richmond and Petersburg for wage labor opportunities (C1850-1860 Petersburg, VA; DB28:44, 357-358).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allotment Notes</th>
<th>Sale Amt / Purchaser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Turner</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>No record of allotment</td>
<td>No record of survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Turner</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>48.5 ac. 1/16 of 1125</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Bozeman</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>42.5 ac. 1/16 of 1125</td>
<td>$172.62 / James Gray [1852]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Woodson</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>45 ac. 1/16 of 1125</td>
<td>$225 / James Gray [1853]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Taylor</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Surveyed together 105 ac.</td>
<td>$150 Timbered [1850]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsey Bozeman</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>48 ac. 1/16 of 721.5 ac.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milly Woodson</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>64.5 ac. 1/12 of 836 ac.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Bozeman</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>50 ac. 1/12 of 836 ac.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>59 ac. 1/10 of 721.5 ac.</td>
<td>$157.5 / Edwin Turner [1855]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb Bozeman</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>71.5 ac. 1/14 of 721.5 ac.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Bozeman</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>75 ac. with a balance of 755 acres</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Nottoway allotments of real and personal property, 1845-1875. Each allottee's proportion was determined by the number of potential applicants, e.g. one of sixteen, one of fourteen, etc. The 1868 allotment to Lamb Bozeman miscalculated the available acreage, as John Taylor's allotment was previously deducted from a survey of 721.5 acres. Jincy Woodson-Taylor sold her 1837-1840 allotments alongside her sons in 1855. Unlike the majority of midcentury applicants, the Taylor lineage-segment removed to urban centers. Figures marked [*] owed money to the Trustees at the conclusion of the 1847-1852 Chancery Court case. Survey fees, attorney's fees and clerk's tickets offset most of the remaining monetary shares of each allottee. Importantly, Indian Town headman Edwin Turner purchased allotment lands from Nottoway planning removal (DB28:699), and thereby retained tribal land, but cultivated non-Indian Town allotments (VA: C1860-1870 Petersburg).
shares in 1833-1838 becomes clear when the shortfalls in cash are considered. James
other mississippian or not in physical assets. Thus, Copp’s motivation for recommending half-
1840 allotments and Copp’s limited direct payment, suggested Nottoway must monies were
Cobb. The trust fund’s cash shortage, evidenced by the increase in land surveyed for the
apportioned Trustee James W. Parker required balanced books from Treasurer Jeremiah
Nottoway allies was more judicious and attentive to the tribe’s property rights. Newly
During the second half of the Allotment Period, the Trustee’s accounting or

mobilation

individual men of individual family segments cooperated for income pooling and resource
family interests held more influence over Nottoway affairs, as agnatic, matrilineal and
segment of the matrilineage. By that time [1878], non-Nottoway made attines and nuclear
particularly after the Civil War. The final 600 acres of Nottoway land was divided by one
control of Indian resources eventually shifted toward the Woodson ohwachira,
individual property owners. Not all eligible claimants applied for Indian lands. The
the time of their adulthood and of those that did not sell, kept their personal tracts as
The matrilineal component of the Nottoway community requested allotments near

ohwachira compounds (C1830-1870; D28:306, 339).

from some land sales were reversed in multi-generation, matrilineal, sibling-set
the household composition and residence of allottees following the transactions, the funds
areas on the Indian Road adjacent to ohwachira compounds (DB28:306, 339). Judging by
smallholders, such as James Gray, who carved a substantial middling farm of nearly 200
his personal property. Other Nottoway collaborated on lands sales with White

French's financial leverage against Trezvant, and the corresponding promissory notes for land sales, ultimately supported the monetary infusion to Nottoway farms.

Records from the ensuing 1849-1852 Chancery Court case indicate that indeed

undertaken emphasi{s} in original).

Land's estate, with interest back to 1841 (L.P. Elizabeth Turner, December 1847),

amortized amount to $873.40, with interest from 1844, and $218.04 was due from

in 1849 letter to the Southampton Court, Trustees Parker noted the missing Nottoway

owed the Nottoway estate, including those of Indian Town neighbor Benjamin Lamb. In

so that there is no accessible information, and that „no interest had been received„ by the

New Trustees Parker, Newsom and Barham found the accounts „lost or mislaid„.

Papers: OBI843-1849.44)

Proceedings to the Executive (L.P. Elizabeth Turner, December 1847: Joseph Johnson

Supernumerary appointments, the Nottoway Trustees were „required to report their

upon those previous actions as Trustees for a settlement of accounts.„ As with previous

Trustees to take charge of the property of the said tribe of Indians with authority to call

Johnson appointed James W. Parker, George W. Newsom and Jesse Barham as

and was „removed from the office„ as Treasurer in 1845, Virginia Governor Joseph

of his Southampton departure. Cobb dismissed Nottoway annuity payments in 1844

French's tenure as a tribal Trustee ended by 1843, likely coinciding with his

land sales, ultimately supported the monetary infusion to Nottoway farms.
Thomas Fitzsimon followed the 1820 land sales were supposed to be invested in public
own advantage and personal gain, through loans, investments and other enterprises. The
by the former Trustees Benjamin Cobb, Jeremiah Cobb, John T. Blow, Henry Welsh and
Documents from the 1849-1852 tribal lawsuits indicate that the monies collected

(Cobb et al. March 1851).

Tom’s sense of peoplehood during the mid-nineteenth century (CC Indian Trustees vs.
actions as a corporate group, the use of the Nansemond name speaks strongly to Indian
„numerous” interested Indian parties in the court proceedings. Combined with the legal
income-earning Trustee scandals. The combined tribal names also reinforced the
increased the process of appointment for tribal Trustees as a result of the earlier
amended the process of appointment for tribal Trustees as a result of the General
repealed the legislative language of an 1816 Act of the General Assembly, which
formally confirmed Indian Town’s historical relationship with the Commonwealth. The
recognized the petitioners as the „Nottoway and Nansemond Tribe of Indians.” This
half a century, the Nansemond heritage of the Tribe was noted and the court officially
Southampton County. As an adjunct to Indian Town’s claim, for the first time in nearly
judicial arguments, their counsel noted the Indians were „still very numerous” in
tribe against their Trustees’ mismanagement of trust funds. In contrast to previous
headdown Turner, stood on behalf of the mmences and all other members of the

The Taylor sub-lineage – males of the Woodson ahwachina – alongside Indian Town’s

Indian Trustees vs. Cobb et al and Indian Trustees vs. Everett et al, 1849-1852).
request to „draw new parties“ and secure the debt from their former Trustees, and any
interest collected annually and applied to „support the Indians.‟ The former Trustees blamed the debt
for „insufficient to secure the amount due from Jere Cobb,‟ as a result of his depressed
fiancance and the other obligations. Having become insolvent, the court allowed the debt was
„insufficient to secure the amount due from Jere Cobb,‟ as a result of his depressed
estate. The new Trustees reported the bond executed by the tribe's previous custodians

of their rights (CC Indian Trustees vs. Cobb et al., 1849-1852).

The case was before the court that the Indians were „very numerous,‟ they were „exceedingly ignorant
under various pretexts.‟ The tribe's lawyers, John R. Chambliss and E.W. Massenburg,
were accused of directing the Act of Assembly, that the per capita interest to the tribe annually, until
1844 when he ceased monetary distributions. The Nottoway complained that they „other
cases, Cobb was reported to have paid the per capita interest to the tribe annually, until
which only $1,200 remained of the approximately $3,300 received from the tribe's land
from the Commonwealth. Cobb was accused of reckoning the money starting in 1820, of

By 1849 all of the former Trustees, except Jeremiah Cobb, had died or removed

execute executor to recover the tribe's communal monetary property.

entitled to, and no necessary, were willing to the suit against every bondsmen, Trustee and
security than the aforesaid bond. „The Nottoway wished to recover the funds they were
securities of stock and suffered to remain in the hands of Jere Cobb without any other
was sold but the former guardians „neglected to invest [the money] in the public
However, according to the new tribal Trustees, Parker, Newson and Barham, the land
directs, with Richard Blunt, Alexander P., Peete, and Henry T. Mason, their Trustees,

The former Trustees entered „into bond in the penalty of $1,200 conditioned as the act
securities of stock, „the interest collected annually and applied „to support the Indians,‟
The Southampton Chancery Court ordered Jeremiah Cobb to answer the allegations to account for any Indian money he retained and to identify "in what capacity he received the [money] and what part directed by any [and] legally expended." The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defendant Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Cobb</td>
<td>Former Treasurer</td>
<td>Executor W. Cobb</td>
<td>Counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Cobb</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>Referred to Executor J. Cobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Blow</td>
<td>Former Trustee</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Referred to Barham and Blow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Welsh</td>
<td>Former Trustee</td>
<td>Relocated</td>
<td>Publication of Charges: Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fitzhugh</td>
<td>Administrator of J. Blow</td>
<td>Relocated</td>
<td>Death during Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Myrick</td>
<td>Committee of Fitzhugh</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Dismissed on final decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George B. Cary</td>
<td>Executor of T. Fitzhugh</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Expired L nugati and Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander P. Peete</td>
<td>Administrator of R. Blunt</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Referred to Execution Cary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry T. Magee</td>
<td>Bondsman</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Referred to Execution Cary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Blow</td>
<td>Former Trustee</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Referred to Execution Cary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Cobb</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Counter</td>
<td>Counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Cobb</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Counter</td>
<td>Counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendant Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Everett</td>
<td>Justice of the Court</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referred to Sheriff J. Darden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bridges</td>
<td>Justice of the Court</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referred to Sheriff J. Darden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Gray</td>
<td>Committee of Fitzhugh</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Myrick</td>
<td>Committee of Fitzhugh</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Blunt</td>
<td>Executor of R. Blunt</td>
<td>Counter</td>
<td>Counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W. Cobb</td>
<td>Administrator of J. Cobb</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Referred to Execution Cary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry T. Magee</td>
<td>Bondsman</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Referred to Execution Cary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Blunt</td>
<td>Bondsman</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Referred to Execution Cary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Myrick</td>
<td>Committee of Fitzhugh</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referred to Sheriff J. Darden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Gray</td>
<td>Justice of the Court</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referred to Sheriff A. Myrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Briggs</td>
<td>Justice of the Court</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referred to Sheriff A. Myrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ricks</td>
<td>Justice of the Court</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referred to Sheriff A. Myrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Everett</td>
<td>Justice of the Court</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Referred to Sheriff A. Myrick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Defendants in the suits Trustees of the Nottoway and Nansemond Indians vs. Jeremiah Cobb et al. and Trustees of the Nottoway and Nansemond Indians vs. Everett et al.

Sources: CC Indian Trustees vs. Cobb et al., 1849-1852; CO1832-1858:260-261, 266, 273, 289.
Court further instructed Cobb "without evasion or equivocation" to itemize his interest payments, reveal on what amount the interest was calculated and submit a receipt for his last annuity disbursement. The Court ordered Cobb to make an "account of his transactions as Trustee and render whatever funds due the Nottoway in a full and fair settlement." Cobb never responded to the January 1849 subpoena and by October of 1849 was deceased, dying intestate with William W. Cobb named as his estate administrator.

Cobb never received any of the funds. Having passed into the hands of Jerra Cobb the Treasurer, Cary requested to be discharged from the suit. Moreover, Cary suggested the statute of limitations had long absolved him of any responsibility. Cary stated he had "long since parted with the whole estate" and that Fitzhugh never did receive any of the funds. Having passed into the hands of Jerra Cobb the Treasurer, Cary stated he had "long since parted with the whole estate" and that Fitzhugh never did receive any of the funds.

In Southampton County, Sheriff Jeptha Darden was subpoenaed to answer as the administrator of Trustee Benjamin Cobb and bondsmen Richard Blunt and William W. Cobb. Darden agreed the parties sold the Indian land and bonded the proceeds, but rather than investing the funds, the Trustees loaned the money out, collected the interest and disbursed the dividends annually to the Nottoway. Darden declared no assets had passed into his hands from the estates in question and that the property of the deceased had passed into the hands of the Trustees. Moreover, Darden stated he had "long since parted with the whole estate" and that Fitzhugh never did receive any of the funds.

In the ensuing flurry of subpoenas to identify culpable parties, most former Trustees and bondsmen were declared "removed" from the Commonwealth or "deceased," their executors requested to answer. George B. Cary, whose father had rented and purchased Nottoway lands, was identified as the executor for Trustee Thomas Fitzhugh. Cary stated he had "long since parted with the whole estate" and that Fitzhugh never did receive any of the funds. Having passed into the hands of Jerra Cobb the Treasurer, Cary requested to be discharged from the suit. Moreover, Cary suggested the statute of limitations had long absolved him of any responsibility.

In a similar manner, Southampton County Sheriff Jeptha Darden was subpoenaed to answer as the administrator of Trustee Benjamin Cobb and bondsmen Richard Blunt. Darden agreed the parties sold the Indian land and bonded the proceeds, but rather than investing the funds, the Trustees loaned the money out, collected the interest and disbursed the dividends annually to the Nottoway. Darden declared no assets had passed into his hands from the estates in question and that the property of the deceased had "long ago been distributed by Jerra Cobb." Sheriff Darden asked any charges against him were discharged, "on account of his transactions as Trustee, and render whatever funds due the Nottoway in a full and fair settlement." Cary stated he had "long since parted with the whole estate" and that Fitzhugh never did receive any of the funds.
be dismissed claiming, "the act of limitations is in complete bar to the plaintiffs claim." Chambliss & Massenburg in turn requested subpoenas on the surviving Justices of the court and amended the bill to include all parties associated with the Nottoway Trustees', bondsman's or court representatives' estate management. Chambliss & Massenburg requested a decree against the co-obligors who were either party to or endorsed the defaulted transaction, "for whatever they may be bound and grant unto [the Nottoway] such other and further relief as justice and equity may dictate." As demonstrated by Table 18 and revealed in the court proceedings, the defendants all deferred to others for responsibility. As Trustee and Treasurer, Cobb had presided over the Trustee Circle for nearly thirty years. In as much, the co-defendants argued Cobb was solely responsible for improperly disposing of Nottoway trust fund management and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial

In death, the "eminent citizen" Jeremiah Cobb was implicated by his fellow Southamptoners as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial Southamponians as the source of the Nottoway trust fund mismanagement and financial

For any wrongdoing or misappropriation solely on him (CC Indian Trustees vs. Cobb et al. 1849-1852: CO1832-1858:260-261).

Jeremiah Cobb was a Southampton County lawyer, judge and a Democratic member of the elite plantation class in the decades before his death, considered members of the elite plantation class. In the decades before his death, Chambliss & Massenburg's socio-economic position, as the Cobb family may be worthwhile to consider Cobb's role and consider his cohorts' accusations, it is

To contextualize Cobb's role and consider his cohorts' accusations, it is

roles as Indian protectors to siphon embezzle and manipulate Iroquoian resources. The Nottoway estate, the last in a long line of Southampton wealth-builders to use their any "misplaced" Iroquoian assets. Cobb was the last Trustee to have such full power over
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Lynchburg's family descended from an Aberdeen Scottish merchant who settled in the Southampton. To provide perspective on Cobb's third party borrower, Charles Fox, his family claimed $2,580 in real estate in Nottoway Parish and owned nineteen slaves at the height of the Indian Town trial. Four hundred acres of Cobb farmlands were under cultivation, with the number and value of horses and farm implements exceeding almost all of their neighbors. Therefore, Cobb's combined wealth placed him within the very small minority of Southampton elites (AG1850; C1850; Crofts 1992:108; Oats 1975:124; SS 1850). What is not known is how much wealth this prominent Southampton family accumulated as the stewards of the Nottoway Trust.

The subpoena for Jeremiah Cobb fell to Assamoosick lawyer and estate executor, William W. Cobb—his Treasurer's son. William W. Cobb's response to the court's query added new insight into his father's handling of the Nottoway Trust, but as the other co-obligators, the younger Cobb attempted to escape responsibility as the executor of his father's property. Cobb agreed that his father was a Trustee, but suggested no sizable assets of the senior Cobb's estate had yet transferred to the executor. Moreover, the monies from the 1820 land sales were not in Cobb's possession, but loaned to multiple parties, the interest from which the former Treasurer collected annually and distributed to the trust's beneficiaries. Cobb stated that the funds were advanced to multiple parties, the interest from which the former Treasurer collected annually and distributed to the trust's beneficiaries.

With Cobb or other Trustees as middlemen, the Nottoway's resources were repeatedly tied-up with the wealthiest and most politically-connected families of Southampton. To provide perspective on Cobb's third party borrower, Charles Fox, his family claimed $2,580 in real estate in Nottoway Parish and owned nineteen slaves at the height of the Indian Town trial. Four hundred acres of Cobb farmlands were under cultivation, with the number and value of horses and farm implements exceeding almost all of their neighbors. Therefore, Cobb's combined wealth placed him within the very small minority of Southampton elites (AG1850; C1850; Crofts 1992:108; Oats 1975:124; SS 1850). What is not known is how much wealth this prominent Southampton family accumulated as the stewards of the Nottoway Trust.

The subpoena for Jeremiah Cobb fell to Assamoosick lawyer and estate executor, William W. Cobb—his Treasurer's son. William W. Cobb's response to the court's query added new insight into his father's handling of the Nottoway Trust, but as the other co-obligators, the younger Cobb attempted to escape responsibility as the executor of his father's property. Cobb agreed that his father was a Trustee, but suggested no sizable assets of the senior Cobb's estate had yet transferred to the executor. Moreover, the monies from the 1820 land sales were not in Cobb's possession, but loaned to multiple parties, the interest from which the former Treasurer collected annually and distributed to the trust's beneficiaries. Cobb stated that the funds were advanced to multiple parties, the interest from which the former Treasurer collected annually and distributed to the trust's beneficiaries.

With Cobb or other Trustees as middlemen, the Nottoway's resources were repeatedly tied-up with the wealthiest and most politically-connected families of Southampton. To provide perspective on Cobb's third party borrower, Charles Fox, his family claimed $2,580 in real estate in Nottoway Parish and owned nineteen slaves at the height of the Indian Town trial. Four hundred acres of Cobb farmlands were under cultivation, with the number and value of horses and farm implements exceeding almost all of their neighbors. Therefore, Cobb's combined wealth placed him within the very small minority of Southampton elites (AG1850; C1850; Crofts 1992:108; Oats 1975:124; SS 1850). What is not known is how much wealth this prominent Southampton family accumulated as the stewards of the Nottoway Trust.

The subpoena for Jeremiah Cobb fell to Assamoosick lawyer and estate executor, William W. Cobb—his Treasurer's son. William W. Cobb's response to the court's query added new insight into his father's handling of the Nottoway Trust, but as the other co-obligators, the younger Cobb attempted to escape responsibility as the executor of his father's property. Cobb agreed that his father was a Trustee, but suggested no sizable assets of the senior Cobb's estate had yet transferred to the executor. Moreover, the monies from the 1820 land sales were not in Cobb's possession, but loaned to multiple parties, the interest from which the former Treasurer collected annually and distributed to the trust's beneficiaries. Cobb stated that the funds were advanced to multiple parties, the interest from which the former Treasurer collected annually and distributed to the trust's beneficiaries.

With Cobb or other Trustees as middlemen, the Nottoway's resources were repeatedly tied-up with the wealthiest and most politically-connected families of Southampton. To provide perspective on Cobb's third party borrower, Charles Fox, his family claimed $2,580 in real estate in Nottoway Parish and owned nineteen slaves at the height of the Indian Town trial. Four hundred acres of Cobb farmlands were under cultivation, with the number and value of horses and farm implements exceeding almost all of their neighbors. Therefore, Cobb's combined wealth placed him within the very small minority of Southampton elites (AG1850; C1850; Crofts 1992:108; Oats 1975:124; SS 1850). What is not known is how much wealth this prominent Southampton family accumulated as the stewards of the Nottoway Trust.
William Urquhart married Virginia-born Mary Simmons—the granddaughter of the Nottoway's first Trustee John Simmons. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, their son John Urquhart owned 14,000 acres in the Southside region during the eighteenth century. William Urquhart, who acted as Urquhart's overseer, concentrated on managing an operation in Prince Edward County. By the 1820s, Urquhart owned 180 slaves in three states, his livestock alone was valued at $2,755—more than Jeremiah Cobb's plantation, where his livestock alone was valued at $2,755. By 1850, Charles F. Urquhart's real estate was valued at a staggering $47,000 and his money in John Urquhart's son Charles, considered to be one of the wealthiest men in the region. By 1850, Charles F. Urquhart's real estate was valued at a staggering $47,000 and his money in John Urquhart's son Charles, considered to be one of the wealthiest men in the region. By 1850, Charles F. Urquhart's real estate was valued at a staggering $47,000 and his money in John Urquhart's son Charles, considered to be one of the wealthiest men in the region. By 1850, Charles F. Urquhart's real estate was valued at a staggering $47,000 and his money in John Urquhart's son Charles, considered to be one of the wealthiest men in the region. By 1850, Charles F. Urquhart's real estate was valued at a staggering $47,000 and his money in John Urquhart's son Charles, considered to be one of the wealthiest men in the region. By 1850, Charles F. Urquhart's real estate was valued at a staggering $47,000 and his money in John Urquhart's son Charles, considered to be one of the wealthiest men in the region. By 1850, Charles F. Urquhart's real estate was valued at a staggering $47,000 and his money in John Urquhart's son Charles, considered to be one of the wealthiest men in the region. By 1850, Charles F. Urquhart's real estate was valued at a staggering $47,000 and his money in John Urquhart's son Charles, considered to be one of the wealthiest men in the region.
Isle of Wight and two in Southampton. Combined, five Urquhart brothers owned an unbelievable number of enslaved laborers – tallied at 611 individuals in 1850 (AG1850; C1850; C1850 Fayette County, TN; C1850 Northampton County, NC; SS1850; SS1850 Bertie County, NC; SS1850 Isle of Wight County, VA; C1850; C1850 Fayette County, TN; C1850 Northampton County, NC; SS1850; SS1850

raised by a merchant father who controlled the import / export exchange between


Scotland to identify and relocate skilled specialists from Great Britain's textile industry
devlop the Virginia factory, and ultimately relied on mercantile connections with
beyond $50,000 in capital stock value. The Urquharts sought textile specialists to further
probably the lease of Wills' manufactory from owning more than 500 acres of growing
be not less than $20,000 and divided into shares of $100 each. The Legislature
became known as the "Mount Holly Manufacturing Company," the capital stock ordered
incorporate a "cotton and woolen manufactory." In 1837 the Urquhart brothers' venture
1828 and 1836 the Urquhart brothers petitioned the Virginia Legislature to allow them to
1828 generated more success; the Urquharts were the capitalists of agro-industry. In
Chapel in such extensive credit. Whatever the true reason, there is no missing that
Notwithstanding this money, why he would borrow a few thousand dollars from Jerseyman
One wonders what exactly the ultra-wealthy Charles F. Urquhart did with the

SS1850 Northampton County, NC).

Berte County, NC; SS1850 Fayette County, TN; SS1850 Isle of Wight County, VA;
of Delegates, while Charles F. Urquhart was the Union candidate for the Virginia state convention in 1861; a nephew, Thomas H. Urquhart, occupied a seat in the state Senate. As entrepreneurs, the Urquharts were early growers of cotton for export and significantly invested in wool manufacture. The family's annual wool production dwarfed their neighbors; in the 1850 Agriculture schedule, the three Southampton Urquhart plantations alone enumerated 440 sheep with an annual yield of 1305 lbs. of wool. By 1860 the market had shifted toward cotton. The Urquharts reduced their sheep herds, invested in cotton agriculture and produced upwards of 100-bushel bales. They also sought ways to improve and increase their agricultural production. Two of the fourteen Southampton subscribers to Edmund Ruffin's Farmer's Register were Urquharts (AG1850-1860; Crofts 1992:189; Farmer's Register 1834:774; Goode 1887:181).

According to William W. Cobb in 1849, Charles F. Urquhart's Nottoway debt had only recently been repaid in full—a nearly thirty-year loan agreement. Questions emerge about what arrangement Cobb and Urquhart made concerning the Indian trust money, what further financial relationship the two men had, and what circumstances precipitated such a lengthy loan with so little return from such prominent men of property, influence, and wealth. Cobb in his capacity as Treasurer of the Nottoway County had income from such returns, which he was entitled to only by law, but by a special order of the Board of Trustees. Cobb argued that his father never received commissions. In a manner that came to typify the Trustee responses of nineteenth-century Nottoway scandals, William W. Cobb argued that his father never received commissions. According to William W. Cobb in 1849, Charles F. Urquhart's Nottoway debt had only recently been repaid in full—a nearly thirty-year loan agreement. Questions emerge about what arrangement Cobb and Urquhart made concerning the Indian trust money, what further financial relationship the two men had, and what circumstances precipitated such a lengthy loan with so little return from such prominent men of property, influence, and wealth. Cobb in his capacity as Treasurer of the Nottoway County had income from such returns, which he was entitled to only by law, but by a special order of the Board of Trustees. Cobb argued that his father never received commissions. In a manner that came to typify the Trustee responses of nineteenth-century Nottoway scandals, William W. Cobb argued that his father never received commissions.
ordered William W. Cobb to "render before a Commissioner...an account of the
accounting of recent transactions. The case was continued and the Southampton Court
defendants presented little evidence other than depositions of innocence and a merger
short, there was not much clarity offered from the court's subpoena of the Cobbs and the
amount was annually given to the Nottoway, or how many annuities were distributed. In
of the deductions made for various 1830-1850 Indian allotments, or what monetary
differences in 1820 sale pieces and the 1845 trust-fund account; there were no discussions
annual return the Nottoway made from the bank. Further, no explanation was made for the
indentation from Cobb concerning what manner Lieutenant invested the money or what
exactly how much Nottoway money Cobb retained, how he loaned it out, nor how he
Based on the extant court documents, no long-term accounting was offered for

Indian Trustees vs. Cobb et al., 1849-1852.

fact all that is due from the said Treasurer if his commission should not be allowed." (CC
continued, "The Treasurer paid up to July 1845 interest on $873.40 and that this is in
the proper time, there will not then be due the amount of $1200," as charged". Cobb
Jeremiah Cobb] is not entitled to any commission for failure to charge [the Nottoway] at
ev ents. William W. Cobb, with some confidence suggested, "It should be declared that
who were appointed under the act of 1819" survived to disagree with this version of
papers of the Nottoway Trustees, or that under legal advice of counsel, no "other Trustees
special order" passed by the Trustees indicated that either he had access to such official
before him, had well learned the shell game of the Trustee Circle. His reference to the
amount, if indeed any, due to the said Indians. Clearly William W. Cobb, as others
The nearly four-year court case was quietly dismissed during the spring of 1852.

The principal amount of the 1820 Nottoway land sales ($5300) and the accumulation of interest was never fully discussed in court. During William W. Cobb's testimony, he indicated Giles Reese, the 1820 purchaser of lot number four, transferred the property to Benjamin Lamb, who became a long-time neighbor of the tribe. Yet, Lamb "never paid the whole of the purchase money in his lifetime to the Treasurer, nor has he been paid since his death." This critical insight reveals that at least two major accounts, the Nottoway's principal monies were tied up in defaulted loans or poorly managed thirty-year lending arrangements. Based on the court records, at least two major accounts, the Nottoway's principal monies were tied up in defaulted loans or poorly managed thirty-year lending arrangements. Based on the court records, the security of the loans was highly questionable, as none of the middlemen or wealthy plantation owners were ultimately held accountable for the missing funds. Cobb stated the monies owed by Lamb totaled $218.04 with interest from 1841, nearly ten years in arrears. Ironically, Cobb assured the court the "sum is secured by a deed of trust on the said land," but that his father was not responsible for the money, nor could Cobb, on the said land, but that his father was not responsible for the money, nor could Cobb, with interest from 1841, nearly ten years in arrears,Ironically, Cobb assured the court the "sum is secured by a deed of trust on the said land," but that his father was not responsible for the money, nor could Cobb, with interest from 1841, nearly ten years in arrears. Ironically, Cobb assured the court the "sum is secured by a deed of trust on the said land," but that his father was not responsible for the money, nor could Cobb, with interest from 1841, nearly ten years in arrears.

The nearly four-year court case was quietly dismissed during the spring of 1852.
court case, however, consumed the residual increments of trust money. Only the large cash disbursement from Cobb remained to be divided among the matrilineal heirs. Source: LP John Taylor, 1856. Figure 32. Nottoway Trustee account ledger, 1855. The document demonstrates contractualization of Indian resources, as well as the efforts of mid-century Trustees to accurately record the state of Nottoway finances following the 1849-1852 lawsuit. Note the entries for calculated interest, allotment disbursement to John Taylor, income from the 'rent of the Indian Seine place,' and the commissioners and clerk's fees.
Following John Taylor’s allotment, the Trustees and Commissioner Henry S. Howard balanced the account books in December of 1855 [Figure 32]. The Nottoway trust fund showed a positive balance of $143.70, but there was no record of William W. Cobb’s payment between 1849 and 1856. The mutual dismissal of the case indicates some agreement was reached; yet, no record exists of what it was (CC Commissioner’s Report of John Taylor, March 1856). A hint that not all was resolved, Trustee George A.W. Newsom wrote Virginia Governor Joseph Johnson in January of 1854: “I beg leave to resign the appointment of trustee of the Nottoway tribe in this county. I think my appointment dates in 1849. I hope you will give this matter your earliest attention as I wish to be released of all responsibility in the matter acts in relation the appt. of Trustees 1816 & 1820” (Joseph Johnson Executive Papers).

Based on a careful review of the documentary record, it is obvious the new Nottoway Trustees and their legal representatives were more careful and transparent with recordkeeping than previous generations. As with the Trustee lease agreements and mismanaged Nottoway assets of the 1770-1790s and the Trustee misappropriation scandals of the 1800-1810s, the exact disposition of the Nottoway trust between 1820 and 1845 may never be known. Equally, the way in which the Trustee Circle Treasurer employed, invested, appropriated, employed, and syndicated the Virginia Iroquoian’s capital for the benefit of Southerners’ cultural and spiritual development has never fully been revealed. It is also unknown what the Trustee’s and their legal representatives were more careful and transparent with in this period.

No further proceedings against the former Trustees emerged before the Civil War.
control of their real and personal property. A pattern of struggle, resistance, accommodation and acceptance is revealed through decades of legislative and judicial proceedings. It is also clear that some Nottoway followed another Indian Town pattern of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries – they opted for removal after concluding the 1849-1852 Trustee suit. One entire matrilineal sibling-set removed during the jural joust.

Figure 33. Indian Town allotment surveys, 1850-1855. Milly Woodson's allotment [center of the map] became one of the main Nottoway Ohwachira compounds during the last half of the nineteenth century. Her daughter, Susanna Clau d, and her descendants, maintained the farm allotment until the late 1940s.

Source: LP Plot of Indians Land 1125 acres, Nov. 18, 1850.
With the infusion of capital, more active participation in labor sharing, cash crop production and property played an important role in the community's transformation during the decade before the Civil War. Chapter VI investigates the constellation of the Nottoway's prime Southside farmland, the increased market demand for agricultural exports and the region's access to improved modes of transportation. Alongside labor, peoplehood and property, production played an important role in the community's transformation.
CHAPTER VI
The Antebellum South, Southampton and the Nottoway within the World-System

"[Incorporation is] the process by which a zone which was at one point in time in the external arena of the world-economy came to be, at a later point in time, in the periphery of that same world-economy... incorporation involves 'hooking' the zone into the orbit of the world-economy in such a way that it virtually can no longer escape, while peripheralization involves the continuing transformation of the ministructures..."

~ Immanuel Wallerstein 1989:129-130

At the time of the Nottoway's reservation allotment, the American South broadly, and Southampton specifically, were peripheral locations within the world-economy. Innovations in railroad transportation and improved shipping lanes allowed Southampton exports of cotton and peanuts to meet the growing needs of the metropolis – Great Britain's textile industry. Wagons laden with Southampton cash crops, mostly planted and harvested by enslaved labor, were hauled to Petersburg where ships on the Appomattox River carried cargoes to Norfolk, Philadelphia and New York, and then destinations across the English Channel, such as London and Liverpool. The South's agricultural produce was key to the growing textile industry in Great Britain, and thus Southampton specifically, were peripheral locations within the world-economy.
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The intertwining of the American South and Southampton County with the
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subject to the same transformative processes of peripheralization, the deepening of capitalist development in Southampton. Five interrelated processes characterize the extension of capitalist economic relationships to more and more aspects of Nottoway life (Hopkins, et al. 1982b:104-106; Shannon 1989:115-116).

First, as described in Chapters III-V, the commodification of Indian land and labor control through coercive legal systems, and wage labor, created a polarity of social groups as the system broadened and more and more aspects of Nottoway were subject to the same transformative processes of peripheralization, the deepening of capitalist development in Southampton. Five interrelated processes characterize the extension of capitalist economic relationships to more and more aspects of Nottoway life (Hopkins, et al. 1982b:104-106; Shannon 1989:115-116).
the constant drive of the system to reduce labor costs and increase profit margins. The invention of the steam engine and the laying of railways in Southampton provided a more efficient means of transportation in the transatlantic commerce. Ditching, plowing and planting implements became technologically part of Nottoway livelihoods, producing cash crops for adjacent plantations and on Indian Town farms as entrepreneurs. The specialization outlined above: Commodity merchants operated within the market and managed petty enterprises. Commodity production continued to intensify in capitalist development through the five processes outlined above. Commodity production was integrated with the production needs of a subsistence economy.

Specialized divisions of labor were integrated with the production needs of an expanding national and global economy. Previous Nottoway pursuits such as subsistence farming and home manufactures were progressively eliminated. Nottoway agricultural expansion contributed to the importation of necessary goods through the Southampton merchants and their dominance in the market economy. The ensuing production became geared toward sale and export, whereas subsistence essentials could be purchased from the derived income. The ensuing move from self-sufficiency towards an entry into a market economy increased the demand, specialization, and elimination of self-sufficiency.

During the Antebellum, Southampton's dominant agricultural and slave-based economy continued to intensify in capitalist development through the five processes outlined above. Competing merchants operated within the market and managed petty enterprises. Local decision-making about crop rotation, indentures for capital, leasing of lands and the hiring of labor influenced the expansion of production. Southampton producers – the landowners of Southampton's farms and plantations, local decision-making and the hiring of labor – influenced the expansion and contraction of production. Southampton's entrepreneurs, the planters, influenced the expansion and contraction of production.
be examined through three interrelated areas:

The growth of mercantile and agro-industrial capitalism in Nottoway County may
individually increased their adherence to Virginia's state structures of law and commerce.
community attempted to disengage their Trustees' management of the tribal estate,
and became reliant on the mercantile goods that pervaded the South. As the
Seminole shifted during this period, as did their notions of labor value. (e.g. Cabell

As seen in Southampton court documents, Nottoway concepts about property
engagement with the market evidence some of the transitions underway.

lawsuits to gain control of their financial assets and Nottoway individual's more full
transformed the community's character. Indian Town's petitions to allot their reservation,
Nottoway commercial interactions with Virginia and Southampton's financial economy
infrastructure and financial institutions continued to develop, providing a level of
Southampton during the Reservation Allotment Period. Virginia and Southampton's
a mixture of contractual labor, coerced labor and slave rentals operated within
"coercible" in some way" (Wallerstein 1989:131).

machines, the materials, the capital, and above all the human labor...[which] must be
capitalist. They possessed the elements needed to participate in the system. The
landowners, financiers and operators of factory-style plantations were combining
The infrastructural development of the Southside transportation, 2) the importation and consumption of finished goods and 3) the production and exportation of agricultural cash crops. The following sections overview the increased mechanization of the agro-industrial economy of Southside Virginia c.1830-1875 and Indian Town’s interdependence with the commodity chains and labor of the nineteenth-century.
Prior to the Civil War, Southampton's access to wider markets, technology and information was transformed by innovations in transportation. Nottoway labor diversified as industry associated with railroads, shipping and factory production opened opportunities in the urban centers of Richmond, Petersburg and Norfolk. Before the introduction of the steamboat in 1816 and with the construction of the canal system market (North 1965:213), costs associated with internal transport dropped rapidly after transportation of the same kind of goods moved 3000 miles from European to American ports as cheaply as moving the same kind of goods could be moved thirty miles by land. This systems-dynamic was true for all segments of the economy, for Americans at the turn of the nineteenth century, one ton of goods could be shipped from New York to Flushing [Queen] was reduced to

Merchants in Norfolk and Portsmouth, Virginia and Edenton, North Carolina

Daily Times, [Figure 35].}
make the Southampton connection to Norfolk and Edenton in the 1830s. By the beginning of the Civil War, a conglomerate of Virginia-Carolina businessmen chartered the Albemarle Steam Packet Company and commissioned Delaware shipwrights to build a 160-foot 357-ton side-wheel steamer. This vessel, the *Virginia Dare*, would provide reliable service from the Tidewater railroad in Southampton to Edenton for the next seventy years (Friddell 1978:3; Harper’s Magazine 14:434 [1857]; Parramore 1992:128-138. The *Knickbocker* 8.45 [1836]). Thus, Southampton and the Nottoway were increasingly connected to more efficient transportation networks of an industrializing market.

More than steam-powered boats, the railroad steam engines radically changed Southampton’s transportation networks. An increase in iron use, first in agricultural implements and then in textile machinery, contributed to Britain’s economic expansion as the European center of the world-economy. The use of iron in railroads during the 1830s provided the base for this continued increase and the true expansion of the iron and steel industry [and] its transformation into the leading industry of the nineteenth-century market.
The Petersburg Railroad began operating from the Roanoke River in 1833. This railroad directly connected the South to Washington D.C. and other points north, stimulating the development of railroads. The development of railroads encouraged the enlargement of coal and iron mining and justified the intense investment in transportation (Polanyi 2001:15-16; Wolf 1997:292). Figure 36 shows the Petersburg Railroad, which ran from the Roanoke River in 1833, directly connecting the South to Washington D.C. and other points north.
Southampton was lost to the crossroads of Mid-Atlantic rail traffic. Traversed by three rail companies, the Nottoway, as with all county residents, entered into a new period of development. Within a few years, the Petersburg Railroad linked north-south lines with new railways at Raleigh and consolidated their union as the Richmond, Petersburg, and Norfolk Railroad. Designed and delivered by Robert Stephenson's factory at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Baltimore, Maryland, a second Liverpool-made engine was added in 1836 to the P. & R.'s fleet, bringing with connecting steamers up the Chesapeake Bay to Washington, D.C. and producing produce delivered. The Petersburg and Roanoke (P. & R.) commenced service in 1835, providing Southside residents quick-access to Petersburg markets, where trans-Atlantic vessels could move the shipping for any produce delivered. The Portsmouth and Norfolk Railroad (P. & F.) completed the network of railways at Raleigh and consolidated their union as the Richmond, Petersburg, and Norfolk Railroad.
commerce and technology. The railroads’ arrival reorganized the county’s settlements and population centers, and business realigned along the rail stations and depots. Improved transportation lanes for farm produce, and increased labor opportunities outside of the agricultural sector, were introduced to Nottoway households. The Atlantic Journal reported “a few Nottoway” were known to “wander occasionally through the streets” of Richmond. Some Nottoway were employed by the Seaboard Railroad and employed Nottoway employees on their steamboats and train workers and steamer hands. The Atlantic Journal reported “a few Nottoway” were known to “wander occasionally through the streets” of Richmond. Some Nottoway were employed by the Seaboard Railroad and employed Nottoway employees on their steamboats and train workers and steamer hands. The Taylor lineage-segment of the Woodson ohwachira relocated to Richmond and Petersburg during the 1850s. One allottee acquired work as a carpenter and lived alongside other laborer households in the urban center. Following the Civil War, members of Scholar descendant-households worked as Petersburg railroad break men, coal yard workers, and steamboat hands. The Woodson ohwachira relocated to Richmond and Petersburg during the 1850s. One allottee acquired work as a carpenter and lived alongside other laborer households in the urban center. Following the Civil War, members of Scholar descendant-households worked as Petersburg railroad break men, coal yard workers, and steamboat hands. The Seaboard Railroad employed Nottoway employees on their steamboats and train workers and steamer hands. The woodson ohwachira relocated to Richmond and Petersburg during the 1850s. One allottee acquired work as a carpenter and lived alongside other laborer households in the urban center. Following the Civil War, members of Scholar descendant-households worked as Petersburg railroad break men, coal yard workers, and steamboat hands. The Woodson ohwachira relocated to Richmond and Petersburg during the 1850s. One allottee acquired work as a carpenter and lived alongside other laborer households in the urban center. Following the Civil War, members of Scholar descendant-households worked as Petersburg railroad break men, coal yard workers, and steamboat hands. The Woodson ohwachira relocated to Richmond and Petersburg during the 1850s. One allottee acquired work as a carpenter and lived alongside other laborer households in the urban center. Following the Civil War, members of Scholar descendant-households worked as Petersburg railroad break men, coal yard workers, and steamboat hands. The Woodson ohwachira relocated to Richmond and Petersburg during the 1850s. One allottee acquired work as a carpenter and lived alongside other laborer households in the urban center. Following the Civil War, members of Scholar descendant-households worked as Petersburg railroad break men, coal yard workers, and steamboat hands. The Woodson ohwachira relocated to Richmond and Petersburg during the 1850s. One allottee acquired work as a carpenter and lived alongside other laborer households in the urban center. Following the Civil War, members of Scholar descendant-households worked as Petersburg railroad break men, coal yard workers, and steamboat hands.
Domestic units around sibling sets or nuclear families (e.g. C1850-1870 Petersburg, VA (Woodson-Taylor); C1910 Petersburg, VA; C1900-1920 Sussex, VA (Woodson-Artis); C1920-1930 Portsmouth, VA (Woodson-Hurst); see Appendix B, Figures 48 and 49).

Through a careful tracing of labor migrations in the documentary record, it is clear the descendant community's wage-labor affiliation with transportation were all employers of Nottoway allottee descendants. While beyond the scope of the present research, future work may explore these linkages, as Nottoway labor mobility can be connected to the entrance of America as a core nation of the world-system (C1920-1930 Portsmouth, VA; C1920 Akron, OH; C1940 Fayette County, PA; DC1917 Willie Artis; DC1942 Benjamin Artis, William Artis; Field notes 2011).

Consumption of Finished Goods

As the system center and "workshop of the world" nineteenth-century Britain manufactured goods efficiently and cheaply and could undersell similar goods produced in other markets around the globe (Wallerstein 1979:viii; Wolf 1997:265-278). Southampton and other Virginia locales imported an array of finished goods from England and the British Empire. As a result of this line of inquiry, the Nottoway may be directly linked to the increased mechanization and specialization of the global economy. By the early twentieth century, some matrilineal grandchildren of the 1850s allottees were employers of America's rising Northern industrial giants. Charles Schwab's Bethlehem Steel, J. P. Morgan and Andrew Carnegie's U.S. Steel, Henry Clay Frick's H.C. Frick Coal Company and the Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation were all employers of Nottoway allottee descendants. While beyond the scope of the present research, future work may explore these linkages, as Nottoway labor mobility can be connected to the entrance of America as a core nation of the world-system (C1920-1930 Portsmouth, VA; C1920 Akron, OH; C1940 Fayette County, PA; DC1917 Willie Artis; DC1942 Benjamin Artis, William Artis; Field notes 2011).

Thomas Artis, William Artis; Field notes 2011).
England, many of them through Northern U.S. markets (Albion 1939; Foner 1941:12; Wolf 1997:283). In fact, Britain supplied nearly half of the U.S. manufactures, 1815–1873. Finished products, such as English ceramics, were regularly imported and widely consumed by Virginia households in the periphery – including those at Tidewater Indian Towns. This market displaced Nottoway production of similar wares, such as the low-fire earthenware shown in Figure 37 (for a limited discussion of Nottoway colonoware, see Binford 1990; Binford 1996:1990, National Park Service).


Following this example, evidence for Nottoway acquisition of imported ceramics comes from limited archaeological surveys of Nottoway Town sites. Researchers, however, misinterpreted the appearance of nineteenth-century wares as a signal of Indian removal; in fact, the scattered English ceramic shards were not the remains of Euro-American occupants (Binford 1964:251, 257), but rather the refuse of Virginia households. This market displaced Nottoway production of similar wares, such as the low-fire earthenware shown in Figure 37 (for a limited discussion of Nottoway colonoware, see Binford 1990; Binford 1996:1990, National Park Service).
most extensively surveyed (Table 19). In contrast, the value of New York’s imports had increased
imparts and disappeared by nearly 85%, while the Commonwealth’s exports remained
Virginia and New York were ‘toughly equal’. Sixty years later the value of Virginia’s
example of the growing North-South asymmetry, in 1790 the commerce of


the North as a semiperiphery (Cocola 2005:22-26; North 1974:69-73; Walleace 2005;
structural differences between the North and South, and contributed to the emergence of
despite having a secondary Southern destination. This pattern of commerce fostered
American imports of finished goods typically entered the U.S. via a Northern port,
as the Northern United States, which had a limited textile manufacturing, remained
finished goods / raw material exchange network also included semiperipheral zones such as
producing their own crop for market or consuming the imports of the merchants. The
whether by providing labor for adjacent planters, renting Indian lands to producers,
peripheries. Southampton’s Indian peoples were engaged in this commodity chain, a
Great Britain exchanged manufactured products for the agricultural produce of the

Finished goods consumed by Nottoway households.

Shepherd 2012; also see Creese and Plane 2010), as ceramics were but one form of
commonly exchanged and their role in transitional Native economies (Akins 2012;
Virginia’s reservation-era communities will likely make more of finished goods’
historic Meherrin reservation sites (1994:122-125). Continued archaeological research on
archaeological samples, Shannon Dawdy reached a similar conclusion concerning
of intercountry-century Nottoway paramounties. Through a revelation of site-calculated
289

Recession that marked the core's hegemony and eventually led to the Civil War.

merchants. The Virginians', rhetoric speaks strongly to the semiperiphery

Northern would secure the Old Dominion's commercial independence from Northern

1977:1-28). Some contemporaries Virginians argued direct trade with Europe from

southward with manufactured products, leaving only the capital behind (Goldfield

to Southern ports, Virginians sell produce northward for export and ships returned

Europeans goods. As well, Northerners cities' limited industrial manufactures were funnelled

Richmond's tobacco, and controlled the importation and distribution lines for finished

Northern merchants dominated the export of Virginias raw materials, particularly

Table 19. New York and Virginia Direct Foreign Imports for Select Years 1769-1840.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New York Direct Foreign Imports</th>
<th>Virginia Direct Foreign Imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>$907,200</td>
<td>$4,085,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>$3,022,000</td>
<td>$2,486,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>$36,000,000</td>
<td>$639,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>$49,000,000</td>
<td>$553,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>$39,000,000</td>
<td>$431,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>$43,000,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>$57,000,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>$68,453,206</td>
<td>$377,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>$50,440,740</td>
<td>$545,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northern gentlemen have grown too fat at our expense…we should establish manufactures of every kind within our own limits” (Richmond Enquirer Feb. 1, 1850).

“[Our] own export commerce would stimulate capital investment in Virginia, as it [has] done in northern market centers” (Richmond Enquirer paraphrased in Goldfield 1977, brackets added).

“Why shall we be obliged to do business for the benefit of Northern ports alone?” (Wheeling Daily Intelligencer, Dec. 10, 1852).

“The export and import trade of Virginia is now reduced with import commerce; it is

The export and import trade of Virginia is now reduced with import commerce; it is

No people are independent who are compelled to rely upon others for industry” (Richmond Whig, Dec. 17, 1850).

“Norfolk has more foreign commerce than any town in Virginia and in 1835, owned more

Norfolk, Petersburg and Norfolk served as initial destinations for Southern export-bound produce and were major distribution points for imported manufactured goods. On a smaller scale, the Franklin depot on the Blackwater River received regional crops for export, which could be shipped south via steamboat through the Albemarle or after 1834, a canal proceeds from the S. branch of the Elizabeth River, 9 miles above Norfolk, through the Dismal Swamp, to Albemarle Sound. The amount of shipping in 1815 was 4,705 tons. A canal proceeds from the S. branch of the
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Norfolk, Petersburg and Norfolk served as initial destinations for Southern export-bound produce and were major distribution points for imported manufactured goods. On a smaller scale, the Franklin depot on the Blackwater River received regional crops for export, which could be shipped south via steamboat through the Albemarle or after 1834, a canal proceeds from the S. branch of the Elizabeth River, 9 miles above Norfolk, through the Dismal Swamp, to Albemarle Sound. The amount of shipping in 1815 was 4,705 tons. A canal proceeds from the S. branch of the
A portion of the Southside's produce was not suitable for international export, such as the extensive vegetable farms that emerged and diversified during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Norfolk's harbor thus served primarily as a funnel for Northern merchants, and Northern importers and traders were able to offload large quantities of miscellaneous goods. New York City dominated the nation's total value of imports in 1860, while Richmond and Norfolk managed less than 1% of the total direct foreign imports, 1821-1860. Virginia merchants bypassed local or import centers and handled by Northern merchants, captured low prices and comparatively lower values of miscellaneous goods. New York City's prominence as an import center and the volumes handled by Northern merchants ensured low prices and comparative advantages. Members of Nottoway matrilineages participated in these market-driven, commercial and agricultural endeavors, particularly in the growing of cash crops for export and the consumption of finished imported goods. Market pressures eliminated the community's home manufactures, whether they may have been spinning, weaving, pottery-making or carved wooden implements. In favor of acquiring and consuming finished or purchased European and Northern alternatives, Virginia merchants bypassed local or import centers and handled by Northern merchants, captured low prices and comparatively lower values of miscellaneous goods. New York City's prominence as an import center and the volumes handled by Northern merchants, ensured low prices and comparative advantages. Members of Nottoway matrilineages participated in these market-driven, commercial and agricultural endeavors, particularly in the growing of cash crops for export and the consumption of finished imported goods. Market pressures eliminated the community's home manufactures, whether they may have been spinning, weaving, pottery-making or carved wooden implements. In favor of acquiring and consuming finished or purchased European and Northern alternatives, Virginia merchants bypassed local or import centers and handled by Northern merchants, captured low prices and comparatively lower values of miscellaneous goods. New York City's prominence as an import center and the volumes handled by Northern merchants, ensured low prices and comparative advantages.
and contributed to the production and export of Southampton's antebellum cotton, Indian corn, Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes and other "truck garden" produce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nottoway Mercantile Goods</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>&quot;farming utensils…household and kitchen furniture&quot;</td>
<td>Turner WB12:106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>&quot;2 feather beds and furniture…farming utensils&quot;</td>
<td>Woodson DB26:395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>&quot;household and kitchen furniture, farming utensils&quot;</td>
<td>Woodson DB26:544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>&quot;2 ploughs&quot;</td>
<td>Woodson DB26:600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>&quot;old waggon&quot;</td>
<td>Woodson DB27:313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Value of farm implements and machinery: $20</td>
<td>Woodson AG1850:421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Value of farm implements and machinery: $15</td>
<td>Turner [W] AG1850:433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Value of farm implements and machinery: $10</td>
<td>Woodson AG1860:416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Value of farm implements and machinery: $5</td>
<td>Woodson AG1860:416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Value of farm implements and machinery: $25</td>
<td>Turner [W] AG1870:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Value of farm implements and machinery: $70</td>
<td>Woodson AG1870:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Value of farm implements and machinery: $25</td>
<td>Woodson AG1870:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Select Indian Town households' farmstead material goods appraised for value, purchased by cash or used as collateral on debt during the Reservation Allotment Period, c.1830-1870. The first table entry is derived from the 1837 will of headwoman Edith Turner, a rare Virginia document from an Iroquoian woman, in which she transferred all of her partible property to the primary inheritor. "Turner ohwachira" entries represent a Nottoway household of a Turner male married to a Woodson women, hence a potential conflict in ownership of partible property between male farmers and Nottoway matrilineages. Later Turner ohwachira entries represent a Nottoway household of a Turner male married to a Woodson woman, hence a potential conflict in ownership of partible property between male farmers and Nottoway matrilineages.

Table 20 demonstrates select examples of Nottoway Town consumption of imported goods and finished commodities, c.1830-1870. The first table entry is derived from the 1837 will of headwoman Edith Turner, a rare Virginia document from an Iroquoian woman, in which she transferred all of her partible property to the primary inheritor. "Turner ohwachira" entries represent a Nottoway household of a Turner male married to a Woodson woman, hence a potential conflict in ownership of partible property between male farmers and Nottoway matrilineages. Later Turner ohwachira entries represent a Nottoway household of a Turner male married to a Woodson woman, hence a potential conflict in ownership of partible property between male farmers and Nottoway matrilineages.
agricultural machined goods at auction, evidence of contractualization, interdependence and mechanization of Nottoway households. Nottoway ohwachira acquisition of a second-hand wagon was likely a means to transport cotton or other produce to market. Agriculture Census schedules for 1850-1870 therefore reveal the accumulation of finished farming tools and implements for the production of cash crops, and the continued deepening of capitalist development at Indian Town.

Nottoway Agricultural Produce: Cotton, Peanuts and Market Gardens

Cotton was one raw material that fueled Britain’s eighteenth-century textile industry. By the end of that century, industrial textile production became the master of economic relationships. The rise of industrial production required increased and constant flows of raw materials to supply the core factories and demanded large-scale labor forces – the “accessory to commerce” industrial production required became the master of economic relationships. The rise of industrial production became the master of economic relationships. The rise of industrial production required increased and constant flows of raw materials to supply the core factories and demanded large-scale labor forces – the “accessory to commerce” industrial production required became the master of economic relationships. The rise of industrial production became the master of economic relationships. The rise of industrial production required increased and constant flows of raw materials to supply the core factories and demanded large-scale labor forces – the “accessory to commerce” industrial production required became the master of economic relationships. The rise of industrial production became the master of economic relationships.

Cotton, Peanuts and Market Gardens

Nottoway Agricultural Produce: Cotton, Peanuts and Market Gardens

continued deepening of capitalist development at Indian Town.
Southampton was also a benficiary of the changed market dynamic, since only the
Growth in the cotton market fueled the South's economy (Oppo 1994:12-13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts in Bales</th>
<th>Direct Exports</th>
<th>Foreign Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1858-1859</td>
<td>6174</td>
<td>317,236</td>
<td>27,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859-1860</td>
<td>17,777</td>
<td>174,888</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1861</td>
<td>33,193</td>
<td>329,411</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-1866</td>
<td>59,096</td>
<td>583,633</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-1867</td>
<td>126,287</td>
<td>112,119</td>
<td>14,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-1868</td>
<td>155,591</td>
<td>147,312</td>
<td>8,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868-1869</td>
<td>164,789</td>
<td>157,262</td>
<td>7,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869-1870</td>
<td>178,352</td>
<td>173,607</td>
<td>4,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1871</td>
<td>302,930</td>
<td>297,788</td>
<td>5,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1872</td>
<td>258,730</td>
<td>254,043</td>
<td>4,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-1873</td>
<td>405,412</td>
<td>397,130</td>
<td>8,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-1874</td>
<td>472,446*</td>
<td>418,328</td>
<td>20,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874-1875</td>
<td>392,235*</td>
<td>309,636</td>
<td>67,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Cotton exports from Norfolk and Portsmouth, 1858-1861 and 1865-1875. Figures include other Mid-Atlantic and Southern States' shipping of cotton through Virginia ports. All figures are approximate. [§] Richmond exported 495 bales to foreign ports in 1858, which was the only Virginia cotton internationally exported that year. [*] Includes shipments through other ports. Source: Walker 1876:161-163.


improved production efficiency and cotton cultivation became the principal Southerm
Europe's imports (Siddiqui 1973:154). The invention of the cotton gin in 1793 greatly
the Southern U.S., including Southampton, overtook India as the dominant source of
Australians replaced the French as direct importers of the world's cotton market. By 1820,

Within the nineteenth-century competition among European cores, the British and

Raw produce (Braudel 1984:71-74; Goldfield 1982:36, 70; Hobdawm 1973:52-57;
Commonwealth’s most southerly soils were suitable for cotton cultivation. By the end of the antebellum era, half of all cotton produced by Virginia was Southampton-grown (Crofts 1992:80). In a similar pattern to the market for Virginia’s imported finished goods, the Old Dominion’s cotton exports were dominantly coastal. In the years leading up to the Civil War, the movement of cotton through Norfolk and Portsmouth ports show an increase in Southern production, but a substantial linkage to Northern merchants and financiers in Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia and New York City received most of the raw materials, mostly of Southampton timber and some cotton (Figure 38). 

By the 1850s, Norfolk’s shipping consisted of a limited direct-international export trade. The Norfolk harbor in the 1870s (Figure 38) reflects types of transportation utilized to pool and export Virginia agricultural commodities. Right of center is the Customs House. The wooden ships at left are transatlantic freighters loading the docks. River types of transportation utilized to pool and export Southampton-grown cotton were Northern U.S. or European markets. Source: Cook Collection, Valentine Richmond History Center. 

Table 21. By the 1850s, Norfolk’s shipping consisted of a limited direct-international export trade.
trading them to European markets. This economic relationship characterizes the role of the semiperiphery, as the North syphoned off Southern surplus and limited direct Southern access to the British center. Published records for Norfolk's coastwise and international trade are more complete for the period after the Civil War, detailing shipping and freight transactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Cotton Bales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam, Netherlands</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antwerp, Belgium</td>
<td>Via Philadelphia</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>48,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremen, Germany</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol, England</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>63,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Via New York</td>
<td>112435</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>48,466</td>
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<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>63,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>48,466</td>
</tr>
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<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Direct</td>
<td>48,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>63,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>48,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>63,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>48,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>2180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1853-1855, Southampton cotton cultivators raised money to improve the overland roadway to Petersburg, including a private bridge over the Assamosock Swamp, which at its lower extremities emptied into the Nottoway River at Indian Town. Individual subscribers agreed to provide financing for the benefit of the neighborhood in building a bridge across the Assamosock Swamp.

\[ Figure \ 39. \] Individual subscribers agreed to provide financing for the benefit of the neighborhood in building a bridge across the Assamosock Swamp.

Source: Eastern Portion of the Military Department of North Carolina, 1862.
headmen Robert and Benjamin Taylor, and Jordan Stewart, an agnatic Nottoway and descendant of the minor Scholar owhawchira. Significantly, Taylor and Stewart contributed as much or more capital than their White contemporaries and were the only non-Whites to help fund the construction (Crofts 1992:17; 1997:53-54).

Fellow subscriber and Southampton planter Daniel W. Cobb lived on the east side of the Nottoway River, adjacent to the Rose Hill plantation and the Nottoway settlement. His 1850s diary entries indicate much cooperation in farming activities in the vicinity of Nottoway Town, including the harvest and shipment of cotton. He also recorded on shared labor with his middling farm and plantation neighbors. African Nottoway men were among Cobb's contractual hires. During the enslavement period, Cobb relied on shared labor with his middling farm and plantation neighbors.

Select examples of Cobb's 1850-1859 diary entries characterize the routines of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cotton planting, harvest, labor and commercial potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From a subscriber and Southampton planter Daniel W. Cobb in Cotton Planting, harvest, labor and commercial potential, 1850-1859 (Crofts 1997:81).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"My [slave] women is picking out cotton. I have 2 men hands at work...we have much company or hired hands &c"

"I finished all of my togs by 12 o'clock and spent the balance of the day in picking out cotton...I want 1 hand...for Yeesteady work & giving $1.00 per day"

"I have 20 hands [including] Mr. Little and others, including Charles Stewart. With 3 of my own and self...a heavy day's work..."
Daniel Cobb utilized a cotton gin owned by his father-in-law, Jesse Little, directly across the river from the Nottoway farms and the plantation acreage pictured in Figure 40. Cobb and other planters drew on surrounding landowners to help gin and cart wagonloads of cotton bales to Petersburg [Figure 41]. It is probable that Nottoway cotton reached either Petersburg or Norfolk through similar contractual and reciprocal agreements. Cotton bales generally ranged between 300 to 400 lbs. and according to receipts, cotton bales sold to Petersburg. Where it was sold to the going market price. Planter received higher prices for cotton. Some growers picked cotton fields two or three times and made as many trips to market. Some growers picked cotton fields two or three times and made as many trips to market. Of the Civil War, Cobb and many Southampton planters staggered their cotton crop from anxious Petersburg wholesalers at the beginning of the harvest season. By the time Petersburg, where it was sold at the going market price, Planter received higher prices. Cobb, Nottoway River planters shipped two to three bales of cotton per wagonload to Petersburg. Cotton bales generally ranged between 300 to 400 lbs. and according to receipts, cotton bales sold to Petersburg. Where it was sold to the going market price. Planter received higher prices. In Figure 41, Cobb and other planters drew on surrounding landsowners to help gin and cart wagonloads of cotton bales to Petersburg. It is probable that Nottoway cotton reached either Petersburg or Norfolk through similar contractual and reciprocal agreements. Across the river from the Nottoway Oschachina Farms and the plantation acreage pictured. Daniel Cobb utilized a cotton gin owned by his father-in-law, Jesse Little.
Cobb's diary records some of the particulars regarding carting, ginning and transporting Southampton cotton to Petersburg in the 1850s and may be considered an approximate to the Nottoway experience:

"I sent all my crop to Petersburg. Cotton sold at 11 cents per lb.

I prepared my wagon & carriage to carry 4 bales for myself & 1 for W.C. at 50 per Cwt.

I fixed my wagon to start to Petersburg & started this evening with 3 bales of cotton.

I wanted my wagon & carriage wheels to the shop in Petersburg & had them fixed.

My wagon & ox cart was engaged in bringing cotton to Petersburg. 3,737 lbs.

I sent a wagon load of cotton to the Jinn... 13,000 lbs of cotton."

During the 1850s, the Petersburg price for cotton ranged from 10 cents to 11 ½ cents.

(Cobb in Crofts 1997:70, 166-167, 171, 174; brackets added.)

During the 1850s, the Petersburg price for cotton ranged from 10 cents to 11 ½ cents.

During the 1850s, the Petersburg price for cotton ranged from 10 cents to 11 ½ cents. Cobb cleared between two to four bales annually during the late 1840s and early 1850s. In response to market demand, by the end of the decade cotton production had increased across the county. Cobb estimated he raised nearly eight bales of cotton in 1859, or at least double the production from ten years earlier (Crofts 1992:71;...

Approximate to the Nottoway experience:

Transporting Southampton cotton to Petersburg in the 1850s and may be considered an approximation to the Nottoway experience.
Some planters recorded as many as twenty. Others raised no cotton at all.

Table 23. Southampton Agriculture Census, 1850-1870, cotton bales (300-400 lbs.) from Indian Town and immediate neighbors. Triple bar divides schedules; dashed line indicates discontinuous listings. All other entries are transcribed in order of appearance. Acres [A.] listed below $100 were omitted in original. 1860 Census: Nottoway Ohwachira labor and agriculture included agnatic and collateral kin, such as the Nottoway allottees listed in Bedney King’s household, and possibly slave hires or labor exchanges. Neighboring plantations used slave labor, slave hires [H], shared black and white labor. Slaves listed in the table are taken from the 1850 and 1860 Southampton Slave Schedules. 1870 Census: farms with less than three acres or producing less than $500 worth of products were not enumerated in the original. Edwin Turner rented portions of his land for cotton tenant farming; Nottoway lands were some of the few non-White farms to produce cotton and other crops for export and profit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Slaves</th>
<th>Ac.</th>
<th>Bales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Bryant</td>
<td>Plantation neighbor, Rose Hill</td>
<td>AG 1850:424</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Crocker</td>
<td>Woodson, affine</td>
<td>AG 1850:424</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lamb</td>
<td>Smallholding neighbor</td>
<td>AG 1860:416</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Turner</td>
<td>Turner, ohwachira male</td>
<td>AG 1870:1-2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hill</td>
<td>White tenant farmer for Turner</td>
<td>AG 1870:1-2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Vaughan</td>
<td>Plantation neighbor</td>
<td>AG 1870:1-2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gray</td>
<td>Smallholding neighbor</td>
<td>AG 1870:1-2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William B. Lamb</td>
<td>Smallholding neighbor</td>
<td>AG 1870:1-2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgiana Stith</td>
<td>Plantation neighbor</td>
<td>AG 1870:1-2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cotton-growing landowners neighboring Indian Town produced three to four bales on average, 1850-1860. Nottoway farms averaged 2.3 bales annually, 1850-1870 – or approximately 816 lbs. each year [Table 23]. The details of the Agriculture Census suggest one to four bales were produced on Indian lands each season: some by Nottoway Ohwachira, some by sharecropping or rentals. Indian Town also provided “hired out” wage-labor for cotton planting, ditching, and harvesting on neighboring farms.

As the cotton market slowly increased, Southampton plantations and smallholding farms began producing more cotton crops each year. According to the 1850 Agriculture Census, Daniel Cobb was the only planter in his vicinity to take cotton to market. By 1859, sixteen of his nearby planter cohort were engaged in cotton production (AG1850:443-444; AG1860:404). In contrast, where the soils south of the Nottoway River were better suited to grow cotton, Indian Town farms were among over twenty-five nearby landowners in the Indian Town vicinity, seven grew cotton and produced a total of thirty-nine bales for the 1849 crop. Of those 1850 plantation producers, one owner, Lewis Thorpe, grew 46% of the cotton surrounding Indian Town. Significantly, Thorpe’s real estate – valued at $1,863 – was previously Nottoway reservation land, just a few generations earlier.

As the cotton market slowly increased, Southampton plantations and smallholding farms expanded their cotton production. Some farmers who previously grew crops other than cotton began producing cotton as well. For example, some farmers who previously grew corn or tobacco began growing cotton as well. This shift in crop production was driven by the growing demand for cotton in the market and the higher profit margins associated with cotton production.

In sum, the expansion of cotton production in the Indian Town vicinity was driven by a combination of factors, including increased demand from the cotton market, the availability of suitable land, and the economic incentives associated with cotton production. The shift in crop production had significant social and economic implications, including the increased reliance on enslaved labor and the transformation of the local economy.
304

Labor plantations. Nottoway households were some of the few landed, non-White small community builders. However, in a county dominated by smallholding and large slaveholdings, smaller-scale agricultural settlements were more common. Lewis Thorpe's immediate household, for example, amounted to several enslaved laborers, each contributing their labor to the plantation economy.

In consideration of Lewis Thorpe's labor needs and other surrounding needs, the combination of labor and land was key to the plantation's success. The labor force of Nottoway and their collateral kin – including the Nottoway, New Town, and neighboring communities – was crucial to the plantation's operations.

The combination of labor and land allowed the plantation to produce cotton for market. Lewis Thorpe and other plantation owners relied on Indian families and collateral kin, as well as wage-laborers, for their agricultural labor. Charlotte Bryant's Rose Hill and Susan Lamb's Rose Hill also utilized Nottoway labor to produce cotton for market.

In a similar pattern to Daniel Cobb's hiring of agnatic Nottoway men (Charles and Jordan Stewart), Lewis Thorpe and other plantation owners relied on Indian families and collateral kin for shared or wage-labor. The “Free Colored” population of Indian Town, in addition to children under ten and seniors over sixty, resided in the town along with laborers and other labor-age individuals. At least twenty-two adult Nottoway households or seven labor-age individuals resided at Indian Town. In addition to children under ten, these residents were “Free Colored People,” all of whom were Nottoway collateral kin. The twenty-five enslaved laborers, most as smallholders with less than ten slaves apiece, were hired to work on the Road between Thorpe and the Nottoway. Of those households, four plantations owed road and plantation operations, seven “residents” were situated along the 1850 Indian Town Road.

In consideration of Lewis Thorpe's labor needs and other surrounding needs, the combination of labor and land was key to the plantation's success.

Beyond Thorpe's immediate household, 1849 cotton were maneuvered, planted, weeded, and picked by many more people.
producers of cotton for sale and profit. Combined with the processes of polarization, Indian Town notions of peoplehood were reinforced, yet transformed by these relationships. Control of capital, property ownership, contractual hires and a continuing association with plantation crop production positioned Nottoway peoples to have increased affiliation and share concerns with their landowning neighbors.

Peanuts

The arrival of peanuts as an agricultural crop in Virginia occurred during the latter half of the eighteenth century. However, early Virginia peanut cultivation did not become a major crop until after the Civil War (Parramore 1992:183) and as such, the Nottoway’s engagement with peanut agriculture and factory work date to this later period. The crop’s earlier introduction in Southampton, however, can be linked to the trans-Atlantic trade that emerged during the antebellum period. The introduction of peanuts coincided with Africa’s more complex incorporation as a peripheral zone of the world-system. Virginia peanut cultivation did not become a major crop until after the Civil War (Parramore 1992:183) and as such, the Nottoway’s engagement with peanut agriculture and factory work date to this later period. The crop’s earlier introduction in Southampton, however, can be linked to the trans-Atlantic trade that emerged during the antebellum period. The introduction of peanuts coincided with Africa’s more complex incorporation as a peripheral zone of the world-system. Virginia peanut cultivation did not become a major crop until after the Civil War (Parramore 1992:183) and as such, the Nottoway’s engagement with peanut agriculture and factory work date to this later period. The crop’s earlier introduction in Southampton, however, can be linked to the trans-Atlantic trade that emerged during the antebellum period.

The popularity of Europe’s West African peanut trade reintroduced the plant to Virginia farmers. Significantly, this networking coincided with Africa’s more complex incorporation as a peripheral zone of the world-system. Virginia peanut cultivation did not become a major crop until after the Civil War (Parramore 1992:183) and as such, the Nottoway’s engagement with peanut agriculture and factory work date to this later period. The crop’s earlier introduction in Southampton, however, can be linked to the trans-Atlantic trade that emerged during the antebellum period. The introduction of peanuts coincided with Africa’s more complex incorporation as a peripheral zone of the world-system. Virginia peanut cultivation did not become a major crop until after the Civil War (Parramore 1992:183) and as such, the Nottoway’s engagement with peanut agriculture and factory work date to this later period. The crop’s earlier introduction in Southampton, however, can be linked to the trans-Atlantic trade that emerged during the antebellum period.

Peabody
cash-crop production transformed Africa's export commodity exchange and encouraged the French and British to stay in West Africa after the decline of the slave trade.

Commercial peanut cultivation began in Gambia 1829-1830 [British] and Senegal 1841 [French] (Klein 1972:424; Brooks 1975:32). Peanuts, and to a greater degree palm-oil products, became staple African exports to France, Great Britain, Germany and America. Among other uses, pressed palm oil was an early form of machine lubricant for the needs produced, became staple African exports to France, Great Britain, Germany and America. [Prenzl] (Klein 1972:424; Brooks 1975:32). Peanuts, and to a greater degree palm-oil commercial peanut cultivation began in Gambia 1829-1830 [British] and Senegal 1841. The peanut was reintroduced along the pre-existing Atlantic networks to Southside Virginia in the 1840's. 1844 (Schnapper 1961:118-128; Wallerstein 1989:148; Wolf 1997:330-332). A Sussex farmer remarked they were increasingly cultivated in this and regularly a Shurry farmer remarked they were increased quantities of peanuts were 'bought every year to the Baltimore market from the counties adjoining counties' and an article in the agricultural journal *Country Gentleman* reported a county farmer is said to have marketed peanuts in Southampton during a court week in Norfolk. A Sussex farmer purchased seed from a West Indian Southside Virginian in the 1840's. The peanut was reintroduced along the pre-existing Atlantic networks to U.S. peanut imports were from Gambia in 1835 (Smith 2002:17).
slow cultivation methods required for harvesting the crop. Post-Reservation Nottoway
descendants recalled “one person, twenty acres and one mule” was the production limit
for a single allottee-generation farm hand. As during other agricultural cycles, “at harvest
time everyone pitched in” [Figure 42] but allottees complained, “it was a lot of hard
labor…before the invention of the peanut picker” [Field notes 2006].

Several Southampton farmers are credited with experimenting and improving peanut
cultivation through inventions of mechanized planting and harvesting devices.

[Figure 42. Peanuts shocked to dry. This fourth-quarter nineteenth-century image captures the
character of pre-mechanized peanut cultivation. Mule team plow scars are visible between the
stands of peanut vines, wrapped around six-foot posts to dry. In 1872 Petersburg’s Rural
Messenger indicated fifty to eighty stakes to the acre was common. By the end of the Reservation
Allotment Period, the Nottoway and other Southampton farmers were planting over 13,000 acres
in peanuts and harvesting over 262,000 bushels annually. Sources: Cook Collection, Valentine
Richmond History Center; Exposition Committee 1888:1; Parramore 1992:183.

One farmer-inventor was blacksmith Bennett Hicks, who by 1902 had patented a
gasoline-powered machine for stemming and cleaning peanuts [Figure 43]. Hicks came
from an Indian Town affine family several times intermarried with Nottoway allottees.
Hicks and his family members were variously described as "Negro", "Mulatto", and "Indian" (C1870; C1870 Norfolk, VA; Field notes 2007; Parramore 1992:184). Hicks contributed to the development of the "peanut picker" and is "believed to have helped revolutionize farming in Southampton and the peanut growing area" (Miller 2009:33; VDHR Benjamin F. Hicks 1847-1925 Marker, U-120-a).

Figure 43. Southside peanut picking, c.1875-1890 and twentieth-century Southampton mechanized peanut harvest. The "peanut picker" eventually replaced what was once a hand-picked-and-cleaned operation. The machine's design was patented by Benjamin Hicks in 1901 and manufactured by Benthall. Seven to twelve-man teams operated the threshing machine, which picked, de-stemmed and housed peanuts into bushel bags. Sources: Cook Collection, Valentine Richmond History Center; Southampton Heritage Village, Agriculture and Forestry Museum; Miller 2009:33.

Late nineteenth and early twentieth-century matrilineal Nottoway grew peanuts as a cash crop on several farms in Southampton, including allotment lands on Indian Town Road. Allottees used their peanut crop for security on debt and took annual peanut harvests to nearby markets. As the main agricultural staple, peanut farming became a major source of rural allottee-descendants' family income. In the early decades of the twentieth century, a peanut processing plant was constructed near the edge of the reservation, near where Indian Town Road intersected the main route to Courtland [U.S. 58 Business], which was once a hand-picked-and-cleaned peanut picking area. The plant was operated by Benjamin Hicks in the early decades of the twentieth century, and its operation contributed to revolutionizing farming in Southampton and the peanut growing area. Hicks and his family members were variously described as "Negro", "Mulatto", and...
Truck Gardens

Cotton and peanut cropping were among several staple agricultural products Southampton farmers pursued. Corn, beans, peas, potatoes, oats, rye and wheat were among the other large-scale nineteenth-century operations. Southampton was also home to some of the finest orchards, melon and berry patches in the Commonwealth. Apples, cantaloupes, pears, peaches, strawberries and watermelons were "grown in all parts of the county to great perfection...for the great markets of the Northern cities" (Exposition Committee 1888:2). During the 1850s, the port of Norfolk became known as the North's "Atlantic Garden" and the city's economy was synonymous with the coastwise export of raw Southern agricultural produce. The mild Southside climate, proximity to a tidewater deep harbor and technological innovations in agro-industry provided favorable conditions for truck garden cultivation. Fruits and vegetables were not ideal produce for direct export to foreign ports but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but neither more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The gardening exchange, the truck trade (Merchants' 1858:733).

The mild Southside climate, proximity to a tidewater deep harbor and technological innovations in agro-industry provided favorable conditions for truck garden cultivation. Fruits and vegetables were not ideal produce for direct export to foreign ports but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The gardening exchange, the truck trade (Merchants' 1858:733).

The mild Southside climate, proximity to a tidewater deep harbor and technological innovations in agro-industry provided favorable conditions for truck garden cultivation. Fruits and vegetables were not ideal produce for direct export to foreign ports but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The gardening exchange, the truck trade (Merchants' 1858:733).

The mild Southside climate, proximity to a tidewater deep harbor and technological innovations in agro-industry provided favorable conditions for truck garden cultivation. Fruits and vegetables were not ideal produce for direct export to foreign ports but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The garden market ports, but rather more suitable for the northern coastwise commerce. The gardening exchange, the truck trade (Merchants' 1858:733).
The processes of mechanization, polarization, and interdependence indicative of the periphery's development may also be seen in this light.
exceeded the value of tobacco manufactured in Richmond. In short, the coastwise northern trade of Southside produce was big business and the market demanded an increase in production as the Antebellum wore on (Merchants’ 1858:733; Norfolk Southern Argus, quoted in American Agriculturalist 1854:166; Norfolk Southern Argus, quoted in Richmond Enquirer, May 2, 1854; Norfolk Southern Argus, quoted in American Agriculturist 1854:166; Norfolk Southern Argus, quoted in American Agriculturist 1854:166; Norfolk Southern Argus, quoted in American Agriculturist 1854:166).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peaches, dried</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>520,131</td>
<td>17,519</td>
<td>$81,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>$5,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>153,369</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$15,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingles</td>
<td>28,806</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>313,912</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$2,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>93,112</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$3,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>15,827</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>$2,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Brandy</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Brandy</td>
<td>43,164</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>133,867</td>
<td>128,595</td>
<td>$13,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>133,867</td>
<td>128,595</td>
<td>$13,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>133,867</td>
<td>128,595</td>
<td>$13,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>133,867</td>
<td>128,595</td>
<td>$13,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other calculations from June, July and August of the same year indicate seasonality impacted some cleared diverse commodities for coastwise exchange (Table 24). Other calculations from June, July and August of the same year indicate seasonality impacted some cleared diverse commodities for coastwise exchange (Table 24).
Much of this truck garden produce came from the Southside counties of Isle of Wight, Nansemond, Southampton, Surry and Sussex. Corn and sweet potatoes dominated the Southampton crop, but other supplements included Irish and White potatoes, and stock varieties of black-eyed peas, coffee beans, red beans and yellow peas. Southampton was known for "the finest sweet potatoes" and the county's agricultural fields, including those at Indian Town, generated the highest yield for a Virginia borough in 1850. In both 1850 and 1860, Southampton out-produced every other Virginia county for swine, pork and cotton (Crofts 1992:78).

Southampton hams were reputed to be the "choicest bacon hams", "celebrated", "eagerly sought", "juicy, tender and highly favored" and comparable to English Westphalia ham "by those who indulge in the luxuries of the table" (Crofts 1992:78-79; Exposition Committee 1888:3). Indian Town matrilineages raised dozens of pigs annually for Southampton-produced hams, bacon and lard. Nottoway swine were finished at matrilineage compounds or sold to some of the region's emerging processing facilities surrounding the town. The livelihood and value of Nottoway lard and pork sales may be seen through comparable period excerpts:

[1834] "shipped 10,000 pounds of bacon and lard on produce cars to Portsmouth, all of which was disposed of next day at liberal prices" [1847 in Petersburg] "Corn is worth $4.50 and flower 7.25, Bacon 10 ¼ per lbs" [1859 in Petersburg] "Bacon 12.5 to 15 cents per lbs. lard same…"

1977; Field notes 2010). The livelihood and value of Nottoway land and pork sales may be seen through comparable period excerpts:

1859 in Petersburg] "Bacon 10 ¼ per lbs. Lard 7.25. Corn is worth $4.50 and flower 7.25. Bacon 10 ¼ per lbs."

which was disposed of next day at liberal prices" [1834] "shipped 10,000 pounds of bacon and lard on produce cars to Portsmouth, all of which was disposed of next day at liberal prices"

be seen through comparable period excerpts:

1977; Field notes 2010). The livelihood and value of Nottoway land and pork sales may
December of 1851, some 2500 lbs. with six hands to assist; in 1857 he culled twenty hogs salting. Followed six weeks later by smoking, Cobb recorded culling thirty hogs in killing required a winter cold spell and two intense days of butchering, processing, and labor. hired workers and recruited specialized slave laborers for hog processing. Hogs Notoway neighborhood relied on one another. Landowners regularly swapped over each year of his charges and indicated the extent to which Southampton planters in the each farm regularly assisted each other. Daniel Cobb recorded winter hog killings when farmers routinely assisted each other. Hog killing and corn shucking were two moments in the agricultural cycle in which farmers assisted each other. Cobb in Crofts 1997:78, 100, 102, 143, 204, 284; Paramore 1992:123, brackets added).
Nottoway hog ownership 1850-1860 reflected this cash-cropping pattern as well. Prior to the Civil War, Nottoway hog ownership was commonly used as a cash crop. In 1859, Cobb estimated the worth of his hog herd at $300, reflecting the economic value of hogs as a cash crop. Similarly, Nottoway headman Edwin Turner also contributed to this pattern, with a hog herd valued at $300 in 1860.

In contrast, the Trustee Ridley family on the Bonnie Doone plantation did not record any slaughtering of hogs, suggesting a potential market for hogs in other areas. The Nottoway were interested in the marketability of swine as much as they were in subsistence. Indian Town neighbor Charlotte Bryant culled a similar amount of livestock as Cobb in 1850 and 1860, indicating a similar level of production.

During a given season, the Nottoway were interested in the marketability of hogs. Records indicate Nottoway households owned twenty, thirty, and more than thirty hogs, with the total number of hogs culled on the reservation ranging from 134 to 200. This indicates a cash-cropping pattern, with hogs being used as a cash crop to supplement subsistence farming. The average weight of hogs slaughtered in 1859 was 117 lbs, with Cobb estimating the weight of 100 lbs per hog for a total of 3,000 hogs on the reservation. This provides evidence of the economic importance of hogs as a cash crop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Relationship to Indian Town</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Hay, Tons</th>
<th>Wool, Lbs.</th>
<th>Butter, Lbs.</th>
<th>Sweet Potatoes</th>
<th>Peas</th>
<th>Irish Potatoes</th>
<th>Indian Corn</th>
<th>Swine</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Milch Cows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Bryant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Hill Plantation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Crocker [affine]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lamb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ridley [Trustee Family]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Turner [head male]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Stewart [agnatic]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Taylor [Nottoway affine]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Swearing [agnatic]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor King [agnate]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bryant [collateral kin?]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gray</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Farmer [agnate]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Edmond [agnate]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stewart [agnate]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William King</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William King</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gray</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Indian Town and neighbors' select agricultural produce, 1850-1860. Triple bar divides schedules, dashed line indicates discontinuous listing; all other entries are consecutive. Source: AG1850:423-424, 433-434; AG1860:416-417.
Therefore, in addition to cotton, one economic niche the late antebellum Nottoway cornered was the Southampton swine market. Whether by contractual sale to neighboring farms or for export, a substantial portion of Nottoway income was gained through animal husbandry. This subsistence pattern continued into the Post-Reservation Period. Family documents of matrilineal Nottoway descendants indicate allottees “lived on the old Indian Reservation…[where they] worked in the fields picking cotton, working hogs, and planting in the fields.” Oral history interviews conducted in the 1970s reveal multiple descendants born during the Post-Reservation Era [c. 1880-1900] recalled the allottee generation [c. 1830-1875] “worked in the fields and picked cotton and tended hogs.” One Woodson farmstead, constructed near the time of the Civil War, was recorded as having a large fenced area for pigs, and an additional “pen near the house for a sow with her piglets.” Another document specifically mentioned allottee production of “fresh meat” from domestic pig and cow butchering, “smokehouse cuts,” and venison. Indian corn production appears fairly stable between the two schedules; 700 Indian Town households produced forty-six and one half tons of hay, nearly 21% of the neighborhood crop and nearly twice the amount of hay cropping, with some individual allotments being twice the amount of Nottoway hay cropping. The 1860 Agricultural Census demonstrates increased amount of fodder and grain. The 1860 Agricultural Census demonstrates increased communally held matrilineage and allotment lands also produced a substantial amount of fodder and grain. The 1860 Agricultural Census demonstrates increased amount of fodder and grain.
bushels were recorded in 1850 and 540 bushels for 1860. This productivity continued after the Civil War, as agnatic and matrilineal Nottoway farms’ Indian corn bushels were estimated as a total of 935 in 1870 and 835 in 1880 (AG1870:3-4; AG1880:25-26).

Growing Indian corn was one cropping staple with continuity to the Nottoway past. The community’s relationship to corn growing remained constant through the colonial period and references to nineteenth-century Nottoway agricultural production begin with corn, "The quantity of land occupied by the Tribe is about 144 acres, all high land, the greater part is common land, and only a portion of it is occupied by the "(Cabell Papers July 18, 1808).

At the end of the growing season, fall corn-shucking activities were the social highlight of Southampton agricultural cycle. Field hands, owners, slaves and volunteers joined in harvest revelry and the social highlight of nineteenth-century Southampton agriculture. At larger farms the host offered a feast, and singing and dancing could accompany the end-of-day’s labor. Corn-shucking time was a form of stripping husks from cobs. A larger farm, the host offered a feast, and singing and dancing could accompany the end-of-day’s labor. Corn-shucking time was a form of harvest cereals, as did farms across the river. It was a time of labor exchange. As autumn revealed plantations up and down the Indian Town path hosted these corn-shucking feasts, both matrilineal and agnatic descendents, participated in this extensive level of inter-corn cooperation and reciprocally take place (Crofts 1997:68).

More than winter hog slaughtering, "at no other time during the agricultural year did so neighbors’ harvest and shuck com.

"finished halling up my Corn… I made 125 of 1851, 1852 [the] Bushel of my Corn… I made 125 of 1851, 1852 Bushels this year[,] I suppose 20 bushels were recorded in 1850 and 540 bushels for 1860. This productivity continued after the Civil War, as agnatic and matrilineal Nottoway farms’ Indian corn bushels were estimated as a total of 935 in 1870 and 835 in 1880 (AG1870:3-4; AG1880:25-26)."
Livesock and personal property. Married to matrilineal Nottoway allottee Martha [Patsy] Ohwachira, periodically used his corn and pea crop for collateral or debt, as well as his Alex Stewart, an agrafee-descended Nottoway from the remnant Scholar.

I sent Lewis to help Gurley shuck corn. I housed 85 bbls of fine corn. I began to pick my cotton again the 3 time &c.

I sent 1 hand to help Jordan Stewart shuck corn at 2 or 3 hours by sun. I picked corn today.

I shucked corn. I began in the morning with few hands. We finished by 9 with an increase of hands, some 20 additional. We shucked some 150 or 180 bbls by the judgment of some of the hands. I've housed 55 or 60 bbls so I put it down at 220 or 230 bbls with 2 horses & probably 8 bales of cotton. We finished all peaceable and well so far as I know by drinking 2 gallons of hooch, 1 sheep, 1 turkey, and part of 250 bbls of corn, 1 1854. I shucked corn. I 

Ohwachira land and allotments yielded 103 bales of cotton, 1,200 bushels of corn in 1860, according to the external documentary record, fodder production was a constant and increasing need for livestock, as was whole corn, bales of hay and bushels of oats. According to the allotment period, fodder production was a common practice. Corn stalks and tops were used as balage, ground into meal and kept in cloth sacks. The latter did not keep well and was prone to spoilage from moisture, so either frequent trips to the mill or small incremental home grinding were the common practices. Corn, meal and meal were used as plate food.

Shucked corn was stored in corncribs while still on the cob; corn intended for human use was shelled before being ground at a mill. Thus, Nottoway corn took several forms during the Allotment Period: whole on the cob in corncribs, shelled from the cob in barrels, ground into meal and kept in cloth sacks. The latter did not keep well and was

Ohwachira

的土地和分配权在1860年产量为103袋，超过任何其他时间。增加的养牛场和谷物产量与增加的印度牲畜持有量相吻合，但反映了大麦和小扁豆的生产也在为市场而生。亚历克斯·斯图尔特，一个支系出身的诺托瓦伊人，定期用他的玉米和豌豆作物作抵押品，以及他的财产。
Woodson-Bozeman, Stewart had no real estate to leverage against debt or to apply for credit, as his farmland belonged to the matrilineage. One 1845 contract with Thomas Maget inventoried Stewart's "twenty head of hogs and increase[, ] 3 head of cattle & increase…my present growing crop of corn[, ] fodder[, ] peas & potatoes & also five barrels of corn & one thousand pounds of fodder now in hand…” (DB26:396). In 1849 Stewart used "one fourth of [his] crop of corn[,] fodder & peas now growing on [this] Steewart's crop land and one-third of another tract’s crop of corn[,] fodder & peas..." to settle his debts by securing the credit and scheduling an auction to "sell the...crop of corn, fodder and corn to the highest bidder for cash" (DB27:430). The value and productivity of Stewart's crop may be seen from his ability to buttress his finances against existing and expected yields. Significantly, Stewart's cropland and labor pool were matrilineally organized, but the moveable property appeared to be his, or at least recorded as such. By 1860, Indian Town had diversified and expanded market crop production. Either apple or peach trees, planted during the 1850s, began to yield a marketable fruit.Videls (Crofts 1992:79), considered a locally specialty, "probably peculiar to this county" (Crofts 1992:79). The best apple brandy to be found in the world…of Brandy, known locally as "Apple Jack," Southampton brandy was included in this increase was orchard produce, sold fresh, dried or pressed for cider and brandy. 
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communities at a relatively early date (Barnwell 1908:34; Lawson 1709; Rountree 1990:108; Woodard 2006). As early as 1733, William Byrd noted the presence of abandoned Indian peach orchards along their path in 1773:32). While there were clear apple plantations of orchards along their path, Washington 1787:108; Woodard 2006). As early as 1733, William Byrd noted the presence of abandoned Indian peach orchards during his visit to the upper Rappahannock River and communities at a relatively early date (Barnwell 1908:34; Lawson 1709; Rountree
yielding $150-200 [3], others claimed $100 or below [5] and most, none at all [9].

No orchard produce was recorded at Indian Town in 1870, possibly due to underreporting or a leasing arrangement. The neighboring Lamb farm, enumerated a yield of $142, but then none in 1880. In that year, an Indian Town orchard again claimed fifty apple trees in production. If this Nottoway orchard was new, it was planted at least by 1870 (AG1870:3-4), likely as a result of a leasing agreement with Lamb, as there is no evidence of Edwin Turner selling or leasing land to his Nottoway wife, Indiana Woodson/Bozeman-Crocker (M1848-55:345, 416, 421). The discontinuous Agriculture Census enumeration may have been the result of an Indian Town leasing arrangement with Lamb, as there was no evidence of Edwin Turner selling or leasing land to his Nottoway wife, Indiana Woodson/Bozeman-Crocker (M1848-55:345, 416, 421).

Planting, managing and harvesting the fruit trees were only the initial stages of the

some form of Nottoway exchange. C. 1870.

neighborhood farm listing of $142 orchard produce but absent 1880 return is suggestive of

locating land to deed (DB29-32: Rountree 1897:121). While conjectural, Lamb's 1870

Town leasing arrangement with Lamb, as there is no evidence of Edwin Turner selling or

The discontinuous Agricultural Census enumeration may have been the result of an Indian

same — situated on Woodson owhachira lands that were eventually divided and allotted.

487), possibly, Arthur's 1880 orchard and that of Edwin Turner in 1860 were one and the

(AG1880:6), yet he was not a landowner, as his farm was on allotment land distributed

by 1870 (AG1870:3-4; AG1880:25). The orchard reportedly belonged to William Arnt.

They apply fees in production. If this Nottoway orchard was new, it was planted at least

of $142, but then none in 1880. In that year, an Indian Town owhachira again claimed

underreporting of a leasing agreement. The neighborhood farm, enumerated a yield of

No orchard produce was recorded at Indian Town in 1870, possibly due to

yielding $150-200 [3], others claimed $100 or below [5] and most, none at all [9].
Cobb recorded $280 dollars in orchard sales that year. If Nottoway production commanded similar prices as Cobb’s, or as those listed in Table 25, the Nottoway members took in cash from one of the following orchard products: four barrels of peach brandy, eight barrels of apple brandy, an undetermined amount of apple vinegar, 100 bushels of dried apples [$2 per], 20,000 lbs of dried peaches [10¢ per], 200 bushels of wheat [20¢ per], some 10,000 lbs of black cow peas [$2 per], 600 bushels of cotton, 4000 lbs of cotton linters, 200 bushels of corn [15¢ per], 120 bushels of wheat [22¢ per], 120 bushels of oats [20¢ per], 200 bushels of barley [20¢ per], 200 bushels of rye [20¢ per], 200 bushels of flax [20¢ per], 200 bushels of oats [20¢ per], 200 bushels of barley [20¢ per], 200 bushels of rye [20¢ per], 200 bushels of flax [20¢ per].

Daniel Cobb’s journal entries provide a comparable for the total of Nottoway agricultural production and sense of value for the orchard, fodder and other crops during the Allotment Period. Nottoway produce bound for export or contracted for sale to neighboring planters earned the income for Indian Town households. Southampton Agriculture Censuses and Cobb’s diary record content for an otherwise silent Nottoway account book:

1853: I sent 2 Bbls and 1 Bushell of corn to Jerusalem. $2.40 Cts per Bbl.
1857: $12 planted 250,000 Corn hills…2.5 Bbls of seed [$60 to plant] 30 Bushels of peas, 12 to the hill [56,000 peas to plant] $12…sowed 35 Acres in Cotton it 100 Bushel of seed [$7.25] 121 Planted 200,000 Corn hills…22 Bbls of seed [80 to plant] 30 Bushels of corn [7.40 Cts per Bbl].
1859: I housed 2000 lbs of corn that at $3.50 makes $700. I made some 7 bales of cotton $350. some 10,000 lbs of Blaid fodder and top fodder to the amount of $150 dollars…1859: I house 2000 lbs of corn that at $3.50 makes $700. I made some 7 bales of cotton $350. some 10,000 lbs of Blaid fodder and top fodder to the amount of $150 dollars.

Nottoway orchard productivity was substantial in whichever arrangement. Combination of the above to reach a total of $280 in orchard commodities. Thus, 100 bushels of dried apples [$2 per], twenty-eight barrels of dried peaches [10¢ per], some 10,000 lbs of black cow peas [$2 per], 600 bushels of cotton, 4000 lbs of cotton linters, 200 bushels of corn [15¢ per], 120 bushels of wheat [22¢ per], 120 bushels of oats [20¢ per], 200 bushels of barley [20¢ per], 200 bushels of rye [20¢ per], 200 bushels of flax [20¢ per].

Cobb recorded $280 dollars in orchard sales that year. If Nottoway production commanded similar prices as Cobb’s, or as those listed in Table 25, the #Nottoway production
The potential income generated by 1860 Nottoway farmers [Table 26]. Figures are estimates based on period reports of crop prices, but underreporting for income and personal property is expected. Shares in the Nottoway tribal estate are not figured. Of which, 721 acres remained undivided by matrilineal Nottoway, valued between $2884 and $5047. Agnatic Nottoway Alex and Charles Stewart "households" are combined, as they were brothers living on Woodson matrilineal allotment land and repurchased Nottoway allotments in his wife's name. Thomas Crocker's listing is a single Nottoway household, but like Stewart, he lived on Woodson matrilineal allotment land [Alex's wife]. Edwin Turner was headman when produced a crop for personal property income and land, $248 for the Nottoway Town. He estimated potential income for 1860 was approximately $2550 for Edwin Turner's self-reported plantation earnings, the backbone of Cobb's wealth was in the late-antebellum rising slave prices. Moreover, Cobb's strategic marriage into the elite family of planter Jesse Little provided Cobb a 700-acre dowry by will. Sources: AG1860:416-417; Brookmire 1918; C1860: Cols. 1859-1900; DB26396; Norfolk Merchants and Mechanics' Exchange cited in Merchants' 1858:733.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>150 Bu. 10 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 10 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogs</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
<td>150 Bu. 15 Bu. 360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using Cobb's diaries of 1850s Petersburg sales, the 1860 Agriculture Census and Norfolk Merchants and Mechanics' Exchange cited in Merchants' 1858:733.
combined with the calculated value of real and personal property, it becomes clear that while the Nottoway were productive, they were economically beneath the plantations owners. Daniel Cobb represented the lower end of this prosperous socio-economic spectrum, with just over eleven slaves, 900 acres of land and a total worth of about $20,000.

For the 1860 Nottoway farms listed in Table 26, Indian resources were dominantly tied to the pea and potato garden market, fodder production for livestock, and swine farming. Each of the households retained matrilineal interests in the Nottoway's reserve, whether by female-descended children and grandchildren. Thus the inherited wealth of smallholding White farms socio-economically separated the Indian Nottoway from their neighbors. In some regards, the accumulated and inherited wealth of smallholding White farms economically shielded the community.
Indian Path. Edwin Turner outperformed [§1483] a young White neighbor, William Gray, generating more income value [§898] than the White Lamb family outfit [§770] just across the land. The 1860 Indian Stewart farm generated competitive producers during this time period. The 1860 Indian Stewart farm generated competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period.

As demonstrated by their agricultural development, evidence suggests the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period. The data in Table 27 confirm that the Nottoway were competitive producers during this time period.
cycles of debt and repayment were part and parcel of the antebellum political economy. A careful reading of Southampton’s deed books and other court records suggests

into income-producing ventures. Inquisitions from both were invested in agricultural pursuits, which the Nottoway developed. The monetary returns, and others sold. The first finds were divided and dispersed. The monetary returns show levels of prosperity during the years prior to the Civil War. Allusions were based on the evidence, one may argue the confined Nottoway farms were beginning to agriculturally-economic, and shaped the routines and choices of Indian Town’s farmers. Cash cropping for the demands of the market garden diversified the Nottoway’s portion of their commercial wage labor pool came from adjacent Nottoway Town farms. While farms relied on slave hire during the agricultural season, like Daniel Cobb, a labor in 1860. With this disclosure, it becomes clear that while all three neighboring Indian Town residences contained twenty-seven adults and eleven teenagers available for labor, four were teenagers and the remainder young women. In contrast, neighboring owner-operator, Gray’s father James had a large household of fourteen, but five were children, four were teenagers and the remainder young women. In contrast, neighboring worlds were single. Susan Lamb’s household had only four members in 1860 and William Gray was single slave holdings, the Gray’s and Lamb’s owned just one or two slaves. Fifty-seven year old unlike Cobb’s Bryant, Ridley and other prosperous planters, but Indian labor supported both operations work and day rates of neighboring planters. But Indian labor supported both operations. Thus, an unrecorded portion of Nottoway income was derived from the wage plantations. Thus, an unrecorded portion of Nottoway income was derived from the wage operations on their own farm operations and added as commercial laborers for the neighboring Indian Town Residents listed
exchange for capital, the Nottoway produced for market demand and replaced the
plantation system and encountered more cash crops for market, and thus for export. In
transplantation and agricultural production improved the efficiency of Southampton’s
credit relationships to support new initiatives. However, the increased mechanization of
continuous transformation of Indian land and labor, and the participation in extended
continuing transformation of the mini-institutions within the system’s dynamics
encompassed into a larger economy played out through continuous transformation of Indian land and labor, involved the
country in such a way that it could no longer escape, “peripheralization” involved the
incorporation involved the capture of Nottoway territory into the orbit of the world-
capitalist owners, comprised with the confines of slavery, slave hires and wage labor.
The drive for the accumulation of real and personal property by prosperous

Concluding Summary

The backbone of Indian Town’s livelihood.

In these spaces, the smallholding farms and the resources pooling of “like people” were
and Nottoway personal property adjacent to the tribal lands were in the hundreds of acres,
the ohwachira retained nearly 725 acres and a small financial trust. Individual allotments
beginning of the 1860s, Indian Town had lost substantial amount of their reservation, yet
Southampton’s non-proportioned, landless Labores – Black, Indian or White – At the
extisting debts and future incomes, distinguished them from the majority of
for all free peoples. That the Nottoway and their allies had property to leverage against
Within this market interdependence, Nottoway — like other Southerners — consumed material goods for farm improvement and finished commodities imported from abroad. The Nottoway residential patterns transformed during the Allotment Period, and while some lineage segments remained conjoined and matrilineal resource pooling was present, elementary family units became the center of Nottoway production. With allotment, individual family members controlled smaller parcels of land and gained more steering of individual personal finances. Allottees invested the proceeds from land sales and income into their immediate families and personal initiatives, some of which included removal to urban centers for wage labor. The uneven development of the system’s dynamics encouraged Nottoway corporate agency, in an effort to end decades of Trusteeship that were harmful to the tribe’s material organization and communal political economy of individualism, the tribe’s matrilineal organization and communal manipulation and sympatry of their resources. However, through allotment and a political economy of individualism, the tribe’s matrilineal organization and communal manipulation and sympatry of their resources, the Nottoway — like other Southerners — consumed material goods for farm improvement and finished commodities imported from abroad. With allotment, elementary family units became the center of Nottoway production. With allotment, some lineage segments remained conjoined and matrilineal resource pooling was present, and Nottoway residential patterns transformed during the Allotment Period, and while
unions and liaisons developed as preferred partnerships with "like people" – a component of which was Indian – but also of Black and White ancestry.

The breakup of the remaining communal land holdings continued through the Civil War. The Nottoway's kinship and descent system became increasingly conflicted with other factors of the economic system's dynamics. Property ownership, inheritance, labor pooling, sharing, and mobility all favored male heads of households and male cooperation. Severely from Nottoway assets and a reliance on elementary family for resources ever more undermined an already weakened Iroquoian social organization and kinship. The breakup of the remaining communal land holdings continued through the war, of which was Indian – but also of Black and White ancestry. – a component

The breakup of the remaining communal land holdings continued through the war, of which was Indian – but also of Black and White ancestry. – a component
The Collapse of the Ohwachira

As demonstrated in Chapter VI, Nottoway Town showed signs of prosperity and agricultural success in the years prior to 1861. Conjoined ohwachira farms composed a significant block of smallholding property owners, producers and laborers along Indian Town Road. The community effectively utilized the scale machinery to recover lost agricultural success in the years prior to 1861.

Like Southamptoners of all socio-economic classes, “they were just struck down, through undermining the social order that had existed under the peripheral South’s labor control and mode of production, contributing to the demise of Indian Town’s kinship system and social organization, crushed whenever potentially Nottoway had gained. The war also destroyed any sense of Nottoway economic stability and increased was destroyed as a result of the 1861-1865 Civil War and crushed whenever potential Nottoway had gained. The war also destroyed the area’s cotton, pea and potato cash crops. The brief ten-year severe hardship and engulfed in cotton, pea and potato cash crops. The brief ten-year capital and resources were diverted into farm production, committed to economic niche with

CONCLUSION
Reconstruction, the last Nottoway allotments were made, as Indian Town families attempted to recover from economic diminishment, boost farm income and socially distinguish themselves as individuals within the South's transforming political economy.

While no significant Civil War battles were fought in the Southampton region, the loss of county resources in support of the war effort was significant. Confederate requisitions drained away White and Black labor for military service, and appropriated much of the county's productive agriculture and animal husbandry. One period observer noted Southampton's "center of civilization, refinement & wealth" had been rendered "poor and desolate" by 1862. Food shortages became a severe problem across the county, and the county court empowered magistrates to consolidate existing private property and stock, in order to redistribute stores to families that had little or no food, including the farms in and around Indian Town. Children of reservation allottees, who lived through the conflict, recalled, "when the soldiers came through the ohwachira "fields" along the Nottoway River", when the soldiers came through the ohwachira "fields" along the Nottoway River.

Susanna Turner, daughter of allottee Milly Woodson/Bozeman-Turner reportedly stated, "we lived off the land, but supplies were got alone...without much...Susanna Turner, daughter of allottee Milly Woodson/Bozeman-Turner reportedly stated, "we lived off the land, but supplies were got alone...without much..."
Compounding the provisioning problems, Southern railways fell into disrepair during the war and were the subject of intense fighting and wartime damage, as opposing sides struggled to maintain or gain control of strategic shipping lanes. Surrounding Southampton, all but one railroad line to Petersburg were destroyed by 1865. Roadways were blocked, bridges burned and waterways made impassable by scuttled war ships. When the war ended, “paroled soldiers, civilian refugees and former slaveholders seeking their homes situated in the Union’s once-thriving cotton agro-industry disintegrated during the wartime as coastal ports fell into Union control and Southampton labor forces were stripped away by conscription and enlistment. Southampton slaves used the approaching Federal army as an opportunity for freedom, soldiers and Southampton labor forces were stripped away by conscription and enlistment, repair the infrastructure devasted by the conflict in Southampton, the once-thriving economy for generations thereafter, making recovery difficult as the South attempted to recover from the war and the subject of intense fighting and wartime damage, as opposing sides attempted to maintain or gain control of strategic shipping lanes. Surrounding Southampton, all but one railroad line to Petersburg were destroyed by 1865. Roadways were blocked, bridges burned and waterways made impassable by scuttled war ships. When the war ended, “paroled soldiers, civilian refugees and former slaves sought to reach their homes, stricken by a wrecked transportation system” (Otto 1994:48; Cumming 1895:240-257). Among those volunteers were members of the Sykes family, who escaped from Southampton's Parish Plantation, Hampshire, Henry and Joseph Sykes fought in Company I of the First U.S. Colored Calvary. After emancipation, their parents, the Sykes family, who escaped from Jacob Williams's St. Luke's Parish Plantation. Southampton slaves used the approaching Federal army as an opportunity for freedom, nearly one hundred of the county's coerced laborers escaped and enlisted in the Union army of traves. Southampton slaves used the approaching Federal army as an opportunity for freedom, nearly one hundred of the county's coerced laborers escaped and enlisted in the Union army of traves. Southampton slaves used the approaching Federal army as an opportunity for freedom, nearly one hundred of the county's coerced laborers escaped and enlisted in the Union army of traves. Southampton slaves used the approaching Federal army as an opportunity for freedom, nearly one hundred of the county's coerced laborers escaped and enlisted in the Union army of traves.
Clearly, the emancipation of slaves following the Civil War impacted the demography of the Nottoway community and marriage-mate selection. Previous generations of Nottoway had closely affiliated property ownership, the use of slave labor and agricultural productivity with social status. However, post-Civil War, Nottoway families became economically competitive with White middling farmers and plantation owners whose property and productivity were decimated by four years of war. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the dire economic period of Reconstruction. Newly freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency. Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers. Having lost control over their coerced labor force, Southamptons' agriculturalists sought to maintain their property, farm production and social order during the economic depression of Reconstruction. New freed slaves were able to negotiate for their labor, income share and residency, Cotton prices soared following the war, providing a limited but substantial lifeline for sharecropping cotton growers and sharecropping cotton growers.
I argue that the scramble for scarce resources and the increased wage-labor pool would ultimately lower the Nottoway's social status. As the post-war economy slowly recovered, individual allottees used their personal property for extensions of credit and long-term loans, entering some Nottoway households into a cyclical credit dependency with their White neighbors (DB32:53, 31:508, 32:345, 33:246-247, 591-592, 37:517-518). Private property as collateral, farm ownership and a small tract of tribal land continued to distinguish Nottoway Town residents from Southampton's propertyless masses, but social divisions with other non-Whites became increasingly blurred.

As perceptions about the racial divisions within Southampton society became a

(C1870-1880, 1900)

"Black" increasingly replaced "Negro" and "Mulatto" on county census schedules. The social divisions between peoples "free" before the Civil War and those recently emancipated underwent realignment during Reconstruction, a period described by some as the "new order of things" (Crofts 1992:218-234). The previous racial terminology used by Southampton officials was maintained throughout this period, however. The social divisions between people's "free" before the Civil War and those from ten years before, competition among landless White and "Colored" laborers increased. The county's residents were non-White, nearly doubling the number of full, free citizens. Southampton's Slave Population [1794] by 1870 was three times that of the White population [1794].

As perceptions about the racial divisions within Southampton society became a}

binary of Black and White, there was little room for persons of mixed blood, not being a

termology used by Southampton officials was maintained throughout this period, however. By some as the "new order of things" (Crofts 1992:218-234). The previous racial
terminology used by Southampton officials was maintained throughout this period, however.
constricted standing in the community; many White prosperous planters were left only
forms of labor cooperation emerged as a result of economic freedom. Property ownership
Black property ownership grew in the years following the Civil War and new
and were employers of wage labor (AG1870; Field notes 2006-2012).
was strengthened, as Indian Town residents were landowners, encouraged by the
themselves as leadership families within the wider non-White community. This position
involvement with affines as church organizers and preachers, the Nottoway signaled
with formerly enslaved families. One insightful theme may be gleaned from Nottoway Baptist
lies with segments of the African American community and led to increased interaction
overall religious leaning. Church membership strengthened alliance descendants’ social
when church leaders and preachers, and thus those individuals influenced the settlement’s
community-based slaves. Post-Civil War Nottoway marriage-mates were Baptist, several of
White neighbors shifted during this period toward the Baptist Church favored by the
Church was formed in 1874, Nottoway affiliation with the Methodist Church of their
organized independent church congregations. So, too, Nottoway farms. Bryan’s Baptist
During Reconstruction, freed slaves became active in county politics and
(Property notes 2006-2012; and see Blakey 1988).
and economic success would all play important parts in defining who were “the people”
strictly “Indian” notion of peoplehood, property ownership, education, civic leadership
Two of them held lands. Additional forms of ownership would come to replace a
Southern Carolina Black community, however, would dissipate with the allotment of the final
from others with African ancestry. The separation of Nottoway people from the wider
brief time following emancipation, county officials distinguished Nottoway individuals
freedom that reinforced the old color-caste system, then simply divided the caste of
desecrable African „blood”classed an individual as „Negro” or „Black.” The degrees of
spectral of phenotypes previously identified individuals, the new rule of „one drop” of
during the Antebellum: Jim Crow’s Virginia was not Old Southampton. Whereas a
socio-economic position, but one that was of a different stratigraphic character than
descended people became subsumed within the „Negro” population. This status carried a
earnest labor commodification polarized people within the system. Nottoway-
regulations subsided, Southampton labor and property commodification resumed in
Following the Civil War, and after the initial Southampton shock of Reconstruction
DB28:341; Field notes 2011; Patricia Phillips MS 1977).
their sisters’ affines and collateral kin (AG1870; Crofts 1992:243, 246, 277, 280;
Allowment Period was ample marriable male Nottoway, agnate Nottoway descendants,
by the agriculture schedules presented in Chapter VI, labor cooperation at the end of the
implementations, seed and livestock, as well as exchange labor with one another. As indicated
for market, groups of men could pool their resources in order to purchase necessary farm
families to form truck gardens, manage their own labor and decide which crops to grow
owned plantations. In either arrangement, the cash crop remained allowed individual
renounced on Indian lands were less common than Black-run sharecropping on White-
where White sharecroppers to cultivate portions of his lands in the post-war years. White
just like neighboring plantation owner Daniel Copp, Indian Town farmer Edwin Turner
position among Southampton’s White and Black population. Thus, it is significant that
war. Nottoway communal and private property ownership shifted them to be in a status
with their land at the war’s end. Others lost their land completely through debt. Post-Civil
White and non-White. Legal degrees of "Mulatto," "Slave," "Free Persons of Color," "Free Persons of Mixed Blood" or "Indian" were replaced with labels of "Colored," "Black" or "White" for an entirely unbound labor force. The Jim Crow South lessened the upward socio-economic mobility of individuals with perceived African ancestry. A result of the one-drop rule was an internal stratification among non-Whites, whereby phenotype and "respectability" determined one's social position within the community (White 1983:188-269; and see Birmingham 1977; Frazier 1966; Wilson 1973; Wynes 1971).

My research shows that, with no ability to resituate themselves with regard to racial identity, the Nottoway and their collateral-kin allies occupied the middle to upper tier of the "Colored" population, which was squarely below propertied Whites. Indicating the Nottoway's changed social position, as an adjunct to the final division of Indian land, the tribe's lawyer, William B. Shands, informed the Southampton Court that the Nottoway allottees were all "negroes and very poor" and thus in need of consideration. Notwithstanding, the Southampton Court held the Nottoway's changed social position, as reflected in the final division of Indian land, inferior to the "Colored" population, which was subsequently below propertied Whites. Inheriting racial identity, the Nottoway and their collateral-kin allies occupied the middle to upper tier of the community (White 1983:188-269; and see Birmingham 1977; Frezier 1966; Wilson 1973; Wynes 1971).
The shortage of Nottoway capital likely precipitated the efforts to divide the remaining 500+ acres of reservation land in 1877. After the 1878-1885 allotments and property divisions, Ohwachira members timbered the tracts and used the proceeds to invest in Indian Town housing and farming ventures (Commissioners Sale of Valuable Land and Standing Timber, 1908, Southampton County Loose Papers; CC Edwin D. Turner et al. vs. William Turner et al., 1881-1885; CC Edwin D. Turner et al. vs. Jesse S. Land and Standing Timber, 1908, Southampton County Loose Papers; CC Edwin D. Turner et al. vs. Standing Timber, 1908, Southampton County Loose Papers; CC Edwin D. Turner et al. vs. Standing Timber, 1908, Southampton County Loose Papers). For the Nottoway, Shands made a literal reading of the law with regards to communally held property. As a corporate body, the Nottoway no longer held real estate or an tribal trust fund. However, the value of their old reservation lands (Mooney MS 2190) remained in the hands of a few prominent individuals who now held mixed bloods’ remains in the county. Each group’s headman were listed and addresses provided to the Smithsonian’s BAE.

It is interesting to note that Mooney’s Virginia BAE circulars identified few tribal groups by name, and even fewer tribal leaders (Rountree 1990:202-203). In my reading of the circulars, Virginia respondents [mostly county physicians or lawyers] acknowledged only three of the contemporaneously state-recognized tribes. A little over a dozen prominent Tidewater White men knew the Pamunkey. Four individuals recognized the town on the Mattaponi River and the Nottoway were identified in three circulars. Southhampton’s William B. Shands wrote James Mooney a longer letter in which he identified and commented on the Nottoway, but also the Pamunkey. Shands described Southampton’s William B. Shands wrote James Mooney a longer letter in which he...
By the end of the Allotment Period [c.1875], the Nottoway's matrilineage organization was quickly unraveling by that time (Field notes 2011). Operating beneath the surface was quickly unraveling by that time (Field notes 2011). Confusion over the multiple use of family names, indicating whatever matrilineal form Noctoway descentants born at the end of the matrilineal century expressed Nottoway descendants born at the end of the matrilineal century expressed

notes 2011.}

Patricia Phillips MS 1977) Continued vertical exogamy, the physical distancing of ohwachira between members and the increased prominence of collateral kin relations, resulted in the decline of the Nottoway ohwachira. As multi-lineal kin units, the ohwachira ceased to be relevant in a capitalist economy that encouraged labor mobility, partible property, and consumption, but above all, individualism (C1870-1880, 1900-1940; C1900-1920 Sussex County, VA; C1900-1940 Nansemond County, VA). Continued exogamy, the physical distancing of collateral kin members and the increased prominence of collateral kin relations, led to the decline of the ohwachira. According to oral history interviews conducted with maternal descendants of Nottoway allottees in the 1970s, the extended family was remembered back three to four generations, but bilateral reckoning of both paternal and maternal lines was common by the beginning of the Post-Reservation Era. As Nottoway ohwachira ceased to be relevant in a capitalist economy that encouraged labor mobility, partible property, and consumption, but above all, individualism (C1870-1880, 1900-1940; C1900-1920 Sussex County, VA; C1900-1940 Nansemond County, VA; C1920-1940 Portsmouth, VA; Field notes 2011). Nottoway descendants born at the end of the nineteenth century expressed confusion over the multiple use of family names, indicating whatever matrilineal form operating beneath the surface was quickly unraveling by that time (Field notes 2011; Patricia Phillips MS 1977).
grandmothers, "take your eyes off her; she's so-and-so's cousin's child" (Field notes 2011). Other allottee descendants recounted being minded by their maternal grandparents and Great-Grandparents, speaking of having to leave the immediate area to get a wife, because they were too closely related to a certain cluster of families (Field notes 2011). Other grandchildren spoke of having to leave the immediate area to get a wife, because they were too closely related to a certain cluster of families (Field notes 2011). Some Nottoway allottee descendants recalled their forebears through their paternal lineages. For some reason, even though "it was known not to be a good thing to do" (Field notes 2011), the previous generation of allottees and their children condoned "cousin marriages." The previous generation of allottees and their children condoned "cousin marriages." With regard to descent, the interviewed matrilineal Nottoway descendants "looked down upon people marrying kinfolk" and included their maternal relatives in an intimate set of kinship relations within a limited circle of acquaintances, recognizing an intimate set of kinship relations within a limited circle of acquaintances, particularly those who lived through the last divisions of the old reservation lands, and those who were seen to be the beneficiaries by which families "lost their land" (Field notes 2011). A sentiment of betrayal and loss permeated the oral histories of Nottoway allottees, particularily those who lived through the last divisions of the old reservation lands, and those who were seen to be the beneficiaries by which families "lost their land" (Field notes 2011). The previous generation of allottees and their children condoned "cousin marriages." With regard to descent, the interviewed matrilineal Nottoway descendants "looked down upon people marrying kinfolk" and included their maternal relatives in an intimate set of kinship relations within a limited circle of acquaintances, particularly those who lived through the last divisions of the old reservation lands, and those who were seen to be the beneficiaries by which families "lost their land" (Field notes 2011). A sentiment of betrayal and loss permeated the oral histories of Nottoway allottees, particularily those who lived through the last divisions of the old reservation lands, and those who were seen to be the beneficiaries by which families "lost their land" (Field notes 2011).
Several individuals violated the rule of matrilineage exogamy during the Post-Reservation Era [see Appendix C, Figure 50]. One turn-of-the-century marriage between two matrilineal descendants caused great disagreement within the family. The discord resulted in the severance of a mother-daughter relationship and motivated the relocation of the couple to an urban center. The children of the union stayed with their maternal grandmother on allotment land until adulthood. The disagreement was so strong that the daughter refused to attend her mother's funeral, which in fact was the last owachira internment in the Nottoway's Indian Town Road cemetery, c.1949 (C1910-1920; Death Certificate, Susana Claud; Field notes 2011; Patricia Phillips MS 1977; TRDB8:117).

The foregoing discussion reveals evidence for the collapse of the owachira matrilineal descent and the undermining of the Nottoway's kin-based social organization. The evidence may be analyzed in the following ways. First, one of the taboo marriages described above took place between two members of the Woodson matrilineage. However, the male was also an agnatic Turner descendant, son of [then] deceased headman Edwin D. Turner. The violation was not due to tracing relatives through the pater, as at least two previous marriages also conflated the remaining owachira [Parson and Mary Turner; Edwin and Betsy Turner; see Appendix B, Figure 48]. As well, agnatic Turner descendants were deemed acceptable marriage mates for owachira Nottoway descendants. Two previous marriages also confused the remaining owachira kinship, as at least two previous marriages also conflated the remaining owachira [Parson and Mary Turner; Edwin and Betsy Turner].

The foregoing discussion reveals evidence for the collapse of the owachira people's kin-based social organization. Some preferences or distinctions made between "daddys' people" and "mommy's people" and among people's extended families highlighted the rule of matrilineage exogamy during the Post-Reservation Era [see Appendix C, Figure 50]. One turn-of-the-century marriage between two matrilineal descendants caused great disagreement within the family. The disagreement was so strong that the daughter refused to attend her mother's funeral, which in fact was the last owachira internment in the Nottoway's Indian Town Road cemetery, c.1949 (C1910-1920; Death Certificate, Susana Claud; Field notes 2011; Patricia Phillips MS 1977; TRDB8:117).

The foregoing discussion reveals evidence for the collapse of the owachira matrilineal descent and the undermining of the Nottoway's kin-based social organization. The evidence may be analyzed in the following ways. First, one of the taboo marriages described above took place between two members of the Woodson matrilineage. However, the male was also an agnatic Turner descendant, son of [then] deceased headman Edwin D. Turner. The violation was not due to tracing relatives through the pater, as at least two previous marriages also conflated the remaining owachira [Parson and Mary Turner; Edwin and Betsy Turner; see Appendix B, Figure 48]. As well, agnatic Nottoway descendants were deemed acceptable marriage mates for owachira descendants. The incest taboo was violated because it was between two matrilineal descendants. The incest taboo was violated because it was between two matrilineal Nottoway descendants. Two previous marriages also confused the remaining owachira [Parson and Mary Turner; Edwin and Betsy Turner].
I would argue that this confirms matrilineal Nottoway descent was still recognized by a portion of Indian Town’s residents at the beginning of the twentieth century. Second, as exogamic principles motivated marriage mate selection outside the ohwachira, the violation also indicates post-allotment descending generations were increasingly recognizing bilateral descent. Continued out-marriage or domestic unions with Whites, FPCs, and after the Civil War, emancipated slaves and their descendants, diminished the cultural relevance of Iroquoian descent. Without reservation allotments to call upon as matrilineal resources, the utility of Nottoway descent system was overwhelmed by other pressing socio-economic conditions. The functions of individual property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property inheritance provide evidence of the Nottoway ohwachira collapse. In fact, in the final division of communal shares of the tribal lands 1878-1880, Edwin D. Turner’s children claimed descent from “a female of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians.” In each of the partitioned shares of communal property, Turner claimed his children继承ed descent from a female of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians, but all used their paternal and married surnames in Southampton’s Chancery Court. Moreover, the Turner children’s claim reflected the shift from matrilineal to patrilineal descent among many Nottoway from their lands. The search for wage-labor separated the family members from each other. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands. Without reservation allotments to call upon as matrilineal resources, the utility of Nottoway descent system was overwhelmed by other pressing socio-economic conditions. The functions of individual property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property inheritance provide evidence of the Nottoway ohwachira collapse. In fact, in the final division of communal shares of the tribal lands 1878-1880, Edwin D. Turner’s children claimed descent from “a female of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians.” In each of the partitioned shares of communal property, Turner claimed his children inherited descent from a female of the Nottoway Tribe of Indians, but all used their paternal and married surnames in Southampton’s Chancery Court. Moreover, the Turner children’s claim reflected the shift from matrilineal to patrilineal descent among many Nottoway from their lands. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands. Widespread adoption of paternal surnames, violations of the matrilineal incest taboo and patricentric property rights, mobility and ownership, separated many Nottoway from their lands.
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of so many obstacles. From this perspective, the activism and the ability of the Nottoway generations in fact — in an effort to retain their lands and support their families in the face — that they fought the bureaucracy of the state and county for so many decades — persistence of the Nottoway people. My research demonstrates their efforts of resilience: emerged from the documentary record and compiled by the extraordinary resilience and In researching this project, I became gripped by the individual narratives that anthropologies of Virginia.

outcome of historical forces, but it is a little known narrative in the historiography and traditional forms of social organization and their kinship system may be seen as an changed by the processes of colonialism and capitalism. The collapse of the Nottoway’s 1875 is in explanatory case study of the ways in which an Indian community was The Nottoway of Virginia: A Study of Peoplehood and Political Economy, c.1775-1885

Field notes 2011)

living in Southampton, Portsmouth, Baltimore, and Philadelphia (CO14:331-332, 400; inheritance case, settled in 1933. By that time, the far-flung Nottoway descendants were property were divided among bilateral descendants of the two last chieftains. In an OBR27:664; TRDB2:471), Treyhigly, the last family of continuously held Nottoway Nottoway, their sisters’ allies and adjacent Nottoway descendants (DB37:190; property, labor cooperation and economic initiatives shifted to male: male-centered property ownership remained (DB42:631); but increasing emphasis, the division of descents, thereby demonstrating a dual, or bilateral, form of reckoning. Some aspects of tribal estate through their matriline and also argued for inheritance through paternal all, 1881-1885). Thus, the descendants had concurrently cousin cases to divide the
The transformation of the Nottoway was a process of both accommodation and more fully integrated into an economic system over which they had little control. The Nottoway, it was a period in which their community was dismantled, subsumed, and the Nottoway had a particular position between the wealthy and prosperous Whites, while and Black landlords and the enslaved. The larger events and historical forces of the Civil War destroyed this social position, which was a small but a preciously unmentioned space in Southampton’s antebellum society. Reconstruction was a period in which all peoples were subjected to a new political and social reality. For the Nottoway, the collapse of the kin networks and the shifts in labor and provisioning practices are all part of a wider American story.
APPENDIX A

The Etymology of “Nottoway”

As a term, “Nottoway” has been used to identify Iroquoian peoples of Southern Virginia since at least the mid-seventeenth century. According to Frank L. Slichter (1996), “Nottoway” may have referred to the Iroquoian peoples as “snakes,” “treacherous” or “marauders.” Historically, Algonquian-speakers used the term to describe the collective identity or peoplehood of the Iroquoian peoples, and Southerners used the term in the Great Lakes region, where it referred to the “condition of heat, state of warmth, hence niper, in the Great Lakes.”

In Algonquian languages, the semantic meaning of “Nottoway” stems from Proto-Algonquian *na:*tawe:wa, which refers to the eastern massasauga or pit viper in the Great Lakes region. Historically, developments in other Algonquian languages extend the meaning of *awe:* to “condition of heat, state of warmth.” Thus, Virginia’s “Nottoway” may not relate to snakes at all: /na:/t-/*-awe:/, which means “close upon, move towards, go after, seek out, track,” and /-awe:/, which means “fur or hair.” In Algonquian languages beyond the geographical range of the viper, the term /na:/t-/*-awe:/ refers to the Iroquoian peoples as “snakes,” “treacherous” or “marauders.”

Thus, an important consideration for the collective identity or peoplehood of the Iroquoian peoples of Southern Virginia is the etymology of “Nottoway.”
Siebert and others agree that in the South, the "Iroquoian" designation was primary (1996:638). The earliest Virginia reference to "Nottaway" (Bland 1650 in Salley 1911) frames English-Algonquian / Iroquoian exchanges in terms of trade: roanoke [shell beads] for skins [beaver, deer and otter]. The emergence of the Virginia fur trade with Algonquian-speakers as the initial southern guides, scouts and porters (Briceland 1987) may have been the cause of the Algonquian term's fixation to the Nottoway as Iroquoian. A name that became Indian Town's doing business as sobriquet with outsiders, colonial administrators and eventually, Southampton County officials.
APPENDIX B

"Within the lineage are smaller segments, usually of three generations, composed of an older woman, her daughters, and grandchildren. While residence is no longer matrilocal, many of the conservative families still are extended in terms of the matriline, or live close enough for the women to cooperate in household and lineage tasks."

~ Report on the Grand River Iroquois (Myers n.d. in Eggan 1972:5)

"There has been an intrusion of patrilineality over the years and now everyone bears a surname that is usually recognized as European in origin…The inheritance of these surnames is normally patrilineal, the child inheriting the surname of the father at birth and passing it on to his children…Women take their husbands' surnames at marriage… Occasionally a woman's English surname is taken by her children if the father is absent or unknown, or if the mother is highly respected."

~ Anthony F.C. Wallace (2012:162)

Tracking Nottoway Descent, Kinship and Marriage

Nottoway records are strewn with individuals using multiple surnames and various diminutives for personal names. European-style surnames were adopted in the eighteenth century, sometimes as honorifics, by descent or through some other association. Females most often acquired new last names, patrilineally through marriage, but also by matrilineal descent shielded to bilateral reckoning. The Reservation Allotment Period [1824-1877] was the era in which the Nottoway's descent system unraveled and also was a time in which the Nottoway's Iroquoian kinship system exhibited an array of monikers in the historical documentary record. Throughout the lens of the Iroquoian kinship system, patterns and relationships may be gleaned, and the familial organization revealed. For purposes of discussing the descent reckoning and marriage patterns and relationships many be gleaned, and the familial

---

*Tracking Nottoway Descent, Kinship and Marriage*

---

*Anthony F.C. Wallace* (2012:162)
An individual’s matrilineage is represented by the first surname: Woodson-Bozeman, the hyphenated second name is the affinal lineage.

2) The format continues, collapsing the previous generation’s marriage with a forward slash and adding new hyphenated affine surnames: Woodson/Bozeman-Williams.

3) For an individual of agnatic Nottoway descent, the originating ohwachira is bracketed, followed by the affinal lineage: [Scholar]-Stewart.

4) Individual Nottoway appear in historical records using Euro-American first and last names; where applicable, these names are used. The last names in the Nottoway records do not always follow the American convention whereby the children take the surname of the father. In multiple instances, surname usage changed during different circumstances, reflecting the matrilineal system’s conflict with the bilateral American standard and the collapse of the ohwachira. Using the Iroquoian descent system as a guide, a careful tracking of individuals in the documentary record reveals the patterns of Nottoway Town’s kinship and social organization.

5) Kinship schedules utilize the following symbols: circles are females, triangles are males, horizontal bars denote siblings, descent lines are vertical from equal signs, equal signs indicate unions and parentage but not always marriage, and strikethroughs indicate death.

6) Blue, Green and Purple are used to denote Nottoway matrilineage members. The Woodson ohwachira is Blue. Grey indicates first-generation agnatic descendants. Light Brown identifies FPCs, who may be of combined Black, Indian and White descent. Dark Brown indicates Black and Indian descent. A semi-curved line indicates where descent lines cross.

The Woodson Ohwachira Nottoway using the Woodson surname first appeared in Southampton’s documentary record during the late-eighteenth century ([1773] DB:97-98, 102; [1793] DB:250-251). This suggests that the acquisition of the Woodson name came about through limited in-marriage sometime mid-century.

The Woodson Ohwachira...

...matrilineage examples [see Appendix C]. At least one recently enslaved parent and a red equal sign indicates a violation of the Brown identities. Brown identities of recently freed slaves [see Appendix C]. While names of Brown identities are often difficult to identify, more often than not, the Woodson ohwachira is Blue. Grey indicates first-generation agnatic descendants. Light Brown identifies FPCs, who may be of combined Black, Indian and White descent. Dark Brown indicates Black and Indian descent. A semi-curved line indicates where descent lines cross.

Blue, Green and Purple are used to denote Nottoway matrilineage members. The Woodson ohwachira is Blue. Grey indicates first-generation agnatic descendants. Light Brown identifies FPCs, who may be of combined Black, Indian and White descent. Dark Brown indicates enslaved or recently freed affines [see Appendix C].
 raise of the remaining nature of the record obscures the previous generation’s relationship with

The Woodson ohwachira included each of the individuals listed above, but the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born Circa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Jency Woodson</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wlliam Bllly Woodson</td>
<td>1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jack Woodson</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly W Woodson ~ Later List as Kary Howl</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wnifred W Woodson</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anny Ann An Woodson</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggest descent from a female sibling-set in close age grade.

descented individuals with the Woodson surname from nineteenth-century documents of Nanny Woodson to other Nottoway is unclear. However, the birth order of matrilineal-parentage and sibling connections were not clearly delineated. The genealogical relationship

records prior to 1800, but 1802-1803 Nottoway Trustees removed occupied an agricultural tract of seven acres. Seven separate Woodsons appeared in Nottoway records prior to 1800, but

Nottoway Trustees in 1773. She lived on the reserved land at Indian Town and during the Indian War, since she was counted one of the „35 Indians” and paid an annuity by the Indian Bureau. She lived in the same property as Micajah Bozman, a White man. According to the Trustees, he had a common-law marriage with Nanny Woodson. However, the birth order of matrilineal-relationship of Woodson Woodson was born sometime close to the French and

alongside James Woodson and Henry Woodson, who may have been Nanny’s brothers or

Woodsons appear on any land patents, tax records or quit rent polls associated with the last name of Woodson was not common in the region prior to 1800, and in fact, no
Woodson and was the "father of one of her children." This statement indicated Nanny had several offspring and that the Trustees were unsure of the exact relationship.

The Trustees indicated Nanny Woodson died c.1805. Afterwards, her female children "composed a family" of residence at Indian Town. "Jenny Woodson, 6, lives with her sisters Anny and Winny Woodson," but Billy Woodson was removed from her residence and first sister Anna. "Jenny Woodson, 6, lives with her sisters Anna and Winny Woodson." Billy Woodson was not one of the Trustees, but he was removed from Nanny Woodson's residence with Micajah Bozeman, "by permission of the Trustees, not one of the Trustees, indicated Nanny Woodson died c.1805. Afterwards, her female children "composed a family" of residence at Indian Town.

The Trustees indicated Nanny Woodson died c.1805. Afterwards, her female children "composed a family" of residence at Indian Town.

Billy Woodson was removed from the Indian land to live with his father, since the death of his mother. "Jenny Woodson, 6, lives with her sisters Anna and Winny Woodson." Billy Woodson was removed from the Trustees' residence with Micajah Bozeman, "by permission of the Trustees, not one of the Trustees, indicated Nanny Woodson died c.1805. Afterwards, her female children "composed a family" of residence at Indian Town.

The Trustees indicated Nanny Woodson died c.1805. Afterwards, her female children "composed a family" of residence at Indian Town.

The Trustees indicated Nanny Woodson died c.1805. Afterwards, her female children "composed a family" of residence at Indian Town.

The Trustees indicated Nanny Woodson died c.1805. Afterwards, her female children "composed a family" of residence at Indian Town.
The senior matriline of Indian Town, in the hands of Edith Turner, disagreed with the Trustees and Micajah Bozeman concerning the residence of maternally orphaned Nottoway. Near the time of her other complaints against the Trustees for mismanagement [see Chapter III], Turner applied to Governor William H. Cabell for assistance and argued the Trustees should return Billy Woodson and other Nottoway children to Indian Town (Cabell Papers July 18, 1808; Rountree 1987:201-202). The Trustees' perspective on the matron's request was one of disdain, "we have never heard of a murmur or complaint respecting his [Billy Woodson] place of residence except from Edy Turner; and we cannot believe that she has, or ought to have any control over the said Billy when opposed by the Trustees" (Cabell Papers July 18, 1808). Obviously as explored in Chapter III, the Trustees and the Nottoway leadership disagreed about many aspects of Nottoway autonomy, including control over the community's residents.

As with the dispute over the accounting of Nottoway finances and land, Governor Cabell rejected the Trustees remarks and ordered the return of the children to the tribe. Evidence suggests upon their reunion, the youths were incorporated into households headed by females, some of which were Iroquoian-speaking. A subsequent list of Nottoway households indicates Billy Woodson soon resided with his sisters, "Anny, Winny, Billy and Jenny Woodson" on "95" acres of cleared land (Palmer 1892 X:46). What can be gleaned from these entries is that the Woodson children belonged to a matrilineal community that fought to maintain some control over the residency of its members – beyond the nuclear family – and in the face of non-Nottoway interference. All of Nanny Woodson's children were referred to in the documentary record as "Woodson," however later in time three of her four children also

Chapter III, the Trustees and the Nottoway leadership disagreed about many aspects of Nottoway autonomy, including control over the community's residents. The Trustees should return Billy Woodson and other Nottoway children to Indian Town (Cabell Papers July 18, 1808; Rountree 1987:201-202). The Trustees' perspective on the matron's request was one of disdain, "we have never heard of a complaint respecting his [Billy Woodson] place of residence except from Edy Turner; and we cannot believe that she has, or ought to have any control over the said Billy when opposed by the Trustees" (Cabell Papers July 18, 1808). Obviously as explored in Chapter III, the Trustees and the Nottoway leadership disagreed about many aspects of Nottoway autonomy, including control over the community's residents. All of Nanny Woodson's children were referred to in the documentary record as "Woodson," however later in time three of her four children also

Woozell-Bozeman

First half of the nineteenth century. [Figure 4] Illustrates two sets of Woodson lineage segments from the classification siblings in an Iroquoian kinship system: the Polly and Jack Woodson. The classificatory siblings were Emmy and Jenny Woodson, potential parallel cousins, also used the Bozeman surname (Cabell Papers, July 18, 1808; C1850-1860 Halifax County, NC; PPTL1807-1821: RFN 31 July 1810).
Near his twenty-first birthday, Billy Woodson began identifying himself by his father's surname of "Bozeman." He was listed in 1818 as "Wm. Boseman," witness to his father's land purchase in Northampton County, North Carolina and by 1823, White landowners in Southampton considered "William Bozeman…to be a young man of good general character, that in intellectual improvements and moral deportment he far outstrips the rest of his tribe" (DB19:136, Northampton County, NC; LP Sept. 15, 1823).

The transformation of Billy Woodson into William Bozeman was a partial result of his residential distance from his maternal Nottoway relatives, but also as an outcome of the erosion of Iroquoian matrilineal descent. His schooling and the influence of his White father also contributed to this shift as he matured. Micajah Bozeman, consistently in debt, left Southampton for North Carolina sometime during the 1810s (OB1803-1805:515; OB1805-1807:67, 75; OB1807-1808:66, 95, 109, 121, 159, 176-177; OB1819-1822:433). His son William followed south on the Carolina road. Like his father and other matrilineal male Nottoways, William Bozeman went looking for prospects elsewhere (C1820, Northampton County, NC; C1820, Halifax County, NC). When he returned to Southampton, William Bozeman identified himself "as a descendant of the Nottoway Tribe of Aborigines," but did so in a manner that suggested matrilineal descent (LP Dec. 13, 1823, OB1819-1822:433). His son William followed south on the Carolina road. Like his father William Bozeman was a partial result of the erosion of Iroquoian matrilineal descent. His schooling and the influence of his education as well as his residential distance from his maternal Nottoway relatives, but also as an outcome of his father's matrilineal descent from his maternal Nottoway relatives.

The transformation of Billy Woodson into William Bozeman was a partial result of his educational experience. William Bozeman was considered "a young man of good general character, well in intellectual improvements and moral deportment," but also "a landowner in Southampton," North Carolina (OB1819-1822:433). His father's surname of "Bozeman" was listed in 1818 as "Wm. Bosman," witness to his father's land purchase in Southampton, North Carolina and by 1823, William Bozeman was identified by his father's surname of "Bozeman."
recognition crystallized for Bozeman early in 1823 when his father died in debt and left no provision for William in his will. A young adult with prospects of owning land and farming, Bozeman was unable to benefit from his father's estate. Micajah Bozeman had remarried and had a new family in Northampton and left his property and land to his wife, leaving the community in the hands of his legal wife and debtors. Perhaps he thought that if he could carve out a place for himself among his mother's people, he could help the community resolve their ongoing struggle with the Trustees for control over Nottoway assets.

In those efforts, Bozeman's 1823 remarks to the Virginia Legislature revealed a less conciliatory stance with the Trustees for control over Nottoway assets. William Bozeman's sisters remained at Indian Town, and he was familiar with the routines of labor and farming on the Indian land. Perhaps he thought he could carve out a place for himself among his mother's people, as discussed in Chapter III. It is conceivable that he was invited to come back to help the community resolve their 250-acre Nottoway claim. The courts held up the deed, since both the grantor and grantee died before the term was due. Thus, with Micajah Bozeman's estate claimed by his legal wife and debtors, Bozeman had to explore prospects with his Nottoway kinmen. William Bozeman's actions are good examples of political economy driving the decisions of individual Nottoway.
Bozeman argued matrilineal usufruct rules and the absence of private property

... entitled by descent, to the rights of their labors. ... (LP Dec. 13, 1823) ...
their children’s children (no matter whether their father or mother was in Indian; shall be
control over them which has descended to him from his ancestors; and their children and
children over that which has descended to him from his ancestors; and their children and
childhood.

Bozeman outlined his position:

"Your petitioner is aware that he asks what may be considered an innovation upon the
Nottoway equal shares in property and resources, regardless of matrilineal or paternal
borne...according to the condition of the mother” (Hening II:170) and thus allow all
members of the Nottoway to hold property in “fee simple, free from the control of the
trustees and all other restrictions” (LP Dec. 13, 1823). He asked the General Assembly
for the community would be to dispense with the matrilineal enforcement and allow all
people – both females and males.

Bozeman was attempting to modify both inheritance and kinship to the advantage of his
Indian population and resistance to the patrimony of the Trustees system, the educated
advocates for individual control. In rejection of matrilineal descent among a dwindling
future children’s inheritance of his accumulated property and real estate, Bozeman
was concerned about his

... entitled to inherit property rights because of his matrilineal descent, "the children of
descendants on the maternal side from an Indian of the Nottoway Tribe," also argued he

stood in the way of the Nottoway adopting "a life of sobriety, industry, order and

Bozeman opposed matrilineal usufruct rules and the absence of private property...
Within the year William C. Boseman married Rebecca Jackson, a White woman, and
After the petition's semi-success, Boseman left Virginia for Northampton County.

The General Assembly granted Boseman's request and agreed that he could
access a division of the tribal land and estate, to hold fee simple. The 1824 Boseman Act,
however, only permitted those Nottoway heirs from the remaining matrilineages to access
access a division of the tribal land and estate, to hold fee simple. The 1824 Boseman Act,
would require individuals to demonstrate three things (1) validable heirship or respect;
the Themes, upheld Nottoway matrilineal descent and usufruct, as well as supported the old colonial
accordance with Virginia law. Through the 1824 Boseman Act, the Commonwealth
applied for allotments, and descendants of a female, the Commonwealth
applying to Virginia law, the Themes, upheld Nottoway matrilineal descent and usufruct, as well as supported the old colonial
would require individuals to demonstrate three things (1) validable heirship or respect;
the Themes, upheld Nottoway matrilineal descent and usufruct, as well as supported the old colonial
Bozeman's marriage outside the Nottoway community opened new opportunities for him. His father-in-law, William Jackson, was a White middling farmer with a large family, slave holdings, and property. Jackson assisted Bozeman with small loans to start his new family (MB1824:21 and WB4:92, Northampton County, NC). In Halifax, Bozeman established a substantial farm compound. His success may have encouraged some Nottoway to relocate, with his sister, Anny [or Nancy] Bozeman, becoming a member of his household compound. Rebecca Jackson died before 1847 and Bozeman remarried another White woman, thirty years his junior. The 1850-1860 Halifax Census indicates William Bozeman continued to be identified as White and by 1840 had a four-member household, including six resident FPCs and three slaves. From analyzing census data, which became more detailed after 1850, it is likely William Bozeman's residence shifted away from his maternal lineage. Bozeman's and an individual's development from lineage lands directly impacted the Nottoway descent system. Through the influence of his Indian mother's White affine, Bozeman's residence shifted away from his matriline. Bozeman, like his father, acquired land and property as the central producer for a nuclear family, affecting a neolocal residence pattern with patricentered, bilateral descent emerging. His Halifax-co-residence land and property as the central producer for a nuclear family, affecting a neolocal residence pattern with patricentered, bilateral descent emerging. His Halifax-co-residence and an individual's development from lineage lands directly impacted the Nottoway descent system.
shift, formerly matrilineal Nottoway placed further emphasis on bilateral inheritance, patrilocal or virilocal residence and increased autonomy of the nuclear family. Anthropology’s research into the impact of residence change suggests descent shift is an eventual possible outcome, when income pooling aggregates toward males who control both mobile labor and partible property. Eventually, men who specialize as cash-crop farmers build modern farms separate from the matrilineage. Consequently, they who control both mobile labor and partible property. Eventually, men who specialize as cash-crop farmers build modern farms separate from the matrilineage. Consequently, they

Scholar and Turner ohwachira compounds.

family of seven was enumerated on Woodson lands north of the Indian Path between the
1837: DB18:297, 1839, DB17:287, LP Dec 8, 1839, DB17:79, LP Dec 8, 1819, Turner the 1820s-1840s. Jincy Woodson also
used her married name of “Taylor” (CC June 1837: DB20:301-302, 25:62: LP June 20,
DB17:97, 21:287, LP Dec 8, 1819). Jency Woodson also appeared by their matrilineal name of “Woodson”
and Jincy/Temire Woodson most often appear by their matrilineal name of “Woodson”
in Nottoway documents, siblings Anny/Anise, Billy/William, Winny/Winfred

Woodson-Taylor

218-221.

have been a descendant of Henry Taylor, a local "colored" farmer who was a generation older than James. The argument may be made that James may have been the "son" mentioned in Henry Taylor's house on an 1813 tax list and a brother to the "fn [free negro]" tithe mentioned along with three horses in 1817 (PPTL1807-1821). Born in the mid 1790s, James Taylor was also possibly related to Richard and Phillip Taylor, both heads of "Other Free" households in the 1810 and 1820 Southampton Censuses. If his father was Henry Taylor, then James Taylor understood the labor and routines of farming. Henry Taylor ran three horses for plowing, worked his land and owned equipment valued at $65. James Taylor's tenure at Indian Town was temporary. He was under the authority of his wife's matrilineage and enjoyed the use of their lands for farming. With the exception of one old male slave, James Taylor at fifty-seven years of age, lived alone (Crofts 1992:17; 1997:3-4; C1840-1850: SS1850).
of Indians, except from Negro and Mulatto laws, regardless of documented partial-African ancestry as "Mulatto." In Southampton, it was understood that matrilineal Nottoway were "tributary" to Virginians, and as "members of a dependent tribe."

The Woodson-Taylor lineage illustrates the shifts in matrilineal descent took several forms at Nottoway Town. James and Jincy Taylor's adult children led the "Nottoway and Nansemond Tribe of Indians" as headmen in the 1849-1852 court case against the tribe's Treasurer Jeremiah Cobb. Like their mother, they inherited their leadership positions and rights to the Nottoway trust and land allotments through the matriline (CO1832-1858:309; M1848-1855:46, 218, 223, 229). The Nottoway Taylor allottees identified themselves by their father's surname, but recognized themselves as matrilineal Nottoway and traced their lineage as "descendants of a female" (CC July 1850). They inherited a patronymic surname, but were recognized as possessing inherent tribal rights by James Taylor, who was listed as a "Free Colored Person" and "Mulatto," their status outside of Southampton County was ambiguous (C1840-1850).

However, because of phenotype and parentage by James Taylor, who was listed as a "free person of mixed blood" and as a "tributary Indian," the certification did not identify them as Indians or Mulattoes. It instead listed them as "residents in this county and...not Negroes." In the 1850s, the Taylor men certified themselves with the Southampton Court and received acknowledgment as "free persons of mixed blood." More than a half-dozen Nottoway also sought this certification of their legal status as "tributary Indians" and "members of a dependent tribe of Indians," exempt from Negro and Mulatto laws, regardless of documented partial-African ancestry as "Mulatto."
The Taylors' certification as Southampton "free persons of mixed blood" may have opportunities – and maybe even different spouses. case, or need or enslaved status propelled men and women toward different competition in the urban centers. Issues of socio-economic class, one's color-perceived personal connections of the rural Southside, the Taylor men may have encountered still Southampton; it was dynamic and subjective. However, outside of the family and personal property, the color-caste stratigraphy was not absolute in antebellum Richmond. As evidenced by James Taylor's real estate, slave holdings and accumulated Taylors' certification to remove from Indian Town to Petersburg and Taylor family made preparations to remove from Indian Town to Petersburg and the Taylors' certification as Southampton "free persons of mixed blood" without being identified as simply "not negro" (MB1848-1855:231).

Taylors were identified as simply "not negro" (MB1848-1855:231). Through the "satisfactory proof by a white person" the John Williams (OB18320), the "satisfactory proof by a white person" the case with previous Nottoway certifications of ancestry (e.g., John Turner and is notable because the county officials did not register them as Nottoway Indians, as had Allotments as Nottoway descendants. Their certification as "free persons of mixed blood" White-Indian mother and a Mulatto father, Robert, Benjamin, and John Taylor drew African ancestry (David Campbell Executive Papers, March 29, 1838). Thus, from a
Robert, his wife and mother were all marked "Mulatto" once settled in Petersburg, where he worked as a carpenter and lived among other laborer households (C1860 Petersburg, VA). Removal to separate urban centers undermined the old matrilocentric configuration; Robert Taylor maintained a matrilocal residence with his mother in Petersburg (C1870 King William County, VA; Rountree 1990:197, 346). Most likely, these eventually returned to Pamunkey’s Indian Town and became community leaders and descendants of some of these same individuals composed community as the Nottoway sharing jobs as boatmen, laborers, salesmen and merchants. Thus, Pamunkey reservation Indians relocated to Richmond and Petersburg. A period magazine feature referring to Pamunkey’s reservation community was a topic of general discussion. The Pamunkey’s role in the Richmond and Petersburg urban environment attracted members of both reservation communities and their Indian groups were not alone in the urban centers. A period magazine article mentioned relocated "Nottoway and Pamunkeys" in the streets of Richmond, adding, "They have built homes, they have built sections of Richmond and Petersburg, then Richmond’s industrializing cities. As hippity Indians, they were not alone in the urban centers. The sale of their allotment lands corresponded to their relocation to Richmond and Petersburg, then Virginia’s industrializing cities. As hippity Indians, they were not alone in the urban centers. The sale of their allotment lands corresponded to their relocation to Richmond and Petersburg, then Virginia’s urban centers. As hippity Indians, the Taylor’s role as headmen was motivated by their desire to head households.
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The Petersburg Woodson-Taylor males participated in Nottoway politics after their relocation. They petitioned the court for a special reservation land survey (CC Oct. 1850), speculated on allotment timber (DB28:44) and complained of Trustee mismanagement of the tribal trust (CO1832-1858: 309). Portions of the old Scholar lands were part of Jincy Taylor's 1837 allotment and were managed by her son, Robert Taylor. Therefore like Billy Scholar's widow Mason Chavis, at least one of Ned Scholar's children exchanged cash to remain engaged in agriculture on the original Scholar lands. These tracts were otherwise lost through tribal exogamy and others' matrilineal inheritance. Alexander [Scholar]-Stewart rented portions of his father's family lands from the Petersburg allotments (DB27:430, 28:357-358). The youngest of the sibling-set, John Taylor, assisted the overall community by selling his 1855 allotment to Nottoway headman Edwin D. Turner, who utilized her land to expand matrilineal lands. Though unlike headwoman Edith Turner, who utilized her money for personal advancement, Edwin Turner encouraged the relocation and cooperation of other Petersburg families in Southampton County. Thus, while the Taylors were sensitive to tribal usufruct, they were savvy about the market's economics of individualism. The Taylor family was one of the first complete Nottoway Woodson ohwachira lineages to remove to an urban center after the sale of their allotment lands. Participation in wage labor and the opportunities of the market encouraged relocation.
property ownership, as well as engendered non-contiguous lineage territory. Privately owned, marketable property also encouraged a neolocal residence configuration and undermined the traditional organizing principle of the matrilineage (Gough 1974:638-639; Jong 1951:115-119; Schrieke 1955:107-123). The Taylor example demonstrates this change in the following ways: 1) an exogamous marriage to a non-matrilineal, non-Nottoway spouse [at least the third consecutive tribally exogamous marriage in this lineage-segment] contributed to 2) the offspring's maintenance of matrilineal descent for one generation with the adoption of a patronymic surname, followed by 3) the complete removal of the sub-lineage from the tribal land base to an urban center, and finally 4) the construction of new urban households where males headed nuclear families.

The Woodson-Taylor lineage-segment provided an example of a lineage member's intermarriage with a FPC male and participation in an economic system that contributed to her descendants' relocation, shift in residence form and continued decline of matrilineal relevance. Another female Woodson sibling's exogamous marriage resulted in a different outcome. Like James Taylor, Burwell Williams was a "free colored person" living at Indian Town with a Nottoway wife. Taylor and Williams' marriage to a Nottoway woman represents a general pattern of Nottoway maritalogamy / clan exogamy, but also a strategy on the part of FPC males seeking advancement within economic and social spheres. Other female Woodson siblings' exogamous marriages contributed to the descent and participation in an economic system that

369: 1-23).

The Taylor example demonstrates this change in the following ways: 1) an exogamous marriage to a non-matrilineal, non-Nottoway spouse [at least the third consecutive tribally exogamous marriage in this lineage-segment] contributed to 2) the offspring's maintenance of matrilineal descent for one generation with the adoption of a patronymic surname, followed by 3) the complete removal of the sub-lineage from the tribal land base to an urban center, and finally 4) the construction of new urban households where males headed nuclear families. After allotment, Indian land was partible and transferable. The productive bottomlands of the productive and fertile (DB17.97-104: Cobb to Powers, Dec. 31, 1821). After First, Nottoway tribal land and was realizable and describable by farmers for its economic value. Also, a strategy on the part of FPC males seeking advancement within economic and social spheres. Other female Woodson siblings' exogamous marriages contributed to the descent and participation in an economic system that contributed to their descendants' relocation, shift in residence form and continued decline of matrilineal relevance.

The Taylor example demonstrates this change in the following ways: 1) an exogamous marriage to a non-matrilineal, non-Nottoway spouse [at least the third consecutive tribally exogamous marriage in this lineage-segment] contributed to 2) the offspring's maintenance of matrilineal descent for one generation with the adoption of a patronymic surname, followed by 3) the complete removal of the sub-lineage from the tribal land base to an urban center, and finally 4) the construction of new urban households where males headed nuclear families. After allotment, Indian land was partible and transferable. The productive bottomlands of the productive and fertile (DB17.97-104: Cobb to Powers, Dec. 31, 1821). After
own farm and become a small freeholder. During this stay at Indian Town, Taylor was able to earn enough capital to purchase his

Eventually, Taylor's union with Woodson dissolved and he removed across the river. Those parcels of Indian land, however, remained with Woodson and her siblings. Taylor utilized the Nottoway agricultural lands for nearly ten years. The control over

renters, but others as well, as a common-law husband of Jincy Woodson. James and Whiles farmed matrilineal Indian lands throughout the nineteenth century, some as

with the Nottoway matriline to use Nottoway lands over extended periods of time. FPCs

Based on a careful examination of documentary sources, several men negotiated

transferrable, and thus was under the authority of the ohowachira, owners. However, before the Allotment Period, Indian land was not partible or

the forms of contractualization offered by neighboring White midhill farm or plantation

Economic relationships with Indian Town may have operate somewhat differently than

Lam owners looking for opportunities to earn capital in a less restrictive setting.

Obtaining Indian-controlled land was an option for landless FPC

organization and Nottoway intermarriage.

and the economic enterprise of outsiders contributed to the erosion of Iroquoian social

kinship structures of the dominant society. Thus, the manipulation of Nottoway resources

weakened and diminished share, unable to hold the line versus the political, economic and

The historical circumstances of two continuities of colonization rendered the Nottoway to a

remained uncultivated, a fact recognized by outsiders (Cobb to Powers, Dec. 31, 1821),

of county, was pressed with the finest cattle and hog range. However, some Nottoway land

Nottoway River were "capable of producing any and every crop common for this section"
Thus, a second point regarding outsiders' land use at Indian Town: through strategic unions, FPC affines of Nottoway women could access agricultural lands without rental or purchase. Burwell Williams, for example, lived at Nottoway Town for nearly forty years and raised crops to support his family, but he never owned the land he worked. His residence at Nottoway was permissible because either he was the child of a Nottoway woman or married to a Nottoway matriline. Evidence suggests the latter. Matrilineal women married non-Nottoway men and their descendants inherited Nottoway usufruct rights. Nottoway men married non-Matrilineal women, and the resulting offspring did not continue to be heads of households unless they were married to females of Nottoway descent. Thus, Burwell Williams's forty-year Indian Town residence was permissible because either he was the child of a Nottoway woman or married to a female of Nottoway descent patterns 1800-1860 indicated second-generation agnate descendants did not continue to be heads of households under the authority of the matrilineages. Therefore, FPC affines of Nottoway women could access agricultural lands without rental or purchase. Thus, a second point regarding outsiders' land use at Indian Town: through strategic unions, FPC affines of Nottoway women could access agricultural lands without rental or purchase.
surnames associated with their matrilineage: "Woodson" and "Bozeman." There were a
narrow number of women who could identify as a "Woodson" and "Bozeman," however, by 1830
appear by name in the 1820, 1830 or 1840 Southampton Censuses. However, by 1830
in contrast, Winny Woodson-Bozeman remained at Indian Town, but did not

Halifax County, NC: PPTL (1807-1821).

with individuals marked as "Mulatto" (Cabell Papers July 18, 1808: C1820: C1830-1870,
remained a constant neighbor of William Bozeman and shared residence and kinship
Colored [in William Bozeman’s 1840 Halifax household, later records indicate she
census and possibly one of the forty to fifty year-old females [free White and Free
forty year-old "Nancy Bozeman...free White Person" enumerated in Halifax’s 1830
Bozeman (diminutive of Ann) removed from Indian Town and was likely the thirty to
their brother and White father’s departure from Southampton to North Carolina. "Nancy"
Ann Woodson did not appear on Nottoway documents after 1820 either near the home of
Nottoway were. Burwell Williams was counted alone at Indian Town. Winny’s sister
Neither were they enumerated in the 1820 Southampton census – no married male
a horse in 1817, but paid no tax on her or her children’s exemption as Indians.
labeled as "Winny Bozeman...an Indian Land." She owned one slave over sixteen and had
first decade of the 1800s, but had no children as of 1808. The following decade she was
Born in 1791, Winny or "Winny" Woodson was of marriageable age during the
Winny to have been the marriage partner of Burwell Williams.
also descended matrilineally. The sister of William C. Bozeman was the correct age and
narrow number of women who could identify as a "Woodson" and "Bozeman" and who
surnames associated with their matrilineage: "Woodson" and "Bozeman". There were a
matrilineal exemption as Indians (C1820-1840; PPTL 1807-1821). Nottoway individuals who requested allotments in the 1830-1840s included a sibling-set, “John Williams, Patsy Williams and Sally Williams members of the Nottoway tribe of Indians” who were “descendants of a female of the Nottoway” (CC Nov. 1840; DB25:60). Another individual, Mary Williams, applied for her allotment as “Mary Turner” with her husband, Parsons Turner. She sold her allotment as “Mary Turner’s home as ‘Mary Woodson’ and appeared in the census in Parsons Turner’s home as ‘Mary Woodson’ [Woodson]. Mary Williams applied for her allotment as ‘Mary Williams’ on documents to apply for Nottoway land allotments, each traced their lineage through matrilineal descent [Woodson]. While Woodson/Bozeman-Williams were born to Winny Woodson/Bozeman-Williams, while three of them used their paternal surname [Williams], each traced their lineage through matrilineal descent [Woodson]. Within Nottoway, Williams would draw on the matrilineal “surnames” of “Woodson,” but also on the married surnames of their grandmothers: “Turner” and “Bozeman.” A kinship diagram (Figure 47) for the lineage of Winny Woodson’s children can help visualize and organize the birth order for Burwell Williams and Winny Woodson-Bozeman’s children (DB24:146, 25:60-61; OBI18:297; 333). Based on census schedules and county records, a conjectural birth order can be made: B. Sarah/Sally Williams (C1820[1822], 1860[1825], 1880[1820]; DB24:146, 25:60-61; OBI18:297). A. John Williams (C1820[1822], 1860[1825]; DB24:146, 25:60-61; OBI18:297). C. Mary Williams (C1820[1822], 1860[1825], 1880[1820]; DB24:146, 25:60-61; OBI18:297). D. Parry Williams (C1820[1822], 1860[1825], 1880[1820]; DB24:146, 25:60-61; OBI18:297).
Figure 47. Matrilineage segment of Nottoway Winifred Woodson/Bozeman-Williams. Also depicted is the Scholar ohwachira [upper right], which became extinct through exogamy.

Marriage-partner selection shifted during the nineteenth century to include more FPCs and fewer Whites. Note the intra-Nottoway marriage of Mary Woodson-Williams and Parsons Turner. The documentary evidence suggests the following conclusions: (1) Male FPC marriages to Nottoway women, such as that of Burwell Williams and James Taylor, allowed them to establish productive farms on Indian land. (2) FPC economic productivity likely impacted Indian Town’s concepts of labor and personal property. (3) Williams’s and Taylor’s understandings of the dominant society’s kinship and social organization influenced Nottoway notions of the same. (4) Nottoway families maintained Williams’s and Taylor’s understandings of the dominant society’s kinship and social organization. (5) Williams’s and Taylor’s understandings of the dominant society’s kinship and social organization influenced Nottoway notions of the same.

The inconsistent usage indicates an erosion of the Iroquoian kinship system. However, conjoined uterine sibling sets of the ohwachira continued to act in ways consistent with Iroquoian preferences for mother.
daughter-son / sister-brother relationships, suggesting enduring social structures of Iroquoian kinship and reciprocity.
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Like clan affiliation, the exact genealogical linkages fade over time. Surely the matrilineage, but the surname’s origin was a patronymic acquisition from an affine to the Woodson surname was identified with the allotment of the reservation as the 1824 act of the General Assembly carried William O. Woodson’s name. The Southampton Court and...
The matrilineal Nottoway petitioners repeatedly referenced "the act passed...for the benefit...of William G. Bozeman" when requesting allotment lands, and thus the name carried a level of authority as securely "Nottoway." The strategic use of the Bozeman surname in the documentary record represents Nottoway agency in linking specific descent lines with matrilineal inheritance. That the surname was acquired from a male affine three or four or generations earlier mattered less than the association of the lineage with inherited Nottoway property rights. In contrast, the affine surname "Williams" was not carried forward by matrilines after the second descending generation.

An older sibling of Milly and Rebecca Woodson/Bozeman-Turner was likely Betsy Turner, born c.1825. A woman using the name "Elizabeth Turner" applied for an allotment in 1847 alongside "Rebecca Woodson" and "Edwin Turner" (CC Sept., Oct., Dec. 1847; OB20:584, 697). Indian Town headman Edwin D. Turner was married to a relative of the Woodson/Williams line, Elizabeth Turner, whose children would later successfully claim matrilineal inheritance to Nottoway land allotments (CC Oct. 1877). However, the alliance Elizabeth Turner and Betsy Turner may or may not have been the same individual. Nonetheless, Betsy Turner's descendants strongly identified with the Woodson/Williams line, suggesting the matriline Betsy Turner was affiliated with the Woodson/Williams names. In contrast, the Woodson/Bozeman-Turner sibling-set were matrilineal descendants of Winny Woodson/Bozeman-Williams through Mary Woodson-Williams [Figure 48]. As with inherited Nottoway property rights, In contrast, the affinal surname "Woodson/Bozeman-Turner" was acquired from a female line, and thus the Woodson/Bozeman-Turner surname was likely not carried forward by matrilines after the second descending generation. With inherited Nottoway property rights, the affinal surname "Woodson/Bozeman-Turner" was acquired from a female line, and thus the Woodson/Bozeman-Turner surname was likely not carried forward by matrilines after the second descending generation. The Woodson/Bozeman-Turner surname was acquired from a female line, and thus the Woodson/Bozeman-Turner surname was likely not carried forward by matrilines after the second descending generation. The Woodson/Bozeman-Turner surname was acquired from a female line, and thus the Woodson/Bozeman-Turner surname was likely not carried forward by matrilines after the second descending generation.
segments of the Woodson and Turner matrilineages were not from the same ohwachira, maintenance of social roles. Second, these marriages provide evidence that the heterogeneous ohwachira signal an end to the Iroquoian kinship system and a remaining ohwachira. Because notions about matrilineage exogamy continued to be strong at Nottoway Town, marriages made exchange between the so many Nottoway marriages beyond Indian Town marriages make exchange between the few children whose parents were both matrilineal Nottoway.

First, incest prohibitions and imbalanced age/sex ratios were the calculations for the matrilineages. Finding appropriate marriage partners at Indian Town was a complicating problem. First, as incest prohibitions and imbalanced age/sex ratios were the catalysts for so many Nottoway marriages beyond Indian Town, marriage mate exchange between the remaining ohwachira signal an end to the Iroquoian kinship system and a maintenance of social roles. Second, these marriages provide evidence that the lineage-segments of the Woodson and Turner matrilineages were not from the same ohwachira.

The unions of Parsons and Mary Turner, and Edwin and Betsy Turner, are significant in the following ways.

Because notions about matrilineage exogamy continued to be strong at Nottoway Town, Rebecca was some of the few children whose parents were both matrilineal Nottoway. Selected their father was also a matrilineal allottee, Parsons Turner. Thus, Betsy, Millie and...
formal clan structures likely collapsed quickly with the removal of the majority of Iroquoians during the eighteenth century. However, remaining kin-based reciprocal responsibilities, descent-group exogamy and differing social obligations at Nottoway Town were rooted in Iroquoian structures. Lastly, the ongoing selection of marriage partners with Whites and FPCs was also the result of exogamic principles, although when crossed with sib size, age and its distribution of the majority of Iroquoians during the eighteenth century. However, remaining kin-based reciprocal responsibilities, descent-group exogamy and differing social obligations at Nottoway Town were rooted in Iroquoian structures.

Patsy Woodson-Williams was about twenty-nine when she and her siblings requested allotment lands in 1840. Later census records indicate she lived at Indian Town her entire life and eventually married a "Mulatto" man named Thomas Crocker. Although she took her allotment with her sib-set as "Patsy Williams," she was listed as "Patsy Crocker" in county census schedules (C1850-1860). Patsy Woodson-Williams sold her allotment lands, but Thomas Crocker purchased several tracts thatformer Nottoway allotments sold her allotment lands, but Thomas Crocker purchased several tracts that were previously allotted to Nancy Turner and occupied by Mason Turner, which likely included the old Ethel Turner farm (DB30:2560).

Woodson-Williams sold her allotment lands, but Thomas Crocker purchased several tracts that were previously allotted to Nancy Turner and occupied by Mason Turner, which likely included the old Ethel Turner farm (DB30:2560). Another seventy acres was allotted to Nancy Turner and occupied by Mason Turner, which likely included the old Ethel Turner farm (DB30:2560). Patsy Woodson-Williams sold her allotment lands, but Thomas Crocker purchased several tracts that were previously allotted to Nancy Turner and occupied by Mason Turner, which likely included the old Ethel Turner farm (DB30:2560). Patsy Woodson-Williams sold her allotment lands, but Thomas Crocker purchased several tracts that were previously allotted to Nancy Turner and occupied by Mason Turner, which likely included the old Ethel Turner farm (DB30:2560).
remained settled on this property, despite recent shifts in ownership. The relationship of Crocker to the Scholar family and their Chavis and Stewart affines is unclear. Thomas Crocker was born to a FPC family that had a long relationship with the Rose Hill plantation and the adjoining Scholar lands. Crocker's sister labored at Rose Hill, alongside the Artis and Hill families, and several marriages occurred between these parallel cousins. Patsy, Caroline, and Rebecca, Crocker's sisters, filed several years earlier as "Caroline Bozeman" to request her share of the real and personal Nottoway estate. "Indiana Crocker", one of Crocker's children, later assumed ownership of the small farm (C1850-1910; Field notes 2007, 2011).

The elder daughter's allotment record stated her name as "Patsy Bozeman."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born circa</th>
<th>Allotment year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Crocker</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Crocker</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy/Martha Crocker</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children applied for allotment lands:

mid to late nineteenth century and later of the Woodson/Bozeman/Williams-Crocker field notes 2007, 2011. The "Crocker Farm" became one of the Rosé Hill Farm in Thomas families and Nottoway affines. Descendants of agnate Nottoway lived in Thomas plantation and the adjoining Scholar lands. Crocker's sister labored at Rose Hill, Crocker was born to a FPC family that had a long relationship with the Rose Hill Crocker to the Scholar family and their Chavis and Stewart affines is unclear. Thomas remained settled on this property; despite recent shifts in ownership. The relationship of
themselves by their father's surname [i.e. Indiana Crocker] and by their own married names: Patsy Stewart, Caroline Artis and Indiana Artis (C1850-1860; DB28:306). It may have been important for the children of Thomas Crocker to firmly establish their matrilineal Nottoway linkage beyond their mother, who applied for her lineage lands as “Patsy Williams.” Parallel cousins Milly and Rebecca petitioned for land under the surname “Woodson,” but unlike their Crocker-classificatory siblings, they had two Nottoway-allottee parents. “Bozeman” may have been the surest route for late-antebellum Nottoway descendants whose father was classed “Black” or “Mulatto” by the dominant society. Caroline Bozeman applied for her allotment lands near her eighteenth birthday [1848]; her siblings petitioned in 1851 [Patsy] and 1852 [Indiana]. That the 1850 census listed the siblings by different surnames reflects the strategy; petitioning Caroline was enumerated as “Bozeman,” minor Indiana as “Crocker,” and married Martha Woodson/Bozeman/Woodson/Williams-Crocker married Alexander Scholar [1849].

Patsy Woodson/Bozeman/Woodson/Williams-Crocker married Alexander Scholar. Also utilized the Bozeman surname, this strategy was deemed successful. The reference to the Reconstruction-era petitions of Patsy Stewart’s children, who Stewart (C1850; M1848-55:22-23, 229, 273, 345, 416, 421, 487, enumerated as “Bozeman,” minor Indiana as “Crocker,” and married Martha “Woodson” [1848]; her siblings petitioned in 1851 [Patsy] and 1852 [Indiana]. That the 1850 census society, “Caroline Bozeman” applied for her allotment lands near her eighteenth birthday Nottoway descendants whose father was classed “Black” or “Mulatto” by the dominant Nottoway-allottee parents, “Bozeman” may have been the surest route for late-antebellum the surname “Woodson.” But unlike their Crocker-classificatory siblings, they had two lands as “Patsy Williams.” Parallel cousins Millie and Rebecca petitioned for land under their matrilineal Nottoway lineage beyond their mother, who applied for her lineage their names: Patsy Stewart, Caroline Artis and Indiana Artis (C1850-1860; DB28:306).
example. His father married a Stewart female and subsequently, almost all of their
interracial additional observation, for which, Alexander Stewart-Scholar is a good
Then the Nottoway influenced matrilineal descent among their FPC allies is an

\textit{owachira} ancestral rights of lineage / clan affiliation.

descentants were enumerated as Indians in the 1870 Census. Ancestral descendents did not retain
descentants of the extinct Scholar owachira. Second generation agnatic descendants were generally considered FPCs by the dominant society, variously identified as Mulatto or Negroes. After the Civil War, some of these individuals, or their
descendants, were enumerated as Indians in the 1870 Census. Agnatic descendants did not retain

Figure 49. Intermarriage of a matriline from the Woodson owachira with an agnatic

1807-1820: SC/p1822.

social residence [See Chapter IV, Table 12] (C1830, 1850, PPL/1782-1792, 1792-1806,
found repeatedly in the extant documents showing close proximity to Indian Town, if not
century, the names Arts, Brown, Byrd, Crocker, Gardner, Joyner, Piers and Smith are
and agnatically-descended females with non-Nottoway males. Throughout the nineteenth-
particularily of Nottoway males with females from outside the Nottoway matrilineages,
later census schedules as Indians is not surprising given the cycles of intermarriage,
Children carried the Stewart surname. The same pattern is present with the [Scholar]-Chavis lineage. Alex Stewart occasionally identified by his father's moniker of "Schola," but his children utilized the Bozeman surname through their matriline to apply for Nottoway land allotments. Patsy Woodson/Bozeman/Williams-Crocker and Alexander [Scholar]-Stewart family's situational use of surnames indicate strategic choices as much as it represents the collapse of the Iroquoian matrilineal system. The ohwachira influence on affinal matrilineal descent appears to only have lasted until about the time of the Civil War, a time in which most matrilineal tendencies began to shift toward complete bilateral reckoning. The later nineteenth-century generations started to conform to this patricentric pattern, coinciding with the further breakup of the reservation's matrilineal lands,

The [Scholar]-Williams family's situational use of surnames indicates strategic choices as much as in representations of the collapse of the Iroquoian matrilineal system. The ohwachira influence on affinal matrilineal descent appears to only have lasted until about the time of the Civil War, a time in which most matrilineal tendencies began to shift toward complete bilateral reckoning. The later nineteenth-century generations started to conform to this patricentric pattern, coinciding with the further breakup of the reservation's matrilineal lands.

Children carried the Stewart surname. The same pattern is present with the [Scholar]-Williams-Crocker and Alexander [Scholar]-Stewart family's situational use of surnames indicate strategic choices as much as it represents the collapse of the Iroquoian matrilineal system. The ohwachira influence on affinal matrilineal descent appears to only have lasted until about the time of the Civil War, a time in which most matrilineal tendencies began to shift toward complete bilateral reckoning. The later nineteenth-century generations started to conform to this patricentric pattern, coinciding with the further breakup of the reservation's matrilineal lands.
This deed made this 21st day of August 1883 between George Minick of the first part and Wm. H. Parker, Trustee of the second part, all of the County of Southampton & State of Virginia. Witnesseth: That for the consideration of one dollar, the party of the first part doth grant and convey with general warranty one gray mare to him the said Trustee, party of the second part, as security on a bond of the said George Minick. And should the said George Minick fail to pay the amount mentioned above, the said Trustee shall proceed to sell the above described mare after giving legal notice of each sale, to the said yeald sum of one hundred dollars, by the 25th day of November, 1883, in the County Court of the said County of Southampton. And should the said George Minick fail to pay the said bond, the said mare shall be sold at public auction and the proceeds of the sale shall be applied to the payment of the above sum, as also the costs of the sale.

Witness the following signatures and seals:

George Minick
Wm. H. Parker, Trustee

and express of this deed and cost of sale, above described mare and apply the proceeds of sale to the payment of the bond of the said George Minick, and should the said George Minick fail to pay the above bond, the mare shall be sold at public auction after giving legal notice of each sale, to the said yeald sum of one hundred dollars, by the 25th day of November, 1883, in the County Court of the said County of Southampton. And should the said George Minick fail to pay the said bond, the said mare shall be sold at public auction and the proceeds of the sale shall be applied to the payment of the above sum, as also the costs of the sale.

Deed Book 37:190

A Sample of Post-Reservation Era Nottoway Male, Affine, and Collateral Relations

APPENDIX C
men and the nature of Indian Town kinship and collateral relations at the beginning of the
Post Reservation Era:

1) John K. Britt - listed as a literate Mulatto carpenter and farmer on late nineteenth-
century census schedules, Britt was an affine of allottee Mariah Turner. After her death,
Britt married her sister, allottee Caroline Rebecca Turner and later, Georgetta Brown
(C1880, 1900-1910; C1870 Hampton, VA). Britt was active in the management of his
wives' Nottoway allotments, coordinating timber sales and milling from their allotment
lands. Britt also acted as an executor to his sister-in-law, allottee Frances Harrison
(DB41:222-225).

2) James Robert Crocker - formerly Robert Chavis, a [S cholar]-Chavis descendant and
lifelong Indian Town resident. Crocker was a descendant of Billy Scholar, but was raised
by Thomas Crocker and allottee Patsy Woodson-Williams. Thereafter, he adopted the
Crocker surname. Crocker maintained a small farm adjacent to Belle Hill. His descendents
were recalled by allottee descendants of John Crocker, who was a White
descendent of a Mulatto Woodson and an Indian Turner. Crocker was known to be a stern
man, who worked for

3) William Artis - matrilineal Nottoway; formerly William Crocker, his mother was allottee
Indiana Bozeman/Crocker-Artis. The Artis sub-lineage eventually moved to Sussex
County and urban centers. William Artis's children, Kenneth and Willie Artis, worked together
in the tobacco factories of Petersburg (C1860, 1880; C1900 Sussex County, VA; C1910 Petersburg, VA).

4) James Thompson Claud - affine of matrilineal Nottoway Susanna Turner, who was a
daughter of allottee William Turner. Claud's father was a White
man, Dr. E.C. Barrett; his enslaved mother was Sarah Claud-Hill. Claud was described as a
short [man] with a mustache, coal black hair and rosy light skin.

1920's; Field notes 2011).
...
portion of what it meant" to be "like people." Therefore, along with erosion of the matrifocal community, the property and labor agreement above also reflects a shift in notions of peoplehood (Field notes 2006, 2007, 2011). Figure 50 illustrates some of the Post-Reservation Era kinship connections, marriage arrangements and collateral relations of the Nottoway allottees and their descendants.
Abbreviations

AG  Agricultural Schedule [U.S. Federal]
C  Census [U.S. Federal]
CC  Chancery Cause [County]
CO  Chancery Order Book [County]
DB  Deed Book [County]
DC  Draft Card [U.S. Federal]
LP  Legislative Petitions [State]
M  Court Minute Book [County]
MB  Marriage Book [County]
OB  Order Book [County]
OBIB  Order Book (Inst. of Free Negro) [LVA]
PMB  Procession Map Book [County]
RFN  Register of Free Negroes [LVA]
SCLP  Southampton County Loose Papers [LVA]
TRDB  Trust Deed Book [County]
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