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ABSTRACT

The morphology of the Upland South peasant farm as it is found in St. Helena Parish, Louisiana, is determined by a variety of physical, historical, and cultural factors, all of which interrelate in a dynamic system, the family farm. Since initial occupancy after 1800, this settlement unit has consistently altered the landscape by methods originating mainly in Atlantic Europe and among American Atlantic seaboard Indians. By and large these folk practices are not derived from the environment, though variation in nature is important since it accounts for many of the differences within one culture area. Deviations from a cultural model across the habitat occupied by one culture emphasize both cultural and physical factors.

Blame for the present low economic status of St. Helena peasant farms cannot be held against the Upland farming system, but against the condition of the regional economy. The Upland farm makes adequate use of its habitat and, in the same way it has adjusted to the past, it continues to adapt to changing regional economic conditions. However, these adaptations have been—and will continue to be—within the framework of culturally given conceptions of suitable time-space arrangements. These time-space conceptions find expression in the peasant farm, a basic unit in the landscape.
which receives explanatory description from the point of view of a unified physical-historical-cultural geography.
INTRODUCTION

There has been developing in recent years a series of what might be termed plain-folks studies. This trend has been manifest variously in many disciplines touching upon man. In Southern historiography there has been the revisionist movement which has called for new conceptions of the Old South which would give greater importance to a broad group of yeoman farmers (peasants) believed to stand between planters on the one hand and poor whites and slaves on the other (Weaver, 1945; Moore, 1948; Heidelberg, 1950; Owsley, 1949; Dick, 1948; Sydnor, 1948). There has been quite a bit of dissatisfaction with the previous focusing of attention on the grand, but limited, on the startling, but uncommon, such as the works of Paxon (1924), Dumond (1939), Beard and Beard (1944), and Phillips (1929). Instead, it has been realized that life is largely made up of rather prosaic, run-of-the-mill events and people.

In cultural geography there has been for at least three decades a growing interest in these plain-folks traditions. Concern with such earthy matters has been left to a group of specialists loosely grouped under the name of cultural geography. These scholars have concerned themselves with such matters as field patterns, house types, fence
types, origins of agricultural regions, place names, ceme-
teries, and the like. Some of these individuals are classed
as cultural geographers because they deal with cultural
items. Others are called so because they employ the concept
of culture as an explanatory tool.¹ Still a third group of
geographers makes no effort to limit its studies to cultural
items nor to the application of the concept of culture.
Instead, this group focuses attention upon the cultural land-
scape, upon the surface of the earth as modified by man
through the agency of culture.² This latter approach is
based upon a balance among what may be thought of as four
fundamental factors of the cultural landscape.

Except for the insistence here on the addition of a
fourth factor, fortuitous events, the basic outline for the
advancement of cultural geography has been stated by Kniffen
(1954, pp. 222-23) who with compelling logic subdivided the
data with which cultural geographers must deal as follows:

Three factors produce the data with which cultural
geography is concerned: man the animal; the physical
earth; and culture. For the cultural geographer man
is largely a constant factor in both time and space;
the physical earth is relatively constant in time, but
variable in space; culture is a variable in both time
and space. Culture is then the great variable factor
that may reflect earth qualities and that effects the
pattern of earth occupance.

Careful attention to correct categorization of data following
Kniffen's scheme will prevent many of the confusions intro-
duced by those who follow overly-environmentalist or overly-

¹ Digressive notes are found at the end of each chapter.
rationalistic interpretations. Care with the "evolving technical competence and a changing code of values, both of which contribute to man's behavior patterns" will help to clarify thinking about the landscape we actually observe, the one in fact in which we live.

The only modification of Kniffen's scheme which seems necessary arises perhaps from the narrower view taken in the present study. From such a restricted and provincial position as St. Helena Parish, Louisiana, the fortuitous event, as a fourth factor, seems necessary. The fortuitous factor is suggested as an aid to clarification of thinking; events which have their origins and force in other areas or systems than that under examination must be kept apart. Fortuitous events may be confused with elements of the three factors outlined by Kniffen unless special care is taken. In the following chapters, a number of events will be seen to be fortuitous—that is, they did not stem from principles or forces inherent in the area or system under study.

The traditional format which discusses physical background or historical background as something separate from cultural geography will not be followed here. This essay is designed to be the geography of the peasant farm of the Upland South, especially as it is manifest in St. Helena Parish, Louisiana, and as such will describe the farm ideally and actually as well as physically, historically, and culturally. It is hoped that the peasant farm can receive here an explanatory-descriptive treatment as a cultural-physical
form with a history of satisfying biologically and culturally determined needs and desires in terms of specific sites of activity which have been modified in a characteristic manner. In addition, it is felt that, if attention is directed at the actual site where cultural forces bring man into contact with the land (in this case the peasant farm), the essential unity of geography will be clear.

The term "peasant" will be used in spite of certain unfortunate overtones. Because of these unnecessary connotations, the term must be defined. Its etymology is innocent enough, stemming as it does from French pays meaning "land" or "country." In simplest usage today it can be taken as denoting "a rustic; a country man; especially a tiller of the soil."

But a geographer is interested in peasantry for more definite reasons than their pursuit of the plow. Evans (1956, p. 237) sees in the peasant system of Celtic Europe "a measure of the intimate associations between early man and his immediate surroundings." Vidal de la Blache (1926, p. 139), in speaking of peasants of the Mediterranean shore, writes:

Whatever the changes brought about by modern life with its industries, cities and cosmopolitan visitors, their modes of life still persist, not as survivals, but as expressions of a natural harmony.

Thus, one aspect of peasantry that interests geographers is the persisting, intimate adjustments of man and nature through culture. Redfield (1960, p. 19) defines peasantry in part as follows:
The land and he are parts of one thing, one old-established body of relationships . . . a peasant community may be composed in part, or perhaps altogether, of tenants or even squatters on the land, if they have such control of the land as to allow them to carry on a common and traditional way of life into which their agriculture intimately enters, but not as a business for profit.

Again, a "common and traditional way of life" (culture) bonds man and land.

Another aspect of culture which is relevant is almost always implicit in any usage of the term "peasant." This aspect is economic; the peasant is an agricultural person, usually a tiller of the soil. Carl O. Sauer (1941, p. 358) directs our attention to the cultural landscape as "the geographic version of the economy of the group, as providing itself with food, shelter, furnishings, tools, and transport." He also noted (1941, p. 360) that it is a "growth in a particular 'soil' or home, an historical and geographical expression." Hence, geographic interest in the peasant farm lies in the fact that it is the earthy expression of a special solution to making a living in a particular place and with the particular technological competence and value system which the fortunes of cultural evolution and fortuitous events have provided. Interest is also generated by the fact that each peasant culture alters the landscape toward its own culturally-given conception of a suitable habitation for man and in the fact that, owing to its relatively low technological competence and its persistence through many years, the peasant system is a sensitive indicator of important earth qualities.
The term "peasant" as employed here denotes a person who follows a tradition-directed life in primary economic exploitation of the soil, whose traditions are derived from such ancient sources, and whose tools, techniques, values, and the like, concerning his life and relations with the land are so interrelated as to make him seem to be a creature of the soil. The peasant's culture has, however, been the important factor in making the man-land relationship seem natural and fitting.

The peasant area of St. Helena Parish provides a challenging test area for the objectives here expressed. A peculiar train of events has marked its history from the initial occupance of an empty land from 1800 to 1819 through its development as a special subculture area of Louisiana and of the Upland South and to its present status as a refuge, or relict, area. These historical episodes have remained unchronicled in spite of the great interest they hold for many persons. St. Helena has had no articulate historian, as many of the counties of the United States have had. Family histories and farm or plantation diaries are nearly non-existent. However, perhaps the most interesting and lasting history possible is inscribed across the face of the land itself in the gnarled trees that mark old fences and the steep sides of sunken roads, in abandoned railroad grades, in the seemingly disordered arrangement of farms, and in many other such landscape expressions. These tangible relics of the past stand among--often as functioning--equals--artifacts
of modern Commercial Culture which has entered the area by fitful steps. The same farmer who regularly hunts meat for his table may just as well take fresh-frozen pork or beef from his own freezer or refrigerator. He will just as well break land with a tractor, but cultivate the crop with a mule; use good commercial fertilizer, but refuse to employ insecticides. In short, while many of the aspects of American Commercial Culture have come and gone, the peasant of St. Helena Parish has remained, picking first one and then another trait to add to his special lifeway which still has many traits in common with its Upland South and, even Atlantic European, antecedents.

The objectives of this essay are to report the findings of nearly 10,000 miles of field traverse and more than 20 hours of airplane traverses conducted from the spring of 1965 through the spring of 1967, to integrate the findings of these traverses with some of the relevant scholarship, and to offer a different viewpoint for the study of an old subject. The approach will be explanatory-descriptive and will move from the general to the specific as the peasant farm is broken down into its parts and subsequently restored to a functioning whole.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1 For example, see Wagner and Mikesell (1962, p. 1): "In this tradition, cultural geography is the application of the idea of culture to geographic problems."

2 In American geography the concept (but not the term) of cultural landscape originated with Carl O. Sauer (1925) and was restated by him in 1941 as "the geographic version of the economy of the group" and among the items that he listed as most suitable for the cultural geographer's attention were food, shelter, furnishings, tools, and transport as expressed in fields, pastures, woods, mines, roads, homes, workshops, and storehouses. Earlier, Sauer (1931, pp. 621-23) had declared: "Cultural geography is concerned with those works of man that are inscribed on the earth's surface and give to it characteristic expression. . . . The facts of the culture are to be explained by whatever causes have contributed thereto, and no form of causation has preference over any other." For a similar call to focus on the cultural, or cultural-physical, landscape, see Evans (1964).

3 Wagner (1960, p. vii) also calls attention to the cultural landscape: "man [is] the inhabitant and beneficiary of artificial environments, created by human effort and mediating between nature and the human individual."

4 Stated differently (C. O. Sauer, 1931, p. 623), this notion reads: "the culture area is essentially economic [hence the peasant farm, an economic type] and its structure is determined by historic growth as well as by the resources of the physical area."

5 The notion that the term peasant implies a dreary life ruled by the rugged hag, Poverty, began early in America. The American Farmer which actually glorified rural life illustrates these connotations in the first number (Anonymous, 1821) in a poem called "The Peasant and His Wife":

   He: The long, long day again has pass'd
       In sorrow and distress:
   I strive my best—but strive in vain,
   I labor hard—but still remain
       Poor and in wretchedness.

6 The value of cultural geography in indicating earth qualities seems to be implicit in Wagner and Mikesell's
(1962, p. 10) listing of the ends of cultural geography: systematic description, regional classification, geographic transformations by man [culture?], and elucidation of culture itself. Nevertheless, it seems worthwhile to draw attention to the surface of the earth as the focus of geography by making earth qualities the explicit aim of cultural geography.

7Weiss (1962, p. 71) argued that "Man creates the spiritual bond between natural conditions and objective cultural items, so that the cultural landscape with his stamp upon it can be seen. . . ." However, there seems to be some confusion concerning the controlling force. Weiss would have been more accurate to have said that culture creates the spiritual bond between natural conditions and man, otherwise we would have as many "cultural landscapes" as we have men. On the contrary, the individual peasant builds his bit of landscape only in terms of three great, powerful, and compelling "traditions": physical nature, history, and culture.

8Evans (1956, p. 220) has defined and discussed the term "peasant" from the standpoint of the cultural geographer and that position is the one taken here: "For our purposes I take the peasant to be the self-employed farmer (as distinct from the non-operating landowner) who is largely dependent on the labor of his family; and we may expect the contribution of this labor to be more important than the contribution of capital." Pfeifer adds a worthwhile distinction (1956, p. 242): "To be a peasant is to have a definite estate, in the historical sense of the word. . . . One does not choose to be a peasant. One is born into peasantry."

9"It is this attachment to the land that gives a peasantry its strength and continuity— an attachment deepened by the devotion of daily work and seasonal festival and by the traditional use of home-grown foods and of local materials for tools, crafts, clothing, and housing." (Evans, 1956, p. 221.)
CHAPTER I

OVER-ALL FARMSCAPE OF ST. HELENA PARISH

In spite of its seemingly stagnant and relict nature, St. Helena Parish is a changing, dynamic place. This fact must be asserted in the face of widespread belief that it is backward, derelict, and unchanging. All factors taken into consideration, the peasant folk have in fact made an adequate use of their land.\(^1\) Such a contention is pointed to by various writers. For example, Vidal de la Blache stated that "these modes of life still persist, not as survivals, but as expressions of a natural harmony" (1929, p. 139). In writing of a culture similar to that of St. Helena Parish, Geddes declares that a peasant lifeway is "characterized still more by the dynamic strength of its continuity" than by static survival (1955, p. 7). And still further, Warringer (1939, p. 17) has shown rather clearly that "the evolution of peasant ownership in Europe should be regarded as a sign of positive political achievement, not as a survival of an outworn mode of life." Evans (1956, p. 223) is even more insistent:

Yet there is general agreement that the rural tradition is an indispensable element in society, a source of vitality and continuity, conserving social values which urbanism tends to destroy. The problem is to preserve these values while increasing the efficiency of farming and the standards of rural living.\(^2\)
We will find in St. Helena Parish that the peasantry has not only continued to adopt and evolve new techniques and tools, but has even produced a variety of solutions to the problem of following a life based upon the land within the context of a greater Commercial Culture.

There have been four basic peasant lifeways, or agricultural types, produced in St. Helena Parish. These four forms include: (1) the general farm, the least specialized and most ancient of the four; (2) the stock farm, the earliest specialization of agriculture; (3) the plantation, the most fortunate peasant farm especially in terms of its site; and (4) the dairy farm, a relatively highly capitalized response to urban development and to the evolution of transportation. We must hasten to note that there are several varieties of forms going under the terms general farm, stock farm (ranch), dairy, and plantation; but the species with which we are concerned here is that of the Upland South. No basic discontinuity separates the varieties of Upland South peasant farm; they vary in size, success, pretentiousness, modernness, and product emphasis, but each variety shows great affinity for the central, ancestral form. In general layout, shapes of fields, arrangement of buildings, types of buildings, general aspect, and so on, these varieties of the Upland South species share more traits among themselves than they do with similar agricultural types of different species. We must be wary of seemingly similar forms which have in fact different histories; dairies are found surrounding or near
urban developments, but not all dairies are Upland dairies. The fact that a dairy or stock farm or plantation evolved from an Upland South general farm is given more weight here than the economic universals (important though they may be) which promote various agricultural types.  

The Upland Plantation.--Of the four varieties of Upland South farm only three remain today, the plantation having disappeared, if indeed it ever existed in important numbers within the confines of present-day St. Helena Parish. True enough, the term "plantation" is used to refer to one's ancestors' farm and the term "big house" for their home. Nevertheless, we might hesitate to accept such beliefs without careful consideration.

After an examination of the form, content, and practices of Upland plantations and comparison of these with Upland farms, one conclusion alone remains: an Upland plantation is an exceptionally successful peasant general farm (Owsley, 1949, p. 133). Dick's (1948, pp. 84-85) descriptions of efforts toward self-sufficiency on plantations show that these had grown from family—or two-family—farms. What determined the success of any particular peasant farm which was elevated to the status of a plantation must be discovered in each place where such occurred. Some peasant farms became plantations because of the providence of the family operating them; others because of favorable locations in terms of natural fertility and transportation. That a planter of
Upland origins elsewhere brought capital (cash, slaves, equipment, sons) with him did not alter the fact that he was a very successful peasant, a point widely ignored by those who class all plantations under one rubric. We must conclude that the increase in poor (impecunious or improvident) farms to the east of the Mississippi, especially in St. Helena Parish, can be credited to a decrease in natural fertility of the soil (Hilgard, 1884, p. 165) and to the decreasing ease of reaching markets (Weaver, 1945, p. 45).

A comparison of the idealized peasant farm (see Chapter II) with Upland plantations (such as Rosedown, West Feliciana Parish; Plate II, Fig. F) will show that the latter is genetically related to the former (Kniffen, 1965, p. 574). In basic house plan, in kind and arrangement of outbuildings and fields, in the occurrence of notched-log construction, and so forth, the Upland plantation points to its ancestry (often but one generation removed) in the general peasant farm. They both even share a tendency to ape Lowland or other prestigious cultures as affluence increases. This continuity in Upland farms is borne out in crops, general layout, cycles of work, tools, and many other aspects, but nowhere better than in house types. Field traverses from the Mississippi to the Tangipahoa River (some of the results of which are shown in Plates I and II) revealed that on each successive interfluve the size, elegance, and variety of what is called a "big house" decreases and that, in spite of this decrease, the big house is almost invariably one of the
dogtrot types in the Pen Tradition (Fig. 10). There is, then, an economic gradient sloping from the Mississippi to a low in St. Helena Parish caused by decreasing fertility and decreasing ease of transport and represented materially by the disappearance of the plantation and the elegant big house. Perhaps the only distinction in kind between Upland plantations and farms is the dominance of the profit motive on the former.

As geographers we will learn more about earth qualities if we consider Upland Culture to be a constant (the peasant-planter continuum) over this small area and focus attention on local factors producing exceptional successes in the Upland farms that came to be known as plantations.

The Stock Farm.--Of the three farm types remaining in St. Helena in 1967, the most expansive is the stock farm. In response to such factors as the government soil-bank program, transportation facilities, inflow of non-agricultural income, and certain legal sanctions as well as an inherent emphasis on stock raising in Upland Culture, the stock farm is the most widespread of the types. An examination of Figure 2 will show that there are generally two groups of stock farms: one group along the Tickfaw River representing quite frequently farms which have changed from dairying in the face of rising capitalization of dairy farming, and a second group along the Amite and on the uplands in range 4 east being mainly general farms and small plantations which
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responded to loss of labor, non-agricultural employment, special government programs, and other factors by emphasizing cattle raising. In both cases, the improved lands (the actual areas that are indicated on Figure 2) are strung along all-weather routes (compare Figs. 2 and 4).

There is no clear-cut break between the stock variety and general variety of Upland peasant farms (Plate XIV, Figs. b, d, f). Indeed, there has been from the most remotely traceable periods an emphasis on livestock among these people and their cultural ancestors (Evans, 1966, pp. 72-73; Arensberg, 1955, pp. 1143-62; Dunaway, 1944, p. v; Trewartha, 1946, pp. 568-96; C. O. Sauer, 1962, pp. 3-7). It may even prove profitable to trace what seems to be a more-or-less unbroken stockman tradition through Halstatt, La Tène, Atlantic Europe, Scotch-Irish, and Upland South. Such an extended evolution is already indicated by the existing literature (Evans, 1964 and 1966; Powell, 1958; Heslinga, 1962; and O'Donovan, 1940). While these most ancient connections are still largely speculative and demand much more investigation, we can rest assured that the peasant stockman tradition of St. Helena Parish finds fitting bases in the general peasant farm of the Upland South (Wailes, 1854, p. 131; Weaver, 1945, pp. 20-21, 42, 45-46; Arensberg, 1955, p. 1156). It is fairly certain that the largest part of the population settling the old Natchez and Feliciana districts of West Florida (of which St. Helena Parish was a part; see Fig. 1) included a "majority of . . . simple hill people,
small-scale agriculturalists [and] that there were North Carolina Regulators [i.e.: Scotch-Irish] among them" (Heidelberg, 1940, p. 16). Heidelberg also declares that the Piney Woods (southeast Mississippi and eastern Louisiana) had a cattle-raising and hunting frontier with some cultivation (1940, p. 44). Similar findings have been voiced by those who have cared to examine the local histories, records, and relics of the areas adjoining or near St. Helena Parish (Dick, 1948, pp. 28, 79; Moore, 1958, pp. 62, 64-65; Weaver, 1945, 20-21, 26, 42, 45, 58-60; Wailes, 1854, p. 131). Furthermore, the earliest census which reported livestock (1840), and probations of estates since the earliest organization of the parish, show a heavy emphasis on stock (cattle, hogs, and sheep; Appendices I and II). Some of the oldest documents in St. Helena Parish relate to cattle and cattle drives (1803 contract in succession of Thomas J. Davidson, File D-3, and 1804 reference to "cowpen" in succession of John F. Dickey, File D-4, Succession Records, St. Helena Parish).

In today's distribution of livestock farms as shown in Figure 2, the stockman is intermingled among farmers and dairymen. Any given farm operator is sensitive to market and other factors affecting production and consumption and he rather quickly responds to fluctuations. Most important at times, he responds according to how he feels external factors will be likely to endanger his freehold tenure. An example of such responses to conditions is to be seen in the racial
aspects of St. Helena's peasant farmscape. While both whites and Negroes are general farmers and stockmen, only whites (with one exception) are dairymen. Most "mule farmers" are Negro today and this has led to thinking of many of these peasant traits as "Negro traits." However, there is no evidence for a Negro culture in St. Helena Parish. On the contrary, the Negroes who were brought to St. Helena Parish had no culture of their own. As better informed Negroes of the area have put it: Negroes learned farming while they were slaves and carry on the same culture as the descendants of their former masters insofar as their political and social status permits. In short, their culture is that of the whites. Even today, we cannot separate Negro farms from white without seeing the farmer. True enough, because of their political and social disadvantages, Negroes are often the occupants of the poorer farms, but they are also owners of quite attractive farms with new, modern homes. Similarly, a number of improvident or impecunious whites live on the poorest and most run-down farms. Between these is a broad overlap.

Because of the reluctance of Negroes to become indebted and because of the ineffectiveness of white agricultural agents among Negroes, dairying did not become widespread among Negroes. Government programs which sought to improve farms by means of loans seemed to hold the chance of losing the farm through foreclosure. So, rather than make elaborate investments in dairying which is very competitive, or in
extensive agriculture for which there was little or no
marketing system, many farmers (Negroes among them) chose to
expand their stock raising. Such a decision was consistent
with the stockman traditions in Upland Culture and, what is
more, it obviated the need for extensive cash outlays.

The Dairy Farm.--Like the stock farm, the dairy farm
(Plate XIV, Figs. a, c, e) tends to have a clustered dis-
tribution; of necessity, the dairy must be readily accessible
to the milk-collecting trucks ferrying between the farm and
the creamery. Hence dairying is focused along Louisiana
Highway 43 running north and south through Greensburg, and
along U. S. Highway 51 and the Illinois Central Railway in
Tangipahoa Parish, all leading to New Orleans. Because of
the demands of transport and the sanctions of the sanitation
laws, those dairymen whose farms are situated most favorably
and who, because of past successes, are able to meet the
increasing capitalization demands are continuing as dairymen;
those who cannot profitably face this tightening competition
turn to stock raising or some non-agricultural occupation.

Large numbers of milch cows were noted in all census
reports since the first to enumerate such in 1840 (Appendix
I). Similarly, butter was for long one of the principal
agricultural productions of St. Helena Parish. Thousands of
pounds were produced annually, but no production of cheese
was noted. Antecedents similar to those of the stock farm
are to be noted for Atlantic Europe (Evans, 1966, p. 73;
Powell, 1958, p. 102). The succession of Lucretia McKnight who died in 1888 can serve as an example of pre-commercial emphasis on dairying. Her land—230 acres of Joiners Creek—was situated far from urban markets, and hence Mrs. McKnight was not serving a fresh-milk market. But the estate included five named milch cows, a heifer, and two calves (see Appendix II). This and many other such records indicate an early, widespread practice of the dairyman's arts among general farm peasants (see also Evans, 1966; Baker, 1927, p. 78).

The General Farm.—Taken as whole, then, St. Helena Parish has the general aspect of a pine woodland inhabited in places by cattle and their masters. Woods predominate in any landscape; even pastures and fields are bordered by wooded strips. Many woodland tracts have been thinned by fire, cutting, or both to permit grazing of cattle among the trees (Plate XV). Taking all classes of stock together, there have always been since the first settlement many more head of livestock than people, so that a landscape of sand hills, pine trees, and livestock has met the observer since 1800. But in addition to these, there has also been at all periods a patched quilt of scattered, irregular fields—generally island clearings—usually draped rather casually over hillsides. Figure 5 shows the extent to which this pattern of scattered irregular fields was set during the period of initial occupance. The metes-and-bounds system
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of surveying that was used still marks the landscape in the alignment of fences and roads (comparison with Figure 4 will show that, to a large extent, the present route system connects points in these original private claims) and the size and positioning of the isolated fields (noted by surveyors because they straddled property lines) gave an indication of the field system used in that period. Comparison of Figures 2 and 5 shows that to a large extent the same areas are valued today as in 1819. Many of these island clearings are fixed today as permanent, improved pastures for beef or dairy herds, but they still maintain their rambling, quadrilateral forms and still remain loosely clustered about the farmstead (Plate XIV, Fig. f). Included among these island clearings, however, are general, or unspecialized, peasant farms. These are scattered primarily over the hill lands in a northwest-southeast distribution, the discontinuous nature of which suggests a relict and retracting range. These scattered islands of general farming in the Upland South tradition represent a once more widespread solution to making a living and the basic form from which the Upland plantation, stock farm, and dairy evolved. If our attention is focused upon these general farms we will be able to visualize a model, chart the working of the model, and describe the effects of the model on the landscape. We may also gain some insight into the "dynamic strength of its continuity" the longevity of which must in turn reveal important earth qualities and cultural attributes, both of
which will give us better understanding of man's occupancy of, and mutual adaptation with, the surface of the earth through culture.
1Cries against the peasant system by those who are actually agents of Commercial Culture (agricultural experts, social workers, reformers, and so forth) need not concern us. As Lanier (1962, p. 123) observes, "It requires little sagacity to discover that progress usually turns out to mean business." In any case, what constitutes progress has varied widely from time to time and from expert to expert, so that the agnostic attitude seems to be the only sensible one; we need not be deflected by the super slogan, "progress." Rather than harp on such themes as conservatism of rural people, backwardness of the South, discrimination, and such, a more profitable position would be to note with Warringer (1939, pp. 5, 7, 12, 23) "Where industry does not develop, and there is no rural exodus, the condition of the farm population is far worse than it is in an industrial economy. . . . The economic level of the farm population is dependent on the economic level of the country as a whole. . . . Under ordinary circumstances the prospects of profits in farming are too low, and land values too high, to make large-scale investment profitable. . . . In general, therefore, it is the degree of industrialization, coupled with political emancipation, which determines the level of the peasantry. In an industrial society the farmer has the advantage of proximity to an urban market." Hence we cannot lay the present low standard of living to the account of the Upland farm system, but to the fact that the requisite concomitant of an expanding industrial economy is just getting under way in the region of southeast Louisiana.

2Pfeifer (1956, p. 242) voiced a similar belief: "It is our task to save what has been best in historic peasantry, lest we lose a fundamental basis of our society as it has grown through time." But, in spite of our personal biases which may favor certain rural values, "our task" as geographers is to determine what exactly a peasant farm does to the surface of the earth. Once this is determined, if we choose to advocate a particular policy, that is another matter.

3On this point Wagner and Mikesell (1956, p. 13) note that "Even the vast issues of economic development concern the cultural landscapes. . . . A study of economic development that disregards the relation of culture to landscape is losing something vital. . . . The evolution of a landscape
is a gradual and cumulative process—it has a history."
Examples of studies that lose the important distinctions between similar type with differing histories are Dick's (1948, pp. 84-85), Weaver's (1945), Prunty's (1952); and Baker's (1948) confusion of Upland and Lowland plantations; they failed to note the distinctions between these two Southern culture streams and treated—at least in part—all plantations as one class of phenomena.

4Weaver's (1945, p. 42) analysis of census and related data shows that "In the Pine Barrens the big planter was practically non-existent. . . ." A similar contention must be made in the case of St. Helena Parish; the largest slaveholding noted so far was 56 slaves (Succession of Col. Abner Womack, File W-4, Succession Records, St. Helena Parish). Such a number of slaves is barely within the standard measure of a large planter which is 50 slaves; and, at that, this estate was broken up at the death of Col. Womack, ending its classification as a large plantation.

5The following list of traits shared by planters and yeoman (peasant) farmers was abstracted from Moore (1958, pp. 64-65):

1. cultivation of as much cotton as possible
2. attempt to supply labor and stock with corn and sweet potatoes
3. system of clean-cultured rows
4. plows and hoes as main tools of tillage
5. methods and cycle of cultivation
6. erosion and exhaustion of the soil
7. livestock: horses, mules, cattle, hogs, and sheep
8. cultivation of about 20 acres of corn and/or cotton per hand
9. lack of diversification

For differences he gave the following:
1. size of operation
2. labor-control methods
3. use of free white labor on yeoman farms

While we would certainly argue with some of the details, Moore has pointed out some of the many common traits. Gray (1933, pp. 473-92) discusses the planter and yeoman, but note particularly his effort, engendered no doubt by Turnerian biases, to find distinctions. Nevertheless, tabulation of the products and practices of the planter—as described by Gray—will compare very closely with such a list for yeomen. As Gray himself admits (p. 438) such distinctions as he found were only "broadly accurate." His classification of "poor whites" exhibits much hedging, and we are led to believe that he is describing improvident persons of white descent rather than a distinct group. Further, he admits (p. 488) that the yeoman "class" merges into both the poor white and planter classes. From a slightly different tack, Weaver (1945, p. 46) rightly overthrows the arguments of
Dumond (1939) and Beard and Beard (1944, p. 299) that "since colonial times small farmers had been pressed back into the uplands by the apparently relentless advance of large plantation economy from the seaboard."

Precedence for calling stockmen "peasants" may be found in Trow-Smith (1959, p. 9).

Bedichek (1961, p. 68) noted that in Texas small cattle interests followed lumbering as gleaners in the weedy regrowth on cut-over lands. A great increase in cattle in St. Helena Parish after 1900 argues that a similar trend may have been taking place. However, control of Bang's disease seems to be a more important factor in this case.

Figure 2 is based upon traverses along nearly every road and lane in St. Helena Parish. The symbol for each type observed was applied to the improved land area indicated on topographic sheets. Hence, the areas of the symbols on the map represent improved land only and the remaining area is in forest or other non-agricultural land use.

c. S. Johnson (1934, p. 208) identifies peasantry in the South though he uses the term "Negro peasant" as though it denoted a separate culture. He also argues that Negro peasantry (and earlier, slavery) is a consequence of the plantation. However, increases in large landholdings, increases in commercial staple production, and increases in tenancy and landless farm labor are all the results of greater fertility and/or demand for agricultural products (Warringer, 1939). See also Baker (1927, p. 64), who notes the higher incidence of freeholders on poor lands in the South.

As yet, no reliable record of any settlement by Europeans prior to 1800 within the present confines of St. Helena Parish has been found (Exhibit of Claims, Greensburg District, General Land Office). The primary foci of settlement prior to 1800 had been Natchez, Bayou Sara (St. Francisville), and Baton Rouge. An eastward-moving "frontier" spread from these centers and Heidelberg (1940, p. 39) notes the passing of that edge of settlement over Amite County, Mississippi, "where no settlement of appreciable size existed in 1800, 4,750 persons were living in 1810." Heidelberg also argues (p. 43) that "the situation was different in the Piney Woods country to the east of Amite and Franklin counties. There we find a different type of frontier—one which was never supplanted by the plantation system." The eastward march of the Natchez Cotton Culture (Moore, 1958, p. 27) apparently encountered the southwestward-moving wave of settlement by Upland South peasant folk sometimes referred to as the hunter-stockman-farmer frontier. These eastward
and southwestward frontiers were not totally distinct groups though many foreigners and non-Southerners were in the Natchez-Baton Rouge centers (Weaver, 1945, p. 32). Some Upland settlers availed themselves of the Tennessee-Ohio-Mississippi river system arriving eventually in St. Helena Parish as is indicated by the familial connections (to be noted in the Succession Records) between that parish and various points along that route. Others (possibly, most) moved overland, however, from the southward bend of the Tennessee through western Alabama and eastern Mississippi. (See Kniffen and Glassie, 1966, Fig. 27, p. 60 for a map indicating routes of migration.) Still others (possibly, later in time) moved due west as is indicated by the connections of the Kemp family with points in Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina. There is a considerable amount of talk of Tory settlement of West Florida (both Natchez and Feliciana districts) (Wailes, 1854, p. 90, for example), but an examination of the Official Records of the West Florida Revolution and Republic (Padgett, 1938) reveals mention of only two Tories, neither of whom appears in the census rolls of St. Helena Parish for 1820.

Figure 5 is based on the Township Plats filed in the State Land Office, Baton Rouge, and on the Exhibit of Claims housed in the same office. These records show the tracts entered and claimed and the dates of the entries. Land entered and claimed after 1819 was surveyed in standard sections (square tracts of 640 acres) insofar as possible. The fields indicated in Figure 5 are only those shown by surveyors to have been intersected by section lines on maps drawn between 1820 and 1844 and filed with the General Land Office between 1845 and 1848. Such representations give only a rough idea of the size, shape, and disposition of fields; certainly many other fields existed.
CHAPTER II

THE PEASANT FARM

Because of its gradual development over a long period of time, the peasant farm is a subject of particular geographic interest. This slow development has resulted in the formation of a set of mutual adjustments, many of which are expressions on the earth's surface and throw earth qualities into bold relief. In each culture there is an inherent conception of space and time arrangements which mediates the activities of man on particular sites. Earth qualities may be perceived in terms of this conception.

General Description.—Upland South farms have a marked personality which has elicited comments of various sorts from writers for the past two centuries. In general, the inhabitants of these farms have not themselves been articulate writers and there have been relatively few statements from them on behalf of their farms and farming system. On the contrary, travelers from other sections have frequently commented upon the Upland farm and its personality. These commentaries have seldom been complimentary (see, for example, Dunaway, 1944, p. v). Speaking from the point of view of their own farming traditions, travelers have seldom tired of
pointing out what seemed to them to be inadequacies in the Upland farm (Thompson, 1910; Latrobe, 1836, pp. 134-38). Nevertheless, the peasant farmer of the Upland South has continued and the values that his culture provides have also continued. Consequently, the morphology of the peasant farm of the Upland South has persisted in spite of variations in agricultural technology, passing fads, and even through changes in physical setting from place to place.

Before abstracting a model peasant general farm, two representative specimens will be examined. These two (described under changed names) were selected as representative of the middle range of the variations in peasant farms of the general type in St. Helena Parish. Their description should introduce the farm and, along with the model, provide the basis for a systematic analysis of the farm.

**Darlings Creek Farm.**—Situated on the right bank of Darlings Creek at about 210 to 240 feet elevation lies what we shall call Darlings Creek Farm. The farm lies among long-leaf pines in island clearings so that most of its fields are hidden from casual inspection. The surface of the land is gently varied in relief, consisting of slightly sloping land except along Darlings Creek and gullies. The soil, as for most of the peasant farm areas of St. Helena Parish, is deep and sandy and varies from red at a depth of about three feet through yellow to a thin, dark, humus layer of a few inches at the surface. Such soils are deficient in mineral and
humus nutrients but respond well to care and fertilizer.\textsuperscript{2} Lime, potash, nitrate of soda, nitrate of potassium, and 8-8-8 are commonly used as fertilizers.

Gullying is rare on this farm as it is on most peasant farms and is limited to road cuts and to the vales between cultivated hills. Any developing gully receives a rather specific, standard treatment: weeds and scrub trees are permitted to grow in the bottom and slash (trash pruned or cut from fields and fences) is stacked in the bottom. However, the tendency toward gullying is abated more importantly by the practice of contour plowing which is a nearly universal trait of peasant farms of St. Helena Parish.

The fundamental crops—those upon which man and animal depend—are corn, sweet potatoes, and peas.* Cotton and some beans are grown for market and constitute the main source of cash income. Darlings Creek Farm is fairly large (185 acres) but only 81 acres are devoted to this farm. The remainder is used by siblings of the owner. Actual cropland amounts to about 30 acres, the remaining 50 acres in Darlings Creek Farm are devoted to pasturing of cattle, the growing of posts, pulpwood, and firewood, and to general foraging. A pasture on the bank of Darlings Creek, actually an old field, amounts to about an acre (Table 1 and Fig. 6).

New land (such as field A in Fig. 6) is first planted

*Specific names of plants mentioned in the text can be found in Appendix IV.
### TABLE 1

**DISPOSITION OF LANDS, DARLINGS CREEK FARM, ST. HELENA PARISH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop or Activity</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivated crops:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas and Beans</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potatoes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarcane</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House yard and garden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing and foraging land (woods)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for the farm</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...to corn while the second year it is planted to sugarcane and sweet potatoes. Corn has long been the traditional new-land crop because it can be relied upon to produce an important food in quantity on land as difficult to cultivate as new land is. Sweet potatoes and sugarcane can, like corn, largely fend for themselves. But sugarcane demands rich soil which forest new land provided. Sweet potatoes constitute a major foundation item in the economy of the peasant farm because they are food for both man and beast. A few rows of "'taters" planted in good new ground will often yield at a rate of more than 200 bushels per acre. The sugarcane is...
ground and converted to syrup each November along with the cane of several neighbors for whom the work is done for a toll, or share of the production. Cotton is planted on well-drained, good land and is shifted from time to time to land that has been occupied by corn or by corn and peas. At any given time one or more fields, like the old-field pasture by the creek (Field B, Fig. 6), will be turned out to rest and eventually it will return to forest.

Whereas the land is broken by use of a small tractor, mules are used to plant and cultivate the crops. The feeling is that the mule and walking plow will enable the farmer to provide closer, more accurate care for his crops. He believes that by this means he can keep rows "on the level" (contoured) more closely, that he can clean them more thoroughly, and that he can work his fertilizers in more to his satisfaction on the gently varying relief that Darlings Creek Farm possesses. Because of the many curves that must be maintained in rather short rows, the mule and walking plow seem much more valuable because of their flexibility. It is also pointed out that a mule can maneuver in much wetter soil than a tractor, permitting the peasant to continue cultivation in spite of the summer rains so characteristic of this region. Frequent cultivation even during the rainy season enables the farmer to retard the rapid increase of weeds and the insect pests which multiply in their shelter. Further, the contours may be repaired between rains more easily with this arrangement.
The multiple use of every part of the farm seems to be the custom. Not only are crops shifted about the various fields as yields indicate need for change, but soil-building pea crops are regularly planted among some of the corn rows. In other fields peas may be planted early in the season to be followed by a late crop of corn, the "may corn." Once any crop has received the most benefit possible by continual cultivation, it is laid by; that is, cultivation ceases and weeds are allowed to grow. These earlier-unwanted invaders, together with unharvested remains of the crop, become forage for livestock after the harvest of the crop. Cattle and mules are turned into corn, pea, peanut, sugarcane, and even cotton fields once the crop is in. Late in the winter, "broom sage," a coarse bluestem grass, is cut to make a supply of brooms for the following year and following this, the fields are burned and the ashes of the weeds and stalks of crops together with the manure left by the stock become nutrients for the next crop.

The forest—seemingly idle land to the casual observer—is also used in equally diverse ways. Posts, pulpwood, and firewood (every peasant farm has an active fireplace) are gathered from the woodland tracts on Darlings Creek Farm. The pulpwood-cutting rights are sold directly to the mill concerned from land that is to be cleared for fields. Posts are cut by the farmer himself. Until recently, posts for the farm have been obtained in the traditional manner of splitting trunks of sweet gum, locust, sassafras, or white
oak. These were inserted in the fence as older posts decayed and consequently the fences have posts of several ages side by side. The continual decay of fence posts has prompted the owner of Darlings Creek Farm to follow the leads of some other farmers in cutting and stripping bark from select post trees to be sold to creosoting mills. The proceeds will then be used to buy longer-lived, pressure-cresoted posts for the farm. There is a small cash profit and, even though more posts must be cut than are needed immediately, the new posts will last much longer.

Fences protect fields in the peasant farm areas because of the open-range laws which permit cattle to forage freely through the woodlands. So, an additional use of the woodland areas of the farm is its serving as pasture. As already noted, the woods are continually thinned by selective cutting of wood for various uses. The woods are also improved (from the point of view of the farmer) by occasional burning of small sections. This fire cultivation takes place during the winter dry season and as far as the peasant is concerned the benefits lie in the suppression of weedy growths, the suppression of insect pests, and in the promotion of grass growth.

The woodland sections of the farm further provide raw materials for handicrafts (white oak for baskets and hickory for axe handles, for example), herbs for curing, and wild fruits, berries, and nuts as well as pot herbs for the table.

Darlings Creek Farm is a comparatively progressive
establishment gradually developing improved means of obtaining desired goals. A tractor used for heavy draft work replaces to some extent mules (and earlier, oxen) in those heavy tasks. A pickup truck replaces the mule-drawn wagon in carrying material on the public roads and an automobile is used for passenger travel. The home, copied by a folk carpenter from a common commercial, low-cost, prefabricated model, is about three years old and completely electrified. The ordinary electrical appliances—refrigerator, deep freeze, radio, television, iron, sewing machine, washing machine, electric water pump, and telephone—are all present. The deep freeze has to a certain extent replaced the smokehouse and much of home canning, but still several hogs are killed each year and some preserves are put up.

Both the farmer and his wife have worked for wages and, after a turn at working in a northern city, they resumed farm life. The husband works intermittently for wages in Baton Rouge, but this side activity is not allowed to interfere with the farm operation. Cash from such work is used to hire occasional help from among neighbors at harvest time. Both man and wife pride themselves on their respectable abilities of reading and calculating and on the fact that all of their children finished high school. The wife also comments on how much she gained from extension courses in farm-home management. All children have married and left.

While the kind of farm life followed on Darlings Creek Farm has been abandoned by the majority of Americans,
it is maintained as an ideal form of life in this instance. All activities carried out by the owners are turned inward again upon the farm; posts are cut and sold to obtain posts for the farm; pulpwood is sold from a tract to be cleared as new land; wages and knowledge are brought from the city to further develop the farm; and so on. The peasant ideal of an agrarian life springing from the soil of a "home place" and based on a proudly skillful exploitation of a wide variety of resources on one's own land is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than on Darlings Creek Farm.

**Muscadine Farm.**—A peasant farm not far from Darlings Creek Farm is operated by an informally adopted son of an elderly settlement patriarch who had no farming sons himself. We shall call this 47-acre portion of the foster father's land the Muscadine Farm. The operator was taken in as a homeless youth and, following faithful performance as though he were so, he received the son's due—a part of the father's land on which to support his own family. With ten persons in his household, he manages to provide the labor for both his own and his foster father's farm.

Actual cropland amounts to about 20 acres, with an apportionment as shown in Table 2. As was the case on Darlings Creek Farm, less than half of the land is devoted to production for sale: cotton, some peas and beans, some watermelons, and one feeder calf; that is, about 5¾ acres of land and one head of stock. Again fields have been carved
from the forest as island clearings to take advantage of special qualities of sites. Since the operator of Muscadine Farm has the right to utilize any unused part of his foster father's 180 acres, he has a wide range of field locations from which to choose. Actually, all but one of his fields is located near his own house and adjacent to the fields of the foster father (Figure 7). Because he and one of his sons continue to aid the old patriarch, it is convenient to keep the farmsteads and fields fairly well concentrated. Nevertheless, woods are left among fields and these presently serve as pasture, though once they were cultivated. One large field has been abandoned to woods and pasture since
1965 on the foster father's part of the farm (Field A, Fig. 7). Some fields are situated on more fertile lands along the creek even though the soil is more difficult to plow and there is a good chance of flooding in the summer. The wooded appearance of the Upland South peasant farmscape is further increased here by permitting trees to grow between fields, along fences and roads, along the vales between plowed hills, and by the irregular arrangement of all of these. Even in the midst of a cultivated area, one usually feels that he is in a forest.

A variety of uses is found for every part of the farm. But, since the Muscadine Farm family is larger and younger than the Darlings Creek Farm family, there is more need and more available labor to exploit a greater variety of woodland resources. Spare-time hunting and fishing provide squirrels, raccoons, opossum, deer, turkey, and rabbits, as well as catfish, goggle-eye perch, and crayfish as table meat. Honey, muscadines, blackberries, huckleberries, mulberries, wild plums, pecans, and hickory nuts are all gathered from the woods.

Preservation of foods—cultivated and wild—is very important to the continuation of the Muscadine Farm. Peanuts and cow peas are dried and stored in a small crib barn while sweet potatoes are placed in dry, cool "tater" houses and covered with pine straw. Corn is stored in the shuck in a crib raised about $1\frac{1}{2}$ feet above the ground. All four constitute a reserve of food for man and animal, especially for
the season from December through March. Sweetened "serves" (preserves) are made of peaches, pears, wild plums, and muscadines, while watermelon rinds, okra, tomatoes, pears, green corn, sweet potatoes, and cucumbers are canned or put up in glass jars. Each year, seven or eight hogs will be killed and hams, bacon, and sausage cured by a small oak or hickory fire in a pit in the earth floor of the log smokehouse.

Muscadine Farm is an example of a poorer operation on the skirts of an older and more successful farm. Even so, the peasant family which presently includes eight children (three others having married and left) manages to get along without charity, except in the case of injury or illness, when the parish charity clinic is used. All children attend school for the appointed term. Regular cash income derives from the sale of cotton and from selling fresh produce in Greensburg and even in the French Market in New Orleans. The foster father's pickup is used to carry produce to these markets. Income is supplemented by the mother's working in a school cafeteria at Greensburg and by the father's occasional wage labor in the pulpwood industry.

As the children of the Muscadine Farm family marry and leave, the drain on the energies of the father and mother to support idle school children will decrease. Children work on the farm when they are not in school, but to support a teen-aged scholar is, nevertheless, difficult. Presumably, as his family decreases, the peasant will shift to less
demanding activities such as a greater emphasis on stock raising. Such a shift has been made by his three aged neighbors. The main difficulties arise when the peasant is quite old and unable to care for all of his own needs; then, if he has no grown children upon whom to depend, he must either seek public charity or, as happened here, "adopt" a son.

The Model.\textsuperscript{3}--It has been stated that each culture has inherent within its value system, technology, annual round, and other attributes, certain conceptions of space arrangements. That this notion applies to such matters as settlement pattern is by now well established and it is equally true of the arrangements within the farm itself. These spatial details, or farm morphology, tell us important facts about the earth qualities of the site; within one culture area, much of the variation in farms may be ascribed to variations in the natural setting. Already we have argued that the Upland plantation represents a peasant farm blessed by a fertile site, easy connections with markets, and at some time in the past an energetic family of peasants who brought out the qualities of the site.

Peasant farms in St. Helena Parish are arranged (as would be expected from their Upland South-Atlantic European origins) in farm towns ("clachans") and Einzelhöfe.\textsuperscript{4} But as a rule these apparent Einzelhöfe (Plate XIII, Figs. a, b, d) are not randomly scattered, but connected by social ties--
largely familial and religious—to form what should be called dispersed hamlets.

In the minds of the peasants there are three levels of social structure and each of these has landscape expression. The first and most basic is the family—usually nuclear, but sometimes extended. The family is expressed in the landscape by the family farm, or home place. It is this fundamental unit, a spatially isolated, single-family farm, that is the main force in sculpturing the landscape and the subject of this study.

But these farms are not totally isolated. The second order of social integration recognized by the local farmers is the settlement, their term for a cluster of farms usually associated with a single founding family and so named. In short, the settlement represents an extended family and includes farms subdivided from an original holding or purchased near the old home place. In earlier times the settlement had more force than it does today. It included quite often a chapel, cemetery, school, and often a mill or store as well as the farms of the patriarch and his sons. The settlement in St. Helena Parish is what Arensberg (1955, p. 1144) calls a "community . . . basic units of organization and transmission within a culture . . . the basic minimum personnel and the basic minimum of social relations through which survival is assured and the content of culture can be passed on. . . ."

Certain of these settlements, because of the success
of their patriarchs, the quality of their sites, or the fortunes of location with respect to communications, developed into more important centers. These higher centers of social organization are known locally as communities and in these have been concentrated more and more of the functions of the settlement. School and church consolidation and the presence of stores, service stations, and even fraternal halls have all favored the community, especially as a result of the increasing ease of travel. For example, within the past three decades the Negro settlements of New Star, Overton, Butler, Crier, Tillery, Hurst, and Gordon have been almost completely consolidated to form Crossroads Community (Figure 8). The latter crystalized around Gordon Settlement and forms the "Negro parish seat" on the outskirts of Greensburg. It is the focus of Negro community life for much of the parish for it contains the Negro high school, a grammar school, church, cemetery, Masonic hall, Boy Scout troop, and seven stores and service stations.  

Such tendencies are true of white and black communities and settlements alike; both have undergone similar consolidations. Only a few of the names of white communities are shown on maps (Figure 4 shows some of these) and none of the settlements of either race is so honored. Nevertheless, these settlements and communities still function. The settlement is still the basis of cooperation, and the country church (there are 52 country churches in the parish) is often the institution that facilitates and maintains this cooperation.
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especially among Negroes because they have no formal political institution.

The whole system of farms, settlements, and communities is knit together by a system of routes which amounts to a landscape expression of the bonds of society. The routes of the peasant farmscape are very sensitive indicators of earth qualities, changing technology, and certain elements in the value system as well as social relations (Brunhes, 1920, pp. 110-15; Wagner, 1960, pp. 119, 129-31; Shantz, 1917). Suffice it to note here that because of a predilection for ridgeways, routes tend to follow ridges and crests of hills (Figs. 3, 4, and 8). Homes are similarly located so that the result is a network of roads connecting farmsteads (except for engineer-built roads). But, in addition to the routes we ordinarily see, two other sets deserve more attention than we can spare here: (1) paths and trails which interconnect the farms of settlements and are the fine-gage expressions of society on the land and (2) routes no longer in use which recount the history of changes in technology and society. But as land values rise and as the range is eventually closed, routes will become less expressive of changes for they will be more and more denied the nearly free wandering over the land which has characterized their past.

The only incorporated places, Greensburg and Montpelier, owe their size to the fact that, in addition to being one-time communities, Greensburg is, and Montpelier was, the
parish seat and both were rail stations during the early 20th century (all three railroads that once existed in the parish have been taken up). But, those additional stimuli were enough to give these little farm towns a little added attraction. Greensburg, for example, serves as a market town.

So, the peasant farms of St. Helena Parish exist as Einzelhöfe and as dispersed hamlets (clachans) whose main functional grouping is determined in part by familial and religious ties. The population and the landscape are, and always have been, entirely rural. Lack of any marked natural attractions and a functional remoteness in terms of communications, together with a cultural disposition to scatter dwellings have worked to maintain a distinctly Upland South settlement pattern. A similar pattern is described for the Isle of Lewis and Harris by Geddes (1955, p. 38) as "the older, unplanned crofts spot the landscape in an irregular way which is often picturesque, yet often almost uncouth."

This "almost uncouth" arrangement carries over from the settlement pattern and route system into the organization of the farm itself (Plate XIII, Figs. a-d; Plate XIV, Figs. e, f). On the individual farm, house yard, barnyard, garden, fields and pastures are almost completely unarranged—at least as far as geometric order is concerned (Fig. 9). Seldom are fences parallel, nor do they meet at right angles. Few buildings are arrayed in rows. But there is order in this seemingly casual arrangement.

Possibly the most salient feature of farm arrangement
is the nearly universal placement of farmsteads on hills and ridges. As far as property rights will permit, farmsteads are located on some of the highest land on the farm and near a road (Figs. 6 and 7). As a rule the house is on the highest ground in the farmstead and all other cultural features are draped over the hill in a casual manner.

Within the house yard there is usually some order, so that the house and house yard could be regarded as a unit. The house—either a variety of dogtrot or a bungalow—is almost always enclosed by a yard fence. Also included within this compound are a variety of ornamental plants (roses, lilies, camellias are common), the well, woodpile, clothesline (though the fence frequently substitutes), smokehouse, a martin house, and sometimes a chicken coop, pigeon cote, tool shed, or garage. As often as not, all outbuildings are of log construction, even though the house is not. Scattered about the house yard—sometimes within the compound and sometimes without—is a variety of characteristic trees: ornamentals include chinaberry, cedar, pecan, hickory, and sometimes oak; fruit trees include fig, peach, plum, pear, apple, and quince.

Usually adjacent to the house yard is a garden, fenced with hogwire, organized in rows and hills, and frequently bordered by weeds and native bushes and trees. Root houses are either within the garden or near it in the house yard. Occasionally the garden is located away from the house, presumably on a more favorable plot or near a former house.
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site, but it is never far away. Similarly, outbuildings (barn, corncrib, stock shelter—if any, pigpens, and outhouse) usually fill out a loosely disorganized barnyard which surrounds the house yard on two or three sides. Beyond all of this, lie the fields, pastures, and woods. If the land holding is small, fields are by necessity closely grouped, otherwise there may be nearly as many clearings as fields.

Then, characteristically there are five repeating space units which make up the peasant farm: house and house yard, garden, barnyard, fields, and woodland pastures. The size and arrangement of these vary according to relief, size of property, density of settlement, transportation, and the industry of the family. Seldom is there any clear-cut division of space other than that defined by the house yard and garden fences. Activities and elements often overlap several space units and functionally there is a very generalized approach to land use.

The way that this generalized approach to life has with the means available altered the landscape toward ideal notions of suitable human living space will take up the balance of this report. After reviewing farm structures, fields and crops, and livestock, pastures, and woodlands, the whole will be resummarized in an explanation of the annual round of events.
Contrary to the assertions of Wright (1956), neither the house nor the use of log construction is the key to Upland Culture (his "Log Culture"). Using this fallacious assumption, Wright was nevertheless able to map the southward lobe of that culture extending into St. Helena Parish. But this is because of the fortunate coincidence of choosing a trait characteristic of an earlier period of the culture. The log house has passed away, but the overall morphology of the Upland farm persists and will continue to do so for many years to come.

The Soil Survey Division (1938, pp. 1069-71) gives a similar description and notes the value of these soils over the wider area of their distribution for cotton, tobacco, peanuts, pecans, peaches, sweet potatoes, watermelons, sugar-cane, pears, figs, oats, cowpeas, and others as well as the dominance of corn as a food and feed crop. See also Hilgard's (1884, p. 165) evaluation of St. Helena Parish and his abstract of a report by a resident.

We are better advised to set up a model rather than to attempt a definition of the peasant farm because the model better "serves to represent the complex variables of a complex situation, thing, or process." (Arensberg, 1955, p. 1146).

Such a use of "clachan" to denote the loose clustering of relatives' farms seems justified from the context of Evans (1966, p. 72) and J. H. Johnson (1961, p. 166) who note it for Atlantic Europe as a type and in Ulster and Scotland as a term.

These settlements and communities usually grew around the farm of a particularly enterprising person. Benjamin Gordon, once a slave, was such an energetic patriarch and his legacy is, in part, the settlement of Gordon and the community of crossroads.

The dualism of an Einzelhof-clachan settlement pattern is noted by Johnson (1961, p. 167) and he also notes the tendency of these to expand and contract as conditions change. Arensberg (1955, pp. 1156-58) also acknowledges this Einzelhof-siedlung, or as he terms it, "open-country neighborhood," and notes "a New World repetition of the same Celtic dispersed-farm, cattle-and-kitchen-garden agriculture that marks Irish small farms and Scots crofts to this day."
CHAPTER III

PEASANT FARM STRUCTURES

Among the most important acts in the lives of most peasants is the construction and maintenance of whatever constitutes home to them. Of course, the content of their image of "home" is seldom decided upon in a purely rational way. This is certainly true of what we can call folk architecture. It may be true as well of more sophisticated forms, but we will concern ourselves more with folk forms. Folk housing and folk building techniques have come to be recognized as diagnostic of diffusion, cultural identity, and cultural evolution. (Kniffen, 1965; Kniffen and Glassie, 1966.) It is equally clear that, aside from the cultural and historic implications, folk construction is also indicative of earth qualities. Because of his relatively closer dependence upon the offerings of nature, the peasant farmer's structures of various sorts reflect the qualities of his site as well as his universal needs for protection, the course of cultural development, and even the vagaries of unpredictable events. Over a single area, for example, we may recognize certain elements of form persisting in the face of changes in available material either from place to place or from time to time. In St. Helena Parish we have examples
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of a form—say, a dogtrot house—being erected in sawn lumber whereas it had previously been more commonly built of logs. Thus, the dogtrot house, originally a solution to the problem of expanding the home for a growing family, became a basic form for what has been termed the "three 'p' order of architecture" (Dick, 1948, p. 28). Actually, we presently see even this order as part of a larger tradition of log pen house types finding its origin in turn in the British square or rectangular genus of architectural forms (Kniffen, 1965, p. 565). Upon this basic dogtrot, or three "p," format a considerable variety of forms has been developed culminating in both elaborate Victorian homes and elegant plantation "big houses" (see Plates I and II). Then, we may further generalize that, while form tends to persist through simple changes in material, the form itself may also continue to evolve.

Still another general aspect of folk structures must be noted: these are the elements, the functions of which have changed or which persist even after their original functions have ceased. Like misfit streams, these relics testify about a former epoch or about different conditions and as such are useful in revealing unsuspected qualities, relationships, or processes. We might think of water supplies for examples. Farms with electric water-supply systems have been observed to retain older well systems for emergency supplies or because of a nostalgic belief that the water is better in special ways. In some cases the well
changes function to become a dump. In the cases of many dug wells (shafts about $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet in diameter), notorious cases of injury and death have led to refilling. In any case, whether the well is changed in function, is retained as a semi-functional relic, or is filled, it is a source of evidence of both former and changed facts of peasant life.

Not only can forms evolve on the one hand and persist tenaciously on the other, but new forms can be introduced. Such non-evolutionary innovations may be significant as period markers indicating important changes in the total makeup of the geographical conditions. But of more direct interest here, the admission or exclusion of a borrowed item by a peasant culture may be clearly indicative of important facts about the site and the peasant's adaptation with it. An item which seems to the casual observer to be quite an efficient improvement, may be rejected by the peasant culture. Such an event may suggest that the peasant is culture bound, blind to progress. On the other hand, the innovation may not be so efficient in actual functioning in the entirety of the peasant's system. Though travelers from other culture areas have criticized the homes and outbuildings of the Upland South, they have done so in terms of their own cultures and without regard to the totality of cultural-physical setting of the Upland farm. A Northerner is apt to criticize the lack of "adequate" barns in the ordinary Upland peasant farm, but even in 1967, log outbuildings are still being erected, often in the same farmstead having a brick-veneer, concrete-
slab house of outlandish style. So, even though money is available that could have been dedicated to the construction of outbuildings, it was not, and older forms were retained.

We may summarize the general tendencies in folk construction before we examine the individual categories of buildings in terms of their cultural-physical setting: while form tends to persist through temporal or spatial changes in material, the form may continue to evolve; in addition, "native" forms may be replaced by exotic types entirely or in part and the two may coexist in a curious mixture. Nevertheless, all such changes will reveal important facts concerning the land and the changing conditions of land use, and will thus lead to a better understanding of the cultural landscape and the processes leading to what it is.

On the peasant farm there is a variety of buildings, some of specialized function. The classes of structures frequently found on Upland general farms as represented in St. Helena Parish include: houses; barns; other outbuildings (smokehouses, root houses, well houses, privy); and pens, fences, and gates. Some special classes are found on the farm types related to the Upland general farm such as dairy barns and an occasional silo on dairy farms, and special cattle sheds and feeders on stock farms. Nevertheless, these other types can best be understood as variations and, hence, it is the basic content of the general farm that enables us to reconstruct the development of the farm complex.
The House.--In and around the house of the Upland peasant are focused most of the activities that mark his lifeway as a distinctive type. In the earliest days of professional geography in Louisiana, houses were recognized as "an element of culture possessing great diagnostic value in regional differentiation" (Kniffen, 1936, p. 179) and as such have been systematically classified and described. We will not have to concern ourselves with setting up classes, but may accept the existing typology.

In present-day St. Helena Parish, there are representatives of three great genera of North American architecture: the Pen Tradition, the Shotgun-Bungalow Tradition, and Commercial Culture. Within the structural parts of any good specimen of these three genera is bound up a large segment of the culture history of the group each represents. So much is this true that an exotic type seems quite inappropriate after one has grown accustomed to the form that "ought" to be there. Similarly, the form of the house blends --at least in the mind of one accustomed to the folk culture --into a fitting relationship with the rest of the farmstead.

Consider, first, the Pen Tradition houses which constitute a distinct flourish in the signature of Upland South Culture upon the face of the earth. The Upland peoples who were the initial occupants of St. Helena Parish carried log construction methods with them. But more lastingly, they carried the conception of a number of basic forms expressed mainly in floor plan, room size, chimney position, and roof
and porch treatment. The most basic forms included (Figure 10): (1) the single pen, a module of about 16 feet square; (2) the dogtrot, a doubled module with a hall between the pens (referred to earlier as the "three 'p' order," stemming from its being called two pens and a passage); and (3) the saddlebag, another double module, but without a central hall, and with a central chimney between the pens. If the frequency of present-day pen houses is any indication, the most important type was the dogtrot. There are more extant specimens in greater variety belonging to the dogtrot species than any other in St. Helena Parish. Examination of Figure 10 will indicate some of the basic varieties in the dogtrot species. Embellishments of nearly every period of American architectural history can be found on specimens in the field and any one house may consist of one, one and one-half, two, or two and one-half stories (Plates I and II). Lengths of fronts of houses in this species generally vary around 40 feet while depths (front to back) commonly vary around 16, 24, 32, and 56 feet. These typical measurements result from the folk conception of fitting room and house proportions derived from the 16-foot square pen, the 8- by 16-foot hallway, and the 8- by 16-foot shed appendage. An aspect of repose in the farmscape is present when the 40-foot front with its full-length gallery—and often a "false gallery" as well—is viewed resting as it often does between two great liveoaks or cedars.
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closing the ends of the hallway, present an intriguing distribution with ten specimens scattered from northwest to southeast across the parish. Only one log specimen was encountered (on the north boundary of section 6, T2S, R5E) which is represented only by the remains of the left-hand pen (Plate I, Fig. a), but enough remains of this pen to show its structurally ancestral relation to the more sophisticated forms. It had been a simple two-pens-and-a-passage form with two outside end chimneys and without shed appendages. The house was located on the 1940 aerial photograph (CPX-24-88) and at that time was a functioning residence situated in the midst of a typical set of outbuildings, garden, and other elements. The fate of the house has been to become firewood for a nearby bungalow which replaced the dogtrot. Dogtrot houses of lumber construction—but duplicating faithfully the form and proportions of the log forebear—are most frequent. Ten of them were found with completely open passages, but many more have passages that were walled in at some time after the original construction. Still more frequent is the dogtrot-based house the passage, or hallway, of which was closed from the first by doors. The dogtrot, because of its distinctive floor plan, serves as a scarlet thread of continuity in tracing what may be called the peasant-planter continuum. Because of its wide distribution in time and space, it clarifies peasant-farm relations.

The Pen Tradition of folk architecture was superceded—but not completely displaced—by what we will call the
Shotgun-Bungalow Tradition. Two basic forms represent this genus: (1) the shotgun, a gable-fronted, one-room wide house with a depth of several rooms, and (2) the bungalow, a double shotgun. The shotgun increases in frequency on plantations west of St. Helena Parish, where it is a quarter house for laborers and sharecroppers. It is almost emblematic of a commercial farmscape and it frequently stands denuded of the softening and enhancing effects of dooryard, garden, ornamental trees, or associated outbuildings. Of hasty, simple construction in rough lumber and frequently with bare studs, it must be regarded as inadequate housing.

The bungalow is much more common in St. Helena Parish than the shotgun and nearly as common as the dogtrot-based house. It is a much more suitable home and is in fact generally nestled in the midst of a homey farmstead with fenced dooryard, ornamental shrubs and trees, fruit trees, a nearby garden, and a goodly collection of outbuildings. The bungalow has very often been modified in the direction of the Pen Tradition by the addition of outside chimneys, galleries, and occasionally false galleries. The bungalow must be considered to be the typical lower-class home in St. Helena Parish, though substantial middle-class bungalows are fairly common.

As the Shotgun-Bungalow Tradition infiltrated the domain of the Pen Tradition, today the forms of the Commercial Culture common to the whole nation infiltrate the landscape of St. Helena Parish. There is no need to describe the forms
of this increment to the cultural scene, for every American, regardless of his region, climate, culture, or whatever, is familiar with subdivision house plans. While such houses represent improved economic status for their owners, their contrived distinctiveness impoverishes the regional character. For reasons that are not altogether clear, the people of the Upland Culture area have failed to rework their traditional house plans in modern materials to suit modern tastes and have chosen instead to accept alien models. Perhaps this is related to what Redfield (1960, p. 19) notes as the passive acceptance by peasantry of the dictates by a literati as to what is correct or desirable. Certainly these suburban homes are dictated from above and beyond the peasant farmer's own traditions and as such are erosional disconformities of the regional distinctiveness of the Upland South.  

One of the most interesting developments in the forms of the Commercial Culture types is the homely attempt by several peasants to copy more fashionable plans without professional carpenters. The general aspects of these counterfeits seem correct from a distance, but upon closer inspection it is quickly seen that a folk carpenter was about work somewhat alien to him. Nevertheless, these echos of modernism are frequently tributes to the ingenuity and resourcefulness --if not the imagination--of their untutored builders.

The bungalow seems to extend into St. Helena Parish from the south and west, whereas the dogtrot and other pen houses extend from the north. Field traverses throughout the
Florida Parishes of Louisiana and through Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky confirm this notion of general directions of diffusion. Continual and increasing frequency of dogtrots noted while traveling north through southern Mississippi, as well as decreasing frequency south of St. Helena Parish, marks St. Helena Parish and part of Livingston Parish as a southward lobe of Upland Culture. Conversely, the distribution of the bungalow and the shotgun points to a center along the Mississippi and in the chief lumbering and plantation areas of Louisiana (Kniffen, 1936, p. 189). Their distribution as well as their construction clearly indicates a connection with increased availability of lumber and the demand for cheap (in both senses) housing. Far different, however, is the distribution of the houses representing Commercial Culture, the "modern," national, pre-packaged, highly rationalized culture of the United States. Wherever any considerable measure of economic success occurs, houses are built which differ in no important regard from those to be found in all parts of the nation.

The two most outstanding facts about all of the houses of all types in St. Helena are: (1) the complete dominance of wooden structures, and (2) a complete dominance of single-family, detached units. Bricks are found only in piers, chimneys, and on a few brick-veneer homes of Commercial Culture types. Even during periods of relative affluence the people of St. Helena have preferred wood construction. This preference for wood must be explained in part at least by
the wealth of timber resources which surrounds the peasant on every hand and conversely by the absence of stone and the cost of bricks. Yet in this area even those who are relatively affluent continue to choose wooden homes as expressions of their status, an indication of their cultural ties (Kniffen and Glassie, 1966).

**Barns.**—Whereas the domiciliary structures of these peasant farms are fairly sensitive expressions of change, the barns and other outbuildings are stolid pronouncements of origin and continuity. Far more earthy and unpretentious than houses, the barns of the general farm are especially practical; most required absolutely no investment of cash other than in the "tin" roofs which replace shake roofs on most. The barns of St. Helena's peasant farms function mainly as granaries in which corn and "fodder" are stored; hence, they might be more correctly called cribs, corn cribs, or granaries. Yet because there are some which house mules, plows, tools, and occasionally a wagon or tractor, we will call the entire spectrum of varieties barns.

On general farms there is but one genus of folk barns, the Crib Tradition. (On dairy and stock farms crib barns are often found among the more rationalized forms demanded by the nature of the business carried on; Plate XIV.) The Crib Tradition is to barns what the Pen Tradition is to houses: a group of basic forms, rich in variety if not beauty, very practical, of simple design, built of native materials—both
log and lumber—and blending "fittingly" into the farmscape.

Of basic types of barns there are only three: (1) the single crib, the module with a door in one gable end; (2) the double crib, a double module of two single pens facing each other and with a plan much like the dogtrot house; and (3) the transverse barn, which by the spacing of the cribs may actually contain the space of nine cribs plus a loft under the frontward-facing gabled roof. The double crib is rather unusual in St. Helena Parish, while the transverse barn correlates with economic success at some time during the history of the particular farm. Even though a transverse barn is generally associated with larger or more successful farms, seldom does it reach the quality of the proud structures of northern regions of the United States—nor does it need to. Occasionally, a transverse barn is found in which one or two cribs were built of logs while the remaining cribs and roof were built of lumber.

Single-crib barns (Plate IV) are nearly universal in the peasant farmscape of St. Helena Parish; nearly every farm has at least one such barn. They even occur frequently as granaries on stock and dairy farms (Plate XIV). They continue to be built of both logs and lumber and today "tin" roofs generally replace the older, homemade shake or board roof. The front, or gable, end of a single crib is generally 12 to 16 feet long while the length along the ridge may vary from 12 to 20 feet. Most are rather low and have no loft other than the small gable space above a few poles or boards.
inserted between the upper logs (Plate IV, Fig. a). But some log cribs reach heights of about 16 feet; these will have a small loft or "shuck house" where fodder is kept.

Many transverse barns and nearly all single-crib barns are expanded in usefulness by the addition of one, two, or three shed attachments to the sides and back (Plates VI, V). While the barn is invariably built on piers of wood, ironstone, brick, or concrete blocks, the sheds are usually built directly upon the ground. These shed additions are used to house mules, fattening meat animals, chickens, wagons, plows, tools, and tractors, though any or all of these are more frequently left in the open (Plate XII, Figs. e, f). Sheds may be either flaring extensions of the roof or walled in lean-tos.

Tabulation of barn types along traverses through St. Helena Parish soon revealed that rather than areal variations in types, function and size of operation were the keys to type distribution. Single cribs were nearly ubiquitous, while larger transverse barns denoted more success. Further, the variety also increased on larger farms, so that large operations often had at least one of each main type: a transverse, a double crib, and one or more single cribs. In such cases each building was committed to specialized uses. As an example of such a complex we might consider a 300-acre farm on the Amite River which is now devoted to the raising of timber and cattle. Before the death of the husband it had been a general farm belonging to a locally prominent
family, at least four households of which settled in St. Helena Parish during the period of initial occupancy (1800-1819). Aside from the dogtrot-based house with three full galleries and outside end chimneys, the most notable building is a transverse barn with a widely sweeping shake roof supported at its outer margins by posts. Significantly enough, the right front crib is of notched-log construction indicating clearly the unpretentious beginnings of a new peasant barn. The remainder, which overwhelms the log portion, stands two full stories, producing a roomy loft reached by a stairway in the left front crib. The newer part is of mortise-and-tenon construction. Though it is not, and never was, painted, it is still dry inside and would still serve its function as a granary after more than a half century. Scattered almost carelessly about this barn and the house are a double-crib barn of plank construction, several single cribs, several stock sheds, a garage, and a smokehouse. All together eleven buildings made up the farmstead—all of them in the Pen and Crib traditions (Plate III). This once-large peasant general farm is representative of the larger operation that has turned to stock farming.

Functional difference between the granary barns of the Upland South and the shelter-granary barns of the more northern areas has led to unending criticism of Southern usages. Until recently, improved stock has been rare and winter confinement of mixed blood and semi-feral livestock was always unusual—if not ridiculous—so that the barn
served mainly to keep corn and fodder out of the rain and out of the reach of farm animals. Further investment of time, energy, and capital would have been a form of conspicuous consumption which the Upland peasant has always preferred to express in other ways. That the quality of barns, instead of being a matter of morality, "is as much a matter of environment as of manners and customs, is shown by its tenacity and its prevalence in localities to which it is well adapted" (Vidal de la Blache, 1926, p. 302). Anything more elaborate would be superfluous—at least in the mind of the St. Helena peasant.

**Other Farm Buildings.**—The other outbuildings continue the seemingly casual care of the peasant's vital food and feed supplies, and in the same earthy, practical way. The smokehouse (Plate VI), where for two centuries the greater part of the peasant's meat supply has hung, is a smaller, single-crib building. Its casual construction makes the lock on the door seem almost comical. The smokehouse invariably rests directly upon the ground (though sometimes a packed earth platform is prepared) and the oak and hickory fire which cures the meat is built upon the floor in a small, casual hearth. The wide cracks between the logs or the planks are partially stopped by strips of lumber or clay. The gabled roof often extends far forward, sheltering the entire area in front of the smokehouse and sometimes it sweeps out to the sides, as well to be supported by posts at
its margins (Plate VI, Fig. a). Today roofs are usually "tin," though some of shakes and even riven boards have been noted.

Today the smokehouse is partially superceded by the refrigerator and deep freeze on all but the very poorest peasant farms. But the smokehouse persists even on some more affluent farms because of a great relish for pork (called simply "meat," all other receiving a specific term), especially ham, bacon, and sausage and because of a belief that home-cured meat is superior. Many rue the day that they stopped smoking their own meat (especially wage workers and town dwellers) and attempt to buy better cuts from those who still kill and smoke pork. Nevertheless, the unglamorous tasks of fattening, killing, butchering, dressing, gathering suitable woods, and tending the smoking prevents most from returning to this method. Yet, new smokehouses are being built (in both log and lumber) primarily because underemployment is reduced by keeping the members of the family "who would have to be fed anyhow" busy at the various tasks. A goodly amount of the meat (especially sausage) will be put up in the freezer even where a smokehouse is maintained.

The electrification of the peasant farm (nearly complete in St. Helena Parish) made possible the incursions of the freezer upon the smokehouse; but even greater effect may be seen on home canning and preserving. These home processes have been almost entirely displaced by the far simpler and quicker tasks involved in preparing food for freezing. It
is around these smoked, dried, canned, and preserved goods that the role of women and children in peasant culture is most clearly outlined. It is especially at this point that the women and children may welcome a cash economy. They can convince themselves, with the help of the television and radio which electricity also brings, that their traditional foods are not really so desirable and that they would be much happier buying ready-made foods. Yet, when the muddy, congested, clots of tiny, thin houses in the wage-labor communities (especially in the southern edges of the parish close to Denham Springs and Baton Rouge labor markets) are examined, one wonders if the idle women and children are in fact happier and more prosperous.

Contrarywise, in November, 1965, the womenfolk and children of two peasant brothers were observed and photographed moving fairly effectively about their respective tasks involved in making syrup from sugarcane (Plate XI). Here a very inefficient system of production relatively unchanged for generations was made to work profitably. That is, more than a year's supply of sweetening for two families was prepared and stored with no cash outlay other than the cost of the pans. Further, a small surplus was sold at the rate of $2.00 per gallon (because of an early frost the price was $2.50 per gallon in 1966-67, and at that high price local merchants complained that little could be found). Beyond economic considerations, the event of making "surps" is always somewhat festive, as relatives gather and prospective
purchasers with a taste for nostalgia come from far away. In addition to the productions from their own cane patches, the brothers ground cane and cooked syrup for neighbors for a toll of one-fourth the product, which was sold as surplus.

The only structures involved in syrup making are the furnace and the mill (Plate XI, and Figure 11). The furnace and mill are similar if not identical to those seen during traverses from eastern Tennessee through the Upland South to its western manifestations in central Texas, over which distance the raw material changes from sorghum to sugarcane in southern Mississippi and Alabama. The furnace is constructed of bricks, sticks, and strips of scrap iron, covered with mud as an insulation and topped with a chimney of iron pipe. The "pans" (actually one) made by a tinsmith are placed directly over the fire. When the cooking is finished the pans are inverted to protect the furnace from the elements. One is led to believe by local informants that especially built structures used to house the syrup pans and furnace as is true elsewhere. What is basically a vestige of this earlier practice may be seen in the long "neck" of the furnace between the pans and the chimney which would have allowed the chimney to rise past the gable end of the roof. The mills observed are to two types: (1) mule-drawn ("Golden's New Model" patented in 1905-06), and (2) gasoline-powered. Both are commercial products, but the mule-drawn model is based upon primitive designs (Wailes, 1854, pp. 189-90; Hart, 1910, p. 46). The one pictured in Plate XI was inherited from the
SYRUP MILL AND PANS

A. SUGAR CANE
B. CANE FED INTO MILL
C. BAGASSE EJECTED
D. BAGASSE PILE
E. MULE
F. JUICE OUT OF MILL INTO HALF BARREL
G. RESERVE BARREL
H. PRE-HEATING PAN
I. PIT; POSITION OF SKIMMER
J. PIT FOR SCUM
K. STRIKING PAN
L. PIT; POSITION OF STRIKEMASTER
M. KETTLE TO RECEIVE STRIKE
N. CANS AND JARS
O. FUEL WOOD
P. FURNACE-FEEDING POSITION
Q. MUD & BRICK FURNACE WITH SMOKESTACK
R. ASH AND CHARCOAL PILE
S. BAGASSE AND CANE LEAVES IN MULE TRACK
owner's father at whose death in 1940 it appraised at $2.50 (Succession Records, File case M4, St. Helena Parish; see also Appendix II, McClendon). The present owner boasts of having made syrup for 27 successive years, an indication of his pride in homely skills as well as his accurateness of memory (his father's death in 1940 to present, or 1967, is 27 years).

Another outbuilding with roots in the traditions of the Upland South is the 'tater house, of which there are four main types (Plate VII, Figs. c-f): (1) a crib form varying from 6 to 10 feet square; (2) a conical form made of cornstalks, pinestraw, and clay or tin; (3) the A-frame type, a roof-like form constructed like a gabled shake roof (Corbett, 1907, pp. 551-52); and (4) a nondescript group, being a collection of hasty constructions of scrap tin and lumber.

The origins of the others are fairly obvious; the most intriguing 'tater house, the conical form, requires some examination. In addition, it provides an example of how much better Upland usages hold up under sympathetic, but scientific examination. In 1854 B. L. C. Wailes (p. 193) described the "most approved mode" of storing sweet potatoes. He noted that "piles as great as 25 bushels of potatoes were built on raised ground upon a floor cornstalks and [pine?] straw;" the sides were lined with the same material. Then the whole was covered by three to four inches of sod or earth. "A small apperture being left near the apex of the cone for the escape of moisture which passes off from the
potatoes. . . . Put properly in this way they will keep perfectly sound and sweet until June or even later" (Plate VII, Fig. c).

We must also note that, in each form of 'tater house, pine straw is used as an insulation material and that by such methods, sweet potatoes have been observed to keep into early summer. But before summer comes any projected surplus has usually been fed to livestock to tide them through the slack period of late winter and early spring.

Other outbuildings are too varied to classify. They include occasional garages, chicken coops, pigeon cotes, cattle sheds, and the almost universal martin house. Martins are knowingly attracted for their special abilities: "Twixt de bug en de bee-martin, 'taint hard ter tell w'ich gwinter get kacht" (Black proverb, Joel Chandler Harris). But the forms of martin houses vary widely, from replicas of plantation big houses to plastic bleach bottles; they are largely an expression of individual imagination and skill.

**Fences and Gates.**--In their types and conditions fences and gates are among the most expressive structures in the peasant farmscape (Mather and Hart, 1954). Elaborate social, political, and legal usages surround fences; a great deal of capital is invested in fences, proportionally greater for smaller holdings; slight legal or technological changes may have far-reaching, even unsuspected, results. Fencing has led to small, local wars, murders, cessation of certain
kinds of agriculture, and even impoverishment and denudation of the landscape. On the other hand, fencing has made possible improvement of livestock and range, the introduction of different forms of agriculture, and safer auto travel. It is not surprising that fencing is now, and since initial occupancy has been, an important issue in the lives of the local peasantry. True to their cultural origins, the initial occupants legally established the open range, requiring the owners of crops to fence their fields against the free-wandering stock. In 1813, the Police Jury (equivalent of County Commissioners' Court) decreed that "each inhabitant shall be compelled to keep a fence of the height of five and a half feet either post & rail or if a worm fence well staked and ridered or braced under resque of suffering without recourse any damage which may arise to his crop . . ." (Prichard, 1940; p. 47). It was not until the passage of the "Hog Law" in the 1920's requiring the containment of swine that the worm fence lost its function of keeping these rooting beasts out of fields by means of low, closely spaced rails. In the aerial photography from flights in 1940, mile after mile of the distinctive zigzag pattern of the snake fence can be discerned. Several times more of this distinctive fence are likely lost to aerial view in woods and brushy growths which frequently border fields. In 1967 only two relics of this fencing era remain (6 panels in section 21, TIS, R5E, and a longer stretch enclosing about an acre of barnyard in section 56, TIS, R4E; Plate VIII, Fig. a). The fate of
the remainder of the rails seen in the 1940 photographs was to become stovewood.

Once the Hog Law was passed, the worm fence was replaced as a field fence by barbed wire for the following reasons: (1) no further need for low, tough protection against free-ranging "piney woods rooters" (hogs); (2) increasing land values in some sections demanded straightening of fences; (3) increasing scarcity of labor as younger people sought opportunity in urban areas; and (4) the relatively simpler task of using barbed wire. The effects of the Hog Law and the resultant changes were far-reaching. Not only was a landscape feature of more than a century-and-a-half's tenure obliterated, but carried away as well were the game and berry resources protected by its meanderings. Also removed was a major fire hazard: the dry wood of the fence often acted as a fuse carrying wild fires through areas they would not otherwise reach—frequently to houses and barns. Changes in kind of tree exploited and amount of wood needed for fencing altered the peasant's utilization of the forest. Confinement of hogs not only changed his view of the woods and required the peasant to feed the animals directly, but also aided in the control of cholera which had been a serious handicap earlier (County Agent, 1918). The control of this disease probably compensated for the increased labor of feeding and the decreased herds; in 1890, for example, of a total swine count of 8,737, some 2,510 were consumed while 1,382 died presumably primarily of cholera (Census, 1890, p. 331).
Concern over fencing continues, as ward by ward the open range has been closed and free-ranging livestock becomes illegal. Protracted and painful struggles over the open-range question point up again the cultural bonds of the peasants of St. Helena Parish with those of the rest of the Upland South where the open range has long been held to be an inalienable right. Closing the range works a hardship on the general farmer as did the Hog Law, requiring him to make a greater capital outlay—and a greater cash outlay as well since the necessary barbed wire cannot be made by his family. Closing the range has the effect of reducing competition for the more specialized and already-fenced stockman. Although some stockmen have public roads running through their pastures, few of them have willingly allowed their now-improved stock to wander onto roads. Aside from controlling stock on highways and helping to improve breeds, fencing has also helped in making St. Helena one of the brucellosis (Bang's disease)-free counties and parishes of the nation and the reduction of the disease has materially aided the dairyman.

When we turn to types of fences we broaden our conception of their roles in the peasant landscape as well as the origins and history of that landscape. Of field fences we have evidence of six types: (1) worm or snake; (2) post and rail; (3) stake and pole (and stake and rail); (4) nail and pole; (5) split post and barbed wire; and (6) creosoted posts. Each of these types has its own geography; that is, each has a definite set of cultural and physical circumstances.
which permitted, or even promoted, its use and eventual decline. The first four types might be grouped under a Rail Tradition, the other two, under barbed-wire types.

The worm fence mentioned in the early laws of the parish (Pritchard, 1940, p. 47) has been known by many names (Merideth, 1951) including snake, split rail, and Virginia rail. As its name implies, it worms, or snakes, its zigzag track across the landscape using great quantities of wood, land, and labor. Since wood, land, and labor were all fairly plentiful and cheap on St. Helena's peasant farms until the World War II migrations, and since the worm fence was the only economical type known that would "turn a hog," this picturesque form persisted. Many adults in St. Helena can still describe with considerable authority the great amount of labor required to build and maintain a worm fence. And since wood is still plentiful (over 80 per cent woodland) and land values are not excessive (about $30.00 farm income per farm acre per year) we can feel reasonably certain that scarcity of labor is the cause of worm-fence decline. Farmers generally claim that a shortage of help requires them to make the cash outlay for wire fencing. If labor were available in such quantities as earlier, some peasants state that worm fences would suffice and require no outlay of precious cash. "We have to use 'bob' wire because our chaps have all left." So, a variety of elements—legal, economic, technological, and demographic—find landscape expression in the rambling story of the worm fence.
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The post and rail fence, mentioned also in the 1813 Police Jury Minutes, was probably never widespread in St. Helena Parish and no genuine examples exist today (other than suburban specimens in the coy rustic style). The post and rail fence always was an expensive form in terms of labor so that it was usually a form used either in conspicuous consumption or in areas of high land values. Since, as noted earlier, the people of St. Helena have preferred to express affluence in ways other than superfluous farm structures, and since they have not felt great pressure of rising land values, the post and rail form has not been widespread.

We have no evidence as yet of stake and rail fences, but a few stake and pole do exist which utilize unskinned poles of three to five inches in diameter in lieu of split rails. Such a fence if well constructed and adequately braced provides a very inexpensive enclosure for small areas such as hog pens (Plate VIII, Fig. b). If the peasant has access to a good woodlot and the use of a chain saw, he can construct a post and pole pen which is larger, healthier, and safer (no wire cutting of stock) than a wire pen. Furthermore, it is proof against hogs such as no wire fence really is and it requires no direct outlay of cash other than a small amount of gasoline for the saw.

The nail and pole fence is about the final degeneration of the rail-fence tradition, as it is no longer self-supporting. Small saplings are nailed at close intervals to the insides of a ring of posts making a small, hastily
constructed enclosure (Plate VIII, Fig. c). Such fences will not last as real working fences because the poles are too weak. Most specimens of this type are eventually supplemented by patches composed of wire and planks and soon result in a jumbled, junky appearance.

Leaving the Rail Tradition, the split post and barbed wire type bridges the change to commercial fencing (Plate VIII, Fig. d). Posts for this type are made by splitting six-foot lengths of a durable wood such as sweet gum, sassafras, or locust. The splitting method reported involves either two men with axes striking opposite ends of the length of trunk and "popping" the post out, or riving posts out in the more widely known manner using a froe and mallet (illustrated in Wright, 1956). Such posts, or stakes, are driven upside down in the fence line and barbed wire is stapled loosely to the stake. The musical note of a tightly strung fence is unusual, though increasing, in St. Helena Parish. Stakes are usually placed between older, rotting stakes so that quite a few fences show three and even four generations of stakes.

On some farms—especially stock and dairy farms—creosoted (occasionally steel or cedar) posts are purchased directly with no thought of self-sufficiency. However, many peasants have found the most economical fence to be purchased by indirect means; that is, having found that pressure-creosoted posts last far longer, these farmers cut and strip posts of specified dimensions to be sold to the creosoting
plants. The cash is then reinvested in prepared posts, thus maintaining a measure of self-sufficiency. Many woodlots are selectively and systematically cut over in such a way as to maintain a continuous crop of salable posts. In this way the farm provides its own posts as before and a small cash gain as well. The resulting change in the landscape involves not only a new fence type, but a peculiar permanent cropping in woodlots, a primitive sustained yield.

Other than field fences, there is a wide variety of enclosures, yard fences (mainly paling, picket, hog wire, and chain link fences), garden fences (mainly hog wire), and temporary squares of stacked posts around young trees (Plate VIII, Fig. e), all of which protect highly valued areas around the farmstead from wandering stock. But yard fences are not only practical; a considerable pride is expressed, not only in the dooryard of some farms, but in its fence as well. The chain link fence and the paling fence which it has replaced in part sometimes surround only the front yard where they are readily seen. The yard fence, then, is one of the forms of conspicuous consumption used by St. Helena's peasants. This is further confirmed by the use of painted board fences on the most pretentious farms and coy rustic ranch-style homes and by the use of chain link fence around family plots in cemeteries where stones and flowers are oriented for public viewing.
Summary: The Functioning of Farm Structures in the Farmscape.—Farm structures do not stand as anamalous features in the landscape; neither are they simply superimposed upon nature any more than they are simple responses to the physical circumstances of their sites. Contrarywise, they are both some of the means by which the culture of the peasant enables him to live in a particular land, and expressions of the suitability of the distinctive bonds which make the peasant and the land a unity. A Georgia stagecoach driver once informed Sir Charles Lyell, who had noted how much faster the train traveled, "the most you can say is, that each kind of vehicle runs fastest on its own line of road" (Lyell, 1849, p. 24). Similarly, we must argue that peasant farm structures are as good as they need be considering the surrounding physical and cultural matrix, including such factors as available materials, market relations, population movements, and general technological level. If we allow for each particular peasant culture's form of conspicuous consumption as well, we will enhance our understanding of peasant farmscapes.

Just as each vehicle has its own best route, each peasant culture has its own best range. That Upland Culture probed many areas and succeeded in some, we know. That its materials changed and its forms evolved we know also. Now we must also admit that where Upland peasant ways persist as seemingly relict forms, these ways are in fact dynamic statements of a viable relationship. Farm structures, by and
large eminently practical, are primary linkages in this dynamic, viable relationship.
NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1Kniffen (1965, pp. 563,574) notes changes in folk architecture in response to changes resulting from migration to new physical surroundings.

2A dogtrot house with full gallery (veranda) across at least the front, a full tier of shed rooms across the back, an ell in back, end chimneys, and a false gallery is a frequent and repeating form in St. Helena Parish. The false gallery is an addition to, or extension of the roof to protrude usually beyond the gallery. Functionally it is a wooden awning; indeed, it has been observed over the windows in the gable ends of houses. But the whole described above is a repeating unit and, at one time, a preferred form of house. As such it may deserve a special name. Professor Fred B. Kniffen has suggested privately that "Bluffland House" might be useful because it would identify the distinct subtype and its range. Bluffland houses are shown in Plate I.

3This disruption of evolution need not be the case; at least one house, completed in 1966, has been observed which is a thoroughly modern version of a story and a half dogtrot.

4Kniffen (1965, pp. 563-65) has outlined the secular changes (C. O. Sauer, 1941, p. 371) which have effected the evolution of the Crib Tradition barns of the Upland South.

5Anonymity of this family will be maintained. Suffice it to say that information for evaluating its importance was obtained from interviews, papers of the General Land Office (Baton Rouge), original census lists at the National Archives, and the Succession Records of St. Helena Parish.

6The roles of women and children in peasant operations, especially in Celtic, or Atlantic, Europe, is outlined succinctly by Evans (1956, pp. 221-22).

7Four "syrup houses" have been seen--two in adjoining East Feliciana Parish, one in Mississippi and one near Greensburg. See also Wright, 1956, for an illustration of a covered syrup furnace.
While much of the resistance in the Upland South to closing the range stems from a heritage of open range, we should also note that strict private ownership of land is an imposition on peasants and largely a product of the 19th century enclosures. "The old peasantries were attached to cooperative schemes of land use. . . ." (Evans, 1956, p. 220.) Another description of such cooperative systems is given by Geddes (1955, pp. 19, 38, 60). Weaver (1945, p. 60) asserts that the people of the Pine Barrens (i.e., Upland South Culture) in Mississippi "treated the forests as community property. . . ."
CHAPTER IV

FIELDS AND CROPS

The argument that the Upland South peasant farm represents a system with temporal continuity and a vital, functioning relationship with its range, or habitat, rather than being the social and economic debris of a former era, is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the fields and crops of these peasants and their cultural ancestors. What we must eventually see when thinking of the peasant farm is Warringer's (1938) arguments that unless fettered by unfortunate circumstances--largely political and economic--the peasant is very practical in adopting and adapting any innovations which will improve his lot. We must only add that an improvement must meet certain tests in the value system of the people who are supposed to be improved. We cannot expect people to, nor condemn morally the failure to, accept the values of other cultures which happen to dominate at the moment.

The crop system, and the nature of the fields that contain that system, of the peasants of St. Helena Parish, were fairly well set before the Revolutionary War. The crop and field system, like the farm structures, has traveled as
a complex of traits spreading over any areas where its practitioners could successfully settle. That this crop and field complex has validity and vitality is certain when today we see still functioning in St. Helena Parish and other Upland areas the same basic forms that have been described repeatedly since about 1750. As in the case of farm structures, there has been evolution in the form, additions and losses of elements, and displacements of the system, but the basic module provides the thread of continuity that permits us to trace origins and relations.

The Pattern.--Perhaps the most striking indication of continuity lies in the classes of the crops: (1) always--after initial efforts to clear and occupy a tract--there is a cash, or staple, crop or two; (2) always there is a group of food and feed crops including at least corn, sweet potatoes, and peas and beans; (3) always there is a herd of cattle, a number of hogs, and other livestock; (4) always there is an omnipresent woodland surrounding island clearings; (5) always there is a kitchen garden with a variety of greens, root crops, peas, and corn; and (6) always there is a seemingly careless, generalized utilization which involves multiple uses for most tracts on the farm. Proportions of the farm occupied by each of these categories has varied through time according to the quality of the land, density of settlement, proximity to market and transportation, and the preferences and experiences of the individual peasant.
Nevertheless, the share of improved land (i.e., excluding woodlands, old fields, home and garden sites, and so forth) devoted to cash crops seldom exceeds one-half and on smaller farms is frequently smaller. True to the practicality and sensitivity of the peasant, the staple-producing portion of his farm expands as the market and general economy are expansive but contracts sharply as depression sets in; it also contracts in the face of government restrictions on production (cotton allotments) and in response to labor-intensive, high-value crops such as indigo-seed production in late 18th century Natchez area.

But the cash, or staple, crop has too long held the attention of students of Southern agriculture,\(^1\) to the extent that regions have been defined on the basis of staple specialty (tobacco, cotton, rice)\(^2\) masking essential unity throughout the Upland South and sometimes more essential differences such as those between Upland and Lowland (Tidewater) cultures in the South.\(^3\) More important to the understanding of the dynamic continuity in St. Helena's peasant farms is the class of food and feed crops; for, while the staples vary in time and space in response to widely variegated stimuli, the subsistence crops remain nearly constant in kind, use, and function in the whole farm.

**Cash Crops.**—Any healthy, full developed peasantry must by definition produce some crops to meet the demands of town and city, of artesans, mechanics, literati, and rulers.\(^4\)
It is in this regard that the "part society" or "facultative symbiotic" aspect of the peasant culture is materialized in the landscape, in the cash crop specialties produced for market. In St. Helena Parish today the cash crops are cotton and green beans. These are grown for sale and shipment beyond the region. Only a few green beans are harvested for home use and these are culls because the idea of a uniform product has been accepted. The sole buyer of green beans is located at Greensburg and keeps an agricultural inspector on the buying lot at all times during the season and either "U.S. No. 1" or "U.S. Mixed" grades are assigned and prices fixed accordingly. In this way the tailored demands of Commercial Culture reach the fields of the peasant. To obtain the best price, he must produce beans that fit current urban tastes. Precedence for raising snap beans for market and an introduction to grading is to be found in the practice of carrying fresh produce to the French Market in New Orleans. Daniel (1941) included St. Helena Parish in Eastern Louisiana in his study of the farmers' section of that market for 1939. During that year 119 (or 6.7 per cent) of the registrants in the farmers' section came from Eastern Louisiana. While most of these farmers came from Livingston and Tangipahoa parishes, some must have come from St. Helena. At any rate, the practice of taking "overs" (left overs) to French Market continues today. It is also worth noting that the average size of farms was 27.5 acres, and of fruit and vegetable land 21.5 acres, for Eastern Louisiana, figures close to those of
St. Helena general farms.

Similarly, the peasant produces cotton to meet the demands of Commercial Culture. He has no use for the crop itself and, as will be seen in Chapter VI, "The Annual Round," cotton seems to be inserted into a preexisting system. The St. Helena peasant has a long tradition of producing cotton commercially and his production methods continue that tradition. Methods differ little from those common since about 1820. Farm-tool inventories in probated estates as well as the accounts of early travelers and reports of agricultural specialists repeatedly affirm that the current solution to cotton cultivation was formed well before the Civil War.

True enough, some farmers now use small tractors to prepare the fields for planting and all use commercial fertilizers. But still the mule and walking plow are found to be the most suitable for the cultivation of cotton as well as other crops.

With the restrictions on the production of cotton by acreage allotments, the more provident peasant has turned on cotton with labor-intensive methods. "I got to feed me and my mule anyway." So he has increased the frequency of cultivation, keeping the middles between cotton rows thoroughly pulverized. He believes that the insects in fallen squares will be killed by the excessive heat built up in the finely pulverized dust, thus preventing reinfestation. So, by means of intensive care he avoids laying out cash for insecticides or weed-killing chemicals; his free, but effective defoliant,
the first frost, bares the stalks for the last picking; he recognizes the necessity of fertilizer, however, and it is applied as a side dressing during cultivation.

Using these seemingly archaic methods, yields are reported regularly to be around 300 to 400 pounds of lint per acre. For the crop year 1964 St. Helena Parish reported 857 bales on 1,181 acres which amounts to .724 bale or about 362 pounds of lint per acre (Census, 1964). One record yield of nearly 800 pounds of lint per acre is reported. While under special circumstances stalks reach over five feet in height, the more industrious peasants usually achieve stands of moderately variable height, averaging about three to four feet tall. Seldom is cotton under two feet tall, and only under very poor cultivation or very unfortunate weather does the yield fall below a two-fifths bale (200 pounds of lint) per acre.

One of the more remarkable traits in the crop and field complex is the widespread folk practice of contour plowing. Nearly all of the crop land of the St. Helena peasants is in gently rolling hill land and cotton is no exception (Plate IX; Plate XIII, Figs. a-d). In all peasant general farm areas fields are laid out in contours. Some fields have terraces but these are the exception and probably stem from the efforts of county agents (County Agent Reports, in general). But good evidence exists to indicate that contour plowing has become a folk trait. It is firmly asserted that William Dunbar of Natchez at the suggestion of Thomas
Jefferson introduced contour plowing in the Old Natchez District about 1800 (Moore, 1958, pp. 44-45; Wailes, 1854, p. 153). The practice is supposed to have become widespread during the period from 1800 to 1830. Field traverses through Louisiana and Mississippi and beyond through parts of Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, all indicate that contour plowing is a folk trait in the Pine Barrens regions immediately adjoining the Louisiana-Mississippi boundary along 31° north latitude (the northern boundary of St. Helena Parish). From the upper Amite River in St. Helena and East Feliciana parishes north and east through Tangipahoa and Washington parishes, Wilkinson, Amite, Pike, Lawrence, Marion, and other Mississippi counties to the northeast to the vicinity of Laurel, Mississippi, contour plowing is a practice of the folk farmer as well as the commercial farmer. The exact extent of the folk practice has not yet been determined; but, suffice it to say that beyond the general area just noted we observe the typical Upland practice of ignoring slope when laying out rows. In areas adjoining the contour-plowing regions, rows are laid out in straight lines running up and down hills (northern Alabama, eastern Tennessee, and the Delta in Mississippi) or cultivation tends to avoid hillsides (western Tennessee and western Kentucky).

But in St. Helena Parish contour plowing represents not only an addition to Upland South methods, but reflects an intensification of cultivation and an instance of the willingness of the peasant to accept innovations which suit
his needs as he sees them and which are properly presented to him. Most St. Helena farmers claim either to have developed the notion themselves or to have acquired it from their fathers. The latter is the case, however, because it is utterly inconceivable that thousands of peasants could have uniformly and independently developed such a difficult practice as contour plowing. The difficulty of setting up and maintaining contours is well illustrated in Plate XIII, Figs. b–e. Such incomplete contouring (panel contouring) has been observed in western Tennessee. Nevertheless, in spite of what its origin may be, the art of contour plowing is now a well-entrenched part of the crop and field system of the St. Helena peasant.

Since cotton is a clean-cultivated crop, its cultivation often promotes erosion of the soil. The complete elimination through cultivation of all competing vegetation leaves the soil open to the full destructive force of the weather elements. But with contour plowing coupled with other usages, the peasant is able to control, if not stay, the down-slope movement of the soil which is his life. The contours are maintained and repaired even during the rainy months (June, July, and August) of the growing season, and at this critical point the mule is superior to the tractor because of the mule's ability to work in wet soil. Furthermore, the contours are left during the winter, contrary to the efforts of an early county agent to introduce the outlandish practice of fall plowing (County Agent, 1918); so
that during the short wet season (late November and February) the soil is still protected by contours and by weeds and stubble (Plate IX, Figs. b, d-f). So it is that peasant, mule, walking plow, contoured rows, cotton, fertilizer, and shifting of fields all combine in a system that not only provides an urban Commercial Culture with a staple product, but also preserves the basis for continuing to provide that staple.

Subsistence Crops.--In a no-less-intimate system the peasant provides the bulk of his food and feed, or subsistence, crops. With same general methods he raises his corn, pulses, peanuts, sweet potatoes, melons, pumpkins, squash, and sugarcane. Each of these crops provides food for man and feed for beast. Failure in one may be at least partially compensated by the others. In any case, generally one-half or more of his improved land is devoted to these fundamental crops. Hilgard (1884, p. 141) felt that, when cotton land exceeded one-third of the tilled land, provisions must be purchased. Today we would have included all cash crops in this figure and we would find that on many farms less than one-third of the plowland is in cash crops.

"To an American today as formerly, maize is 'corn,' the chief cereal, like wheat to the Mediterranean . . . the gift of this food crop, which has had a remarkable social significance whenever it has been accepted, is no mean legacy . . . it contributed toward the colonization of America
and it became the viaticum of explorers and pioneers" (Vidal de la Blache, 1926, pp. 216-18). The importance of corn in America can hardly be understated. But the great Vidal de la Blache (not alone) seems in this passage to have overlooked the fact that corn exists in a suite of food and feed crops. The peasant cannot live on corn alone and would not rely upon it singly. In spite of its prodigious growth,\textsuperscript{11} corn can fail. So, the peasant of St. Helena has a set of subsistence crops including corn, peas and beans, and sweet potatoes\textsuperscript{12} which, when considered in the context of the whole farm including garden, livestock, game, wild products, and cash, provides him, his family, and his animals with a varied and—under favorable conditions—a sufficient subsistence.

The corn grown by most St. Helena peasants is a mixed variety of dent corn called "finger cob." Seed is selected by the fallacious, but effective, method of choosing the largest kernels in the straightest, fullest rows. The effectiveness derives from their also selecting the slenderest, longest cobs. In spite of the belief that the kernel is selected, the selection is for ears of corn. The result, a rather spindly stalk four to six feet tall producing usually two ears with long, slender, red cobs bearing 16 rows of notably tall, yellowish-white kernels, provides good feed for mules, and will store for a little more than a year with little deterioration.

Corn is the first field crop planted each year and one of the last harvested. Since the earliest records, the Upland
farmer has gotten a variety of uses from his corn. After his cotton has been laid by in early August (see Chapter VI, "The Annual Round"), the peasant frequently turns the ears down following an ancient belief of Indian origin that this prevents damage by rain, wind, birds, and weevils (Moore, 1958, p. 58; Dick, 1948, pp. 100-101; Wailes, 1854, p. 184). It was once the practice to pull fodder; that is, the leaves of the corn stalk were gathered and stored as fodder (G. L. Anderson to J. O. Bullock, Anderson Papers, B-16/1; Dick, 1848, pp. 100-101; Moore, 1958, p. 58). Most often, however, the stalks are left intact in the field (Plate IX, Figs. d-f) for later stock penning13 which provides winter forage, manure for fields, and keeps a cover on the land during the winter short rainy period. Some corn may be gathered in August, but most awaits the end of cotton harvest. Selected corn for human use is ground for a toll (a share, usually one-sixth to one-fourth). Some of the rest may be ground corn, cob, and shuck as special stock feed. Most, however, is stored in the corncrib and doled out to the various stock and poultry as needed.

For man and beast alike, corn is supplemented by a second great subsistence crop, the sweet potato. Throughout the history of Upland Culture, the various forms of sweet potato have been reliable, abundant supplements to corn as a staple of the peasant's subsistence. With insight that should please the cultural geographer, Wailes (1854, pp. 194-95), observed: "It is generally conceded that the Irish
potato cannot in our climate be kept through the summer out of the ground. For this reason and possessing no value for stock, together with the preference which most Southerners give to the sweet potato, it is not more cultivated" (italics added; see also Appendix I and Weaver, 1945, p. 97).

Under favorable circumstances the sweet potato is a prodigious producer. Yields have been reported to be in excess of 200 bushels per acre. Indeed, the rate of production is so great that sweet potatoes are planted on rows with double the ordinary spacing, or about six to eight feet apart. Even at that interval and considering that only a few rows are planted, most peasant farms manage to fill a sizable root house with volume varying between 10 and 20 bushels. In addition, a large part of the crop is left in the field as forage for hogs, a practice that was much more common in the past (Wailes, 1854, p. 193). Whether hogs are allowed to run in the potato patch or not, surplus sweet potatoes are fed to hogs and even to cattle during the winter.

Generally speaking, two types of sweet potatoes are grown today, whereas five varieties are described for earlier periods. The more popular of these is a red tuber, long and pointed with relatively few eyes, called the Porto Rico. This variety is preferred by most as a human food. The second variety is called a choker, and is highly variable in size and shape with white or very pale yellow flesh and few eyes. The choker may be related to the Spanish, or white, sweet potato noted by Wailes (1854, p. 191) to be second in quality.
among five types. The white choker is grown if at all as a supplement to the red Puerto Rico variety. While red potatoes are prepared in the traditional sweet potato pie, the white variety is cooked like a baked Irish potato as well as made into pies.

At least as important as corn and potatoes in the crop and field system is a group of pulses. Their importance stems from their roles as soil improvers and forage as much as from their use as food. At least by the mid-eighteenth century the Upland farmer had taken up the practice of growing peas among his corn stalks, a practice which shields the soil from some of the ills of clean cultivation in addition to the other benefits which peas and beans offer (Moore, 1958, pp. 59-60; Gray, 1933, pp. 173, 197-99). The pea and bean crops grown on each farm vary, but includes green (string) beans (already described as a money crop), field peas, cowpeas, crowder peas, butter beans, and peanuts. Each of these has special uses in the scheme of the peasant. Cowpeas (black eye peas), for example, make an excellent fodder, soil builder, and erosion control. They are planted along with corn and provide forage for livestock after the harvest of corn. Peanuts play a similar role, with the added value on some farms of providing a small cash income. Peas and beans have been the continuing companion of the peasant at least since the early 18th century (Gray, 1933, pp. 173, 179) and their importance is difficult to estimate from such sources as the census (Appendix I) for, as Wailes (1854,
p. 195) noted, often they are not harvested as the census asked, but are fed directly to the stock in the field.

Most farms include a few rows of sugarcane (contrary to popular notions, not sorghum) seldom exceeding one-fourth of an acre. But, like the similarly small tract devoted to sweet potatoes, the few rows of sugarcane form an important link in the system that keeps the peasant farm on the land. As long as the peasant can grow the sweetening required by his household and thereby avoid laying out additional cash, he will be better able to maintain his way of life. Furthermore, the full-flavored "surps" made in the open pans compliments the other dishes in the peasant's diet and may even fill in certain nutritional requirements. Suffice it to note that the purchase of the same amounts as he ordinarily makes would amount to an expenditure of from $100.00 to $150.00 per year, which is a great deal of cash in this system.

In earlier times syrup was more important when the relative value of sugar was higher. And more use was made of the wastes. For example, a portion of the scum removed during the cooking process was fermented to make "clar bear" (clear beer), a sweet wine-like drink. The waste from this home brew along with the lightly fermented bulk of the cooking waste was fed to hogs as an additional fattener. Wailes (1854, pp. 189-90) described a similar home use of sugarcane and the making of molasses, using simple, crude mills with oak rollers and cooking in open pans. He noted the practice
especially in Amite, Pike, Marion, and Perry counties of Mississippi, an area immediately north of St. Helena Parish and in the Pine Barrens region discussed in connection with contour plowing.

Other field crops characteristic of the Upland peasant farm in St. Helena Parish are pumpkins, squash, and watermelons. These are all food and feed crops, like the rest of the subsistence crops. But, these crops along with some of the pulses are all the more interesting because of certain tendencies they point out. The peasant farm seems to be a merger between a number of systems. First, there are the obvious relations to general European concepts of field agriculture—as opposed, say, to paddy or hydraulic systems. Certainly the notion of a definite space allotted to this or that crop and clean cultivated by rather extensive methods is present. But we also note a second tendency: that of using mounds or hills upon which to plant.15 Evans (1966, p. 78) believes that hill tillage is a trait borrowed from Indians along with the crops grown on the hills: corn, beans, tobacco, pumpkins, gourds, and squash. These hills are not a mere consequence of planting, but are prepared in advance of any planting either by hand for smaller plots or by plow for larger plots. Like the lazy beds of Atlantic Europe (Evans, 1965, p. 225), these hills have turned into their cores the stubble, weeds, and animal manure that have accumulated there since the last crop. Wailes (1854, p. 150) describes the purposeful preparation of a ridge by as many as
five passes of the bar share plow without a coulter. Clods were broken with the harrow and, sometime later, a furrow was opened on top of the ridge by means of a bar share with coulter. Pumpkins, squash, and watermelons are planted on the handmade hills and their location brings up the third tendency: the mixed growths in many of the plots constituting an approximation of true gardening. Garden culture as a distinct agricultural (or horticultural) form involves the multi-storied, mixed planting which approximates, and even merges with, natural vegetation and depends on hoe tillage. As has already been noted, peas are often planted on rows of corn. Similarly, a few pumpkins, squash, and watermelons may be planted among the corn stalks. In this way a two-story vegetation is created; if corn, peas, and squash or pumpkins are planted together, a three-story vegetation is created. This multi-storied planting appeared early in the colonial period and was claimed to have been adopted from aboriginal practices (Gray, 1933, pp. 173, 179; Evans, 1966, p. 78).

Still a fourth tendency, another which may hark back to Ulster, Scotch-Irish, origins seems possibly related to the infield-outfield, or runrig, system of land use (Evans, 1964, p. 225). St. Helena peasants, except on the smallest holdings (20 acres or less), generally have a number of fallow ("resting") fields, a tract that is reverting to forest, and a tract being cleared. Examination of Figures 6 and 7 will show that there is a slow shifting of cultivation which may involve cycles of about 20 to 30 years.
Gray (1933, pp. 197-99) describes a soil-management system arrived at about the time of the Revolutionary War and involving stock penning, resting periods, alternation of staples with lighter crops, use of cowpeas as soil-builders, and, finally, return to forest. The whole cycle required 20 to 30 years. The lack of population pressure and the general population mobility that has marked American history may account in part at least for the incomplete development of the infield-outfield system. Nevertheless, there is a marked concentration of horticultural crops near the homestead while field crops are dispersed, often in separate clearings. The garden, the multi-storied field crops, the few fruit trees, and sugarcane (which is troublesome to transport though not to grow) are clustered around the barnyard. Cash crops lie beyond these, while corn and fodder pulses are likely to be at some distance. But it should be noted that, while these more intensively cared-for plots are always near the house, they are not always on the land nearest the house. Often, to take advantage of some particular properties, a plot of intensive-care crop may be located at some distance from the house. Hence, it is not merely a matter of transportation efficiency or fertility, but a combination of both with a preference for a system that resembles to some extent the infield-outfield system.

Whether these suggested origins are valid or not, there is in fact this suggested combination of special traits in practice, and it serves not only to garner increased
yields, but to preserve the soil which is the basis upon which any complete system must be built.

Field crops merge into gardens and these merge into the "natural" vegetation, including woodland growths and weeds. The garden, usually cared for by the woman (but, there is no clear-cut sexual division), is generally located near, but not always next to, the house. While fences always define gardens as far as space allotments are concerned, gardens cannot be so clearly delineated in functional terms. We have already noted the use of garden (horticultural) methods in some so-called field crops; the plants that are raised by gardening techniques (hand cultivation, individual attention, transplantation, propagation by slips or cuttings, grafting, and related practices spread beyond the vegetable garden to the dooryard, the few rows of fruit trees, the field crops already noted, and even to the toleration of certain weeds and other wild plants. A garden on a St. Helena peasant farm, in addition to containing collard greens, turnips, mustard greens, onions, sweet corn, radishes, lima beans, tomatoes, peppers, and other vegetables of recognized value, usually sports a variety of weeds or "yarbs" (herbs) such as pokeweed and "wild garlic" (mullein) tolerated for their real or imagined special properties (Plate X). Fruit trees. (figs, plums, pears, peaches, quinces, and apples) often border the garden, but just as often grow in a scattered pattern about the more intensely cultivated parts of the farm. Fruit trees, herbs, and such wild offerings as
blackberries, huckleberries, and wild plums may be found almost anywhere near the farmhouse in a semicultivated state. Sometimes a little care is given wild elements, while domesticated forms are left to grow in a semiwild condition. Even weeds are sometimes purposely left on certain garden rows such as among peppers and greens to give them protection from early frosts. Thus, the term garden is difficult to define in this culture, for gardening techniques have been merged with field-crop methods.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of the gardening concepts of St. Helena's peasant farms is the lack of concern for efficiency. And in this may lie one of the more important marks of this culture: the peasant does not measure his success in terms a ratio of profit versus costs expressed in terms of money, but in terms of successfully completing another year of eating the foods he enjoys, in feeling pride in his independence and in his skills, in seeing his children grow up with some education, and in seeing his farm produce more effortlessly the goods that he values by methods that he approves. To the peasant the good life is "a structure of meanings that gives the pleasure that comes from a life well lived with little." His "satisfactions come from the exercise of unquestioned virtues and the enjoyment of one's own skills and the fruits of one's own labor" (Redfield, 1960, p. 74).

One of the last traits that is given up after one abandons the Upland rural life is the garden. The Uplander
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turned welder or bookkeeper or schoolteacher often continues the garden just as does the stockman and dairymen of Upland origins. These sentimental relics are often things of bucolic beauty, but they have lost their eminent practicality. Their owners often expend excessive amounts of labor and even money on their care, which has become highly rationalized under the influence of horticultural practices disseminated through government circulars and newspapers.

However, in spite of their overdrawn care, these non-farm gardens share diagnostic traits with the more unkempt garden of the peasant. Among these are: the same vegetables but with an increased emphasis on tomatoes, roasting ears, and radishes, and with the addition of such as lettuce; the growing of peas, squash, pumpkins, and watermelons on and among corn; the bending down or "topping" of corn stalks; and the same general annual round of garden events. Plate XIII, Fig. e shows a group of houses in a nonfarm settlement near Baton Rouge. Extensive garden plots and other features show peasant backgrounds.

Human tastes, an emphasis on livestock, cultivation tools and methods, and certain concepts of space arrangements combine to deal with the realities of human and animal nutritional needs, soil, slope, climate, market arrangements, and transport systems and, taken together, these produce the landscape which has come to be recognized as characteristic of the parish. The elements all function as a whole, as has been argued repeatedly. Possibly the simplest demonstration
of unity can be seen in aerial photographs which show the results of attempts to establish the practice of terracing. As the years wear by, the photographic record shows a decline in the amount of terraced land. There is an eventual return to forest except where permanent improved pastures happen to have been developed on terraced old fields. This decline is a net loss to the nation that must be charged off to general, unnecessary prejudice against the Upland farm system. The retraction of the areas of terracing has three causes, all stemming from the fact that terracing is an undesirable disruption of an existing system. First, the resulting changes in field size and shape restricted the peasant's use of his land by putting fixed, permanent limits to his fields in unfamiliar units. A great change in field shape resulted from terracing. Such long, slender, meandering fields were more suitable to extensive field-crop methods the county agent wanted to introduce than to the semi-horicultural methods familiar to the peasant. Secondly, the terraces had the effect, if they were permanently respected, of ending the practice of allowing land to revert to forest for regeneration. Such a recommendation assumes more-stable land use and demographic conditions than actually exist. As a family fluctuates in size and in age composition, its land use varies. So, in many cases, systemic changes in land valuation inherent in the aging of a St. Helena peasant family obliterated the conscientious efforts of the county agent. Thirdly, the terraces demanded a marked increase in investment
to establish and maintain. The maintenance of the terraces was the real problem, requiring more effort than the peasant was willing to invest. This reluctance had its origin in part in the conservatism of the people, to be sure; but considering the general remoteness of St. Helena Parish in terms of marketing systems, such a shift to extensive, commercial methods was too great a risk for the peasant. Even today, it is with difficulty that truckers are brought into Greensburg to take on loads of green beans and near the end of the season cucumbers and sweet peppers are added to the loads of beans to lure the truckers to the buying lot.

While the contour plowing practiced by the peasant may seem like an incipient form of terracing, the failure of the terracing program shows that functionally in this system they are not. Similarly, we must reject the frequently voiced belief of agricultural-extension people that contours are merely degenerated terraces because we have good evidence that contour plowing is a folk trait of long standing. True enough, there are some general peasant farms where parts of an old terracing project are maintained. However, such plots (Plate XIII, Fig. b) are generally located in amphitheater-like tracts so that the plots created by the terraces are small and of more familiar size to the peasant—an instance of adaptation of novel ideas when they are in fact suitable.

In 1884 Hilgard (p. 141) advised Louisiana farmers "to plant cotton as a money crop after subsistence is provided
for, and to cultivate smaller areas well, while husbanding the powers of the soil. . . ." Since that time cotton production has declined from a high of 8,122 in 1890 to 856 bales in 1964, partly through crop limitations and partly through a decline in tenant farming. But concern with subsistence (food and feed) has not declined similarly: corn production in 1890 was 135,315 bushels, while in 1964 it was 85,996 bushels, a much smaller decrease. Similarly, sweet potato production declined from 52,775 bushels in 1880 to 7,118 bushels in 1964. During the great depression and World War II corn and sweet potato production (i.e., subsistence) increased to some of the highest figures of record, but cotton production did not similarly rise. Over the same period there has been a continuing increase in both numbers and quality of beef and dairy cattle. From 1880 to 1890 St. Helena's population began leveling off (7,504 and 8,062) and, except for two peaks in 1910 and 1940, has exhibited a very low growth rate to 1960 (9,162). All of which indicates that knowingly or not, Hilgard's 1884 advice has been followed.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1See, for example, Haystead and Fite (1955, pp. 102-10), who describe the most extreme instances as general for the entire South. By contrast, Sydnor (1948, p. 6) writes "before describing Southern money crops it should be plainly said that they were superimposed on a background of general farming. Only rarely did Southern farms plan to devote every effort to a single crop . . . furthermore, there were a great number of farms where little if any of the staple crops were raised . . . particularly back from the coast and away from the larger rivers. . . ."

2Upland rice was grown rather extensively in the Piney Woods sections of Louisiana and Mississippi (including St. Helena Parish) until the late 19th century. (See Wailes, 1854, pp. 188-89; and Appendix I.) Since the region is no longer notable for its rice production, it would be presum­ably significantly different from what it was in the 19th century. However, we know that this is not true. Rice has come and gone along with many other traits, but the Upland farm of the Piney Woods has not. Again we are impressed with the error of classing regions by their products.

3Upland-Lowland differences were missed, for example, by Dick (1948), Gray (1933), and others.

4While it may be inadvisable to use biological ter­minology, Wagner (1960, pp. 19, 71) has pointed to the important peasant trait of "facultative symbiosis" with a larger social unit in which "the organism may take advantage of a symbiotic relationship, but may survive without it quite well." However, on this point we must hasten to add that the peasant will not do "quite well" without the relationship with an urban market, as Warringer (1939) has pointed out. Further discussion of this "part-society" and "part culture" aspect of peasantry may be found in Wolf (1966, pp. 2, 8-9) and Redfield (1956, pp. 23-39), who also give references to additional literature.

5As indicated in the following table, cotton planting has been declining since 1890 and is related to many factors other than crop restrictions:
CHANGING MONEY CROP-TENANCY-RELATIONS, 1880-1964
ST. HELENA PARISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. Farms</th>
<th>No. Tenants</th>
<th>Bales of Cotton</th>
<th>Average Size of Farm in Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>5,328</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>8,122</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aAll figures from Census Reports; see Appendix I.*

6The spread of the boll weevil reached St. Helena Parish about 1908-10 (Baker, 1927, p. 68) and must account in part for the declines in production. Increasing competition, a marginal position, and a shift to cattle owing to maturing of the region (Trow-Smith, 1959, p. 2), together with the advent of the boll weevil seem to have nearly obliterated cotton production (table above).

7Hilgard (1884, p. 165) computed St. Helena's production in 1884 at .39 bale or about 185 pounds of lint per acre, while the county agent (Report, 1918) estimated yields at 500 pounds of seed cotton, or a little over one-third bale per acre. From various census reports the following recent rates have been computed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Year</th>
<th>Bale Per Acre</th>
<th>Pounds of Lint Per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Excellent land was soberly reported by Wailes in 1854 (p. 139) to produce stalks 5 to 10 feet tall for the state of Mississippi. Hilgard (1884, p. 165), abstracting the report forwarded to him by H. C. Newsom of Greensburg, noted that cotton frequently ran "to weed in wet seasons, and topping was resorted to to restrain it."

These traverses for Louisiana and southern Mississippi were made both by auto and by airplane. All traverses included well over 10,000 miles on the ground and over 20 hours by air.

The relation between crops and stock is discussed by Pfeifer (1956, pp. 249-50). There is a reciprocity between the peasant, the stock, and the crop, each benefiting the other.

Corn yields more feed on sandy soils with only light fertilization than any other crop (Baker, 1927, p. 59).

The association of these three crops has been noted by many: Moore, 1958, pp. 57 and 176; Sydnor, 1948, p. 6; Gray, 1933; Weaver, 1945; Evans, 1965; and others.

The practice of stock penning can be traced to the Atlantic colonies (Gray, 1933, pp. 197-98) and on to Atlantic Britain (Evans, 1966).

These are agricultural types; see Appendix IV for a correlation of common and botanical names.

The cultivation of crops in rows by plow did not appear in Europe until 1731 (Slicher van Bath, 1963, p. 305). This innovation comes after most of the important trends in trans-Atlantic migration had begun, and consequently purely European agricultural practices were not likely firmly fixed. The opening was thus provided for the admission of Indian practices to the new culture stream.

This distinction is based upon a paper ("Agricultural Classification, Extreme Southern India") read by William Noble in 1966 at the Southwestern Division Meeting of the Association of American Geographers at New Orleans.

Once one has gained a little familiarity with the contents and schedules of peasant gardens, he can gain a fair notion of current rural events by noting what is happening in suburban gardens. The persistence of peasant values among nonpeasants (or ex-peasants) has been noted by Evans (1956) and others. It is far from unusual to find suburban men in Southern cities keeping gardens that are pampered versions of the peasant kitchen garden. Interesting too is the persistence of yard work (other than gardening) as
"women's work," no doubt a retention of the woman's role in the peasant backgrounds of the South. This woman's concern with the dooryard is reflected in the letter of Lilly Batts (Bates?) of January 16, 1873 (Anderson Papers, B16/1): "Sissy when you write to me you must put sum little flower seeds like sipprus vine seeds and tutch may nots and of all little seeds in the envelop."

18 Such an opinion was voiced in private discussion by people in Agricultural Extension work at Louisiana State University and in the office of the County Agent at Greensburg.

19 The peak in 1910 was due largely to an increase in white population as a result of the growing lumber industry. The 1940 increase represents the cumulative effects of the Great Depression. Not only did people return to farm life, but at least as important, the out-migration from the farm areas was curtailed.
CHAPTER V

LIVESTOCK, PASTURES, AND WOODS

An emphasis on livestock raising and the omnipresence of woodland are two of the most characteristic elements in the landscape of St. Helena Parish. They are as notable as Pen Tradition houses, Crib Tradition barns, and the corn-sweet potato-peas crop complex.¹ About 80 per cent of the parish is wooded and nearly all rural landholdings have stock of one sort or another. Nearly every general farm has, and has had in the past, an assortment of livestock almost invariably including cattle and hogs. Other kinds of stock kept were horses and mules; in the past many oxen and sheep; and a variety of poultry including chickens, turkeys, and at times, ducks, geese, and guinea fowl. Pigeons and rabbits have been kept infrequently.

Nearly all discussions of early periods in areas of culture similar to St. Helena Parish note an emphasis on livestock. Often a hunting-herding-farming frontier is suggested.² But rather than a response to certain frontier conditions, this hunter-stockman-farmer "frontier" was in fact the culture of the people who were on the forward edge of settlement; they carried their culture to the edge of settlement instead of redeveloping it on the edge of
settlement with each advance in the frontier. Instead of a "pioneer culture" arising in response to the frontier, there was an uprooted peasantry on a quest for land (Ackersucht), the primary repository of value to peasants; this peasantry moved into all available areas to which their culture was suited. That culture and its derivatives are still suitable to most of the same areas, though Commercial Culture has been able to override it in certain restricted zones.³

Therefore, the spread of the stockman-farmer or the hunter-stockman-farmer frontier was actually the expansion of Upland Culture into the range, or habitat, it was competent to manage. Its contemporary successors are not evidence of lingering frontier conditions, but of persisting suitability. The peasants of St. Helena's general farms, whether 19th or 20th century, are equally at home with hunting, with handling stock, or with farming and gardening. The same man who sold feeder stock today may be plowing corn or hunting table meat tomorrow.

The role of livestock in Upland economy was varied. Some persons specialized in the raising and in the management of stock even in the 19th century (Bonner, 1964, pp. 25-31; Succession Records, St. Helena Parish) as they do today. However, these specialists arise from the same cultural bases as the general farmer. The farming peasant in St. Helena Parish is also stockman, though he follows less intensive husbandry methods and has too many other interests to be classed as stockman alone. Cattle and hogs are important to
him, but in ways that derive mainly from his cultural ancestors. In the same way that the peasant uses unspecialized methods of tillage, he follows a generalized method of animal husbandry.

Even though somewhat improved cattle are kept, they are turned loose to forage in the woods in much the same way that was followed in the early 19th century. Mixed-blood feeder stock originating in part at least as a by-product of the dairy farms have largely replaced the semi-feral breeds called Atakapas and Opelousas$^4$ of an earlier age. Yet, we can still see creatures in the woodland herds that have long, curving horns; a mottled, variegated coloring; and a wiry build, all of which seem to indicate that ancient ancestors may still influence the local bloodlines. Little is known of the old, local breeds, but speculation derives them mainly from Spanish stock imported from Florida, Cuba, Santo Domingo, Mexico, and Texas (Moore, 1958, p. 62; Gray, 1933, pp. 78-80; Holmes, 1965, p. 101). To these were added strains from the border states and even purebred stock from the east coast and the British Isles. In recent years, mainly since World War II, serious efforts to improve dairy and beef herds have introduced Guernsey, Jersey, Holstein, Hereford, Shorthorn, Brahma, and other highly regarded breeds. Occasionally, however, we meet a creature whose mien convinces us of this entire mongrel ancestry.

The cattle customs of the St. Helena peasant share a number of traits with those of their cultural relatives.
The releasing of stock to fend for themselves in rough pasture, the casual provision of winter fodder, and the reluctance to house the stock in the winter, are traits shared with most Upland South and even some of the herders of Atlantic Britain (Evans, 1965, pp. 223-25; 1966; Slicher van Bath, 1963, p. 286; Trow-Smith, 1959, pp. 3-6; Bonner, 1964, pp. 25-30). Similarly, the annual roundup and drive by mounted cowboys, drovers, or crackers along with concentrating points known as "cowpens" are traits which stem from Atlantic Britain (Trow-Smith, 1959, pp. 3-22). Continuity can also be traced at least to the Carolinas in the practice of branding and earmarking (Bonner, 1964, p. 26; Cargill Graham, 1956, pp. 113-13). Tradition, along with general conditions of physical, economic, and technological environment, influenced the type of animal raised. Since it was the custom to allow cattle to wander at large, nature had an important role in shaping the breed; an animal resulted which could fend for itself in the swamps and woods; resist heat, disease, and insects; require several years to reach marketable condition; and then endure a long walk to market. Such a beast had a small rangy body (about 500 pounds) and immense, wide-spreading horns (Gray, 1933, p. 846). (Some Louisiana cattle, Opelousas, were large and notable as draft animals.) But it is interesting to note that, in spite of differing physical environments, Upland peoples produced cattle similar in size and value as well as in function to those of their forebears of the British Isles—and did so
by means of similar practices. Interesting also in its possible indication of direct diffusion is the occurrence of the term "black cattle" to denote rough, "native" neat cattle without regard to color (Trow-Smith, 1959, p. 3). The term "black cattle" was used in St. Helena Parish in 1815 apparently to describe range cattle (Succession Records, File Case S-1).6

Cattle herds of fairly large size were occasionally built up in St. Helena Parish. Some herds were greater than 200 head, but most were under 40, and quite a few estates listed fewer than 20 head (Succession Records, various). The Census reports cattle at a rate of nearly two head per person in the earlier days (1840-50) and declining to about one head per capita (1890 and later), but this decline is relative, for the present cattle population is several times what it was in 1840 (Census, various; Appendix I). It is doubtful whether census returns are accurate for these early days since it is very likely that many persons did not know exactly how many range cattle they owned and wild herds were apparently fairly large.

These animals ran at large in common herds on the open range, with ownership being traced by means of brands and earmarks. General Land Office surveyors complained that there was scarcely any form of survey mark that was proof against the milling, curious herds which had obliterated much of the evidence of earlier surveys (Elliott, 1961, pp. 73-75). Lacking descriptions of annual roundups and overland drives...
of cattle specifically attributed to St. Helena Parish, we must argue for their presence from the general cultural background of the people. We are supported in this argument by the mention of both "cowpens" in 1804 and cattle driving in 1803 in the Succession Records (File Cases D-4 and D-3).

However, today driving cattle is out of the question from the standpoint of safety, economy, and, where the range is closed, law. Instead of consigning his marketable cattle to a drover, today's peasant either sells them to buyers who collect them in trucks or he takes them in his own pickup truck to an auction yard or slaughter house, usually in Kentwood (Tangipahoa Parish) or in Baton Rouge. Considering the changed conditions under which the modern peasant operates, especially with regard to law, transportation technology, and the notable taste of urban people for tender, fat beef, the tough, wiry, small "black cattle" are no longer fitting. Nevertheless, except on stock and dairy farms, cattle raising follows the old, familiar customs as much as practicable: cattle range freely over one's own land with a minimum of care; as winter range degenerates, they are brought into the fields to feed on stubble and fattened on corn, pumpkins, pea vines, sweet potatoes, and other available food; while the cattle are so assembled, and during the dry seasons, as much of the range as possible is burned in order to improve the grass and cut down on bushy growth.

As we noted earlier, there are no clear-cut distinctions among gardens, fields, and forest. Exploitation and
management extend generally over all three, and "fire cultivation" or burning the woodlands is a good example. The peasant not only uses fire in the cultivation of his fields, but also in the forest, in the somewhat justified belief that he is maintaining or developing desirable conditions. During the same season that he burns unconsumed or undecayed stubble from last year's fields and broom sedge from older fields, he burns tracts in the forest. Once universally condemned by foresters, this practice has limited acceptance today, especially from those who manage quail, turkey, and deer preserves. Peasant farmers in St. Helena Parish almost universally condemn strict forest-fire prevention. They assert that burning improves grass, maintains an open and park-like woodland desirable for cattle and preferred game, reduces insect pests, eliminates dangerous dead wood, and reduces undesirable competition from weed trees. Regardless of the correctness of their arguments (and they are supported by well-schooled experts), their care or management of the woodlands has left important marks in the landscape.

Burning has been practiced by Europeans in the Florida Parishes, including St. Helena, at least since the late 18th century (Romans, 1775, pp. 11, 15-16), and the practice is said to have originated with the Indians. If such is the case, Europeans must have learned their lessons from Indians of the Atlantic shore, for entire South (chiefly Upland Culture) is remarkable in its frequency of incendiary fires in forests. Celtic, or Atlantic, Europe seems to be the more
likely source of the practice for at the critical period—the 18th century—burning of outfield areas was widespread (Evans, 1956, p. 229; 1964, pp. 233-34; Cobbett, 1821, pp. 135-36). While Evans (1966, p. 78) argues that burning the brush was borrowed from Indians, he also notes (1964, pp. 233-34) the use of fire cultivation in the outfields in Atlantic Europe. Owsley (1949, p. 108) also argues for an Indian origin of burning. Burns (1948, pp. 1-4) argued that "this problem of burning seems to be peculiar to the South" and reported that in 1946 the South suffered 79.2 per cent of the forest fires while having only 28.4 per cent of the forests of the United States. "No discussion of the Southern forest fire problem would not be complete with some mention of the high ratio of incendiary fires which . . . lead all other causes . . . 44.1 per cent of fires started in 1945 being incendiary." Burns further noted that Louisiana led all states by having a rate of 75.5 per cent incendiary forest fires. Perversity, lawlessness, and even psychological defectiveness of the Southerner have been suggested as the cause of the origin and persistence of the custom (Owsley, 1949, p. 110, mentions such allegations). In spite of such prejudices, the practice of burning does in fact produce what the St. Helena peasant wants in a woodland: an open, grassy park growing posts, pulpwood, and timber along with cattle, turkeys, deer, and plants such as blackberries and pokeweed which do well in disturbed tracts. Such a park produces desired products, but requires little expense for
the farmer. It reaches its most complete development on certain dairy farms in St. Helena Parish (Plate XV, Fig. c).

While the raising of meat cattle seems to be quite important, especially in the overall relations between the various sections of the farm, the raising of hogs has been, and still is, more important to the general farm peasant (Baker, 1927, p. 78). The number of hogs has continuously exceeded either cattle or humans until after 1920 (Appendix I). Pork is called simply "meat," whereas all others receive special terms. To the food of corn, sweet potatoes, and peas we must add a fourth element, pork, for while most beef has been raised for sale, pork is raised for home consumption. Ham, bacon, sausage, and lard have long been mainstays in the St. Helena peasant's diet. In earlier times, before the passage of the "Hog Law" in the 1920's, herds of Piney Woods rooters, often amounting to 200 head or more, roamed free in the woods along the stream bottoms. In this free, semi-feral state they multiplied freely, costing the peasant nothing for their support until ready for fattening. Late each fall hogs, like cattle, were rounded up, sorted, marked, and those to be fattened and killed, chosen. Hogs selected for "meat" were confined and fed corn, sweet potatoes, pumpkins, and fermented scum from sugarcane syrup making. Disadvantages of the whole procedure included not only occasional losses to crops and loss of hogs turned too wild to capture, but the spread of disease was made easy by the high population density and uncontrolled mobility.
Hog cholera was taking a serious toll of the free-ranging swine at least by 1890, when the census reported that there were 8,737 head of swine, and that, while 2,510 were consumed, 1,382 died (Census, 1890, p. 331). We can believe that the hogs that died fell largely to cholera, on the authority of the county agent who was called on to deal with that disease from 1918 on (County Agent, 1918).

So today, while most peasants in St. Helena recognize the reasons for the practice of keeping fewer, better hogs and feeding them in pens, some complain about being required to pen them up and carry feed to them. The number of hogs has decreased to one-tenth the number enumerated in 1850, but the incidence of cholera is now nil. Those who have invested in adequate pens and shelters have realized the advantages of the new system. Large, drained hog pastures with ample ponds and shade have been observed, as have "pig parlors" with board- or concrete-floored shelters. Such methods make the keeping of improved swine more rewarding whether for consumption or for sale—especially since hogs must now be confined anyway.

Like cattle and swine, the mule has come to be thought of as an integral feature in the farmscape of St. Helena Parish. Mules gradually came into importance during the 19th century, but a baffling fluctuation in the ratio of mules to oxen to horses marks the census returns. From the erratic figures in the census reflected in Table 3, especially for 1880, we are led to suspect some of the figures. Nevertheless,
TABLE 3
RATIO OF OXEN TO MULES TO HORSES, 1850-1964,
ST. HELENA PARISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Oxen</th>
<th>Mules</th>
<th>Horses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>No Longer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Counted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Separately</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

throughout the 19th century both horses and oxen outnumbered mules until oxen were no longer counted separately. The number of horses reflects, no doubt, the stage of transportation technology and their use in connection with stock tending. Stock and dairy farms still maintain a goodly number of horses for that purpose, and a few general farms keep horses as well. The numbers of oxen reflect the cheapness of such traction, now largely replaced by tractors and trucks. The notable increase in number of oxen in 1900 reflects their use for heavy traction in the lumber industry. In the estate of Lucretia McKnight for 1888, for example, one brown mare mule was valued at $75.00, which was more than a bay horse and a yoke of oxen together ($70.00). (Succession Records, File Case M-4.) Oxen were inexpensive, being valued usually
between $15.00 and $25.00. Their general employment stemmed not only from their being produced on the farm, but also from a general familiarity with their use.

Also, in spite of certain irregularities in the census, we can easily see that horses (and throughout the 19th century, oxen) were more common than mules. Nevertheless, the mule persists through even the introduction of tractors, trucks, and automobiles. Many peasants who also own tractors perform most cultivation with mules, preferring the maneuverability and all-weather performance of the mule. Rather than replace mules on the general peasant farm, the tractor has replaced the ox.

Instead of a clearly distinct activity, we find that the exploitation of woodlands is merged with the use of cultivated areas. We have already noted this generalized exploitation in connection with crops, burning, and cattle raising and, during the 19th century, with swine raising. This generalized exploitation of woodlands pervades most forest activities. Woods provide new land to replace tired ground. As fields are judged to be too depleted of the little fertility they possessed, they are abandoned and new fields are carved from the woods. Land near the farmstead is less subject to abandonment because more care is taken with maintaining its fertility; but outlying fields are often abandoned after 15 to 20 years of cultivation. These may be maintained as old fields for rough pasture for many years. Some of these old fields, so overgrown by broom sedge as to
look like a field of grain, are burned annually. The searing heat of such fires retards and even prevents the regrowth of forest vegetation. Hence, we can find in the midst of the forest nearly permanent old fields serving as pasture, the only care of which is "fire cultivation," and which accumulate ashes of burned broom sedge and manure of cattle, thus "resting" until needed again.

Cedar trees can be found in the woods of St. Helena Parish, but are most often found associated with man's disturbed lands (Plate XVI): on abandoned farmsteads, around churches and cemeteries, and along old roads and fence lines. Occasionally, they seem to be spreading across an old field, being taller on one side or along the edges than in the middle. That these trees are valued by the peasant is clear, though he frequently seems unable to articulate their value. Few house yards and scarcely any churchyards or cemeteries are without these trees. Generally, they do not seem to be planted intentionally, but rather to be tolerated. Today the only use other than esthetics to which they are put is to make posts. Cedar posts are occasionally used in fences (Plate VII, Fig. d), but most often they are used when an especially long-lasting post is needed. An example of such is in building the base for a syrup mill (Plate XII, Fig. b). In the past there were very likely other uses for cedar; one will occasionally hear of a cabin's having been built of cedars.

Another wild plant which follows man, taking hold in
land which he has disturbed is the pokeweed (J. D. Sauer, 1952; Plate XVI, Fig. f). And similarly, pokeweeds are tolerated happily rather than cultivated, and again play a useful role. As one of the earliest plants to stir after winter, greens and tender sprouts of the pokeweed are cut in the early spring and eaten by the peasant. The tender sprouts are cooked as asparagus which they resemble, while the leaves are leached by parboiling to remove an unpleasant taste.

The blackberry and the huckleberry, two more inhabitants of disturbed tracts, not only live along roads and fences, but frequently spread tellingly over old fields and old farmsteads.

Still other culturally influenced semiwild plants could be listed (mullein, Cherokee rose, trifoliate citrus, and others) but will be set aside for the time being. But, one of the peasant's uninvited followers must be mentioned: the cockleburr. This extremely prolific and stubborn weed quickly invades cropped fields soon after the crop is laid by. Its spiny seedpods attach to nearly every passing object: the clothes of men, the cotton before and after it is picked, and the coats of mules which are frequently encrusted with cockleburrs, especially in the late fall and winter. If asked to volunteer his most troublesome weed, the peasant will usually name the cockleburr. Yet, functionally at least, these weeds represent a quick-growing cover crop which is either burned, leaving fertile ashes, or turned
into next year's ridges, leaving a mould to nourish the new crop.

These so-called wild plants (broom sedge, cedar, pokeweed, blackberries, huckleberries, Cherokee rose, mullein, crepe myrtle, pyracantha, trifoliate citrus, and cockleburrs) are in fact the peasant's allies, unplanned though the association may be. They are part of the cultural landscape as surely as is corn or the old cabbage rose. In some cases, some wild plants, such as broom sedge, cedar, and pokeweed, the mere disturbance of the natural landscape favors their spread. In other cases, such as Cherokee rose, chinaberry, crepe myrtle, honeysuckle, tung nut, pyracantha, and trifoliate citrus plants have escaped captivity finding a suitable home in the disturbed cultural landscape.

Passing from plants which follow man's disturbance we come to those which respond mainly to natural controls but are exploited by the peasant. Such plants include white oak (shakes and baskets), sweet gum (posts), mayhaw (jam and jelly), wild plum (jam and jelly), muscadine (jam, jelly, wine), wild cherry, cypress, hickory (handles and smoking meat), various pines, and others. Most of these are lowland or bottomland trees. They generally grow along rivers and large creeks and around hill-land swamps. The well-drained uplands and hills, on the other hand, are covered mainly by longleaf pines (with some shortleaf and slash) with under-stories of dogwood, honeysuckle, and brambles of blackberries, huckleberries, and such plants. Inspection of the
different years' aerial photos convinces us, however, that these pine woodlands are far from natural landscapes. Lumbering, shifting of cultivation, farm abandonment, new clearing, and burning have all kept the landscape in continual turmoil. As we have noted in connection with the program of terrace building, and farm-woodland distribution is fluid, changing gradually through time. Fields and even farmsteads shift as soil wears out, generations and owners change, and regional transportation and economic alignment vary. In addition, industrial cutting of pines for lumber, pulp, and posts shifts irregularly over the parish. When we recall the practice of burning together with the agricultural and industrial exploitation just mentioned, we will realize that even these pine woods and forested bottoms are not natural landscapes. Both field traverses and aerial photographs show that the entire surface of St. Helena Parish has been worked over by man at some time in past century and a half. Thus, we are unable to believe any part of St. Helena Parish's vegetation is uninfluenced by man.14

The peasant's use of this entirely cultural landscape is much less extensive than the lumberman's (Plate XIII) and the paper company's, and much more intimate. But more important, his use does not impoverish the resources as do the more extensive, rationalized systems. While we should not think of the peasant's land-use methods as being natural, we should see very quickly that his farmer-herder-hunter approach to exploitation is unspecialized and as such puts much less
strain on both the whole landscape and any single aspect of it. Under peasant use the land is never stripped of its cover over wide areas as has happened under extensive lumbering (Plate XIII, Fig. f). Even Upland dairies and stock farms maintain the wooded aspect characteristic of the Upland general farm (Plate XIV). Never is the landscape so impoverished in its variety as are more extensively developed and specialized industrial farm areas with their continuous fields often growing but one of a few plant species.

To the peasant of St. Helena Parish the forest is a source of wood for fuel, lumber for barns and fences, material for baskets, for tool handles, for shakes; the forest is pasture for his cattle and, at an earlier time, his swine; the woods provide him with game such as deer, turkey, squirrel, raccoon, beaver, opossum; the bramble patches of the forest yield berries; wild cherries, mayhaws, wild plums, and muscadine vines give fruits and berries for fresh fruit, jams, jellies, and beverages; and, not the least in importance, the forest provides new ground from which fields may be carved. Hence, we must view the forest included in a peasant's farm not as wasteland, but as he does, that is, as foraging grounds.

Thus, if we examine the St. Helena peasant's livestock raising and his pastures, we must also think of his woodlands. The peasant farmscape cannot be compartmentalized into such simple categories as garden, field, pasture, and woodlot. On the contrary, these are mere aspects of a whole, the peasant
general farm, and must be seen in terms of the mutual dependence of each category on the other relations with other farms and cultural systems, the changes effected in the natural landscape, and the integration of man's activities with the site of occupation through the agency of culture. The peasant shifts his activities, both in kind and site, according to the demands of nature, economics, and law, and in response to the opportunities presented by economic fortune and changes in technology. But for the past century and a half the St. Helena peasant farm has remained a fairly constant element in the landscape, especially in the field-pasture-woodland arrangements which characterize it.
NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1Evans (1966, p. 78) even argues that "cultivation was subordinate to livestock husbandry, mainly cattle and pigs, for which the backwoodsmen claimed free woods-pastures." See also Owsley (1949, pp. 135-35) and Baker (1927, p. 78).

2Turner's (1893) argument for stages, or waves, of the frontier need not be considered at length for, as will become apparent, those "stages" were as often as not peopled by the same persons simultaneously. Dick (1948, pp. 23, 25), who struggled with Turnerian notions of the frontier, noted waves and seemed to believe that these were distinct groups, finally concluded (and rightly so) that the Old Southwest was "settled by great planters, small planters, and farmers in one great intermingling with small farmers often in the lead" (p. 79). Then, contrast this conclusion with Paxon's (1924, pp. 205-207) phases of the Cotton Kingdom Frontier: first, small farmers who cleared and brought land under cultivation with free labor and, second, planters who purchased and consolidated smaller farms. Paxon's notions fit the social philosophy which has long been coin of the realm, but which is not borne out by close examination. The earliest census returns for St. Helena Parish (1820) report 28.5 per cent Negro population (including free Negro slaveholders) and Negroes have increased steadily in number and proportion ever since, as has the number of farms, all of which shows that there was no second wave of rich planters and no significant consolidation of holdings.

3C. O. Sauer (1941, p. 377) suggests the contest between cultures for mastery over land as a theme for historical (cultural) geography. The relation between Commercial and Upland cultures should be examined from this point of view.

4Moore (1958, p. 62) names two "breeds," Attakapas and Opelousas, the latter being preferred for draft purposes. Interestingly enough, Moore also calls attention to similarities between Old Southwest cattle-raising practices and those of the farther West. He lists the use of the lariat and whip, the cowboy on a pony, the roundup, and the use of branding and the overland drive.
Gray (1933, pp. 45-47) states that the first settlers in North Carolina were interested in stock raising (hogs, cattle, horses, and sheep) and characterizes their economy as "hunting and fishing, raising a little corn and keeping a few head of swine and possibly a cow or two on the range" for some of the settlers, while others, more industrious, followed a similar pattern but with more emphasis on export products (tobacco, maize, pulse, livestock, and timber products).

In its usage as a term for rough, rustic, or native, the term "black— " as a specific place-name seems most common in the Upland South and in Atlantic Britain. Its coincidental usage in a similar way in reference to cattle, sheep, and horses over the same area seems to lend support to an argument that somehow the term is connected genetically in a special way with that cultural lineage. Contrasts with other areas and other colors also support the notion. Scottish Highlanders settling in the Cape Fear Valley of North Carolina raised "black cattle" as they had in Scotland (Cargill Graham, 1956, pp. 113-15). In addition, they employed the open range, communal drives, branding, the roundup, fattening in fenced fields, and some dairying (butter and cheese making). Similar settlements were founded at Cross Creek, North Carolina; Darien, Georgia; and Jefferson County, Mississippi. Small numbers of both Scots and Irish settled in St. Helena Parish directly from the British Isles (Durnin Mathematical Notebook). Further likelihood of Atlantic-British origins of Upland cattle customs is shown in Trow-Smith's (1959, p. 5) description of Highland stock raising in the 18th century:

1. no improved pasture
2. very little hay made
3. small cattle
4. cattle left in the hills during much of the winter
5. poorly fed when penned
6. marketed in third or fourth year
7. overland drive

Trow-Smith next asserts that "this was a form of stock husbandry which can have differed little from the ranching of the pre-historic pastoralists of Scotland. Insofar as it is not extinct, it may be said to be a valid and economical method of land use in these remote, wet and ill-pasturing hills."

The value of these practices is discussed by Bell (1949), who concludes, interestingly enough, that (p. 93) "St. Helena, Livingston, and Washington Parishes [sic] contain areas which are ideal turkey ranges" and that "agricultural and forestry practices that tend to evict the turkey population can also evict man from the same land." Similarly, Campbell (1946, pp. 203-204) concludes: "the conservative use of fire as a silvicultural tool or to reduce..."
fire hazard appears to improve forage values. The combined income from livestock and timber should be greater than from either alone." See Gerlen and Duvall (1966) for a recent statement of the value of controlled burns.

Evans (1956, pp. 229-31) outlines the distribution of infield-outfield practices in Europe and contrasts them with the three-field system. Four important changes have occurred in the outfield of the Upland South: (1) fire cultivation of woodlands as well as fields; (2) shift to non-human traction; (3) the end of cooperative exploitation (rundale), and in St. Helena Parish and the surrounding Piney Woods; (4) a replacement of downslope plowing by contour plowing.

There seems to be no end to the "Smokey-the-Bear" type of guff concerning forest burning. As an example, Wixon (1940, pp. 17-19) described in his discussion of causes of forest fires, the "ignorant" or "uneducated frontier philosophy" which is hostile to fenced land and believes that fire improves the range.

There are many references to free-ranging hogs: in addition to Appendix II, see S. A. Morgan to Child, Morgan Papers, B-16/1: "I have twenty pigs at the house and between forty-five and fifty in the woods. . . ."

It is widely held that cedars are planted along fences by bluejay's excreting seed while sitting on the fence. (Mather and Hart, 1954, p. 200.) However, consider Plate XIII and note the cedars that have appeared away from fences. It seems likely that along fences cedars find protection from the plow, but will grow away from fences if plowing is stopped.

See report of H. C. Newsom in Hilgard (1884, p. 165): "cocklebur is the worst weed on both these soils" (black loams of mixed woodlands and heavy bottomlands).

Wailes (1854, p. 154) notes that cotton is picked into bags and then emptied into "large baskets made generally of white oak splints and capable of holding about one hundred and fifty pounds." See Plate XII, Fig. c, for a current example of such a basket and usage.

Anderson (1956, p. 763) wrote "that in the last analysis a significant portion of the plants and animals which accompany man is directly or indirectly of his own making." The mobility of plant material is illustrated by two letters in the Anderson Papers (Lilly Batts to Miss A. J. Anderson and S. A. Morgan to Mollie, B-16/1) asking that seeds be sent through the mail.
CHAPTER VI

THE ANNUAL ROUND OF EVENTS

It is perhaps in the synchronization of man's activities with the annual round of natural events that the role of the peasant's culture in giving a characteristic stamp to the landscape can best be summarized. In this periodicity too can be seen the fittingness which has made that relationship lasting. Many activities absorb the peasant's year and the phasing in of one and the phasing out of another will show us by their very timing not only their relations to the culture, but to the site as well. Quite often it is the close timing of the activities of the peasant farm that gives the farm and the peasant their seemingly natural appearance.

Perhaps the St. Helena peasant farm year should begin with the preparation for the new corn crop. As the moderate rains of late winter permit, usually in mid and late February, the ridges upon which the new corn crop is to be planted are prepared. The new ridges are built upon the old, following the old contours and improving them as winter erosion has indicated weaknesses. If a tractor is not available or if the ground is too wet, the mule and walking plow are used in turning the soil onto the ridge, but
actually moving it downslope in the process. Stubble and ashes from last year's crop and the winter's burning are turned into the core of the ridge, providing the basis for the crop. The bar-share plow without coulter has long been a favorite for this plowing; it has seldom been more than two to six inches deep. Ridges are built today at intervals of about three to four feet, while in the 19th century the spacing was sometimes as much as six feet. But the availability of inexpensive, simply-applied fertilizer permits closer ridges today. If the field ridges are unusually cloddy, they are smoothed with the A-frame harrow.

Shortly after March 1—but rarely before, unless an extensive cotton crop is planned—the corn is planted, since the likelihood of killing frost will be past by the time the corn is up. Planting is generally done by means of a mule or horse-drawn planter. However, in the past a field was checked; that is, furrows were opened by a bar share plow with coulter and then crossed at right angles by the same plow followed by women dropping seed at the intersections (checks) (Dick, 1948, p. 100). These 19th century planting methods preserved not only the planting interval of four to six feet in both directions, but ancient Atlantic (Celtic) European usages as well (Campbell, 1935, p. 61). But the spread of contour plowing in the early 19th century throughout the Piney Woods, together with the gradual perfection of planting devices contributed, no doubt, to the disappearance of the practice of checking.
Of no less importance than the corn crop, sweet potatoes are planted in March as well, usually early in the month. Some are planted directly in the double-spaced (six foot) ridges prepared for them by mule and plow. But others are first allowed to sprout, lightly covered with soil in starting beds, to be transplanted to the ridges on or about April 1. This latter practice is old and was aimed at prevention of frost damage. Some reports of transplanting into rain-soaked soil were noted and this is also an old practice (Wailes, 1854, p. 192). Sweet potatoes are able to compete with weeds and so, after planting, very little attention is given them until harvest.

In planting corn and sweet potatoes, the St. Helena peasant has insured the subsistence of his family and his animals in the time-honored method of his ancestors. The prudent peasant provides subsistence first and then turns to money crops.

No sooner than the first of April, and as soon as corn is planted, cotton is planted on ridges similar to those prepared for corn and by similar methods. Today, crop restrictions limit the extent of cotton planting. The remaining money-crop planting time is taken up in planting green beans. Beans are usually planted during late April, while cotton is, and has been at least since 1858, planted from April 1 to May 15, with emphasis on May. Crop restrictions have promoted better consideration not only of sites of cotton crops but also of timing. There is no longer a great
effort to plant extensive tracts, but to plant the small allotments in a well-chosen plot, well after frost danger.

The establishment of green beans as an April activity required not only crop restrictions on cotton, freeing some of the peasant's time, but as well the organization of a marketing system for beans. Prior to the establishment of a buying lot in Greensburg, all fresh produce had to be either peddled to stores or carried to French Market in New Orleans, and oftentimes such a trip was either impossible or unprofitable.

During the time that the peasant is preparing ridges and planting subsistence and money crops, his wife, with the help of any available children, restores and replants the kitchen garden. The mule and walking plow may be brought into the garden to hill up the necessary ridges in a rough form (the spade work of the town garden), but the majority of gardening is done by hand using mainly the hoe. A variety of garden vegetables is planted, the selection depending in part upon the tastes of the family. But almost always included are corn for roasting ears, turnips, mustard greens, sweet peppers, collards, butter beans, peas, okra, watermelons, onions, and squash. Some of these crops, such as squash and pumpkins, are also field crops. Okra is sometimes raised for sale; small patches of it are planted after the last frost.

An energetic peasant family may often try to crowd the last frost by planting early, thinking that they can replant.
any rows that are killed. For example, in a letter dated February 14, 1887, we read that "Ma . . . is very slow gardening this spring she hasnt planted anything yet" (S. B. Woods to Mrs. Mollie E. Anderson, Anderson Papers, File B-16/1). Similarly, for March 12, 1886, "Mollie I must tell you how my garden is getting along I have pease big enough to stick [i.e., tie to bean poles] I have beans planted lettuce beets cabbage tomatoes it looks nice . . ." (S. A. Morgan to Mollie, Anderson Papers, File B-16/1). Generally, such efforts to get ahead by early planting are rewarded with success; the peasant family with its more intensive methods is better able to replant than a more-extensive farmer, even if there is a late frost.

So, by the end of April all garden and subsistence crops are planted and by the end of May cotton is planted. Cultivation begins immediately in both field and garden, because weeds, vines, and grass begin to compete with the young crops. The period from March through June is complicated and hectic for the peasant. During this four-month period he must prepare ridges, plant, and cultivate, and at the same time deal with the most unreliable weather of all his seasons. Indeed, it is the spring season that is the test of the peasant's skill and endurance. A hectic spring has been the lot of peasants in St. Helena Parish for many years. In a letter dated April 2, 1887, we are informed "Pa has planted all of his corn except his may patches and wants to plant cotton next week . . ." (Sarah B. Woods to
Mrs. M. Anderson, Anderson Papers). On April 26, 1886 (A. J. Bookter to Mollie Anderson, Anderson Papers) we read:

We are getting Mity slow we havent worked out none of our corn Nor we are not near done brakeing up our land but we Have planted some cotton and it is beginning to come Up and the grass is coming to well Mollie I believe That is all I can say about our crop

At times the peasant is unable to care for all of his land and crops, especially when he is lured into overextending his cash crop, as occurred in the late 19th century (see census figures for cotton in Appendix I; note that the greatest production of cotton was reached in 1890). As an example, a letter of May 20 in the late 1880's (S. A. Morgan to Child, Anderson Papers) complains:

We got a big new ground that has never been burnt of yet and I dont [know] whin we can get to it for our cotton needs scraping very bad and no body to do it but me and Linwood and Fanie and it is slow business we have between 12 and 15 acres to scrape yet and it dont seem lik I can lift up the hoe.

Today, the St. Helena peasant does not find himself in such straits since he no longer becomes overly dependent on a single cash crop, this because of crop restrictions and the near disappearance of tenant farming.

As the spring wears on the peasant's concern gradually shifts from planting to cultivating, or "scraping." As much scraping as possible is done with the mule and walking plow equipped with a bull-tongue, buzzard wing, or sweep, all wide, flaring plows which make a shallow cut and push soil up next to the plants. The A-frame harrow is also used to keep the middles pulverized and weed free. Supplementary cultivation
is carried on by the women and children with hoes. As cotton plants reach the third- or fourth-leaf stage (about three inches tall) between the 10th and 18th days, they are thinned or chopped. Chopping cotton continues with hoe scraping until the desired interval of one plant every ten to twenty-four inches is achieved. Scraping and pulverizing continue until the crop is able to withstand competition from weeds; then, it is "laid by." Corn is laid by first; this frees cultivation energies for the care of cotton. As corn is laid by, peas are often planted among the stalks in certain fields, though some farmers plant the peas at the same time as the corn.

The unreliable weather season gradually fades into the rainy season, June through August (Figure 12), and the peasant's work narrows to cultivation between rains. After each rain and as soon as his mule can maneuver in the fields, the peasant is scraping and pulverizing to turn back the tide of weeds, vines, and grass. At this time too, he is able to repair contours damaged by excessive runoff. Cultivation of cotton continues through July on most farms and the crop is laid by to mature usually by early August.

Not all of the peasant's summer days are taken up with scraping cotton. Time is taken, especially in larger families, to forage in the brambles for blackberries and huckleberries. Monotony is further relieved by fishing. The ripening of watermelons during July is eagerly awaited. In spite of the hard task of continual cultivation, the early summer is a
period of filling out for man and beast after a winter of more restricted diet and a spring of strenuous endeavor. In late June and throughout July the pace of life slackens and the coolness of a watermelon, the freshness of the creek bank, and the shade of the porch are frequently sought. During the month or month and a half after the summer solstice, the provident farmer can with luck have time to enjoy watching the crops he has planted gradually mature.

But as the warming effects of the high sun wear off, the rate of activity begins to increase again to a peak similar to that of spring. Beginning in early August attention is turned to the ripened subsistence crops. Sweet potatoes are usually mature in August and can be eaten. But, if possible they are left in the ground to add more bulk. But corn will increase no more. Cribs are cleaned and readied for the new crop, and some of the corn may be harvested during August. But much of it is left in the field after the ears, and sometimes the tops, have been turned down.

This practice which is old is explained as helping to preserve the crop against the predations of birds (crows, blue-jays, and woodpeckers), and against damage from wind and rain. The effectiveness of this protective measure may be doubted, but it assures the peasant that he has done what he can to protect the unharvested portion of his crop while he turns to harvesting the cotton crop. That the practice is thoroughly ingrained in Upland peasant culture is evidenced by the standing corn in nonfarm gardens, with its ears and
tops turned down and with peavines using the corn stalks as bean poles. But whatever the reasons for the introduction of turning corn down, it is an old custom and an August activity characteristic of much of the Upland Culture area (Wailes, 1854, p. 184; Moore, 1958, p. 58).

Another August activity, but one which is rarely observed in St. Helena Parish, is pulling fodder, or the stripping of green corn leaves from the stalks to be used as hay, or fodder, during the winter (Dick, 1948, pp. 100-101; Moore, 1858, p. 58; G. L. Anderson to J. O. Bullock, Anderson Papers, B-16/1). Perhaps the practice was common only under slaveholding conditions or perhaps the increased availability of hay and of forage crops has obviated the need for pulling fodder (Wailes, 1854, p. 184; also see increasing hay production in Appendix II). At any rate, today the blades are left on the stalks to be eaten by cattle and mules when turned into the field in winter.

Fall gardens are prepared during August. Such crops as collards, turnips, and broccoli are planted. These garden crops catch the waning benefits of the 240-day growing season (Appendix III). Some of the garden crops, such as collards, can endure frost and even light freezes; others, protected by pine straw and a growth of weeds and grass, may survive until mid-winter. All of the fall garden crops will supplement the winter diet, providing important nutrients while the family is living mainly on preserved foods. The work of rebuilding the garden after summer depletions can be carried
out by the family after scraping and before picking cotton.

To fill out the work schedule for August, some farm maintenance is carried on, especially that concerned with preparation for the cotton harvest, and the repair of a few fences that will pen cattle in cropped fields during winter. The provident peasant must do all he can on these tasks as an investment against weather catastrophes which sometimes mark the ensuing season, for by mid-August much of his cotton already shows the white of open bolls.

From mid-August to mid-November there is a rather sharp fall in temperature paralleling a mid-July to mid-October decline in precipitation. Except for infrequent hurricanes and related tropical storms which keep precipitation averages misleadingly high, the fall season is marked by dry, cooling weather. Under such a weather pattern, corn begins to dry on the stalk and growth of the cotton stalk is slowed and then stopped. Soon, as nights become cool and moisture fails, the leaves of the cotton begin to wither and the open bolls begin to dry. Picking of cotton is usually underway by early September. It may last through November. Sometimes, because of such adversities as late rains or because of improvidence, cotton is still being picked in January.

The price of cotton is enhanced if it is thoroughly dry before picking and the peasant’s labor is more rewarding if he can gather a greater amount in each picking. He is tempted to delay picking in the hope of a better grade of
lint and in hope of making fewer pickings. But, he delays in the face of possible serious damage from hurricanes and tropical storms. So, while it can begin earlier, cotton picking is usually in full swing by mid-September and is repeated once each in October and November. The last picking usually follows the first killing frost, or "black frost," and often consists of stripping the remaining bolls, burr and all, producing a very low-grade product. Cotton is picked into sacks or baskets, weighed, and stored either in piles on the ground or in cotton houses. Once a bale (1,300 to 1,400 pounds of seed cotton) is picked, it is loaded into a pickup truck or farm wagon and taken to a gin.

As the cotton harvest closes, the peasant's attention turns again to his subsistence crops. From mid-October to mid-November the corncribs are gradually filled. The corn is stripped from the stalk and stored in the crib, shuck and all. At this time the choice corn is separated for flour and for seed for the following year. Some corn is also ground, cob, shuck, and kernel, for stock feed. When the corn has been harvested, cattle are brought in from their woodland pasture and penned in the cornfields. This practice of penning stock on fields is but another of the old practices connecting the present-day peasant farm with its antecedents throughout the Upland South and even back to Atlantic Europe.

During this fall season, from mid-August to November, the farmscape gradually wilts from a lack of rainfall. Only
hardy plants such as pines and some weeds continue to flourish. The first killing frost, expected in the first week of November, punctuates this wilting period by turning the farmscape from green to brown. With the first black frost, the growth of unprotected, nonresistant plants ends. Most of the important field and subsistence crops of the peasant farm are subtropical and tropical plants, and as such fall to the first frost. Cotton, corn, sugarcane, and sweet potatoes all wither after the first black frost if they have not already succumbed to the droughty fall weather. Sugarcane and sweet potatoes usually await a killing frost for any particular attention since planting.

The preferred time for harvesting sweet potatoes is after the vines have been killed by frost and the weather is cool and dry. Hence, early in November sweet potatoes are usually dug and stored in 'tater houses. If the patch is well fenced, hogs may be turned in to clean up the remains of the crop.

Life on the farm draws in to the farmstead in November. Already corn and cattle have been moving toward the barnyard; with the first black frost, the peasant's activities begin to concentrate there too. Foraging continues in the woods in the form of hunting, collecting nuts, and the gathering of fatwood (rotted, resinous, heart-of-pine stumps) for the upcoming syrup cooking. But most activity focuses around the farmstead after mid-November.

We might take as the turning point from fall to
winter the making of syrup from sugarcane. Unless the first frosts are severe enough to kill the cane outright, thus souring the juice, the making of "surps" is a festive event falling most often in the week of Thanksgiving. But there is little or no connection with the formalized holiday identified as Thanksgiving in Commercial Culture other than by the flock of visitors freed from their wage jobs. Indeed, Thanksgiving Day is usually a work day with all of the family involved in the syrup making or cooking for the syrup makers. Even those farmers who do not make syrup themselves are often busy getting their cane to a neighbor's mill. The festiveness of syrup making derives in part from the gathering of all of the family for the task, the visits of friends and relatives, and the end of the crop-growing year.

The winter of the peasant farm is usually underway by the first of December; it is marked by different activities from those of the previous three seasons. Farming in the sense of planting, cultivating, and harvesting is ended. Fields contain only spent crops, weeds, and sometimes grazing cattle, mules, and horses (Plate IX, Figs. c, d). A light yellow ochre colors all but the pines. But, though the only sign of motion around a winter farm may be the smoke from the chimney, work is being done by the provident farmer. Any meat that is put up for the next year will be slaughtered usually in the first cold spell or as soon after as possible (Sarah B. Woods to Mollie E. Anderson, January, 1889, Anderson Papers, B-16/1). The farm must be repaired and if
possible improved for the hectic activity of spring which will begin in a mere two and a half months.

Rainfall increases from late November through December, waxing with the influence of the continental polar fronts which bring repeated spells of cold and rain and wanes as the returning sun dispells these northern influences. Throughout the winter season the peasant must concern himself with maintenance of his farm. Barns, smokehouses, fences, and gates must be built and repaired. Axe handles, plow handles, and baskets are made. Plows and harness must be repaired. Many peasants still keep forges in their farmyards which they use to fabricate parts and rework old parts. The preferred method of sharpening plows, for example, is heating and hammering rather than grinding. These winter restorations use the peasant's time rather than his limited cash and thus forestall new purchases. To many a peasant, his craftiness in "making do" is a source of bucolic pride and constitutes one of the rewards of peasant life which, in turn, adds to the persistence of the farm as a landscape form, for "the ordinary laws of economics do not apply to traditional subsistence farming, and statistics cannot measure the values of rural living (Evans, 1956, p. 217).

Another winter activity and a chief landscape modifier is burning. While some burning of woodlands begins as early as mid-November, most awaits the declining rainfall of late winter (Anderson Papers, S. A. Morgan to Child, B-16/1; Owsley, 1949, p. 108). Burning for improvement of woodland
pastures may take place anytime in the early and mid-winter while weed trees and shrubs are dormant and dry. Burning of slash and felled trees in new land which has been cleared in the early winter awaits a late winter date so that the trash will burn well. Burning of crop fields and old-field pastures is frequently a prelude to spring and a new calendar round to be initiated when ridging-up beings. So, by the spring equinox, St. Helena's peasant farm has begun literally to rise phoenix-like from its own ashes to begin a new round of life in quiet expectation based upon ancient plans modified only slightly by another winter's contemplation.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1The date of March 1 has been the stated time of the beginning of corn planting, at least since 1854 (Wailes, p. 184). The planting period was said to last through March. A second crop, the "May corn," might also be planted after cotton planting (Moore, 1958, p. 58; and Sara B. Woods to M. Anderson, Anderson Papers).

2Of seven Marches for which weather records are available for Greensburg (1958-62 and 1965-65), there was a total of 30 days showing minimum temperatures as low as 32°F. Since none was recorded in a like number of Aprils (for the same years), it seems reasonable that the cold days were concentrated in the first half of the month. For Amite, Tangipahoa Parish, the latest frost was on March 18 (Records of the State Climatologist; Appendix III).

3Weather records for Greensburg are of poor quality, but the evidence in the record of extremes (Appendix III) supports most historical evidence. From February through March the frequency and force of cold weather decreases, from an average of about six to a little more than three; none is reported for April. As a rule, then, crops planted early in March will come up after the last frost. With the decline in cotton production, the crowding at the early end of the growing season has been reduced.

4By consulting Figure 12 and Appendix III the variability of the late-winter and spring season can be discerned. Particularly notable is the variation in rainfall. April, for example, exhibits both the greatest and least monthly precipitation of record. In the "normal" sequence (if we consider the longer records of Amite and Clinton) a precipitation high should be expected in March, between two lows in February and April-May. However, the short-term records of Greensburg reverse this expected pattern. The model expressed in this chapter must be kept flexible during the winter and spring seasons.

5In addition to plowing and sewing (15 dresses, 9 shirts, and 6 pairs of pants) G. C. Morgan could report (Anderson Papers, G. C. Morgan to Miss M. E. Morgan, B-16/1) that she had eaten watermelons until "my belly almost drags in the ashes."
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

After extended consideration of the farmscape of St. Helena Parish, the following conclusions seem justified:

1. The term peasant is applicable in the case of the general farmers of St. Helena Parish and related Upland South areas because of their traditional, nonprofit-oriented solution to the problem of making a living on and off the land.

2. The low standard of living is a function of the general economic condition of the region, not of the Upland peasant farm. The latter will continue to make appropriate adjustments to changes in the economic environment, but in terms of culturally-given values and space-organization conceptions.

3. The Upland peasant farm is a segment of a system involving physical nature, historical circumstances (including fortuitous events), and culture. These three abstractions are materialized as expressions on the earth's surface in such units as the family farm. Culture is the mediating factor and much of its intervention between man and land is in terms of preconceived notions of fitting space arrangements.

4. It is not as meaningful to class regions in terms
of economic product (e.g., "cotton belt") because these can change without redefining the region. In the case of the Piney Woods of southern Mississippi and Florida-Parish Louisiana, the rise and fall of any one cash crop has not altered the fundamental farmscape of St. Helena Parish.

5. Some cultural facts emphasize earth qualities, especially those that vary from place to place within one culture area.

6. Much of the cultural landscape of St. Helena Parish has its origin, not in elusive properties of the frontier, but in Europe—especially Atlantic Europe—with significant increments from Atlantic seaboard Indians.

7. Failure to think of American farmers as peasants, especially those we have called Upland general farmers, has led to an incorrect conception of the man-and-land situation in St. Helena Parish. Without facing up to the real nature of the problem—that of a peasantry in the matrix of a regional economy—any planning by government agencies will be deflected from its objectives. Similarly, social scientists will also err seriously unless the simple term peasant is accepted along with the valid implications of the term.
NOTES TO PLATES

Plate I, p. 158.
A. The left-hand pen of a dogtrot house. The open passage, or central hallway, was on the right side of this pen. The logs are on the lower side.
B. A dogtrot house with an open passage. This example was built about 1910 after the rise of the lumbering industry in St. Helena Parish and is entirely built of lumber. Note the false gallery on the front porch.
C. A dogtrot house built entirely of lumber. Note that the left-hand part of the porch has been converted to a shed room much like those in the rear of such houses (see Figure D below).
D. A dogtrot-based house with shed rooms as well as an ell on the rear and a false gallery over the front gallery. Note that this house is a story and a half in height. It is an example of a form that has been called the blufflands house.

Plate II, p. 159.
A. A town version of a dogtrot-based house. The open passage was closed in from the beginning. Note the replacement of the false gallery by commercial metal awnings.
B. An excellent example of a blufflands house built in a town (Greensburg). Note end chimneys, full gallery, false gallery, story and a half, and central hallway.
C. A two-and-a-half-story dogtrot-based house. On both main floors, there is a full gallery, central hallway, shed rear rooms, and galleried ell to the rear. This is one of the most impressive dogtrot-based houses remaining in St. Helena Parish and it is located in Greensburg.
D. One of the finest flowers of the Upland South Pen Tradition, Rosedown Plantation (St. Francisville, West Feliciana Parish), included here for comparison.

Plate III, p. 160.
A representative St. Helena farmstead. The casual arrangement of nine Crib Tradition outbuildings about a Pen Tradition house, the two roads (one old road running upper right to lower left), the stock pond and cattle, and the cutover woodland in the lower right all mark this as a representative Upland farm which has changed to stock-raising coupled with timber production.

Plate IV, p. 161
A. A single-crib, notched-log barn with sheds on three sides. Note that the crib rests on piers and that there is a loft formed by inserting planks between the fourth and fifth logs.
B. A single-crib barn with one shed room. This barn was
built about 1948 of logs obtained in clearing the farm for the first time (an aerial view of the farm is shown in Plate XIII, Figure B).

C. A single-crib barn which included side sheds from the beginning. Note that here too the crib is on piers whereas the sheds are not.

D. A two-story single-crib barn with three sheds. Note the electric light over the loft door.

Plate V, p. 162.
A. A single-crib barn with truss-supported shed roof.
B. A double-crib barn of log construction. Note the wide overhang at the ends of the barn.
C. A transverse-crib barn of log construction. Corn was stored in the cribs on the left, fodder in the loft, and mules quartered in the cribs on the right.
D. A transverse-crib barn of lumber construction and with three sheds.

Plate VI, p. 163.
A. The rear view of a log smokehouse built in 1965. The widely-flaring roof is supported by both posts and a truss.
B. A lumber smokehouse with battens closing the cracks between boards.
C. A log smokehouse. Note that, as is usual, it sits upon the ground rather than being supported by piers.
D. Ham and bacon hanging in a smokehouse.

Plate VII, p. 164.
A. A small utility building (basically a single-crib barn with one shed) serving as a granary and a stock shelter.
B. A long-bucket well representative of wells of much of the area. These are being replaced by electric pumps.
C. Conical, earthen sweet-potato houses.
D. A small, crib-like potato house with mud chinking.
E. An A-frame potato house made of lumber and tin scrap.
F. A large, crib-construction potato house.

Plate VIII, p. 165.
A. A snake fence made of split rails. This is one of two surviving remnants of a formerly dominant landscape element.
B. A pen of post and pole construction.
C. A nailed pole fence.
D. A split post and barbed wire fence. The massive post on the right was split from a cedar tree.
E. A temporary square of stacked posts protecting a young tree from stock.
F. A palimpsest of fencing. Note the pole gate, a remnant of pailing fencing, scrap lumber fencing, and split post and barbed wire fencing.

Plate IX, p. 166.
A. A representative early-spring field. Note the wooded margins, the tree and burned stumps standing in the middle, and the irregular shape of the field.
B. A contoured and terraced field in winter. Note the entrapment of soil in the furrows and the burned stump.

C. A late-summer view of the field shown in Figure A.

D. A spent corn field representative of late fall. Note the bent-down stalks and the weeds.

E. A winter view of the same field shown in Figures A and C. Note the cattle in the far right.

F. Sugarcane and firewood gathered on the edge of a cotton field in November in preparation for syrup making.

Plate X, p. 167.
A. A representative garden maintained for kitchen use.
B. A garden maintained for kitchen and market. Note sugarcane and peach tree on the left and two types of greens in the foreground.
C. A second garden mainly for kitchen use and supplementing the garden in Figure B.
D. A kitchen garden. Note the paling fence and the weedy margins of the tract.
E. Bean poles, or sticks, readied for use in a garden.
F. Pig pens in the shaded margin of the woods and free-ranging stock.

Plate XI, p. 168.
A. The ordinary position of the patch of sugarcane; near the house and garden complex of the farmstead.
B. A syrup mill readied for grinding cane which is stacked in the background.
C. A syrup mill with the boom attached ready for the mule that will turn the mill.
D. Rear view of syrup pans and furnace.
E. Front view of syrup pans and furnace. Syrup making is a festive event and family and friends are on hand for the occasion.
F. Cooking the juice to make syrup. The strikemaster (center) controls the work of the skimmer (left), the firemaker (foreground) and the canner (right rear) as well as others.

Plate XII, p. 169.
A. Making a broom of broomsedge.
B. Making a tenon on a cedar log to support the cane mill shown in Plate XI, Figure B. Two axes are used, one as a wedge.
C. A field basket made of split oak and used to gather crops.
D. Material to make a new singletree.
E. A barnyard shaded by an oak and with equipment scattered about in the weather.
F. Plows and a scoot along the margin of a barnyard.

Plate XIII, p. 170.
A. A representative small farmstead. Note the arrangement of buildings, fields, and garden. The dark conical trees are cedars.
B. A small farmstead. Intensive, horticultural methods are used on the small, low tract on the right. The dark
rectangle on the right is a "waste" area where herbs are tolerated, most notable being poke.
C. An example of incomplete, or "panel" contouring.
D. A representative farmstead. Note field shapes.
E. An area of mixed form and nonfarm settlement. Note the large garden tracts. This linear settlement has been bypassed by the highway which had been its focus.
F. Land that has been cut over for timber. Note that modern practices leave pines at intervals to reseed the forest.

Plate XIV, p. 171.
A. An improved dairy herd on improved pasture.
B. Land being cleared for pasture on a stock farm.
C. An Upland dairy. Note the log crib barn back of the milk barn.
D. An improved beef herd on improved pasture.
E. An Upland dairy. Note the arrangement of buildings and pastures.
F. An Upland stock farm. Note the arrangement of buildings. An old road once passed from upper right to lower middle between the house and one of the barns.

Plate XV, p. 172.
A. A view of late-winter burning of woodlands.
B. A pasture burned to improve forage.
C. An open, park-like woodland pasture maintained by burning, grazing, and selective cutting of trees.
D. The burning of slash and dried grasses to improve pasturage.
E. A clear strip made by the forest service to stop a wild fire which burned up to the tree on the right.
F. Typical deformation of trees along sunken roads.

Plate XVI, p. 173.
A. An old field covered by broomsedge, cedar (small), and blackberries.
B. A plum thicket representative of those frequently noted on old house sites.
C. A sunken intersection lined by cedar trees.
D. A waste land cut off by a change in road position. On the right are cedars, on the left, a blackberry bramble.
E. A representative cemetery.
F. A colony of poke growing under a pine tree in a barnyard.
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## APPENDIX I

### TABULATED CENSUS RETURNS

**ST. HELENA PARISH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1820</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>4,661</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>4,624</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>3,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>3,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Farms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved Acreage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,913</td>
<td>37,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Farms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>310,769</td>
<td>154,464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>988&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,590</td>
<td>4,854</td>
<td>6,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>17,854</td>
<td>14,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheep &amp; Goats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>3,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Livestock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>149,402</td>
<td>306,528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton (bales)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>6,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice (pounds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,060</td>
<td>54,868</td>
<td>11,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats (bushels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,978</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (tons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (pounds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,331</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>36,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (pounds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>6,408</td>
<td>6,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn (bushels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102,903</td>
<td>109,751</td>
<td>169,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses, Peanuts (bu.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,782</td>
<td>44,225</td>
<td>43,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potatoes (bu.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molasses (gallons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Horses and mules reported together.

<sup>b</sup>All cattle reported together.

<sup>c</sup>St. Helena and Livingston parishes separated.

<sup>d</sup>Sweet and Irish potatoes reported together.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1880&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>5,423</td>
<td>7,504</td>
<td>8,062</td>
<td>8,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>3,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negro</strong></td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>4,589</td>
<td>4,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Farms</strong></td>
<td>560</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved Acreage</strong></td>
<td>33,673</td>
<td>29,188</td>
<td>36,658</td>
<td>38,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Farms</strong></td>
<td>374,508</td>
<td>358,576</td>
<td>499,890</td>
<td>543,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horses</strong></td>
<td>807</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>1,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mules</strong></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxen</strong></td>
<td>720</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milch Cattle</strong></td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>2,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beef Cattle</strong></td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>4,713</td>
<td>3,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swine</strong></td>
<td>8,977</td>
<td>10,978</td>
<td>8,737</td>
<td>11,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheep &amp; Goats</strong></td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>2,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poultry</strong></td>
<td>31,035</td>
<td>7,381</td>
<td>6,363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Livestock</strong></td>
<td>161,281</td>
<td>152,854</td>
<td>181,170</td>
<td>220,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotton (bales)</strong></td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>5,328</td>
<td>8,122</td>
<td>6,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rice (pounds)</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23,722</td>
<td>10,565</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oats (bushels)</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11,053</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hay (tons)</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Butter (pounds)</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>31,940</td>
<td>14,975</td>
<td>60,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wool (pounds)</strong></td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>6,294</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>6,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corn (bushels)</strong></td>
<td>91,265</td>
<td>133,855</td>
<td>135,315</td>
<td>194,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pulses, Peanuts (bu.)</strong></td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sweet Potatoes (bu.)</strong></td>
<td>38,961</td>
<td>52,775</td>
<td>23,515</td>
<td>21,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irish Potatoes (bu.)</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molasses (gallons)</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10,594</td>
<td>26,750</td>
<td>10,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>St. Helena and Tangipahoa parishes separated.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>9,172</td>
<td>8,427</td>
<td>8,492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>4,198</td>
<td>3,881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>4,573</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>4,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Farms</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Acreage</td>
<td>39,298</td>
<td>51,729</td>
<td>35,971</td>
<td>31,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Farms</td>
<td>1,401,546</td>
<td>2,166,388</td>
<td>1,657,482</td>
<td>2,028,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mules</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cattle</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>3,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Cattle</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>6,817</td>
<td>6,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swine</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>9,336</td>
<td>4,143</td>
<td>3,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep &amp; Goats</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>43,378</td>
<td>45,302</td>
<td>35,248</td>
<td>51,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Livestock</td>
<td>295,770</td>
<td>906,858</td>
<td>364,689</td>
<td>517,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton (bales)</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice (pounds)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats (bushels)</td>
<td>142c</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (tons)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (pounds)</td>
<td>89,509</td>
<td>71,398</td>
<td>22,710</td>
<td>50,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (pounds)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>4,488</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn (bushels)</td>
<td>156,496</td>
<td>187,760</td>
<td>133,239</td>
<td>180,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses, Peanuts (bu.)</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>4,603</td>
<td>450d</td>
<td>2,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potatoes (bu.)</td>
<td>42,396</td>
<td>80,329</td>
<td>10,893</td>
<td>71,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Potatoes (bu.)</td>
<td>7,227</td>
<td>9,005</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>5,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molasses (gallons)</td>
<td>35,897</td>
<td>83,239</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>74,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*aOxen reported as steers and bulls hereafter.

*bChickens only.

*cAlso 1,660 bushels of wheat.

*dAlso 2,193 acres of velvet beans.

*eReported only as 521 tons of cane.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>9,542</td>
<td>9,013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>4,228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>5,048</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Farms</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Acreage</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>31,665</td>
<td>25,213</td>
<td>37,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Farms</td>
<td>1,442,381</td>
<td>1,883,042</td>
<td>2,563,185</td>
<td>5,593,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mules</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cattle</td>
<td>3,161(^b)</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>6,139</td>
<td>8,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Cattle</td>
<td>8,599(^b)</td>
<td>6,317</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>10,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swine</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>3,173</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>2,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep &amp; Goats</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>42,810</td>
<td>63,783</td>
<td>81,220</td>
<td>45,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Livestock</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>674,238</td>
<td>1,422,426</td>
<td>1,411,079(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton (bales)</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice (pounds)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats (bushels)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (tons)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (pounds)</td>
<td>33,017</td>
<td>9,285</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (pounds)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn (bushels)</td>
<td>119,179</td>
<td>154,113</td>
<td>197,471</td>
<td>156,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses, Peanuts (bu.)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potatoes (bu.)</td>
<td>96,574</td>
<td>78,290</td>
<td>53,006</td>
<td>34,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Potatoes (bu.)</td>
<td>15,288</td>
<td>22,966</td>
<td>43,840</td>
<td>6,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molasses (gallons)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>19,489(^d)</td>
<td>44,715(^e)</td>
<td>23,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Sales only.  
\(^b\)Excludes those less than three months old.  
\(^c\)Reported as 5,451 tons of cane.  
\(^d\)Also: Sorghum $3,237.  
\(^e\)Also: Sorghum $1,565.  
\(^f\)Not recoverable.
## APPENDIX I (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>9,102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>5,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Farms</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Acreage</td>
<td>33,865</td>
<td>26,537</td>
<td>23,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Farms</td>
<td>7,205,198</td>
<td>10,407,155</td>
<td>13,144,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mules</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cattle</td>
<td>10,896</td>
<td>8,080</td>
<td>7,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Cattle</td>
<td>15,588</td>
<td>15,190</td>
<td>18,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swine</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep &amp; Goats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>44,362</td>
<td>30,276</td>
<td>24,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Livestock</td>
<td>1,914,500</td>
<td>2,253,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton (bales)</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice (pounds)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats (bushels)</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (tons)</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>4,647</td>
<td>14,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (pounds)</td>
<td>504e</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (pounds)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn (bushels)</td>
<td>177,562</td>
<td>92,293</td>
<td>85,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses, Peanuts (bu.)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potatoes (bu.)</td>
<td>18,479</td>
<td>8,798</td>
<td>7,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Potatoes (bu.)</td>
<td>8,191</td>
<td>1,336b</td>
<td>479b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molasses (gallons)</td>
<td>16,418</td>
<td>6,664</td>
<td>5,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSales only.

*bReported in hundredweight.

*cHorses and mules reported together.

*dNot published in 1964.

*eFor week preceding enumeration.
APPENDIX II

SELECTED INVENTORIES OF ESTATES, SUCCESSION RECORDS, ST. HELENA PARISH

Estate of Ephrain Bates, 1811 (File Case B-1)

2 cows & calves 30.00
1 cow without calf 12.00
4 3 year old heifers 40.00
1 2 year old steer 5.00
1 1 year old steer 2.00
3 yearlings 6.00
3 sows 12.00
8 1 year old shoats 16.00
"some piggs running at large, number & value not known"
1 heifer 5.00
3 cows & calves 45.00
1 ring & staple fer ox yoke 1.50
1 weeding hoe .50
1 pair of truck wheels 5.00
1 bell 1.50
Cash owed to the estate 127.50
Total Estate $316.00

Estate of Jacob & Elizabeth Starnes, 1813 (File Case S-1)*

10 Negroes
1 Road wagon
1 one "bar shear plough"
1 pair traces, chain & hames
3 weeding hoes
1 mattock
1 work oven
2 ox yokes
1 lot household furniture
1 large trunk

*No evaluations were given for this estate.
4 bedsteads & cots
1 lot kitchen utensils
1 ladies' side saddle
1 hand gin
5 raw cow hides
stock of hogs (number not known)
"Stock of Black Cattle supposed to be about Twenty
head which could not be acritly known"
3 saws
1 lot assorted hand tools.

Estate of Dennis Corbet, 1813 (File Case C-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 lot of clothes</td>
<td>33.87½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 small box of sundry articles</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pen knife</td>
<td>.62½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 razor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 gun</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 trunk with contents</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"a crib of corn in shuck with the exception of
40 bushels claimed by William Spiller of shelled corn
said crib being full and about thirteen feet
long, eight feet wide & seven feet high valued at
four bits per bushel and supposing there to be
two hundred and twenty bushels . . ."

1 bedstead
1 Negro man about 35 years old
1 Negress & two children
1 Negress twenty years old & one child
1 yoke oxen
1 cow with calf
2 steer yearlings
1 improvement of land on Brushy Creek
(conflicting claims noted)
1 improvement of land on Twelve Mile Creek occupied
in 1802 (conflicting claim noted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2759.---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estate of William Albritton, 1817 (File Case A-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Negro man (Frank), 35 years old</td>
<td>700.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Negro woman, 23 years old</td>
<td>750.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sorrel horse, 7 years old</td>
<td>75.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 head horned cattle</td>
<td>96.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 head hogs</td>
<td>193.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 head sheep</td>
<td>28.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 head &quot;gees&quot;</td>
<td>11.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 horse cart</td>
<td>20.---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 saddle & bridle 6.00
5 plows, one iron tooth harrow 22.00
1 lot plow harness 7.00
3 axes & 3 weeding hoes 3.00
1 lot of carpenter's tools 7.00
1 lot of cooper's tools 2.75
1 lot of "Beels and other small things" 6.00
1 "steal mill" 4.00
1 "rifle gun" 8.00
1 shotgun & pouch 16.00
1 crop of corn when gathered valued at 50 cents per bushel
1 crop of cotton when gathered valued at $5.00 per hundred
2 stacks of fodder by the hundred 5.00
1 lot of leather 13.00
1 barrel of salt 7.00
1 lot of barrels 3.00
2 bedsteads & one "cord" 7.00
1 spinning wheel & 3 pair cotton cards 5.00
1 "coffee pot, 6 tins, one sugar box, candlestick, tin canister" 5.68 1/4
1 pair smoothing irons, one pair fire dogs, &c 6.62
6 "slays" 4.50
6 books 3.00
1 trunk & set of razors 6.00
1 lot of cooper's ware 4.50
1 lot of "puter" 4.00
"tin boles" 3.12 1/2
1 lot dishes 5.00
1 lot dishes & kitchen utensils 18.12 1/2
powder & shot 9.75
1 lot of feathers 3.50
1 pot, 2 ovens, 1 kettle, 1 frying pan,
1 pair pot hooks, 2 pot trammels,
2 skimmers 8.12 1/2
1 lot of wool, 1 pair bridle reins 2.75
60 yards cotton baling & 120 of cordage 33.60
1 cow hide 2.00
1 loom 8.00
1 patch of potatoes 15.00
1 big coat & two hats 22.00
Total Estate 2208.28 3/4

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
**Estate of John Watson, 1867 (File Case W-1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>667 acres of land</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 horse (Fleck) 5 years old</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ox wagon</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 yoke of work oxen</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 head of stock cattle</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 head of stock hogs ($3/head)</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total estate</strong></td>
<td><strong>2615.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estate of Lucretia McKnight, 1888 (File Case M-4)

70 acres land on Joiner's Creek (Cosby W, p. 116) 300:--
160 acres land on Joiner's Creek (Cosby 1, p. 68) 500:--

TOTAL REAL ESTATE 800.00

1 Brown mare mule (Babe) 75.00
1 Bay horse (Jack) to Daniel 40.00
1 Yoke oxen (Buck & Logan) 30.00
1 Ox wagon (old) 20.00
1 Cow & Calf (Browny) 11 yrs old 14.00
1 Cow (Rose) to Lizzie 12.50
1 Cow (Beauty) to Josephine 12.50
1 Heifer to Daniel 7.50
1 Cow (Rosa) & calf to Narrah [!] 18.00
1 Cow (Pink) & calf to Robert 18.00
1 lot farm implements
   1 jimmy plow, 2½ shovels & stock, 1 hand saw, 1 cross-cut saw, 3 augers, 2 pair plow gears, &c 9.25
1 "old double barrels shot gun" 5.00
1 four poster bed stead 3.00
1 old clock 1.00
1 wash stand & 6 chairs 1.50

Total Value of Estate 1067.25
Estate of Joe McClendar, 1940 (File Case M-4)

Total Estate $1327.00

Real Estate

Separate Property:

90 ac. (SW cor. Sec 5/2/5) $450.00

Community Property:

62 ac. (NE Cor. Sect 6/2/5) $310.00

Personal Property:

3 mules 150.00
19 cattle 190.00
8 hogs 12.00
1 Model T. Ford 15.00
1 1930 Chevrolet 75.00
1 mowing machine & Rake 30.00
1 disc plow 15.00
2 planters 10.00
1 wagon 10.00
1 lot farm tools 10.00
- 5 turning plows, 1 middle buster
- 1 harrow, 1 scraper
- 2 Ga. stocks.
1 set well tools 5.00
1 set shop tools 5.00
2 shot guns 2.50
1 SW 32-20 pistol 5.00
1 lot house hold goods 20.00
1 Cane Mill 2.50
APPENDIX III

CLIMATIC DATA, ST. HELENA PARISH

[From the records of the State Climatologist, U.S. Weather Bureau, E.S.S.A., Baton Rouge]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRECIPITATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yr.</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |                                                 |                                             |                                               |
| **TEMPERATURE**   |                                                 |                                             |                                               |
| J                | 46.3                                            | 51.6                                        | 51.2                                          |
| F                | 52.5                                            | 53.6                                        | 53.5                                          |
| M                | 59.6                                            | 60.1                                        | 60.0                                          |
| A                | 66.6                                            | 66.4                                        | 66.2                                          |
| M                | 73.8                                            | 73.3                                        | 72.9                                          |
| J                | 78.2                                            | 79.4                                        | 79.2                                          |
| J                | 81.7                                            | 81.2                                        | 80.6                                          |
| A                | 80.9                                            | 81.1                                        | 80.3                                          |
| S                | 77.7                                            | 77.3                                        | 76.5                                          |
| O                | 66.9                                            | 67.5                                        | 67.0                                          |
| N                | 58.9                                            | 57.8                                        | 57.7                                          |
| D                | 50.0                                            | 52.2                                        | 52.0                                          |
| **Yr.**          | **66.1**                                       | **66.8**                                   | **66.4**                                      |
FREQUENCY OF CERTAIN TEMPERATURE EXTREMES
BY MONTHS AND YEARS
Greensburg, St. Helena Parish, Louisiana

[The first number in each entry indicates the number of days with 90°F. or higher. The second number in each entry indicates the number of days with 32°F. or lower. The dash (-) indicates that no data were reported.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0:16</td>
<td>0:11</td>
<td>0:20*</td>
<td>0:16*</td>
<td>0:22*</td>
<td>0:12</td>
<td>0:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0:4</td>
<td>0:10</td>
<td>0:6</td>
<td>0:1</td>
<td>-:-</td>
<td>0:11</td>
<td>0:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0:2</td>
<td>0:4</td>
<td>0:7</td>
<td>0:2</td>
<td>0:5</td>
<td>-:-</td>
<td>0:1</td>
<td>0:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2:0</td>
<td>0:0</td>
<td>0:0</td>
<td>0:0</td>
<td>-:-</td>
<td>3:0</td>
<td>-:0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:0</td>
<td>7:0</td>
<td>11:0</td>
<td>7:0</td>
<td>21:0</td>
<td>-:-</td>
<td>9:0</td>
<td>11:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>23:0</td>
<td>16:0</td>
<td>28:0</td>
<td>21:0</td>
<td>19:0</td>
<td>-:-</td>
<td>3:0</td>
<td>-:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>26:0</td>
<td>25:0</td>
<td>29:0</td>
<td>-:0</td>
<td>31:0</td>
<td>-:-</td>
<td>20:0</td>
<td>-:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26:0</td>
<td>26:0</td>
<td>17:0</td>
<td>21:0</td>
<td>31:0</td>
<td>31:0</td>
<td>-:0</td>
<td>28:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>17:0</td>
<td>16:0</td>
<td>19:0</td>
<td>-:0</td>
<td>22:0</td>
<td>-:-</td>
<td>22:0</td>
<td>21:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1:0</td>
<td>8:0</td>
<td>3:0</td>
<td>2:0</td>
<td>10:0</td>
<td>-:-</td>
<td>0:0</td>
<td>7:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0:2</td>
<td>0:9</td>
<td>0:0</td>
<td>0:2</td>
<td>0:1</td>
<td>0:6</td>
<td>0:2</td>
<td>0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0:10</td>
<td>0:8</td>
<td>0:13</td>
<td>0:13</td>
<td>0:3</td>
<td>0:23</td>
<td>0:13</td>
<td>0:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of days with a maximum of 32°F.:*

|       | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 3   | 2   | 0   | 0   |

Growing Season (days)

|       | 254 | 239 | 254 | 244 | 239 | --  | 261 | 249 |
EXTREMES IN PRECIPITATION BY MONTH
Greensburg, St. Helena Parish, Louisiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Highest Rainfall</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lowest Rainfall</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean Rainfall</th>
<th>Length of Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18.80a</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>.00b</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>78.64</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>62.10c</td>
<td>--c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aGreatest single month.

bLeast single month.

The sum of the monthly averages is 62.10. Only six annual averages are reported; these average 64.42, which is greater than the record-extreme station, Amite (63.34).
APPENDIX IV

SOME SIGNIFICANT PLANTS, ST. HELENA PARISH

The plants mentioned in the text of this essay are here classified as to scientific name, family, origin, and significance in the farmscape of St. Helena Parish, Louisiana. No pretense is made of offering a complete botanical listing or even a complete ethnobotanical listing. On the contrary, this listing is offered only to clarify the references to plants mentioned in the text and to add certain digressive notes about the plants.

Across the top of each entry are the principal common name, the family name, and the specific name. Immediately following appears the digressive note, synonymy, and place of origin of the plant. Authorities for the botanical data and some of the uses and synonyms of the plants include:

- Louisiana trees and shrubs: Brown (1945)
- Other Southeastern United States native flora: Small (1933)
- Cultivated Plants: Bailey (1948)
- Supplementary information: Bailey (1941, 1908), J. D. Sauer (1952), Gleason and Conquist (1963), Harrar and Harrar (1962)

For specific names the first three authorities were relied upon insofar as it was possible.

The following table shows a summary display of the origins of the plants noted. It is interesting to note that more than 22 per cent of all plants noted are shared with Asia and that a little less than one-half are exotic. The exact proportions obtained are of course a function of the sample; nevertheless, it will be interesting and rewarding to trace the diffusion of the exotic plants that make up part of the farmscape of St. Helena Parish. Discovery of the reasons that exotics were successful in this landscape should illuminate cultural processes and earth qualities in a new way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Exotic</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Noted</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AMERICAN PLUM
See Wild Plum.

APPLE
Rosaceae
Pyrus malus
1 Of poor quality; used mainly in cooking; many pomological, ornamental, and wild kinds, both native and introduced, as well as hybrids, make specific identification difficult; several varieties are used for jams, and so forth; P. angustifolia (Southern Crab) is native. Native and Eurasia.

BEANS
Leguminosae
Phaseolus Spp.
2 An important economic group; P. vulgaris includes such as Kidney, Bush, Field, Green (Snap); P. lunatus includes Lima and Butter Beans; these all grow well in nearly any soil provided it contains lime. Americas.

BIC- TREE PLUM
See Wild Plum.

BLACKBERRY
Rosaceae
Rubus Spp.
3 Term seems to include Southern Dewberry (R. trivialis) and R. louisianus as well as some others; also called Dewberry, Bramble. Native.

BLACK GUM
Cornaceae
Nyssa sylvatica
4 Common in boggy bottoms in hill areas; wood tough, difficult to split; woodenware and crates; a variety(?) Swamp Black gum (N. sylvatica var. biflora) noted especially for swamp areas and with swollen bases; Sour gum, Tupelo. Native.

BLUEBERRY
See Huckleberry.

BLUESTEM
See Broom sedge.

BROCCOLI
See Cabbage.

BROOMCORN
Gramineae
Sorghum vulgare var. technicum
5 Noted by Wailes (1854) as frequently used to retard gullying, together with other varieties (S. vulgare var. Drummondii ?); =Andropogon sorghum var. technicus, Holcus sorghum var. technicus. Africa.
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BROOM SEDGE **Gramineae** **Andropogon** Spp.
6 Very common forest and old-field weed; good feed when young; burned when dry to promote new growth; brooms made from this grass; Broom sedge Bluestem (**A. virginicus**) one of the most common species of a genus that provides over one-half of the native forage; Bluestem, Beard Grass, Sage Grass.
Native.

BULL THISTLE **Compositae** **Cirsium** Spp.
7 Many species of **Cirsium** native to Gulf Coastal Plain; a common weed, frequently growing singly, especially in field margins, fence rows, roadsides, and moist places.
Native and Eurasia.

BUSH BEAN
See Bean.

CABBAGE **Cruciferae** **Brassica oleracea**
8 Large group of economic plants derived from **B. oleracea** (Collards); **B. oleracea capitata** (Cabbage),--botrytis (Broccoli); various species and varieties of Mustard reputed to be naturalized in all cultivated areas of the U. S.: Black Mustard, or Charlock (**B. nigra**), Indian Mustard (**B. juncea**), and Curled, or Potherb, Mustard (**B. japonica**) common in waste places; Turnips (**B. rapa**) cultivated for roots and greens; Collards and Turnips especially important in gardens of St. Helena Parish; Collards produce through the winter.
Western Europe.

CAMELLIA **Theaceae** **Camellia japonica**
9 Many varieties; very common in house yard and around old homesites.
East Asia.

CANADA PEA
See Pea.

CEDAR **Pinaceae** **Juniperus virginiana**
10 Colonizes old fields, but most notable along fence rows and roads; tolerated and planted in house yards, barnyards, churchyards, and cemeteries; Red Cedar, Eastern Red Cedar, Cemetery Tree.
Native.

CHERRY
See Wild Cherry

CHEROKEE ROSE **Rosaceae** **Rosa laevigata**
11 Escaped; formerly used as hedge; sometimes confused with Prairie Rose (**R. setigera**), a native (Pink
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Cherokee Rose); Cherokee also called Macartney, or Chickasaw, Rose.
China.

CHICKWEED  
**Caryophyllaceae**  
Stellaria Spp.
12 Many species under this name throughout the area; common in moist woods, pastures, and fields.
Europe.

CHINABALL  
See Chinaberry.

CHINABERRY  
**Meliaceae**  
*Melia azedarach*
13 As a house yard ornamental tree, typical St. Helena Parish farmscape; escaped in some places; Chinaball, Pride of China; *M. lazedarach* var. *umbraculiformus* (Texas Umbrella Tree) also reported.
Asia.

COCKLEBUR  
**Compositae**  
*Xanthium* Spp.
14 Deemed the worst weed in St. Helena Parish; spreads through most fields as soon as crops laid by; during fall and winter, mules covered with burs (seed pods) of cocklebur; tea made of leaves to treat arthritis; may include *X. spinosum* and *X. strumarium*.
Native.

COLLARD  
See Cabbage.

CONFEDERATE ROSE  
**Malvaceae**  
*Hibiscus mutabilis*
15 Common house yard ornamental.
China

CORN  
**Gramineae**  
*Zea Mays indentata*
16 Recommended hybrids are used, but a folk variety, Finger Cob Corn, raised; 16-row, yellowish-white kernels, white meal, two (sometimes three) ears per stalk, small red cob.
Americas.

COTTON  
**Malvaceae**  
*Gossypium* Spp.
17 The small acreages planted currently include good upland varieties; seed no longer selected from the crop of previous year.
Gulf and Caribbean.

COWOAK  
**Fagaceae**  
*Quercus prinus*
18 Widely distributed, especially along creeks; Basket Oak.
Native.
COWPEA  Leguminosae  Vigna sinensis
19  "Clover of the South"; a staple food, feed, and soil improvement crop; more than 40 varieties classed as either crowder or kidney peas; Black Eye, Purple Hull Crowder, Blue Hull, White Crowder, and many others; important to agriculture in India, China, and Southeastern United States. India.

CRAB APPLE
See Apple.

CRAPE MYRTLE  Lythraceae  Lagerstroemia indica
20  Widely escaped; common in house yards and old homesites where used as an ornamental. Asia and northern Australia.

CROWDER PEA
See Cow Pea.

DAY LILY  Liliaceae  Hemerocallis Spp.
21  Widely planted in house yards; at least one variety naturalized (possibly H. fulva, Common Orange Day Lily). Central Europe to China and Japan.

DOGWOOD  Cornaceae  Cornus florida
22  Common understory tree in open woodlands; may be a weed following firing or grazing; little use as house yard ornamental despite its beauty. Native.

EASTERN RED CEDAR
See Cedar.

FIELD BEAN
See Bean.

FIELD PEA
See Pea.

FIG  Moraceae  Ficus carica
23  Very common house yard fruit tree; great amounts of fruit; used preserved and fresh; Adriatic type? Mediterranean.

GREEN BEAN
See Bean.

HICKORY  Juglandaceae  Juglans nigra
24  Planted in house yards; nuts sometimes gathered and eaten. Native.
HOLLYHOCK  Malvaceae  Althea rosea
25 Common house yard ornamental.
China.

HONEYSUCKLE  Caprifoliaceae  Various.
26 Frequent house yard and woodland plant; several genera represented, including: Sambucus canadensis, Viburnum nudum, V. dentatum, Phenianthus sempervirens, Lonicera caprifolium, and japonica, the latter being more common in house yards and native to Japan.
Native and Asia.
See also Wild Azalea.

HUCKLEBERRY  Ericaceae  Various.
27 Frequent in pinelands; gathered for fresh berries, jams; folk term seems to include Vaccinium corymbosum, V. pallidum, Gaylussacia baccata.
Native.

INDIGO  Leguminosae  Indigofera Spp.
28 May have been cultivated in St. Helena Parish in first decade of 19th century and may have gone wild (I. tinctoria), the latter, Asia; others native.

KIDNEY BEAN
See Bean.

LIMA BEAN
See Bean.

LOBLOLLY PINE  Pinaceae  Pinus taeda
29 Rapidly invades idle and abandoned fields and cutover areas; natural on slopes of small streams; Old field Pine.
Native.

LONGLEAF PINE  Pinaceae  Pinus palustris
30 Fire resistant; sandy hills; most frequent natural tree of the parish.
Native.

MAYHAW  Rosaceae  Crataegus Spp.
31 Mayhaw and near relatives supply fruit for jams, beverages; frequent along bottoms; tolerated where found, hence notable near farmsteads, fences, roads; often forming thickets (Mayhaw slashes); other Haws or Hawthorns are common.
Native.

MEXICAN PLUM
See Wild Plum.
**MULLEIN**

_**Scrophulariaceae**_  _**Verbascum Spp.**_

32 Herb widely naturalized in South; commonly found in old fields, along roads, and in waste places; generally a pasture pest; used as a tea (leaves) to treat rheumatism; Moth Mullein (_V. blataris_), Purple Mullein (_V. Phoniceum_), White Mullein (_V. lychnitis_), and Great or Wooley Mullein (_V. thapsus_) may all be present, especially latter. Eurasia.

**MUSCADINE**

_**Vitaceae**_  _**Muscadinia Spp.**_

33 Widely distributed in South, especially in moist thickets along creeks; main species seems to be _M. rotundifolia_ (Scuppernong); also possibly Southern Fox Grape (_V. labrusca_) and Post Oak Grape (_V. lincecumii_). Native.

**MUSTARD**

See Cabbage.

**OKRA**

_**Malvaceae**_  _**Hibiscus esculentus**_

34 Common garden plant grown for seed pods to be used as vegetable (gumbo); also grown sometimes as truck; reported as naturalized in waste places and along road sides. Africa.

**ONION**

_**Liliaceae**_  _**Allium cepa**_

35 Common garden vegetable, though in small quantities. Asia.

**PALMETTO**

_**Palmae**_  _**Serenoa repens**_

36 Noted palmetto in old field with broom sedge (which see) and cedar (which see); called _S. repens_ because such is reported from "Dry pine barrens and sandy soil" in Florida Parishes; ordinary palmetto (_Sabal minor_) occurs in southern part of the parish in the Flatwoods. Native.

**PEA**

_**Leguminosae**_  _**Pisum sativum**_

37 An early pea valuable as fresh, dried, and canned vegetable and as hay, forage, and manure; Garden Pea, Canada (Field) Pea. Mediterranean and West Asia.

**PEACH**

_**Rosaceae**_  _**Prunus persica**_

38 Common in house yards, gardens, barnyards, and even fields; no orchards; poor in quality, possibly due to lack of cold weather, but also to the casual treatment of such trees; used as preserves and hog feed. Asia.
PEANUT  
**Leguminosae**  
**Arachis hypogea**  
39 Common field crop; some sold; others dried and stored as food and feed; vines used as hay and forage; grown with corn in rotation with cotton; important as soil renovator.  
Brazil (via Africa?)

PEAR  
**Rosaceae**  
**Pyrus communis**  
40 Common in house yard and garden; treated much as peach (which see); used for preserves and jelly.  
Eurasia.

PECAN  
**Juglandaceae**  
**Carya illinoensis**  
41 Common house yard tree; also frequent in woods; cultivated varieties widely disseminated and naturalized; nuts gathered as supplemental food.  
Native.

PERSIMMON  
**Ebenaceae**  
**Diospyros virginiana**  
42 Frequent in hill lands, especially along small creeks; fresh fruit, ripe and taken during fall.  
Native.

PLUM  
See Wild Plum.

POKEWEED  
**Phytolaccaceae**  
**Phytolacca americana**  
43 Colonizer of disturbed ground; noted in fields, barnyards, and old fields as well as naturally disturbed areas; used as potherb (leaves) and vegetable (shoots).  
Native.

POST OAK  
**Fagaceae**  
**Quercus stellata**  
44 Typical hill-land tree often mixed with pines.  
Native.

POTATO (IRISH)  
**Solanaceae**  
**Solanum tuberosum**  
45 Rarely grown today; some observed during this study; peak of production reached in early 20th century during influx of lumber people.  
Temperate Andes.

PRAIRIE ROSE  
See Cherokee Rose.

PUMPKIN  
See Squash.

PYRACANTHA  
**Rosaceae**  
**Pyracantha Spp.**  
46 A common house yard ornamental; escaped cultivation along fences and roads and around old homesites; _P. coccinea_ and _P. angustifolia_.  
Asia and Southwest Europe.
QUINCE  
Rosaceae  
Cydonia oblonga
47 Sometimes a house yard tree; as much as ornamental as a fruit (but not Flowering Quince); some preserves made. West Asia.

RED CEDAR
See Cedar.

RED GUM
See Sweet Gum.

RICE  
Gramineae  
Oryza sativa
48 Production was relatively high in the early 19th century, declining to nil by the beginning of the 20th century. Southeast Asia.

ROSE  
Rosaceae  
Rosa Spp.
49 Many old types common in house yards and around old homesites; R. centifolia (Cabbage Rose) especially frequent. Eurasia.

ROSE OF SHARON  
Malvaceae  
Hibiscus syriacus
50 Common house yard ornamental; Althea. East Asia.

SHORTLEAF PINE  
Pinaceae  
Pinus echinata
51 Common in Flatwoods region in southern part of St. Helena Parish and scattered over much of the rest especially along streams; occurs with Sabal minor (Palmetto, which see); may be confused with Spruce Pine (P. glabra). Native.

SLASH PINE  
Pinaceae  
Pinus caribaea
52 "Found naturally as far west as the Amite River"; common regrowth pine. Native.

SNAP BEAN
See Bean

SOUR GUM
See Black Gum.

Squash  
Cucurbitaceae  
Cucurbita Spp.
53 Some Autumn and Winter Squash (C. maxima), occasionally Cushaws (C. moschata), but mainly Summer and Autumn Pumpkins (C. pepo) grown, especially as stock food and somewhat for human consumption; frequently interplanted with corn. Americas.
SUGARCANE  
*Graminae*  
*Saccharum officinarum*

54 Notable on St. Helena general farms as a nearly con­stant element in the farmscape, though usually less than 1/8 acre; replaced to the north of the area by Sweet Sorghum (*Sorghum vulgare* var. *saccharatum*) which was grown at times in the past; both used to make syrup.  
East Indies.

SUMMER AZALEA
See Wild Azalea.

SWAMP AZALEA
See Wild Azalea.

SWAMP BLACK GUM
See Black gum.

SWEET GUM  
*Hamamelidaceae*  
*Liquidambar styraciflua*

55 Widely distributed in the area, especially in wetter areas; a common woodland tree.

SWEET POTATO  
*Convolvulaceae*  
*Ipomaea batatas*

56 A mainstay of the Upland peasant farm as food and feed crop; two varieties cultivated in St. Helena: choker (white) and Porto Rico (reddish-yellow); only a few rows (usually less than 1/8 acre) planted; cultigen.  
South America.

SWEET SORGHUM
See Sugarcane.

THISTLE
See Bull Thistle.

TRIFOLIATE ORANGE  
*Rutaceae*  
*Poncirus trifoliata*

57 Escaped in several places; formerly used as a hedge material and as root stock.  
Southeast Asia.

TUNG NUT  
*Euphorbiaceae*  
*Aleurites fordii*

58 Escaped; noted growing in houseyards, old homesites, and along creeks; formerly extensively used to produce tung oil.  
Central Asia.

TURNIP
See Cabbage.

WATERMELON  
*Cucurbitaceae*  
*Citrullus vulgaris*

59 A garden and field crop; small amounts planted.  
Africa.
WHITE OAK (Fagaceae, Quercus alba)
60 At least 11 oaks grouped under "White Oak"; Q. alba main supply of material for split-oak baskets and some other woodcrafts; common woodland tree. Native.

WILD AZALEA (Ericaceae, Rhododendron canescens)
61 Common pineland understory shrub, especially along streams; R. Serrulatum (Swamp Azalea) blooms later and more common along streams; R. canescens also called Honeysuckle. Native.

WILD CHERRY (Rosaceae, Prunus seratina)
62 Scattered through woods; used for jams, preserves, beverages (cherry bounce); Black Cherry, Rum Cherry. Native.

WILD PLUM (Rosaceae, Prunus Spp.)
63 Wild, or American, Plum (P. americana) marked by root suckers and so forms thick stands, especially around old homesites; Big Tree, or Mexican, Plum (P. mexicana) makes a tree without root suckers; both scattered in pine woodland, especially near boggy bottoms; folk term may also include Mock Orange (P. caroliniana) and Chickasaw Plum (P. angustifolia).

WISTERIA (Leguminosae, Wisteria Spp.)
64 Common house yard ornamental; often escaped and to be noted on old homesites, along fences and roads, and even occasionally in woodlands; mainly W. frutiscens.
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