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ABSTRACT

Over the past 150 years, there has been an open question as to whether or not plantation owners of the ante-bellum South engaged in the breeding of slaves for the purpose of sale. During the years prior to the Civil War, the abolitionists and others claimed that slave breeding was indeed a primary objective of slave owners. Furthermore, propagation was forced, according to many, and done so for the economic gain of slave owners. Others, particularly the Southerners, and even more so the slave owners, denied that such a practice existed.

The purpose of this paper is to study the nature of slave breeding in the ante-bellum South and to investigate the possibility of slaves being bred for profit. It does not attempt to focus on the moral or legal aspects which are involved with slavery; rather, it is an investigation of slave breeding as it existed. This paper presents possible reasons for forced breeding, and various sources are cited in an effort to point out the discrepancies in the testimonies of those people who were involved in this particular aspect of slavery. Although the evidence presented does not offer definitive answers, it is sufficiently convincing to lead this author to conclude that the practice of slave breeding did exist in the decades prior to the Civil War.
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INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with exploring one facet of slavery in the Antebellum South of the United States: "slave breeding." It is not the writer's intention to deal with any of the moral aspects of slavery; rather it is an attempt to create an interest in this particular aspect of slavery by reviewing some of the literature on this subject. A great deal of speculation concerning breeding exists, and it is difficult to give a definitive statement concerning the practice of breeding. The primary sources for this paper are traveler accounts, newspapers, testimonies from private individuals, abolitionists, people in political office, and most importantly, testimony from former slaves.

Slavery has always been a part of the history of man. Man has enslaved for basically two main reasons: the first, as a form of punishment either for transgressors in social behavior or for vanquished soldiers; and the second, as a response to the demand for men and women to serve as laborers. In the United States, a paradox existed which is an anathema to the very nature of the institution of slavery. In the United States, slavery, not indentured servitude, was based on the skin color of the human being.
In 1619 a Dutch privateer appeared at the river in Jamestown and offered for sale twenty Negroes who had been taken from a Spanish slaveship. The Dutch had no use for them and consequently they sold the Negroes to the Virginia colonists for tobacco. The Virginians did not refer to them as slaves at first, because slavery, as such, was not recognized by law or custom either in England or in the colonies. Until 1660 Negroes were mentioned in the Virginia court records as indentured servants, and were evidently as free as such servants were.

Other slave ships came with Negroes to sell, and by 1649 there were about three hundred black servants in the colony. At first there was much confusion over their status. As early as 1640, Negroes were sold by one planter to another, and, at the same time, they were trained like free men in the militia. By 1650 a few Negroes had become free landowners. The white indentured servant gained his freedom after working for his master for a term of years, and it is entirely probable that the Virginia Negro was in this same category in the beginning. It was not until 1662 that an act passed by the House of Burgesses made it clear that slavery existed and was legally recognized in Virginia. The act established slavery as the hereditary legal status of Negroes; it also stated that the status of a Negro would be determined by the condition of his or her
mother. Slavery continued to increase during the seventeenth century, with every colony having a slave population.

The literature concerning slavery in the United States is filled with contradictions and myths. Folklore and ignorance are, to a great extent, responsible for many of the misconceptions which still exist regarding this institution. Many myths have been accepted as fact; many have not. It could be said that only those cases that have supportive evidence are true. However, as time passes, new evidence will surface and change the significance of these myths.

There is one element of slavery which has become exceedingly controversial, the breeding of slaves for sale. This aspect of slavery is clouded with conflicting evidence that results in the support or denial of the practice of breeding: each aspect has some degree of accuracy. To examine and weigh the evidence that does exist and to make an interpretation of this evidence are the duties of the historian. As a result of human bias, it is virtually impossible to achieve a totally objective view of slave breeding.

Before any discussion of slavery in the United States can begin, it is necessary to understand the connotation of slavery as it existed in the Southern States
of the United States. It must be remembered that slavery was an economic institution. Slaves were considered to be property much in the same category as real estate, live stock, or other investments. Consequently, slaves were, in some limited respects, merely economic objects. It is generally accepted that slaves were chattel in the same light as were cattle. With this in mind, the definition of breeding "to produce by the mating of parents, and rear for use; as to breed canaries; to breed cattle for market" would also be appropriate as applied to slaves.

From a purely economic view, a business cannot remain solvent if it is not producing a profit. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that in order to attain maximum profit, the master (owner) would take good care of his breeding stock. Plantation agriculture was a business and it was a business that had an expanding market. The paramount need of this venture was manpower to harvest the crops, and the manpower was slaves.

----------


A condition that may have arisen from this need for manpower was the systematic breeding of slaves in order to supply the demands for them in the expanding market. It is here that the fundamental question rises: what constituted slave breeding and did it actually exist? The historian, Avery Craven, for example, stated in 1957 that, "The charge of slave breeding, which the abolitionists hurled at the border states, can be dismissed until some evidence other than gossip has been found to support it."³

Before discussing slave breeding, breeding must first be defined. Breeding is commonly used to describe the natural procreation of a species. Women were often referred to as breeders when they were pregnant. This had no derogatory connotation whatsoever.

Breeding was used colloquially and in proper medical literature. The use of the term to describe the matching or birth of animals parallels its application to humans. The word lingered longest in speech in the American South, where fertile or pregnant black slaves were called "breeding women" an indication of the animality implied in the word.⁴

Breeding can be defined as the producing of children for benefit another. Often-times planters used the term by


⁴Catherine M. Scholten, "Changing Customs of Childbirth in America, 1760 to 1825", William and Mary Quarterly, XXXIV (1977), 426-45.
... applying it to the rearing of slaves, the selling of slaves, and the rewarding of mothers. Actual mating of selected individuals is what men understand when the term is used regardless of what is being described.\textsuperscript{5}

This definition of slave breeding also has much in common with that of Richard Sutch. He defined breeding as:

\textit{... any practice of the slave master intended to cause the fertility of the slave population to be higher than it would have been in the absence of such interference. So defined, "breeding" includes the use of "rewards" for childbearing, the encouragement of early marriage and short lactation periods, as the provision of both pre and postnatal medical care, as well as practices more reprehensible to modern as well as to many nineteenth century sensibilities.}\textsuperscript{6}

For the purposes of this paper, the word "breeding" will be used to connote the attempt to increase slavery progeny as a result of direct or inferred pressure applied to slaves by their master. Any increase of children precipitated by any form of inducement, other than by the genuine desire of the parents to continue to increase their own immediate family, will therefore constitute breeding.

\textsuperscript{5}Craven, p. 447, notation 14.

CHAPTER I
TESTIMONIES FROM PRIVATE CITIZENS

Contemporary testimony is an asset in helping to understand the reflections of people of a particular era. The testimony from private citizens concerning breeding offers an invaluable source of evidence on the subject of breeding. Such testimony involves people with various concerns who may not have had preconceived ideas and may offer objective testimonies.

The first apparent evidence of deliberate slave breeding in the United States surfaced early in the seventeenth century.

In 1639 Samuel Maverick of Noddles Island attempted, apparently rather clumsily, to breed two of his Negoes, or so an English visitor reported: "Mr. Maverick was desirous to have a breed of Negroes, and therefore seeing [that his "Negro woman"] would not yield by persuasions to company with a Negro young man he had in his house; he commanded him will'd she nill'd she to go to bed to her which was no sooner done but she kickt him out again, this she took in high disdain beyond her slavery."

It must be remembered that slaves were an economic investment for the planter. Planters were also at times


\[8\]Often times planters would extend their real capital in slaves to enhance their prestige. Slaves were regarded as a sign of wealth in the aristocracy. As a result, people would purchase slaves and sacrifice other
slave poor. Therefore, it was of paramount importance to the slave owners to protect their interests, as is evident in the writing of John Brickell of colonial North Carolina:

It frequently happens, when these women have no children by their husband, after being a year or two cohabiting together, the Planters oblige them to take a second, third, fourth, fifth, or more husbands or bedfellows; a fruitful woman amongst them being very much valued by Planters, and a numerous issue esteemed the greatest riches in this country.  

A manager for a Virginia plantation in 1759 was sent the following instructions:

The breeding wenches particularly, you must instruct the overseers to be kind and indulgent to, and not to force them when with child upon any service or hardship that will be injurious to them and that they have every necessity when in the condition that is needful for them, and the children to be well looked after to give them every spring and fall the jerusalem oak seed for a week together and that none of them suffer in time of sickness for want of proper care.

The following is heresay evidence. However, this must also be brought to the attention of the reader because it is a contemporary account. It is from this type of testimony that inference is derived. In 1789, Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut reported about George Mason, who owned economic interests.


... about three hundred slaves, and lives in Virginia, where it is found prudent management that they can breed and raise slaves faster than they want them for their own use, and could supply the deficiency in Georgia and South Carolina.\textsuperscript{11}

One South Carolinian advertised in 1796 that fifty slaves he wished to sell "... had been purchased for stock and breeding Negroes, and to any planters who particularly wanted them for that purpose they are a very choice and desirable gang."\textsuperscript{12}

The charges of breeding were still in their early stages and perhaps based mostly on hearsay. Slavery as yet had not fully developed in the South. By the turn of the nineteenth century more and more evidence surfaced. This is evident by the testimony of both travelers and slave owners. The testimony of these people became increasingly louder over the decades. Many Southerners boasted about their slaves as being breeders. One Virginia planter "... boasted to Olmsted that his slave women were uncommonly good breeders; he did not suppose that there was [sic] a lot of women anywhere that breed faster than his."\textsuperscript{13}


\textsuperscript{13}Lerone Bennet, Jr., \textit{Before the Mayflower. A History of Black America} (Chicago: Johnson Pub. Co., Inc., 1969), p. 84; Stampp p. 246. Planters would care for their slaves much in the same way as they would for cattle:
The testimony of a North Carolina slaveholder to his grandfather in 1835 is most interesting and it helps support the idea of breeding. It reads:

There is one fact generally admitted in support of the view I have taken which is that negroes are unprofitable in this country except for their increases and I believe there are few persons having as many or half as many negroes as Father has, that would be willing to take your negroes or an equal number from anyone else, keep them on a farm and use them well, for all their profits arising from them.14

Southerners made no qualms about breeding. Rather, it was openly discussed and recognized. Professor Thomas R. Dew of William and Mary College said in 1836: "The slaves in Virginia multiply more rapidly than in most of the southern states; the Virginians can raise cheaper than they can buy; in fact, it is one of their greatest sources of profit."15 This is reinforced by a planter, John C. Reed, from Georgia when he stated, "Really the leading industry of the South was slave rearing."16 Frederick Law Olmsted also cites similar testimony from a roommate from

"... negroes will breed much faster when well clothed, fed and housed." When conditions were good this could help create a feeling of security among slaves and result in larger families. Stampp, p. 249.


Mississippi, who claimed that Virginians "... did not keep them to make corn; he said, they kept them to breed and raise young ones." 17

In his work, The Cotton Industry, Professor M. B. Hammard observed that in Virginia and Maryland "... slaves were seldom kept ... for the sake of raising crops, but crops were often cultivated for the sake of raising slaves." 18 This is reinforced by Morgan D. Conway, whose father was a slaveholder near Fredricksburg, Virginia.

As a general thing, the chief pecuniary resources in the Border States is the breeding of slaves; I grieve to say that there is too much ground for the charges that general licentiousness among the slaves, for the purpose of a large increase, is compelled by some masters and encouraged by many. The period of maturity is hastened, the average youth of Negro mothers is being nearly three years earlier than that of any free race, and an old maid is entirely unknown among the women. 19

The border states were notoriously accused of breeding, as seen from testimony by the Reverend Philo Tower during his travels.

17 Frederick Law Olmsted, A Journey in the Back Country (New York: Mason Brothers, 1860), pp. 283-284. On page 285 there is an exceedingly interesting argument concerning breeding that was published in a Mississippi newspaper.


Not only in Virginia but also in Maryland, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee and Missouri, as much attention is paid to the breeding and growth of negroes as to that of horses and mules. It is a common thing for planters to command their girls and women (married or not) to have children; and I am told a great many negro girls are sold off, simply and mainly because they did not have children.  

An Alabama planter felt cheated when a female he purchased as a "breeding woman" proved to be "... incapable of ... bearing children," and he sued the vendor for fraud.

The Duke of Saxe, Weimer, wrote that many owners of slaves in the states of Maryland and Virginia "have . . . nurseries for slaves, whence the planters of Louisiana, Mississippi, and other southern states draw their supplies."

Richard Drake, captain of a slaver for fifty years, traveled throughout the South in the 1830's and was told this story by a private citizen in Fredricksburg:

Slave breeding was the most profitable business in that quarter. Whole farms were used as nurseries to supply the market with young mulatoes . . . .

---


21 Stampp, p. 249.

22 Collins, pp. 68-69. Not only in the border states of Virginia and Maryland but in Florida, climate was considered to be "peculiarly adapted and fitted to the constitution of the Negro. It is an excellent and cheap climate to breed and raise them. The offal of the Sugar House fattens them like young pigs." Stampp, p. 247.
The fertility of the negroes in Virginia seemed to be about the same as in Africa. On a farm near Alexandria I counted thirty about to become mothers, and the huts swarmed with pickaninies of different shades.23

Similar testimony has been left by William Chambers, a Scotsman who visited the South in 1853 and wrote:

Richmond is known as the principle market for the supply of slaves for the South—a circumstance understood to originate in the fact that Virginia, as a matter of husbandry, breeds negro labourers for the express purpose of sale.24

The English economist, J. E. Gaines, conversing with a Mr. McHenry on the subject of breeding,

... computed from reliable data that Virginia had bred and exported to the cotton slave states between the years 1840 and 1850 no less than 100,000 slaves, which at $500 per head would have yielded her $50,000,000.25

The figure of $500 per slave is a moderate to low price per slave. By 1850 the price of a prime field hand would be upwards of $1,000. The figure arrived at by J. E. Gaines could easily have been much larger.

Another foreigner, Sir George Campbell, also told a similar story after listening to slave breeders.26

--------------------

23W. P. A., p. 163.


25DuBois, p. 44.

26"... The slaves were not worked out like omnibus horses; in fact, the capital rank in slaves was so
man, an English geologist, after visiting the South held that Texas would convert old slave states into "... a disgusting nursery for young slaves, because the 'black crop' will produce more money to the proprietors than any other crop they can cultivate."27

Other travelers have left similar accounts. Professor E. A. Andrews, in a letter from Fredricksburg, dated July 26, 1835, conveyed to a friend his thought that "... the only profit for the planters is derived from the negroes whom he [sic] raises for the market."28

This is hearsay evidence and does not constitute any concrete admission of deliberate breeding. It must be remembered that this last statement comes from a person who would possibly not have had any prior contact with a subject such as this. Consequently, he may not have been knowledgeable on the subject and, therefore, may be

heavy, and produce had become so cheap, that the principle source of profit was what was called the 'increase' of the slaves—the breeding them for the market or for new plantations opened in the more Western states. As for breeding farms for other kinds of stock, the human stock, was carefully, and, on the whole kindly treated . . .[.] although the selling of the young stock as it became fit for the market was a barbarous process . . . ." Gunner Myrdal, An American Dilemma, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers Pub. Co., 1944), II:1234.


somewhat naive.

From some of the testimonies previously given, it may be assumed that the South as a whole defended breeding. Many planters detested breeding as ethically evil, as well as inhumane. Others felt it was a blight on the South. Here is another side of this practice that indicates the inconsistencies and contradictions concerning breeding. A Virginian, Jesse Burton Harrison, was opposed to slavery, and he kept in contact with other Virginians who felt the same. "It may be that there is a small section of Virginia (perhaps we could indicate it) where the theory of population is studied with reference to the yearly income from the sale of slaves." 29

The important point here is that he saw a situation that existed where perhaps the owners of slaves could sell their increases. There are, however, no implications that slaves were bred or any indication that the increase of slaves was encouraged.

A Virginian named Shaffer questioned whether any planter bred slaves:

We doubt if there exists in America a slave owner that encouraged the breeding of slaves for the purpose of selling them. Nor do we believe that any man would be permitted to live in any of the

southern states that did intentionally breed slaves with the object of selling them.\textsuperscript{30}

There appears to be some evidence in both directions regardless of how tainted it may or may not be. It is reasonable to assume that some Southerners who were involved in breeding would deny such practices to preserve their reputations. In another light, many Southerners, generally speaking, believed that breeding did not exist. Frederick Law Olmsted, who traveled extensively throughout the South, concurs. From his travels he writes:

Most gentlemen of character seem to have a special disinclination to converse on the subject: and it is denied with feeling, that slaves are often reared, as is supposed by the Abolitionists with the intention of selling them to the traders.\textsuperscript{31}

A clergyman from the North, Nehemiah Adams, traveled in the South in the early 1850's. Though personally biased against slavery, he recorded a view which seems to be fairly objective. He explains that

\begin{quote}
\ldots the charge of vilely multiplying negroes in Virginia is one of those exaggerations of which the subject is full, and is reduced to this: that Virginia being an old state fully stocked, the surplus black population naturally flows off where their numbers are less.\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{30}Collins, p. 78.


\textsuperscript{32}Collins, pp. 68-69.
The previous evidence cited offers no conclusions regarding this subject of breeding. It does, however, indicate that there may be substantial evidence to suggest that breeding may have occurred to some degree. The accounts offered by these private citizens vary considerably and carry no independent authority. It should also be questioned whether any of the testimony cited is objective. What can be definitively deduced is that this evidence is contemporary. On that basis it can be inferred that breeding was discussed by a variety of people with various backgrounds. This reflects the difficulty of precise verification.
CHAPTER II

INTERNAL SLAVE TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES

The slave population had been increasing regularly during the years prior to 1860. To what can this increase be attributed? The practice of breeding does offer some possible answers. The South was still demanding an increase in the number of slaves. From where would this increase come? One possible answer could stem from the development of a domestic (or internal) slave trade.

The South had increased its need for slaves by the beginning of the nineteenth century largely, as a result of the invention of the cotton gin and the development of a new and hardier strain of cotton. Cotton was the South's most important crop, and it was the basis for its material prosperity. However, cotton was to boom only in the lower South. In the border states, tobacco had been the major crop. Unlike cotton, there was no sizeable increase in the demand for tobacco after 1800.

In the eastern and border states of the South, especially Virginia and Maryland, economic prosperity based on the system of plantation agriculture was waning. Soil depletion, coupled with a lack of room for expansion, took its toll on the Piedmont regions of the border states. In these areas, cotton was not "king." Planters with slaves
in this region could not move to up-country west of the
Blue Ridge Mountains because of a lack of adequate routes
by which to transport new crops which were primarily
grains. The planter could not move west to states such as
Kentucky and Missouri because the main crop grown there,
tobacco, had passed the point of profitable development
with slaves. The territories of Indiana and Illinois
prohibited slavery by law. The only route slave owners
might take would be the move "down South." In contrast to
the eastern and border states, the deep South began
experiencing new economic expansion due largely to cotton.
This growth necessitated an increased demand for slave
labor. The deep South was still a largely untapped
wilderness. When the Texas Territory was annexed, it
opened up still more land for potential development.

There was expansion into the deeper South, but the
planters of the border states often times found it
difficult to move. The planters of this region had their
capital tied up in slaves and exhausted lands.
Consequently, many planters were not able to acquire tracts
of land to develop new plantations. There were, however,
those individuals who were able to migrate south and
perpetuate the planter life style. As a result of this
emigration southward, the border states began to experience
a decrease in population, and property values declined.
Those who did move south recognized a need for slaves in the cotton industry and became staunch supporters of slavery. As cotton became the attraction for planters in the deep South, a great demand for an increased number of slaves developed. How this increased demand was going to be met was of paramount importance to those planters in the deep South who saw a direct ratio between the increase in the number of slaves and the increase in the amount of dollars from cotton. Planters saw the abolishment of the African slave trade in 1808 as the cause for the decline in the number of new slaves. The suppression of this trade, however, "... had increased the demand for Virginia bred slaves in the states further south."33 The states of Virginia and Maryland had found a market for their excess slaves and they were enjoying the profit from this trade. There were also similar demands on other states. Most border states seemed to have exported some slaves southward.

The demand of the Southwest for slaves induced a great flow of black laborers out of the older South. In the 1830's, when the flow reached its peak, some 118,000 slaves were exported from Virginia, 23,230 from Kentucky, 67,707 from South Carolina, and large numbers from Maryland and North Carolina. Mississippi imported an estimated 102,394, thus increasing its slave population 197 percent within the decade. Alabama's importations were about as large, and Louisiana, Arkansas, and

Missouri were receiving considerable numbers.\textsuperscript{34}

Twenty years later the flow of slaves southward had declined but was still somewhat large. "Between 1840 and 1850, Maryland had exported 26,279 slaves; Kentucky 25,937; and Virginia 111,259. Even the radical pro-slavery state of South Carolina had lost 40,154."\textsuperscript{35}

The domestic trade appeared able to accommodate this increased demand for slaves. This trade was increasing and it remained largely unchecked. Men, such as Issac Franklin, Austin Woolfold, and Nathan B. Forrest, made comfortable livings from involvement as slave traders, or as they were called "breeders."\textsuperscript{36} It has been generally believed that the slave traders were ostracized by planters for involvement in a traffic that was inhumane, vicious, and extremely venal. However, this may not have been the case since traders provided a necessary function for the planters. That is, they kept the steady flow of slave traffic open as was indicated by advertisements of the day.


\textsuperscript{36}The Oxford English Dictionary, defines breeder as: "1. That which breeds or produces offspring. ... 2. One who breeds cattle or other animals." These definitions can certainly be applied to the above mentioned traders. The Oxford English Dictionary, vol. I: A-B, p. 1086.
NEGROES.

On the 1st of October past, my house will be open for the sale of all classes of Negroes, male and female, free or bond. I can, at the moment, offer for sale, a large number of Negroes, consisting of Field Hands, House Servants, House Secretaries, House Servants, House Secretaries, House Servants, House Secretaries, House Servants, House Secretaries, House Servants, House Secretaries, House Servants, House Secretaries, House Servants, House Secretaries, and many more. All of which are on hand, and will be offered at a fair price, and all of which are for sale, for cash or approved paper. The above advertisements offer an example of the accessibility of slaves in the domestic trade. They

---

Bancroft, p. 316.
suggest a regular market for slaves from Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina. There is, however, no mention of slaves being reared for this market or of breeding women being offered for sale on this market. These advertisements certainly do not imply breeding of slaves on a regular basis.

During the process of sale, slave-breeding slaves were often requested by the planters, as is noted by Charles Ball.

The auctioneer would reply that he was selling some of the best breeding slaves and he might exaggerate, that, for example, a particular female had twenty-two children and could produce as many for the new master.38

George Melville Weston had this to write concerning the profits of slavery: "Under the actual conditions of things in the slave States, the profits of slave breeding are almost fabulous. . . . [T]he attention of the reader is requested to the enormous prices paid for children."39

The domestic trade facilitated the perpetuation of slavery. There is little doubt that this trade was increasing, but the exact percentage cannot be formulated. Slaves were encouraged to increase. What is unique about


the relationship between the traders and their trade is that they rendered services that were needed by the planters. If the traders were ostracized, as previously mentioned, why was the breeding of slaves not looked down on by those of the planter class? Slave breeding owners were more numerous and more highly esteemed than slave traders. Although we have no direct admission that it was done, we can infer that breeding of slaves was widespread and accepted. The actual trade, however, may not have been accepted but was recognized and did fulfill a service.

CHAPTER III
EVIDENCE CITED IN NEWSPAPERS

Accounts relating to the question of slave breeding can be found in the newspapers of the era. The newspapers provide an important source of evidence about slavery. Much insight can be acquired on a subject through the printed word. In the ante-bellum South the news media had a tremendous influence on the subject of slavery. For the most part, people accepted the media's news as fact, because it was the only source of outside news. It must be remembered that often times the papers reflected the biases of their editors and were often tainted on subjects concerning politics. However, as a source of information, they are invaluable as a means for finding out peoples' opinions and views.

A former New England Methodist minister, a resident of Virginia in 1835, wrote the following on "breeding slaves" in a letter to the Rev. Orange Scott, editor of the Wesleyan Observer, Lowell Massachusetts.

There is a great temptation to this. No property can be vested more profitable than in young, healthy negro women. They will, by breeding, double their value in every five years. Mulatoes are surer than pure negroes. Hence planters have no objection to any white man or boy having free intercourse with all the females; and it has been the case that an overseer has been encouraged to make the whole posse his harem and has been paid for the issue. This causes a general corruption of
morals.41

In 1836 the Virginia Times published "... an estimate of the money arising from the sale of slaves ... making the aggregate $24,000,000, which showed the enormous profitableness of slave breeding."42 Evidence from the Richmond Whig of July 25, 1845, suggests that the number of slaves sold south from Virginia and other border states cannot be accurately determined, but it seems likely that it was quite large. The sale south was so large that perhaps there was a regular market for the slaves who were bred for that reason.43 The Natchez Mississippi Free Leader carried an advertisement on January 24, 1853, in which Henry I. Peck boasted: "I have raised as many negroes on that plantation in proportion to the number of women as can be found elsewhere."44

---


42 William Henry Smith, A Political History of Slavery, vol. 1 (New York: The Knickerbocker Press, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903.), p. 3. The Times says that 120,000 slaves were exported that year out of Virginia. Smith, page 3, note 2. However, Bancroft, p. 392. calls this absurd.


44 Charles S. Sydnor, Slavery in Mississippi
Would this constitute concrete evidence or still speculative evidence? It seems logical to assume that Henry I. Peck, by his own admission, convicted himself of the act of breeding slaves for profit.

The following was published in an article in the Columbia South Carolinian which discussed the different kinds of planters—those who managed their own plantations and those who used overseers. The use of the term "breeding women" in the statement confirms that female slaves were viewed as tools for propagation: "[T]o him it is of no consequence that the old hands are worked down, or the young ones overstrained; that the breeding women miscarry, and the sucklers lose their children . . . ."45

Offering a point of view contrary to claims that slaves were bred for the purpose of sale, the editor of the Richmond Enquirer commented on August 14, 1855 that

[n]o man in the South, we are sure, . . . ever bred slaves for sale. . . . Will some Yankee or Englishman, ere the charge is repeated that slaves are bred to be sold like horses, when they are old enough for market, point out a single instance in the present or the past of a Southerner's pursuing such a business?46

-------------


45Olmsted, p. 60

46Craven, p. 447, note 14.
A statement from June 10, 1847, appearing in a moderate, anti-slavery newspaper, the National Era, also supports the argument that breeding slaves for the purpose of sale was not practiced.

The sale of slaves to the south "he says," is carried on to a great extent. The slave holders do not, so far as I can learn, raise them for that special purpose. But here is a man with a score of slaves located on an exhausted plantation. It must furnish support for all; but while they increase, its capacity of supply decreases. The result is he must emancipate or sell. But he has fallen into debt, and he sells to relieve himself of debt, and also from the excess of mouths. Or he requires money to educate his children; or his negroes are sold under execution. From these and other cases, large numbers of slaves are continually disappearing from the state ... 47

What is exhibited here is the cold economic fact of capitalism; without sufficient returns, a business man often times is forced to reduce his inventory in order to remain solvent.

Encouragement, incentives, forced breeding or whatever the case, the following appeared in a Lynchburg, Virginia paper concerning a woman who may have established a record.

Very remarkable: There is now living in the vicinity of Campbell, a Negro woman belonging to a gentleman by the name of Todd; this woman is in her forty-second year and has had forty-one children and at this time is pregnant with her forty-second child, and possibly with her forty-third, as she has frequently had doublets. 48

--------------

47 Collins, p. 82.
48 Bennett, pp. 85-86.
The previous is just a small sampling of what was written in newspapers concerning slave breeding. What is evident are the numerous contradictions involved. In recognizing this as a problem, one may ask: Which accounts are correct and which are not? Given the great number of slave holders, some undoubtedly bred and others did not; some admitted it and others did not; some recognized breeding for what it was while others could not, did not, or chose not to.
CHAPTER IV
EVIDENCE FROM POLITICIANS AND THE COURTS

The people who were elected to public office in the South exercised a tremendous influence in the thinking of their constituents. Those elected officials should also have been somewhat moderately informed on the issues of their districts. However, this might not always have been the case. It may help to understand the southern beliefs by reviewing a few of the testimonies from those people who held political office. We can also gain further insight into customs of the ante-bellum South by briefly reviewing court records which relate to the breeding of slaves.

The South had become a "cotton culture" by the first decade of the nineteenth century. Slavery comprised the backbone of this industry, regardless of how profitable or efficient it may or may not have been. It was the slave labor force which alienated the South, not only from the rest of the country but from much of the rest of the world. It was slavery to which the South clung so tenaciously. Slavery offered an opportunity to better one's social and economic status. To own slaves meant a chance to climb the social ladder, to be accepted as a planters, and to be respected in Southern culture. It was to this plateau that most Southerners wished to aspire.
In an attempt to satisfy the growing demand for slaves, the domestic trade (internal trade) began to increase. Consequently, at that time the beliefs (rumors) about breeding of slaves for deeper Southern markets were to accelerate. In 1832, Governor Thomas Mason Randolph of Virginia estimated that 8,500 slaves yearly from Virginia, for over a twenty year period between 1790 and 1832, were sold southward. There is an interestingly close proximity here between Governor Randolph's statement and the testimony made by Governor James Wood. In 1804 Governor Wood had estimated that from eight to ten thousand slaves were exported annually from his state. He was persuaded that nothing but the large exportations of slaves from Virginia would prevent their being over stocked in a few years. It is interesting that these two governors of Virginia estimated relatively the same figures. "Virginia was the leading exporter of

49 There seems to be a direct tie between the breeding of slaves and domestic trade. Each supported the other, and because of this link they were sometimes mentioned conjointly.


51 These figures could also be used for the years 1830-1860. "One recent estimate [is that the number] of slaves sold south from Virginia between 1830 and 1860 averaged annually 9,371." Is this just coincidental evidence? If it is, why would these estimates be so close? Jackson, p. 53; see also Bancroft, p. 386.
In Richmond, on January 21, 1832, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, in a speech to the House of Delegates of Virginia said: "The older states, and the border slave states particularly, took the place of Africa as the source of supply. They raised slaves to sell. That was the slaveholders' one certain profit." Again speaking in 1832 to the Virginia Legislature, Thomas Jefferson Randolph said:

... It is a practice, and an ever increasing practice, in parts of Virginia, to rear slaves for market. How can an honorable mind, a patriot, and a lover of his country, bear to see this Ancient Dominion, rendered illustrious by the noble devotion and patriotism of her sons in the cause of liberty, converted into one grand menageries, where men are to be reared for the market, like oxen for the shambles.

52 August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, From Plantation to Ghetto, 3rd ed. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), p. 58. Between 1830 and 1860, the authors estimate, nearly 300,000 slaves left Virginia, which would again produce an average of about 10,000 slaves a year.


54 Helper, p. 203 see also Dumond, p. 68 and Chapter 7, note 2. Dumond cites Theodore Weld's American Slavery as It Is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses (New York, 1839), p. 182, as having a Thomas Mann Randolph, Governor of Virginia, as the author of this quote in 1832. There appears to be some confusion either in Dumond's text or perhaps Weld's. Thomas Mann Randolph was governor of Virginia and he did address the Virginia Legislature, but Hinton R. Helper has Thomas Jefferson Randolph as the author of the quote.
It seems reasonable to assume that Virginia did have an excess of slaves and was selling them southward. However, does that constitute deliberate breeding? No, that would only create inferential assumptions on the part of the reader. If the slaves naturally reproduced at their own rate and among themselves, and given a modest death rate, would not an excess have existed? Considering that, would it not be logical to assume that the increase could be sold South to obtain profits from this excess regardless of whether or not the slaves had been purposely reared for the market? People in other states denied the existence of breeding, as in one example from Missouri:

I never heard of any Missourian who consciously raised slaves for the southern market. I feel sure it was never done, said Ex-Lieutenant-Governor R. A. Campbell of Bowling Green. Mr. Robert B. Price of Columbia denied that slaves were consciously bred for the southern market. Letters from old residents and slaveholders in all parts of the state deny that in Missouri, at least, slave breeding was ever engaged in as the anti-slavery people so often charged. The better classes at any rate frowned upon the practice. 55

Perhaps this practice did not exist in Missouri. However, the quote is not a definitive denial because as it reads: "The better classes at any rate frowned upon the practice." 56 Through Mr. Price's own admission, breeding


56 Trexler, p. 45, note 145.
could have existed, but perhaps not in the "finest circles."

One more very important source of evidence which should be cited is that coming from court records. Judicial cases reinforce the evidence that breeding was recognized in the South. One example where direct reference to a slave as a "breeding woman" appears in the account of a case in South Carolina:

Moon v. Moon, Strob. Eq. 327. November 1848. (328) "the slave Harriet is a breeding woman of the age of twenty-three years; Henry is about five years old, John is about three years old, and Hannah about 9 months old; 'They were sent to Mississippi by Mrs. Moon, . . . 'she was arrested by a writ of ne exaet to prevent her from doing what she had already done: sending the property out of the state.' She had been confined in jail three months when this case was heard. Her answer to the bill states that . . . 'the girl becoming a breeding woman, has been ever since an actual incumbrance and expense, and not a benefit to her . . . ." 57

Other cases concerning breeding are: In Virginia, Upshaw v. Upshaw, April 1802 and Ellison v. Woody, April 1814; in North Carolina, Lillard v. Reynolds, June 1843 and Chesson v. Chesson, December 1851; and in South Carolina, Lewis v. Price, November 1850 and Villard v. Robert, January 1848.58 These court cases may possibly


present some of the strongest evidence in support of the existence of breeding. If the evidence was recognized by the courts (and in some cases it was) then those states in which these cases were heard, must have recognized breeding or the judicial system could not have admitted it in court or made rulings on it, thus establishing a precedent.

Regardless of how tainted it may or may not have been, there seems to be some evidence supporting both viewpoints on the question of whether or not slave breeding was practiced. It is reasonable to assume that some Southerners who may have been involved in breeding would deny such practices in order to preserve their reputations, or to ease their consciences. On the other hand, many Southerners believed that breeding did not exist.
CHAPTER V

THE ABOLITIONISTS' POINT OF VIEW

While an attempt to supply slaves to the deep South was being made, cries from abolitionists against breeding slaves for the Southern market rang out. It must be remembered that abolitionists were proponents attempting to build a case against the South in order to persuade public opinion to pressure the South into abolishing slavery.

In bringing the accusations of breeding before the public eye, the foremost abolitionist in the United States, William Lloyd Garrison, spoke before the Great Anti-Colonization Meeting in Exter Hall, London, on November 9, 1833:

... But as in the case of the Israelites in Egypt, the more our slaves are afflicted, the more they multiply and grow. Their increase is more rapid than even that of our white population; and in half of the slave-states, the soil is so completely exhausted, and the market is so glutted that slave labor is almost wholly worthless, and the planters are enabled to support themselves only by breeding slaves for sale in the extreme southern markets.59

Generally, a man of Garrison's fanatacism would not be given much acclaim for his rhetoric; however, further analysis of his attitudes should be carried out since he

was accepted as an authority on this subject regardless of how biased he was. Garrison attempted to present an argument throughout the world on the evils of slavery. This is just one short extract from one of his public appearances where he demonstrated to the audience of another country one more aspect of slavery, the breeding of slaves. No doubt this could have had a sensational effect on any audience. However, it remains important because, from this account, breeding had become a matter of public record. On July 23, 1836, Garrison used the testimony of a minister named George Bourne, who resided in the South for many years:

... Young colored women, stripped to a thin scanty body garment, after the most offensively indecent examination, are publicly placed in scales, weighed, and sold by the pound. Breeding wenches, as they are shockingly termed in the slaveholders' ungodly and impure phraseology, are as regularly nurtured and trafficked, expressly to supply the human flesh market, as a northern farmer endeavors to improve and enlarge his stock of horses, cattle, hogs and sheep.60

It is true that Garrison was biased in his crusade, but these accounts are important as a reflection of the time in contemporary testimonies. It is also a fact that he did attempt to sway public opinion. However, one intriguing question that arises is: Are these testimonies true and, if not, how can a person disprove the claims made in them?

60Ibid., p. 100.
Another abolitionist, Frederick Douglass, delivered an address on October 14, 1845. In County Cork, Ireland, he said:

... The most cruel feature of the system in the Northern States is the Slave Trade. The domestic slave trade of America is now in the height of its prosperity from the Annexation of Texas to our Union. In the Northern States they actually breed slaves and rear them for the Southern Markets; ... 61

The sensationalism in this passage can clearly be seen, but that was the purpose of the abolitionists. Even though people recognized this as propaganda, the abolitionists were extremely successful in their cause. Perhaps the greatest victory in swaying public sentiment came in 1852 from Harriet Beecher Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin. The complete impact of this novel is extremely difficult to assess. Abolitionists had been developing their crusade over decades. This novel, however, did have a tremendous effect throughout the world on millions of its readers. So extensive was the audience and the impact of the book that when it alluded to breeding,62 it appears

61 Frederick Douglass, The Frederick Douglass Papers, ed. John W. Blassingame (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), p. 42. The Northern states that Douglass talks of are the northern states of the South, such as Virginia, Maryland, Tennessee, and perhaps North Carolina.

likely that it could have agitated the caldron of breeding by abolitionists and anti-slave people.

The Negro abolitionist writer, William Wells Brown, wrote of his interview with Joe Budge, the father of one hundred children:

"How near together were your wives?", Brown asked. "Masser had fore plantations, dey live 'bout on 'em, dem dat warn't sold." "Did your master sell some of your wives?" "O! Yes, ser, masser raised slaves fer de market, an' my stock ware called mighty good, kase I were very strong an' could do a heap of work."63

There were charges by abolitionists that slaves had reputations, such as stockmen, breeders, studs, stallions, etc. On the occasion of a fugitive slave being questioned as to why he ran away, the slave replied that he did not like his work. He explained "... that he was kept as a breeding man in order to improve the stock of little niggers for the market."64 Evidence such as this gave the abolitionists ammunition to support their charges. Abolitionists as propagandists were successful. This is evident by the fact that the South felt threatened by the North to such an extent that many of the Southern states were closed to abolitionists. It would be virtually impossible to get a totally objective view of breeding


64 Bennett, Jr., p. 83.
from abolitionists.

The accounts of these abolitionists carry no independent authority. One problem with these arguments is that they remain largely hearsay and possibly even contrived accounts. Nonetheless, the abolitionists were able to stoke the fire.
CHAPTER VI
RECOLLECTIONS FROM FORMER SLAVES

One of the single most important sources of evidence on breeding comes from the narratives of former slaves. The authenticity of these narratives may be questioned for they were recorded as many as seventy years after the demise of slavery. Further, exaggeration may have occurred in these accounts (and it is extremely like that it did) as ex-slaves attempted to emphasize a particular point. Any number of variables may be included (e.g., sympathy, sensationalism, pride, bias, prejudice, etc.), but the testimonies are important because they were given by those who experienced slavery. This is an important point which must be taken into consideration while reading these accounts. It is doubtful that any person could forget as demeaning an experience as slavery even if he or she wanted to.

Elige Davidson, a slave in Virginia, reported:

I been marry one 'fore freedom, with home widdin! Massa, he bring some more women to see me. He wouldn't let me have jus' one woman, I had 'bout fifteen and I don't know how many children. Some over a hundred I's sho.65

--------------------

Since slaves were considered chattel then, it can be assumed that many masters could have mated their slaves as they did their other livestock. An ex-slave had this to say about Old Mack Williams, a small planter in Jasper County, Georgia.

One day he told me that if my wife had been goodlooking, I never would sleep with her again 'cause he'd kill me and take her and raise childrens offen her. They used to take women away from their husbands, and put with some other man to breed just like they would do cattle. They always kept a man penned up, and they used him like a stud hoss.66

To increase offspring, slaves were at times ordered to get married. One former slave recalls:

In July, Claypole told us, we must cultivate five hogshead of Tobacco for our summer's work. Added to this, was the order for us to "get married," according to Slavery, or in other words, to enrich his plantation by a family of young slaves. The alternative of this was to be sold to a slave trader who was then in the vicinity making up a gang for a more southern market.67

Katie Darling, born in Texas in 1849, revealed that "Niggers didn't cou't them like they do now, massa pick on a po'thy man and a pe'thy gal and just put 'em together. What he want am the stock."68

-----------------------


Robert Williams recalled that he saw slaves sold from the auction block in Lynchburg, Virginia.

Some of the bids would start as high as $480. 'cordin' to de condition of de person. De women would have jus' a piece around her wait (something like lights.) De seller would have her turn roun' an' plump her to show how fat she was an' her general condition. Ef dey was in good condition, dey would bring good money such as $1,000 or more 'cause dey would have plenty of chillum an' dat was what de profit came from . . . 69

The testimony of West Turner tells of a "stud" slave.

Joe was 'bout seven feet tall an' was de breedinges' nigger in Virginia. Didn't have no work to do jus' stay 'round de quarters sunnin' himself 'till a call come fo' him. 'Member once ole Massa hired him out to a white man on a Friday. Dey bring him back Monday mo 'min. Dey say dat de next year dere was sebenteen little black babies bo'n at dat place in Suffolk, all on de same day.70

This testimony may be somewhat inaccurate. One must wonder if seventeen Negroes born on the same day as a result of this man's visit the previous year might be a bit exaggerated. If this does appear exaggerated, then this could violate the credibility of this testimony.

Martha Jackson, who was a former slave, gave the following testimony at age 87:

---

69 W. P. A., p. 171.

Laudy, Laudy, them was tribbolashuns! Wunner dese here women was my Antie en she say dat she skacely call to min' he e'r whoppin' her, 'cause she was er breeder woman en' brought in chillun ev'y twelve mont's jes lak a cow bringin' in a calf . . . . He orders she can't be put to no strain 'casen un dat.71

An important question that the reader must ask himself here is: What is the condition of the faculties of this person? Would an advanced age such as this discredit this person's testimony? Certainly it could, but another argument a person could add is that regardless of her age she could not forget such inhumane conditions as existed with slavery. On the other hand, people tend to elaborate, exaggerate, romanticize, and misrecall with age, especially with regard to another's motives.

An interview with Charlotte Martin tells of breeding on Judge Witherson's plantations in Sixteen, Florida. Wilderson found it very profitable to raise and sell slaves. He selected the strongest and best male and female slaves and mated them exclusively for breeding. The huskies babies were given the best attention in order that they might grow into sturdy youth, for it was those who brought the highest prices at the slave market.72

One very interesting and vivid recollection is that of an ex-slave named Rose. Rose, whose owner, "Master" William Black, put her on the auction block when she was


72 Smith, p. 212.
young. Rose recalls what the auctioneer said: "What am I offer for this portly, strong wench. She's never been 'bused and will make the good breeder." 73

Rose was bought by "Master" Hawkins, who treated her well, but she could not forgive him for one thing.

There am one thing Massa Hawkins does to me what I can't shunt from my mind. I knows he don't do it for meaness, but I always hold it 'gainst him. What he done am force me to live with that nigger, Rufus, 'gainst me wants.

After I been at he place 'bout a year, the massa come to me and say, "You gwina live with Rufus in that cabin over yonder. Go fix it for living." I's 'bout sixteen year old and has no laming, and I's jus' ignomus child. I's thought dat him mean for me to tend do cabin for Rufus and some other niggers. Well, dat am start de prestigation for me.

I's took charge of de cabin after work am done fixes supper. Now, I don't like dat Rufus, 'cause he a bully. He am big and 'cause he so, he think everybody do what him say. We-uns has supper, then I goes here and there talkin', 'till I's ready for sleep, and then I gits in de bunk. After I's in, dat nigger come and crawl in de bunk with me 'fore I knows it. I says, "What you means, you fool nigger?" He say for me to hush de mouth. This am my bunk too, he say. 74

Rose goes on to say that Rufus left after about an hour and she barred the door of the cabin. The next day she went to the missey and told her what Rufus wanted. Missy told her that was the massa's wishes.

73 Botkin, p. 160.
74 Ibid., p. 161.
"You am de portly gal, and Rufus am de portly man. The massa wants you-uns for to bring forth portly children." I's thinking 'bout what the missy say, but say to myself, "I's not gwine live with that Rufus." That night when him come in the cabin, I grabs the poker and sits on the bench and says, "git 'way from me, nigger, 'fore I bust your brains out and stomp on them." He say nothing and git out.

The next day the massa call me and tell me, "Woman, I's pay big money for you, and I's done dat for the cause I wants you to raise me childrens. I's put you to live with Rufus for that purpose. Now, if you doesn't want whipping at the stake, you do what I wants." I thinks 'bout Massa buying me offen the block and saving me from being separated from my folks and 'bout being whipped at the stake. There it am. What am I's to do? So I 'cides to do as de massa wish and so I yields.\textsuperscript{75}

May Grayson makes the following testimony about her mammy, who was described as a breeder.

The Creek man that bought her was a kind sort of man, Mammy said, and wouldn't let the master punish her. He took her away and was kind to her, but he decided she was too young to breed, and he sold her to another Creek . . . .

The McIntosh men was [sic] the leaders in the bunch that came out at that time, and one of the bunch, named Jim Perryman, bought my mammy and married her to one of his "boys," but after he waited a while and she didn't have a baby he decided she was no good breeder and he sold her to Mose Perryman.\textsuperscript{76}

This passage continues to mention Mary Grayson's mammy as having ten children by one of Mose Perryman's slaves named Jacob. This, however, does not suggest anything out of the ordinary. What is interesting in this

\begin{footnotes}
\item[75]Ibid., p. 162.
\item[76]Ibid., pp. 130-131.
\end{footnotes}
testimony is that Mary Grayson speaks of her mammy as a breeder. This does not appear to denote any negative connotation. With that in mind, does a person assume that this was just another practice or condition of slavery?

Sojourner Truth made the following statement concerning her own plight: "I have borne thirteen chillun an seen 'em mos' all sold off into slavery, and when I cried out with a mother's grief, none but Jesus heard . . . ."77 This could be interpreted as a planter using this woman to breed but not necessarily of her desire to comply with the wishes of her master.

In the Fisk University's Unwritten History of Slavery, the narratives support the accusations of breeding as told by Frederick Douglass. He stated that the master could only afford to purchase one slave and therefore he bought a

... breeder and then hired a married man to live with her for one year. Every night he would place the man and woman together in a room, and at the end of the year, the woman gave birth to twins. The children were regarded by the master as an important addition to his wealth, and her joy was such that the breeder was kept in the finest material comfort in the hope that she would continue providing good fortune to the master and his family.78

77 Genovese, Roll, Jordan, Roll, p. 458.

78 Feldstein, p. 90. James Roberts also reports a very strong testimony supporting breeding.
Slave women were at times referred to as breeding wenches, breeders, and brood mares.

The Negro female was reduced to a breeding animal. She [a girl about twenty years of age] . . . . is very prolific in her generating qualities, and affords a rare opportunity for any person who wishes to raise a family of strong, healthy servants for . . . [his] own use . . . . 79

Young Negro girls who had given birth to two children by the age of seventeen were "called a 'rattlin good breeder' and commanded an extraordinary price." 80

This, however, does not imply an extensive practice of breeding. Rather, it only alludes to the fact that Negro girls had children and had a potential to have more. There can be little doubt that the owners of slaves encouraged increases in their number of slaves. This is no great surprise, because slaves were a source of capital, and it was on this principle that the economy of the South was based. Possession of slaves was one indication of prestige and prosperity. Therefore, it is quite logical that if a person owned slaves, he would encourage them to increase or breed. Very often incentives or rewards were given to those slave women who did breed. These incentives were not extended throughout the entire South, and there are countless examples of slaves not being treated well when they had children. However, as a reward for bearing

79 Tannenbaum, p. 81.
80 Ibid., p. 84.
children, slave women might receive a new calico dress or extra rations of food. Time off from field duty in the later stages of their pregnancy may have been granted to insure that a healthy child would be born. After birth of the child, the mother may have been given time to nurse her baby. Even in some remote cases, a mother might have received her freedom as a result of her success as a breeder. The barren, however, often times risked the penalty of being sold. As one Alabama slave put it, "Iffen she ain't er good multiplier dey gwine ter git shut er her rail [real] soon."81 This in itself may have been enough of an incentive to increase her pregnancies.

Francie Anne Kenble had this to say concerning incentives used on her Georgia plantation:

Many indirect inducements held out reckless propagation, which has a sort of premium offered to it in the consideration of less work and more food counterbalanced by none of the sacred responsibilities which hallow and ennoble the relation of parent and child; in short, as their lives are for the most, those of mere animals, their increase is literally mere animal breeding, to which every encouragement is given, for it adds to the master's livestock and the value of his estate.82

One planter shared his policy on plantation management:


82Bennett, p. 85.
... no inconsiderable part of [a] farmer's profit being in little negroes he succeeds in raising; the breeding women, when lusty, are allowed a great many privileges and required to work pretty much as they please. When they come out of the straw, a nice calico dress is presented each one as a reward and enducement to take care of their children.83

The uncle of Mrs. Roger A. Pryor rewarded his slaves.

A case that appeared in the Chancery Court of Virginia in 1828 involved a slave woman, Jenny, whose mother had promised that "when she shall have a child for every one of his (his then being five) he would set her free. Jenny won her freedom.84

One slave recalled that "[t]ime goes on, and the war come along, but everything goes on like it did. Some niggers dies, but more was born 'cause Old Pinchback sees to that. He breeds niggers as quick as he can, 'cause that money for him."85

Fogel and Engerman's massive studies on the complexity of slavery in the South "... have failed to produce a single authenticated case of the 'stud' plantations alleged in abolitionist literature."86 This is

83Stampp, p. 250. James H. Hammond offered rewards to his slaves for increases, "For every infant thirteen months old and in sound health that has been properly attended to, the mother shall receive a muslin or calico frock." Phillips, American Negro Slavery, p. 362.

84W. P. A., p. 163.

85Botkin, p. 159.

to be expected. Those planters who did engage in breeding certainly would not have kept any such records of actual matings for several reasons.\textsuperscript{87} The first reason was that the planters who were fostering an increase in their slaves on a large scale may generally have been scrutinized and ostracized by the other more genteel planters, much in the same manner as slave traders may have been. These two occupations were seen as being somewhat necessary for the continued growth and success of slavery. However, there are differences of opinions as to whether they were or were not generally accepted in the social circles of the "planters." Consequently, a slave owner who was breeding his slaves would keep a low profile concerning his primary income and still wear the facade of a planter. The second reason was to avoid the possibility of such records of a breeding plantations falling into the hands of abolitionists. One can only imagine the repercussions this would have had. Generally, the South attempted to show how well their slaves were treated and taken care of. The South collectively resisted the abolitionists' writing as being propagandist. On the charge of breeding, the South claimed hearsay evidence was being presented. The South defended slavery and attempted to present a humane impression of slavery. If only one case of definitive

\textsuperscript{87}This is an assumption on the part of the author for the sake of presenting a possible point of view.
evidence could be presented against breeding, the entire Southern credibility could have possibly been destroyed. Finally, who would have kept such records? A planter who bred slaves for that sole purpose possibly could have had his respectability destroyed if his records were revealed.

This is why contemporary evidence, whether hearsay or concrete, must be weighed so meticulously. If evidence can be found that overwhelmingly supports or denies breeding, a legitimate case can be made. Perhaps this problem was more clearly stated in the Arkansas Narratives: "... the breeding of slave children for the sole purpose of sale did not exist on a large scale, but it certainly did exist." With this in mind, one must ask, what is "large scale?" Certainly, by today's standards, large scale need not be proven and the mere fact that it existed at all is significant. Nevertheless, based on the evidence presented in this paper, slave breeding was not merely an occasional occurrence but seems to have been an established part of plantation life.

---

88Feldstein, p. 89.
CONCLUSION

The testimony of those people who have previously been cited vary considerably with regard to the question of whether or not slave breeding was practiced in the ante-bellum South. By themselves, these testimonies carry no independent authority. Slaveholder reports can hardly be accepted as being objective; nor can the accusations made by the abolitionists. In the preceding pages, the testimonies have been from people who were trying to establish some type of evidence for their case. One would expect abolitionists to use whatever means available to sway public opinion. Conversely, one would expect planters to defend their perspective, whatever it may have been. One could not expect former slaves to present an objective view of the conditions in which they existed, because they were the victims of those conditions. Time does not remain motionless; neither do the circumstances by which an event is interpreted.

One must weigh these various kinds of testimony against one another. It would be gratifying if, in the final analysis, the evidence put forth by one faction were to be so convincing as to override contrary reports. For example, since the slaveholders' letters and diaries, travelers' accounts, the W. P. A. narratives, etc. seem to
agree on breeding, even if they disagree on interpretation and value judgment, one might be tempted to view these reports as establishing the fact that slave breeding was not practiced. However, it is the role of the historian to investigate objectively reports from all factions. Thus, one must give weight to contrary evidence given by former slaves, abolitionists, and others who argued that slave breeding was a part of plantation life. Frequent use of conflicting reports in this paper reflects the difficulty of precise quantification.

In researching this paper, two major difficulties were encountered. First, the evidence from which the information was drawn is not conclusive. Second, the author was unable to find any plantation records that definitively substantiate slave breeding.

Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, in their book, *Time on the Cross*, put forth the following ideas concerning breeding:

Systematic breeding for the market involves two interrelated concepts: 1. interference in the normal sexual habits of slaves to maximize female fertility through such devices as mating women with especially potent men, in much the same ways as exists in breeding livestock; 2. the raising of slaves with sale as the main objective, in much the same way as cattle or horses are raised.89

89Fogel and Engerman, p. 78.
If these are the only criteria for breeding, then it would appear likely that "interference in the normal sexual habits of slaves" did exist to some degree on some plantations. There also appears to be valid evidence that does support the strong possibility that the raising of slaves for sale as the main objective did exist, in much the same way as with cattle or horses.

The review of this evidence may appear to give an affirmative statement concerning the practice of breeding slaves. Clearly, on the basis of the evidence presented in this paper, it seems unlikely that we will ever have the proof we would like for a complete historical analysis of slave breeding. Nonetheless, it is the author's conclusion that patterns of breeding are discernible and do point to the existence of that practice in the decades before the Civil War.
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ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of structural family relationships upon personality adjustment during late adolescence. It was hypothesized that subjects reporting a primary two-person bond of parent-parent within the family during childhood would demonstrate less crisis or discomfort during the adolescent transition than subjects reporting a primary cross-generational bond. University students, ages ranging from 17 to 25 years, reported on the primary two-person bond during their childhood. Subjects were assessed for personality adjustment using the Beck Depression Inventory, the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale and the behavior of help-seeking. Results did not statistically support the hypotheses that adolescents reporting a cross-generational primary bond would demonstrate a higher level of depression and a lower sense of personal control than adolescents reporting a primary parent-parent bond. Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research in the area of family relationship patterns were discussed.
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Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of specific structural family relationships upon personality adjustment during adolescence. It is expected that during this period in human development the individual is psychologically separating from the family of origin and establishing himself as a more autonomous person. There are certain factors within family structure, however, which are thought to influence the success of this late adolescent-young adult transition. The present study examined the relationship between one of those factors, the primary two-person alliance within the family and three measures which were thought to reflect crisis or comfort with the developmental task of transition. The measures used reflected (1) the current level of depression, (2) the sense of control and direction felt by the adolescent over his life and (3) whether or not the adolescent sought help from the University Counseling Center.

Developmental Stages

Personality theorists (Erickson, 1963; Sullivan, 1946; Levinson, 1979) have made common the idea of universal human developmental process. Influenced both by the physiological maturation process and by the cultural pressures and expectations, each individual undergoes the same basic life changes. Movement.
from one stage to another is a time of transition and readjustment. This time requires psychological changes and the reorganization of relationships and roles. Difficulty with a particular transition can be reflected in both immediate personal difficulty or dissatisfaction as well as interfere with later life transitions.

Peter Blos (1975) views adolescence as another individuation process - the shedding of family dependencies in order to become a member of the adult world. According to Blos, individuation implies the growing person assumes increasing responsibility for identity and behavior. Similarly, an issue common to the Ericksonian model of developmental stages (1963, 1968) is the growth of increasing individual competence and a developing sense of personal identity and self-acceptance.

Erickson postulates a series of eight developmental stages with the successful completion of one often dependent upon the resolution of earlier stages. Erickson's fifth stage of human development begins as the individual experiences puberty. At this time the individual is struggling with the need to balance an attachment to the family of origin with the need to find one's role in life as an autonomous adult with a set of attitudes and values about oneself and one's goals. In our culture the stage of adolescent separation is marked by graduation from high school. Although many young adults do not actually leave home, this is commonly seen as the period in life when one is mature enough to leave the shelter of the family
home and adjust to the outside world. (Duval, 1962) This study examined the adolescent task of becoming an individual with a distinct self-concept and goals independent from those established by the significant people in one's life.

**Familial Influences on Adolescent Separation**

This late adolescent separation is a time of great change and reorientation not only for the separating individual but for the entire family as well. One of the major tasks of the family is the eventual separation of the child from that family. (Fleck, 1966) This, of course, cannot be viewed as a sudden development; it is an evolutionary process, it is prepared for slowly by a series of steps and changes in the family relationships. Those individuals in the population under study who have not been able to "warm up" or to practice separation will find it a much more difficult maneuver than those who have been gaining a sense of self-definition over a period of time.

Adolescence is normally a difficult time for both the child and the parents. There are several factors which can make it even more so. Fleck (1966) defined the "healthy" family as a family capable of readjusting to meet a change or crisis. A part of this family health includes the ability of the parents to clearly establish generational boundaries. This means the marital couple should be capable of forming a primary bond and setting themselves up as a unit to nurture and guide offspring. They become an allied subsystem. Minuchin (1974) agrees that
effective parenting requires a primary alliance of the parental subsystem. Parents are the executives and, as the executives, need a base of authority. A non-existant or weakened parental alliance often corresponds with the development of a cross-generational bond (e.g. mother-daughter) as the primary bond in the family. The main goal of this study is to examine the effects of a cross-generational bond upon the personality adjustment of the late adolescent. A strong emotional involvement of primary importance in the family structure, this bonding pattern crosses those generational boundaries established by the "healthy" family and undermines the parenting dyad. The primary bond within the family, therefore, becomes the parent-child bond rather than the parent-parent bond. For the parent that relationship with the child may assume primary importance. The parent may begin to look to the child for intimacy and for the fulfillment of relationship needs. The child may be expected to serve in some ways as a "parent" to the parent.

Boszormenyi-Nagy (1973) offers the relevant concept of parentification. Parentification is the process of looking to significant others to gratify those emotional needs normally provided for by one's parents - the nurturance, the care-taking, reassurance, approval and sense of belonging. To some degree parentification of others as an adult is normal and appropriate; the extreme, making a parental relationship from a non-parent, can be detrimental to the growth of both parties.
The parentified child may become trapped into a continual care-taking relationship, striving to meet the emotional needs of his own parent while receiving a minimum of parenting for himself. The child may be discouraged or prevented from separating emotionally from the relationship for fear of deserting or causing pain to the dependent parent or of disrupting an established family balance. Any attempt to practice independence, to "warm up" for the eventual separation, will place stress on the delicate family system and may be viewed with alarm. Parentification is a difficult process to assess directly. It could, however, be suggested by certain structural relationships within the family. A primary cross-generational bond suggests a high emotional involvement with and dependency upon that child in order to meet the parent's security needs.

This cross-generational involvement can also be observed in the degree of parental intrusions into the child's life. (Borzormenyi-Nagy, 1973) While one task of parenting is the establishment of boundaries to guide and protect offspring, an overly involved parent may intrude into a child's life in a variety of personal and inappropriate ways. A parent who continues making excessive personal decisions for a growing child or adolescent, who interferes in relationships with others or who does not allow the child privacy also interferes with the growth of an increasing sense of autonomy, competence and self-control. Attempting to meet the rigid expectations of
an intrusive or needy parent requires the child yield or forfeit developing independence. The child will not easily undertake the developmental tasks of independent exploration and problem-solving and may, therefore, fail to develop an adequate sense of personal competence.

This study utilized self-reports of family structure to examine the hypotheses below. When the primary dyadic bond within the family has been between that parent-parent dyad, the adolescent-young adult will find it less difficult to separate from the family. When the primary bond has been cross-generational, the adolescent-young adult will find it more difficult to separate from the family, a difficulty which is reflected in both the measures of personality adjustment and the help-seeking behavior.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 predicted that subjects reporting the primary bond within the family as cross-generational will experience significantly greater depression as measured by the Beck Depression Inventory than those subjects reporting a primary bond between the parenting dyad.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that subjects reporting the primary bond within the family as cross-generational will have a lower sense of personal control over their lives, scoring more external on the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, than those subjects reporting the primary bond to be parent-parent.
Hypothesis 3 predicted that subjects reporting the primary bond within the family as cross-generational would be significantly more likely to seek counseling than subjects who reported the primary bond within the family to be parent-parent.

Measures Used to Reflect Difficulty

Three measures were used to determine the extent of the difficulty experienced during this late adolescent developmental transition. Depression was chosen as the first outcome measure in this study for several reasons. Seligman (1975) hypothesizes depression as resulting from a sense of human helplessness—a feeling of inadequacy and incompetence in dealing with day-to-day problems. A child who has not been allowed to explore, to develop a sense of self as a separate person and a sense of competence in solving problems will frequently suffer from low self-esteem and feelings of inadequacy and helplessness. Recent research seems to indicate a relationship between depression in young adults and their reports of parents as non-nurturing and non-supportive. (Blatt, Wein, Chevron and Quilan, 1975) Raskin (1971) found patients reported their parents to be overly intrusive and intolerant of any autonomous exploration. Lastly, depression is frequently associated with guilt and self-blame; guilt is a prominent personality component of the parentified child who sees himself as responsible for the parental unhappiness or, at least, inadequate at providing happiness for that parent. It would then
be predicted (Hypothesis 1) that subjects reporting a primary parental bond would also report a lower level of depression. Subjects reporting a cross-generational bond as primary were expected to demonstrate a higher level of depression.

The second measure (Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale) reflects the sense of being responsible for and able to have some effect upon one's life. An Internal Locus of Control reflects the subject's belief in one's own personal efficacy in guiding one's life. An External Locus of Control reflects a subject's belief in the basic inability to effect one's own life or environment. To have developed this Internal Locus of Control an adolescent needs to have developed the belief that personal control can be exerted and decisions made effecting the course of one's life. The parent who is heavily invested in and controls the child's life interferes with the child's developing sense of personal or "internal" control. Offspring of an overly-involved or highly bonded parent will tend to look to others for feedback and direction. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 predicted that subjects reporting the parental bond as primary would score more internal on the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale than adolescents who reported a cross-generational bond as primary.

The third measure was whether or not a late adolescent would seek counseling. The population in this study was self-divided into two contrast groups. The experimental group
or help-seeking sample were clients at the University of California, Riverside, Counseling Center. The contrast group was a sample of volunteer students from general education classes who had not sought help in the form of counseling. It was assumed that help-seeking subjects were, in general, experiencing greater adjustment difficulties at this time. Hypothesis 3 predicted that late adolescents reporting a primary cross-generational bond would be more likely to seek counseling than adolescents who reported a primary bond of parent-parent.
METHODS

Design

The overall design of this study was a 2 X 2 factorial design with sex of subject and reported two-person primary bond within the family as the independent variables. Dependent variables were the scores on the Beck Depression Inventory, the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale) and the behavior of help-seeking in the form of counseling.

Measures

A three-part questionnaire was administered to subjects. Part One, the Family Relations Questionnaire (See Appendix A) collected data to be used as an independent variable. Although there are no published validity and reliability data, the Family Relations Questionnaire has been successfully used to differentiate adjustments in female college students as a function of primary marital bond. (Teyber, 1977) This questionnaire solicited information on bonding patterns between family members in the childhood home of each subject. Specifically, each subject was asked to rank order the importance of various familial dyads. Subjects reported the primary two-person bond within their family e.g. mother-father, parent-child. If parent-child was reported, further delineation was requested, i.e. mother-son, father-son,
mother-daughter, father-daughter. Subjects were also asked to report on the quality of the marital relationship as perceived by the subject.

The last two parts of the questionnaire, the Beck Depression Inventory (Appendix B) and the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Appendix C) served as two of the three outcome measures. The Beck Depression Inventory (Beck et al., 1961) is probably the most widely used self-report depression scale. It contains 21 categories of symptoms and attitudes clinically related to depression. The Beck Depression Inventory was chosen for its ease of administration. Analysis of the Beck Depression Inventory demonstrated good reliability as indexed by internal consistency and stability criteria; split-half Spearman-Brown corrected Pearson r = .93, significant at the p < .001 level. (Becker, 1974) Validation studies (Beck et al., 1961) using clinician ratings of the severity of depression were found to be significant at the p < .001 level. Finally, recent investigation (Bumberry and Oliver, 1978) found the Beck Depression Inventory to be a valid instrument for the measurement of depression in a University population.

With a possible range score of 0 to 63, Beck (1961) categorizes 0 to 9 as not depressed, 10 to 15 as mildly depressed, 16 to 23 as moderately depressed and 24 to 63 as severely depressed. It was predicted that adolescents reporting a primary bond of parent-parent would be less depressed than adolescents reporting a cross-generational bond.
The I-E Scale (Rotter, 1965) has been used in this study as a measure of the personal sense of control over self and life events as felt by the individual. An Internal Locus of Control, demonstrated by a low score on the I-E Scale, reflects an individual's belief that life events are dependent upon one's behavior or characteristics. An External Locus of Control, demonstrated by a high score on the I-E Scale, reflects the belief that reinforcement following an action is the result of luck, fate, chance or powerful others and cannot be predicted because of the complexity of the forces around the individual. (Rotter, 1966)

Split-half and Kudar-Richardson reliabilities for the I-E Scale tend to consistently fall around .70. Retest reliabilities within a few months remain at the same level. (Anastasi, 1976) The I-E Scale contains 23 items in a forced-choice format plus six filler items. The possible range of scores is 0 to 23; the higher the score the more external the orientation of the individual. It was predicted that adolescents reporting the parental bond as primary would be found to have a more internal orientation. Adolescents who reported a primary cross-generational bond would be more external in outlook.

Subjects and Procedures

Subjects were male and female students at the University of California, Riverside campus. For research purposes
adolescents were considered to be between the ages of 17 and 25 years. The grouping of the subjects served as the third outcome measure. The hypothesis predicted that subjects reporting the parental bond as primary would be less likely to choose to seek help in the form of counseling while subjects reporting a cross-generational bond as primary would be more likely to seek help. In order to test this hypothesis, subjects were selected from two populations. Those seeking help were labeled the experimental group and were thought to be seeking help in the form of counseling because of personal crisis or discomfort experienced during this period in their lives. Participants for the experimental group, self-selected by choosing to seek help, were clients of the Counseling Center. Subjects voluntarily chose to participate by completing and returning the questionnaire.

The comparison group, students not currently involved in counseling, were assumed to be in less personal discomfort at this point in their lives. The comparison population was obtained by soliciting students from the University of California, Riverside campus. In order to duplicate as closely as possible the general campus characteristics, the population sample was contacted by requesting volunteers from a wide range of classrooms. Respondents who identified themselves on the questionnaire as currently involved in counseling were excluded from the comparison group.

The entire questionnaire took approximately 45 minutes to
complete. It was mailed to the University Counseling Center clientele during the seventh week of the Spring quarter, 1980. Completion and anonymous return of the questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope were considered to indicate the subject's informed agreement and consent to participate in the study.

For the comparison group the questionnaire was distributed for individuals who volunteered from campus classrooms in response to request. The control population subjects were allowed to take the questionnaire with them to be completed and returned by mail. No identifying data was collected with the questionnaire.
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to test the general hypothesis that separating adolescents who reported a primary bond of parent-parent would experience less difficulty with personal adjustment than separating adolescents who reported a primary cross-generational bond.

Of the 150 students who responded to this study, 55 were male and 95 were female. The mean age of all subjects was found to be 21.03 years; the median age was 20.72 years. Table 1 summarizes the reported primary bond across sex of subject.

Hypothesis 1 predicted significantly greater depression in subjects reporting a primary cross-generational bond than in subjects reporting the primary bond as parent-parent. T-tests were performed for females and for males comparing the two group means for the Beck Depression Inventory. A t-test analysis comparing means for females reporting a primary bond of parent-parent ($\bar{X}=9.06$) with the means for females reporting a cross-generational bond ($\bar{X}=10.51$) was non-significant, $t(66.2)=.67$, p-value of .849. A t-test analysis comparing means for males who reported a primary bond of parent-parent ($\bar{X}=8.71$) with the means for males reporting a cross-generational bond as primary ($\bar{X}=8.77$) was also not significant, $t(42.1)=-.02$, p-value of .982.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Primary Bond</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Parent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Son</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Daughter</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Son</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-Daughter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Child</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent Involved in Primary Bond</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Bond Reported as 'None'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2 predicted subjects reporting the parent-parent bond would score significantly lower on the I-E Scale, therefore, demonstrating a more Internal Locus of Control than subjects who reported a cross-generational bond as primary. An independent t-test comparing the means for females reporting a primary parental bond ($\bar{X}=10.94$) with females reporting a primary cross-generational bond ($\bar{X}=9.89$) was calculated. Results were not significant, $t(61.5) = .19$, with a p-value of .849. T-test analysis comparing the I-E Scale scores of males reporting a primary parent-parent bond ($\bar{X}=7.4$) with the scores of males reporting a cross-generational bond as primary ($\bar{X}=8.8$) was also not significant, $t(41.3) = -1.01$, p-value of .319.

Hypothesis 3 predicted a significantly greater number of subjects reporting a cross-generational bond would seek help at the Counseling Center compared to subjects with a primary bond of parent-parent. Chi-square analyses were performed for, first, the female population and, secondly, the male population. Tabulations on help-seeking by reported primary bond are indicated in Table 2 and Table 3. A chi-square analysis for females reporting a primary bond of parent-parent and for females reporting a primary cross-generational bond was not significant, $X^2(2) = .962$. Similarly, a chi-square analysis for males reporting a primary bond of parent-parent and males reporting a primary cross-generational bond was not significant, $X^2(1) = .399$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED BOND</th>
<th>Parent-Parent</th>
<th>Cross-Generational</th>
<th>totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Population,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Seeking Help</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Center</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3
HELP-SEEKING BEHAVIOR BY PRIMARY BOND FOR FEMALE SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTED BOND</th>
<th>Parent-Parent</th>
<th>Cross-Generational</th>
<th>totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Population, Not Help-Seeking</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Center Clients</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Research findings were non-significant and did not support the three specific hypotheses of (1) a higher score on the Beck Depression Inventory, (2) a more external score on the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale and (3) a tendency to be in counseling for those subjects reporting a cross-generational bond. The results can be examined and discussed from three vantage points, those of the procedures, the measures and the theory of cross-generational bonding patterns.

Measures

Two of the measures chosen to assess adolescent adjustment difficulties during the transition into adulthood may work as limitations in this study. Both the choice of depression as a major symptom of adolescent adjustment difficulties and the assumption regarding the Counseling Center clientele may be examined further.

While the Beck Depression Inventory is an excellent measure of depression, it may be that depression is not necessarily a major resulting symptom of crisis in the late adolescent transition. A heightened degree of anxiety may be more symptomatic of a subject attempting to emancipate from the family of origin. According to Bowen, families
work on an emotional level. The adolescent withdrawal from the family - even the healthy family - creates intra- and interpersonal conflicts for family members. If a family feels they need the adolescent member to safely maintain the equilibrium the family will experience emotional crises. The adolescent will be caught between two pulls, the urge to grow and individuate and the need to be loyal to and responsible for the pain of family members. The intense emotional crisis and conflict creates anxiety for both the family and the separating adolescent who is placed into a double bind.

A second measurement flaw is the assumption that the Counseling Center clients would have a significant percentage of the reported cross-generational bonds within their families of origin. Counseling Center clients may be suffering distress from a wide range of difficulties, ONE of which is the cross-generational bond. Also, since many people in emotional distress do not seek counseling, there will be in the student sample some adolescents undergoing those same adjustment issues. Furthermore, loyalty and a sense of responsibility for parental happiness may interfere with the healthy behavior of seeking help.

Procedures

Some of the procedures used to conduct this study may have acted as interfering variables upon the research results. Both the age range of the subjects and the manner in which the
the data was collected will be discussed.

The age range of the subjects in this study were 17 to 25 years with a mean age of 21.03 years. Teyber (1981, 1982) has consistently found significant results in the effects of the cross-generational upon adolescent emancipation from the family; Teyber, however, used only freshmen and sophomores in college as subjects in his research. This suggests that adjustment difficulties, complete with family conflict, may occur most urgently as the separating offspring begin the process by entering college. Those older subjects, while sharing the personal issues and difficulties caused by the cross-generational bond, may have already spent a few years resolving their internal conflicts or learning to cope with their feelings. The adolescent adjustment difficulties may be a "freshman phenomena."

Another aspect of the procedure which calls for examination is the manner used in collection of the information on early family bonds. The Family Relations Questionnaire asks subjects to report the most intense or the closest two-person bond within the family by checking the appropriate line. There are limitations to the pencil and paper questionnaire as opposed to the interviews conducted by Teyber. Questions can be raised concerning the uniform understanding on the part of the subjects about the task of reporting bonding patterns. Both the vocabulary used and the concept of family bonds may be foreign to some people. Subjects may need an
"education" in the ideas of family structure and a chance to begin using the concept before attempting to report their own family in those terms. Perhaps, a paragraph or two describing the terminology and ideas involved would better orient the subject to the task. Subjects might also benefit from drawing a three-generational map (Satir, 1967) of family relationships, discussing the patterns with the interviewer.

In support of this idea it can be observed that subjects in this study tended to report from an egocentric point of view. Female subjects, while reporting parent-daughter bonds, rarely reported parent-son bonds. Male subjects reversed the tendency, reporting parent-son bonding but rarely reporting parent-daughter bonds. There may be an immediate tendency to report that emotional bond which is most salient for the subject. While this has merit in that the most salient bond may be the most "real" for that subject, it may cause difficulty in the objective assessment of overall family relationship patterns and resulting personality adjustment in adolescent offspring.

Theory

In this study cross-generational bonds were reported by both populations, Counseling Center clients and non-clients, by those scoring depression on the Beck Depression Inventory and those not and by both those subjects who had external and those who had internal orientations to life as measured by
the I-E Scale. Theorists such as Minuchin (1974), Bowen (1965) and Boszormenyi-Nagy (1973) and current research (Teyber, 1981, 1982) still suggests that a cross-generational bond complicates and interferes with adolescent leave-taking.

In the cross-generational relationship, however, there may be more to consider than family structure alone. There are, perhaps, a variety of variables which moderate, neutralize or intensify the effects of the parent-child bond.

Within that parent-child relationship alone there are several elements which may need to be examined further. It may be important to more precisely measure or assess the degree of parental neediness or identification with the child. How much emotional care-taking did that parent need from the child and was the child the only or main source of care-taking for that parent? A parent who "needs" constantly or consistently or who has frequent outbursts of crisis may have a different long-term effect than a parent who is closely bonded and needs emotional care-taking but finds alternative sources when the child does not or cannot respond.

Another element within the parent-child relationship requiring examination are the sexes of the parent and the child. Greater information on the sex of the parent to whom the child is bonded is needed. A same-sex bond and a cross-sex bond may demonstrate significantly different effects in late adolescence. Would it be easier or more difficult i.e. more anxiety producing to separate from a parent of the opposite sex?
Because of the difference in the socialization process and the ego development of boys and girls, differing effects for each of the four possible bonds could be possible.

There are variables within each individual child's environment which needs recognition. Significant people other than the bonded parent may have the potential to counteract or modify the effects of that cross-generational bond. Having a significant adult to turn to as refuge and relief and to serve as a validator of the child's internal response to the parentification process may help the child deal with those feelings in a less potentially damaging manner. It may be important to know what position or role the other parent assumed and whether they encouraged, accepted or reinforced the cross-generational bond. Whether or not the child has another role model may affect the degree to which the child accepts the responsibility for meeting that parent's needs.

More examination of the entire family system which accompanies the parentification process is needed. Several possible limitations of this study have already been offered and there are many improvements, some already mentioned, to be made. While the hypotheses are not statistically supported, the results are in the predicted direction in every case but one. Further consideration of this complex problem is encouraged; certainly, greater understanding is needed in the area of healthy adolescent individuation.
APPENDIX A

Family Relations Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Siblings</th>
<th>Present Place of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents' home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Own apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dormitory room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) As you look back to your childhood and consider the bonds of emotional closeness and involvement, what was the primary two-person relationship in your family? Check one.

- Mother-Father
- Parent-Child
- Grandparent-Parent
- Grandparent-Child
- Child-Child
- None

(2) If you answered 'parent-child' in the previous question, then what relationship was primary?

- Mother-Son
- Mother-Daughter
- Father-Son
- Father-Daughter

(3) Once again, considering bonds of emotional closeness and involvement, what two-person 'teams' went together in your family? Check as many as applicable.

- Mother-Father
- Child-Child
- Mother-Daughter
- Mother-Son
- Father-Son
- Father-Daughter
(4) Were there any highly involved sub-groups or teams larger than two people in your family, e.g. mother-children? List as many as applicable.

(5) Did you feel that either parent was closer to and more involved with grandparent than with the family unit of father, mother and children? If so, mark as applicable.
   ___ Mother-Grandmother
   ___ Mother-Grandfather
   ___ Father-Grandmother
   ___ Father-Grandfather

(6) To which relationship would your mother and father give greater priority and importance?
   Mother: ______ Marital relationship primary
           ______ Parental relationship primary
           ______ Relationship with her parents primary
   Father: ______ Marital relationship primary
           ______ Parental relationship primary
           ______ Relationship with his parents primary

(7) How do you imagine that your parents would describe themselves in terms of roles? For each parent, please rank order as many role labels as applicable, i.e. assign numbers (1,2,3,4,etc.) in order of importance to that parent.
   Mother: ______ Wife
           ______ Mother
           ______ Daughter
           ______ Career/Working Woman
           ______ Homemaker
           ______ Friend
           ______ Community Volunteer
   Father: ______ Husband
           ______ Father
           ______ Son
           ______ Breadwinner/ Career Man
           ______ Head of Household
           ______ Friend
           ______ Community Volunteer

(8) While you were growing up, with which of the following did you feel your parents were highly involved? Again, please rank by assigning numbers according to involvement.
   ______ Marital Partner
   ______ You
   ______ Other Children
   ______ Grandparent
   ______ Education/ Schooling
   ______ Career/ Job
   ______ Community Activities
   ______ Friends/ Social Life
(9) Please pick the adjective set that best describes the marital relationship of your parents.
   _____ close and generally cooperative
   _____ cool and distant
   _____ conflicted and tense

(10) While you were growing up, with whom did you feel more emotionally close and more closely bonded. Mark one.
   _____ Mother
   _____ Father
   _____ Both equally
   _____ Neither parent
APPENDIX B

BECK DEPRESSION INVENTORY

Please select one descriptive sentence from each of the following sets of sentences as it applies to you.

(1) _____ I do not feel sad.
    _____ I feel blue or sad.
    _____ I am blue or sad all the time and I can't snap out of it.
    _____ I am so sad or unhappy that it is quite painful.
    _____ I am so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it.

(2) _____ I am not particularly pessimistic or discouraged about the future.
    _____ I am discouraged about the future.
    _____ I feel I have nothing to look forward to.
    _____ I feel that I won't ever get over my troubles.
    _____ I feel that the future is hopeless and that things cannot improve.

(3) _____ I do not feel like a failure.
    _____ I feel that I have failed more than the average person.
    _____ I feel I have accomplished very little that is worthwhile or that means anything.
    _____ I look back upon my life and all I can see is failure.
    _____ I am a complete failure as a person.

(4) _____ I am not particularly dissatisfied.
    _____ I feel bored most of the time.
    _____ I don't enjoy things the way I used to.
    _____ I don't get satisfaction out of anything any more.
    _____ I am dissatisfied with everything.

(5) _____ I don't feel particularly guilty.
    _____ I feel bad or unworthy a good part of the time.
    _____ I feel quite guilty.
    _____ I feel bad or unworthy practically all the time.
    _____ I feel as though I am very bad or worthless.

(6) _____ I don't feel I am being punished.
    _____ I have a feeling something bad may happen to me.
    _____ I feel I am being punished or will be punished.
I feel I deserve to be punished.
I want to be punished.

(7) I don't feel disappointed in myself.
I am disappointed in myself.
I don't like myself.
I am disgusted in myself.
I hate myself.

(8) I don't feel I am any worse than anyone else.
I am critical of myself for my weaknesses and mistakes.
I blame myself for my faults.
I blame myself for everything that happens.

(9) I don't have any thoughts of harming myself.
I have thoughts of harming myself but I would not carry them out.
I feel I would be better off dead.
I have definite plans about committing suicide.
I would kill myself if I could.

(10) I don't cry any more than usual.
I cry more now than I used to.
I cry all the time now. I can't stop it.
I used to be able to cry but now I can't cry at all even though I want to cry.

(11) I am no more irritated now than I ever am.
I get annoyed or irritated more easily than I used to.
I feel irritated at all times.
I don't get irritated at all at the things that used to irritate me.

(12) I have not lost interest in people.
I am less interested in other people now than I used to.
I have lost most of my interest in other people and have little feeling for them.
I have lost all my interest in other people and don't care for them at all.

(13) I make decisions about as well as ever.
I try to put off making decisions.
I have great difficulty making decisions.
I can't make decisions at all any more.
(14) I don't feel that I look any worse than I used to.
   ____ I am worried that I am looking old or unattractive.
   ____ I feel that there are permanent changes in my appearance and they make me look unattractive.
   ____ I feel I am ugly or repulsive looking.

(15) I can work about as well as before.
   ____ It takes extra effort to get started at doing something.
   ____ I don't work as well as I used to work.
   ____ I have to push myself very hard to do anything.
   ____ I can't do any work at all.

(16) I can sleep as well as usual.
   ____ I wake up more tired in the morning than I used to.
   ____ I wake up 1-2 hours earlier than usual and find it hard to get back to sleep.
   ____ I wake up early every day and can't get more than five hours sleep.

(17) I don't get any more tired than usual.
   ____ I get tired easier than I used to.
   ____ I get tired from doing anything.
   ____ I get too tired to do anything.

(18) My appetite is no worse than usual.
   ____ My appetite is not as good as it used to be.
   ____ My appetite is much worse now.
   ____ I have no appetite at all any more.

(19) I haven't lost much weight, if any, lately.
   ____ I have lost more than five pounds.
   ____ I have lost more than ten pounds.
   ____ I have lost more than fifteen pounds.

(20) I am more concerned about my health than usual.
   ____ I am concerned about aches and pains or upset stomach or constipation.
   ____ I am so concerned with how I feel that it's hard to think of much else.
   ____ I am completely absorbed in what I feel.

(21) I have not noticed any recent change in my interest in sex.
   ____ I am much less interested in sex than I used to be.
   ____ I am much less interested in sex now.
   ____ I have lost interest in sex completely.
APPENDIX C

ROTTER INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE

Please select the one statement from each pair of statements that you strongly believe to be the case as far as YOU are concerned. This is a measure of personal belief; there is not right or wrong answers.

(1) Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   ___ The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

(2) Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   ___ People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

(3) One of the major reasons we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   ___ There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

(4) In the long run people get the respect they deserve.
   ___ Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

(5) The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   ___ Most students do not realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

(6) Without the right breaks one cannot become an effective leader.
   ___ Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

(7) No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   ___ People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

(8) Heredity plays a major role in determining one's personality.
   ___ It is experiences in life which determines personality.
In the case of the well-prepared student there is rarely, if ever, such a thing as an unfair test. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to coursework that studying is really useless.

Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place in the right time.

The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions. This world is run by the few people in power and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

When I make plans, I am almost certain I can make them work. It is not always wise to plan ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyway.

There are certain people who are just no good. There is some good in everyone.

In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place at the time. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little to do with it.

As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand or control. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings. There is really no such thing as "luck."

One should always be willing to admit mistakes. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
(21) In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness or all three.

(22) With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

(23) Sometimes, I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give. There is a direct connection between the grades I get and how hard I study.

(24) A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

(25) Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

(26) People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people; if they like you, they like you.

(27) There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

(28) What happens to me is my own doing. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction of my life.

(29) Most of the time, I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as a local level.
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