

An Historic Archaeological Survey of the Liberty Hall Plantation: Lexington Virginia

T. Patrick, C. Brennan

December 12, 1977

Anthropology 378

Dr. John McDaniel

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following for their assistance in compiling this research. Dr. John McDaniel for allowing me access to the historic data compiled thus far on Liberty Hall Academy. Mrs. Gladys Gray, secretary to the treasurer; Mr. Rupert Latture, "archivist", Dr. Gaines files; Dr. Charles Turner, archivist, Rockbridge Historical Society; Ms. Susan Coblentz, archivist, McCormick Library; Mr. Vernon Eddenfield, archivist, Preston Library. Special thanks go to Mrs. Anna Claytor for deciphering my writing and typing this paper.

J. D. B.

INTRODUCTION

Not very long ago there appeared to be a widespread feeling that survey alone could offer only a small amount of the total information of an archaeological site. It is possible, or more likely probable that much of the data available on the turf has been ignored and consequently lost. It is also probable that some investigators have not extracted as much information from past surveys as was possible. As a prelude to this survey of the literature pertaining to Liberty Hall Plantation, a brief review of current problems of contract archaeology and the types of survey available will be discussed.

Issues in Contract Archaeology

Thomas F. King of the National Park Service (1977) discusses some of the current problems in contract archaeology. One of these problems relate to the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974. This legislation provided broader grants for salvage work and requires all federal agencies to spend up to one percent of its construction funds for archaeological salvage. This "ceiling" resulted in two problems. If the necessary salvage costs more than one percent of the budget, it is usually difficult to make up the balance of the funds. On the opposite extreme, some archaeologists take advantage of this view and ask for money approaching that amount

whether they need it or not. Hence some archaeologists may end up wasting tax dollars that would have been saved had the project undergone a closer evaluation.

Another controversy in contract archaeology today surrounds the methods by which archaeological services are procured. The oldest method of procurement is to find the archaeologist who knows the most about the area to be studied and grant him or her the contract. There are several problems with this method. One is that there might be several archaeologists in the area--or none. Second, this method could become partial to the institution over the individual archaeologist. Not only is this unfair but it can also lead to intellectual atrophy when one institution with a single point of view dominates an area's archaeological research. Sometimes federal agencies procure archaeological services by advertising for a project and selecting the lowest bidder. Understandably, in the field of archaeology where the exact product of research cannot be fully defined; cheapest is by no means always the best. The AHPA does recommend another means of procuring archaeological services.

The "Moss Bennett Act" (A.H.P.A.) recommends negotiated procurement. Under this system, an archaeological project is advertised and a detailed request for proposals is provided to interested parties. The resulting proposals are then evaluated by a panel of professional archaeologists and one or more adequate proposals are selected. Only then is cost taken into account, and negotiations for a reasonable price begin. This

approach also fails to work out in the same way the "sole-source" method did.

What could be done is to establish guide lines by which agencies would advertise their proposals and the archaeologists would present their bids. The agencies would be required to first contact a federal office to establish if their area needs survey. If it does, then the agency would have to write up a proposal which would include a blueprint of the area with existing structures and proposed structures.¹ The proposal would be advertised and the detailed proposal sent to the bidders who request them.

The bidders would then, using established federal standards, determine their cost respective to the area they believe has to be surveyed. These bids would then be reviewed by a federal agency of professional archaeologists to be checked for compliance to federal standard and proper establishment of the possible limits of the survey site. Then if they comply to standards and the disturbed area is properly defined the proposals would be forwarded to the agency who established the proposal and only then a review of cost would start. This may seem like a long process but it is one way by which the agencies are kept honest and the bidders are kept up to accepted standards.

Types of Survey

Reynold J. Ruppe (1966) in his discussion of archaeological survey distinguishes between four types of survey.

Type I is made with the goal of securing a catalog of sites. Surveys of this type are usually large-scale efforts that cover a large territory rather quickly. They tend to be extensive rather than intensive. The data compiled from this type of survey contributes an enormous amount of information however does not tend to conform to the rules for statistical sampling. Therefore, the major drawback of Type I survey is that the sample taken does not represent the universe sampled. Ruppe points out that the nature of archaeological resources available in such a large geographical unit makes it difficult to find small sites of the simpler cultures.

Another type of survey discussed in the article is the brief survey conducted in conjunction with a specific program excavation. These surveys are usually brief and are undertaken to provide additional information, usually a large sample of artifacts are collected. These materials may be compared with those collected from the excavated site. The major problem that may occur with this Type II survey is the chance of ignoring other artifacts which relate to previous or later periods. However, this "neglect" of other sites may be defended by carefully defining the scope of the report and informing the regional office of all uncovered sites.

Type III survey can be explained as a problem-oriented survey with some specific reason. Surveys of this type seek information about certain attributes of an area. This type of survey is often highly successful because they set out to solve

a specific problem with a conceptual scheme involved. The problem with this type is the same as mentioned above with Type II; the possibility of ignoring other artifacts which relate to other periods.

The last type of survey discussed by Ruppe is an intensive survey of a local area designed to extract all possible information from the surface of every site that can be found. If the program is successful, there is no need to worry about an adequate sample because the small finds is reasonably complete. In many regions it will be difficult or even impossible to conduct a survey of the scope suggested due to lack of manpower, geographic area, time and money available.

Liberty Hall Plantation

The type of survey this paper will involve fits closely with Ruppe's description of a problem-oriented Type III survey. It is my purpose to conduct an intensive historical survey of books, manuscripts, deeds and oral tradition pertaining to the Mulberry Hill site of Liberty Hall Academy after 1803. The goal then is to trace the history of Liberty Hall Plantation (as it became known after 1803) in order to offer speculation on the location of Academy structures built between 1790 and 1801. Since this is a survey of essentially literature the site survey form and section on methodology will not be included. These features are more relevant to a survey of a site which entails some excavation.

THE LIBERTY HALL ACADEMY PLANTATION

Mulberry Hill -- the first site

One of the few effects of the American Revolution that we hear of today is the inflation that played with the American economy. Many small businesses were forced to close and their owners, those who did not choose to fight, began to rely more heavily on the land for their subsistence. Such was the case for the Reverend Mr. Graham, Rector of Liberty Hall at Timber Ridge. In 1777 Mr. Graham finding that inflation had tendered his salary worthless and his farm land at the Ridge to be incapable of supporting his family, bought two hundred and ninety acres of land along the North River from Joseph Walker.² The Trustees established an agreement whereby Graham would visit the school each week. However, the drop of enrollment made this ten mile trip impractical and the school closed in 1779.³

During the war there were a few students who had not been drafted and still hoped to obtain an education. Graham undoubtedly was pleased to accommodate these students since they meant an extra source of income. Since some of the students are reported to have received boarding as well as instruction from Graham the house must have been a structure of some significance. The main support of Graham teaching during this time is made by a contemporary Archibald Alexander

addressing the alumni in 1843. In that address Alexander stated that Graham taught in his own house after the school at Timber Ridge closed. An article in the Evangelical and Literary Magazine and Missionary Chronicle, published in Richmond, Virginia, in 1821 indicates that the structure that the students were taught in was "an old house which had once been used as a dwelling house." However, the location would most likely be the same.⁴

There is another report on the first school of learning that Graham established on Mulberry from a second member of the Alexander family, Archibald's grandson, Andrew Alexander. In an interview made shortly before the later's death, Andrew had this to say about Graham's move to Mulberry Hill.

But finding an opportunity to purchase a farm which pleased him [Graham] on the North River, not much more than a mile from the present site of Lexington, he transferred it to that place, and had influence with a majority of the trustees to give their assent. The spot was on the extreme part of my father's property. My father was pleased to have the school brought so near him, [since Timber Ridge had been ten miles away] and made a donation of as much land as was needed for the buildings. In the mean time, studies were pursued in an upper room of Mr. Graham's. Here I first entered on classical learning.⁵

Andrew Alexander was the son of William Alexander and the grandson of Archibald Alexander. William would have good reason to be "pleased to have the school brought so near"⁶ because when Graham started teaching at Mulberry Hill in 1779 Andrew would have just reached the age of eleven and would soon be qualified to "enter on classical learning."⁷ We could speculate that the

Mulberry Hill Mansion was the home of William Graham for the following reasons. First because the old road to the Academy, which is a branch of the Old Liberty Hall Road, leads directly to Mulberry Hill. Second, because there is an old road bed next to the Mulberry Hill House which could conceivably be an extension of the old road leading to the Academy. Third, the land where Mulberry Hill House now stands was sold to Andrew Reid in 1797 just a few months after William Graham resigned as rector of Liberty Hall to go out west.⁸ Fourth, it is not certain that Andrew Reid built Mulberry Hill.

Mulberry Hill -- the second site

In October 1782, Graham and two of his neighbors, Joseph Walker and William Alexander, each donated a tract of land where their farms came together to establish a permanent site for the school. The tracts consisted of ten, six and six acres each. The twenty four acres of land were located approximately one-quarter mile to the northeast of Graham's home but still on Mulberry Hill. The small frame school building was erected in a grove of oaks. "There was a fountain of pure limestone water in a ravine, and an eminence covered with trees."⁹ A handwritten note by Edward Graham (William Graham's son) written in an article in the Southern Religious Telegraph about the school house states that ". . . the building stood near the place on which Andrew Alexander's house now stands."¹⁰ I think we will find through excavation that this structure, which prior to February, 1783 burned, was contained in the features on the

northwest side of the farm house.

After the small school house burned a second building was erected. Originally planned to be thirty feet by twenty feet and ten feet high, the structure was reduced in size to twenty feet by sixteen feet as a result of financial difficulties.¹¹ This building served as the site of tutor until 1790 when it too burned, apparently as a result of an accident.¹²

The Interlude -- J. Mairs home

After the fire, classes were held in the house left to the academy by John Mairs.¹³ Nothing seems to be known about the Mairs site of the academy. The courthouse records do not show a deed of transfer to the academy of land from John Mairs. There is also no record of a will under that name. There is a record of taxes paid on the estate of a John Mares by his executors in 1789. The land was less than an acre, had a structure on it that was located one mile North West of town.¹⁴ There was no record of taxes being paid on the land prior to 1789 or after 1789. So, it seems that the tax was paid to settle his final estate, but for some reason no note is made in the land books of transfer.

Back on the Hill --

While the academy was using the house lent to them by the executors of John Mares a committee was formed to draft a set of plans for a new building to house the academy. The background history of this building and the academy's subsequent

affiliation with the Synod of Virginia has been thoroughly investigated and documented in preceeding papers. So, for our purposes it is sufficient to say that in 1793¹⁵ the academy bought additional land from Wm. Graham upon which the Board commissioned William Cravens to draw up plans for a dormitory/classroom building and a Steward's house.¹⁶ The following discussion will review the possibility that the foundations surrounding the farmhouse today at one time supported the Steward's house.

The Steward's House -- a close look

The plans drawn up by Craven for the Steward's house were in a document placed in care of the Rector's office.¹⁷ They have subsequently been lost; so any discussion put forward here on the house is pure speculation. Crenshaw believed that the building probably had a kitchen, dining room, and a dairy.¹⁸ If the building had a dairy incorporated into it, an ice house would be adjacent to the dairy. This was common policy and for good reason. The dairy was the place where the milk products were stored--obviously. To keep the milk from spoiling the icehouse was kept in close proximity to the dairy to keep the milk cool. The icehouse often was lined with sand and sawdust; sand as an insulator and sawdust to keep the iceblocks from sticking together.

In my interviews last spring I contacted Mrs. Bessie Whitmore Woodward who was born and raised on the Liberty Hall Farm in the early 1900s. Her father Ward Whitmore rented the

door that comes out right where Mrs. Woodward remembered the sand pit being and where Parker found her "lost marbles" last spring. Furthermore, that southwest wall of the foundation is part of the old foundation and was not originally made to support the farmhouse.

Mulberry Hill -- the final years

After Craven finished the new school building and Steward's house, a number of other buildings were constructed. A twelve foot square stone smokehouse was built in 1793, near the Steward's house. In 1794 rail fences were placed along the lane to the Academy that bordered the school's property and Graham's.²⁰ An interesting color picture is owned by Mrs. Woodward of the road leading up to the school. The caption on it is "The Road Home" but it gives an excellent portrayal of what the road looked like and how deep it had worked itself into the ground. Today the road and sections of the fence still survive behind the Mulberry Hill Mansion.

In 1799, plans were drawn up for a house to be used by the Rector. The original contract specified that the Rector's house should be twenty by twenty five feet with foundations of stone and walls of brick. The final structure on the Mulberry hill site was a stable built in 1800.²¹ This stable survived until the 1940s. W. E. Tilson rented the farm from the University in 1947, '48 and '49. Henry Foresman worked for Tilson on the farm and tore down several structures. One of these was a "structure-barn on the northeast side of the

house which was made of log." It was about 100 yards straight off the back of the grainery.

The Move from Mulberry Hill

In November of 1802, the Board members insured the stone dormitory/classroom building in case of fire with the Mutual Assurance Society of Richmond.²² The incidents surrounds the burn of the Craven structure and the reports thereof have been discussed in other papers and their repetition would serve no purpose here. Sometime after the fire, arrangements were made whereby Andrew Alexander would trade his property in town to the Trustees for their tract on Mulberry Hill. Andrew Alexander had inherited the land on Wood's Creek from his father, a prominent man of Lexington.²³

Andrew Alexander at Liberty Hall Plantation

Some question has been raised on where the Alexanders lived when they moved away from the 31 1/2 acre site in town. The most erroneous report of their home site was made by James W. McClung. In Historical Significance of Rockbridge County, Virginia, McClung attributes the Mulberry Hill residence to William D. Alexander.²⁴ William D. Alexander was the son of Andrew Alexander who switched lands with Washington Academy in 1803 and the grandson of William Alexander who was a contemporary of Wm. Graham. William D. Alexander could not have built Mulberry Hill for several reasons. The main reason is that the Alexander's never owned the land where Mulberry Hill stands. The land was sold to Andrew Reid by William Graham in 1797 just

before Graham went out west.²⁵ This could imply that the Mulberry Hill house belonged to William Graham and was the structure he used to teach in between 1779 and 1783. This speculation would fit with the report of the frame building being located "approximately one-quarter mile to the northeast of Graham's home."²⁶

Not Mulberry Hill Mansion --

McClung continues to misreport the background on the Mulberry Hill house when he states that W. D. Alexander lived in the house "until June 21, 1848, when he sold it to Francis T. Anderson and S. McD. Reid, Deed Book 'BB', page 152."²⁷ William D. Alexander is mentioned in Dr. Duncan C. Lyle's The Archibald Alexander Geneology as being born at Liberty Hall Farm in 1804 and in "1825 Removed to Meriwether County, Ga."²⁸ In September 1844 William came home after his father's death to help Francis T. Anderson and S. McD. Reid settle up his father's estate. By May of 1847 the last payment had been made by S. McD. Reid to his mother for "the sale of this plantation lately owned by Andrew Alexander."²⁹ The deed of transfer on this land is even wrong in the McClung book. He cites Deed Book BB, page 152, June 21, 1848 while the deed was recorded in AA, 153-155, October 17, 1844. The author continues to rewrite history with no basis of truth which causes me to question the accuracy of the other reports in this book.

Back on the Farm --

Many reports exist in family histories that put the Alexanders at the "Liberty Hall Plantation." First there is the exchange of land with the academy in 1803. Then the report of Nancy R. Graham as recorded in W. A. Ross's "Family notebook" which states: Andrew Alexander, born Apl. 13, 1768 at South River. m. Ann Aylette of King William Co. 1803 -- He lived and died at Liberty Hall in the neighborhood of Lexington."³⁰ The date of entry is unmarked but it was some time after 1857 and within the lifetime of Andrew's oldest daughter. A third report of Andrew Alexander and his family living at Liberty Hall is made by his granddaughter Mrs. John H. Moore. She states that Andrew Reid "owned a large farm, adjoining that of his nephew Andrew Alexander. . . ." ³¹ Finally, in January 1828 Andrew Alexander "living at Liberty Hall Farm" sold the water rights from his reservoir to Lexington. ³² If these pipes were traced they would form a line from the Brushy Hills passing through the Liberty Hall tract and finally down to town. ³³ What can be speculated on about the farm house itself?

As has already been mentioned, after the "sale" in 1803 "Andrew, moved to the farm adjoining the Liberty Hall ruins." The author of an unpublished manuscript I found in the Rockbridge Historical Society Files discussing the Alexanders states: "I think it [the Liberty Hall Farm] already had a house on it, but Andrew and his mother may have built the house they lived in. This was burned later and the present

house erected on the old foundation." This statement will have to be tested by the excavation of site four but the features surrounding the house would indicate the existence of a previous structure. However, what historical evidence would indicate that a previous structure had burned on the site?

When a tax trace is made on the Alexander land between 1803 to 1820 little is revealed about the buildings. However, after 1820 buildings are taxed separate from land and mention of the appraised value is distinguishable for the first time. This tract of 202 acres including Liberty Hall, and lying between Woods Creek and the North River adjacent to Andrew Reid land shows a structure with an appraised value of \$1000.00.³⁴ This is identical to the appraised value of Andrew Reid's Mulberry Hill. However, after 1840 the appraised value drops to \$500.00 at Liberty Hall but not at Mulberry Hill. The explanation for such a drastic change in value could only be the result of a fire. If there had been a change in tax structure then there would have been an identical change for Mulberry Hill.

The type of structural material and style used in the farmhouse which stands there today supports the 1840 date posed in the land records. The bond pattern used on the house is an American bond first used in the early part of the nineteenth century. This bond started out with four courses of stretchers to one course of headers, but by mid-century as many as seven courses of stretchers were used to each row of headers. The

farm house has a five stretcher to one header pattern.³⁵ So, the brickwork offers the information of no earlier than 1810 but any time later.

Another type of structural material used that can be dated is the nail type.³⁶ A nail chronology of the nails used in the present house were first introduced in 1815 and were in popular use by 1830. So, the nail type would give us the earliest date of 1815. The third way by which a date can be established on the house would be architectural style. This style occurred frequently in houses in Lexington between 1840 and 1850.³⁷ Yet another means exists by which the date of the burn occurring and establishment of a date exists.

This quote from Memories of A Long Life in Virginia actually offers us more than just the burn date on the Alexander farm. It also tells us definitely that Andrew Alexander never lived at Mulberry Hill Estate. This is a certainty because the author's mother was the youngest child of Andrew Alexander and her father's mother was the eldest child of Andrew Reid.

My father was Samuel McDowell Moore, and my mother was Evalina Alexander, youngest child of Andrew Alexander, who owned a large farm near Lexington, Virginia, where I was born on the 20th of May, 1840.

Andrew Alexander, my grandfather, owned many slaves, he would never sell one, thought it wrong. He had a school for his slaves, said he wanted everyone on his plantation to be able to read the Bible, and my mother told me of her teaching the maids in the house to read and write. The blacksmith on the place had a school; he was one of the slaves. When my grandfather died, my uncle, William Dandridge Alexander, his

eldest son, a lawyer in Georgia, came on to settle up the estate. The negroes were given their choice as to whether they would stay in Virginia. A few who had wives on other plantations stayed, all the rest wanted to go with "Marse William." So they made a caravan of covered wagons drawn by mules and horses and moved to a cotton plantation my uncle had bought near Griffin, Georgia. This was about 1843. There were no railroads then. . . .

My grandmother's father was Andrew Reid. He was Clerk of the County of Rockbridge for many years, and was one of the heroes of Point Pleasant. He built "Mulberry Hill," his home near Lexington, where he owned a large farm, adjoining that of his nephew Andrew Alexander, and he inherited another large tract of land.³⁸

This is probably the best report we have of Liberty Hall Plantation to date.

The best evidence in manuscripts of the structure burning is hinted at in the following quote. The unpublished manuscript which contained the information on the Alexanders had a note affixed to it by the author:

Andrew Alexander's house must have been quite large. My Aunt Anne Junkin (b. 1833) remembered the 'big library full of books.' She was 10 or 11 years old when her grandfather died and had often stayed at Liberty Hall Farm when she was a little girl.³⁹

This quote alone is not significant for affixing a date for the burned structure. We can conclude from the report that there was a room (big or small) in the Alexander house full of books after Anne Junkin's birth--say 1837-38. Andrew Alexander died in 1843. His will tells us nothing about the house but the inventory of his personal estate shows "1 Lot Books Various Kinds \$.50."⁴⁰ The amount of books that may have been purchased for fifty cents would not fill a small "library full of books"

let alone a "big library." After Andrew Alexander's death in 1843, what happened to the Liberty Hall Plantation?

The Final Estate of Andrew Alexander --

The fate of Liberty Hall Plantation has already been mentioned above. Mrs. John H. Moore, the granddaughter of Andrew Alexander, remarks that "when my grandfather died, my uncle, William D. Alexander, his eldest son, a lawyer in Georgia, came on to settle up the estate."⁴¹ According to the Land Records⁴² Samuel McDowell Reid, the owner of Mulberry Hill, held the Liberty Hall Farm in trust as an executor of the Alexander estate.⁴³ Deed Book AA, pages 153-155 records the land as being officially transferred in 1847 to Col. Samuel McDowell Reid. The actual payments that Col. Sam made to Alexander's wife Betsy Alexander still survive and are on file in the Rockbridge Historical Society's files. The last payment was made on May 7th 1846. It was probably soon after that that William took the family back to Georgia.⁴⁴

The Reid Farm --

Many changes were made at the farm by Col. Reid and by the business woman of the family Mary Lou Reid. The major change was the addition made on the back of the farmhouse in 1858.⁴⁵ It seems by this letter written by Mary to her father that a man by the name of Days was working the plantation for the Reids.

Everything is going along very smoothly at Mulberry Hill and at Mr. Days too as far as I know. Mr. Kirkpatrick has nearly finished their little room and the plaster will be here tomorrow morning.⁴⁶

Five days later there is another letter to Col. Reid from his daughter.

I was very busy all last week having the house cleaned and white-washed & William Charlton is here now finishing off his job

. . .
I wrote to Mr. Paine for matting for the parlor which he purchased and sent up by the packet; & afterwards I wrote again for paper for the dining room: this came last Friday evening in good order. . . . I want some quilt cornice sheeting very much for windows. It is much cheaper bought in this way. . . . I want enough of it for the library window & the little room above. Mr. Wallace the plaster is here today lathing the little room; he did not come last week as I expected.⁴⁷

After Col. Samuel McDowell Reid's death in September 1869 the Reid estate is thrown into court due to Col. Reid's failure to make out a will.

The White Farm --

Dr. Leslie Lyle Campbell in his Notes on Rockbridge County, Virginia gives us some insight into what happens next: "Col. Reid's daughter inherited from him a large and valuable landed estate such as Mulberry Hill, Reid Farm and Sunnyside." The farm's name is now changed from Liberty Hall Plantation to Reid Farm but it is still on the same site. In October 1869 J. J. White (Mary Lou's husband) and J. D. H. Rop (Reid's second daughter, Agnes' husband) are declared agents for the Reid estate. In December, 1871 the partition of land is made. Mary L. R. White is to get 536 acres comprising the portion of Mulberry Hill land northeast of the Millboro and Kerrs Creek Turnpike, excepting the Mansion House and about eight acres

laid off adjacent thereto. The deed also conveys about eight acres of land, together with about eighty acres lying on the southwest side of above named road was set apart for Agnes Reid Ross.⁴⁸

The Lexington Development Company --

During the boom period the land is transferred temporarily out of Mary L. R. White's hands.⁴⁹ In 1891 the Lexington Development Company bought all the land on the northeast and northwest side of town for development.⁵⁰ The Development Corporation drew up grandiose plans for Lexington. New streets and large buildings were planned where nothing but farm land and forests stood. In 1894 the great boom busted and the Development Corporation went bankrupt. The land accumulated by the corporation passed into the hands of the Special Commissioner of Lexington to be sold.⁵¹ By 1901 Col. Reid's land had been returned to Mary L. R. White.⁵²

The Heirs of Mary L. R. White --

Learning by her father's mistakes, Mary L. R. White left a very detailed will which declared that her estate would be equally divided among her children.⁵³ Just like Andrew Alexander's will and final settlement, the latter tells the most. In April 1902, \$600.00 was paid by J. H. Whitmore for "rent from farm. . . ." ⁵⁴ From an interview conducted with the husband of one of the Whitmore daughters, Earnest Bare, we know that Whitmore rented the Liberty Hall Farm until 1928 when he hung himself in the lower barn. See Appendix I for

map of the farm at that time. After Whitmore's death, J. Sensabaugh rented the land from the heir of M. L. R. White until its sale to the University in May of 1940. See Appendix II for a map of the farm at that time.

Two years after her death in 1903 the heirs of Mary L. R. White decided to formally divide the estate among themselves. The estate was formally divided up into two tracts. Tract one had mostly been sold off already by Sallie W. Bruce, Reid White and Lucy P. White. Tract two was given to Belle W. Brown and Agnes R. W. Goldsby. The dividing lines between these two tracts are clearly defined on a map in Deed Book 99, page 239.⁵⁵ In February 1932 Mrs. Isabelle W. Brown and Mrs. Agnes W. Goldsby sold the Liberty Hall Academy plot to the University,⁵⁶ with the agreement that "the grantee covenants that it will maintain the property hereby conveyed as a place of historic interest. . . ." ⁵⁷ Finally, after being put aside five times by the Trustees, the University reluctantly made an agreement to buy the remainder of tract one. This decision to buy has been fully realized today as probably the best purchase ever made by the University.⁵⁸

The Final Years --

In November 1947 W. E. Tilson was given permission to rent the Liberty Hall Farm from the University.⁵⁹ He remodeled the interior of the house to make two separate apartments. Several of the farm structures were torn down by Henry J. Foresman between 1947 and '49. Some of these were the chicken

coop and pig pen in the rear of the house. Foresman also remembered tearing down a "structure barn on the northeast side of the house which was made of log."⁶⁰ This was the barn that Ward Whitmore hung himself in and was built for the academy in 1800. Also, at this point the road which used to run past Mulberry Hill past the Liberty Hall Farm and back to North River was leveled out and a baseball field was put over its path. The old road was ended at Belfield and a new road was cut in from Route 60. The old road's path could best be defined by charting it out with the aid of the deeds.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Deeds --

Enclosed in the Appendix of this paper is a one page summary of the title trace made on this land last spring. Also accompanying that trace is a copy of the key deeds with their stated bounds. These bounds should be staked out on the surface next spring in an effort to: first, determine the boundaries of the academy as it existed in 1799; second determine the original path of the Old Liberty Hall Road; third, the deeds show that a "tenant house" existed in the valley where John Hutson is now surveying. This should be carefully excavated if John agrees that it is a significant site.

It was my original intention to determine the boundaries of the academy before 1799. I have done so by tracing the deeds and deciphering the writing of the county clerk. Now what remains to be done would not be satisfied by scale drawings, these would just become a time consuming exercise after which the work would have to be repeated in the field. Finally, there was some mention made in the Liberty Hall manuscript (page 45) that the deed records indicate that "the core of the Mulberry Hill campus . . . was approximately 300 feet to the east of the ruins." This statement may have to be reevaluated. The only definite Liberty Hall structures mentioned in the deeds

are the spring house and Liberty Hall road. The "farmhouse" is referred to but that is not a Liberty Hall period structure and the tenant house is mentioned but that also has not been proven to be a Liberty Hall structure.

The Site --

The value of the Liberty Hall Plantation is inherent with its close proximity to the site of Liberty Hall Academy. Therefore, this section of Mulberry Hill may yield important answers to questions that have been posed about the Scotch-Irish in this area and can only be answered through careful archaeological excavation of the area. Some of the questions to be tested are: that the academy on Mulberry Hill established by the Scotch-Irish was significantly different from other early American academic institutions; that the school located near the frontier in the eighteenth century was culturally isolated; that extracurricular activities of a recreational nature were limited. The answering of these questions and more will give us a new insight to the Scotch-Irish culture.

The Problems --

In this report the problems encountered were generally minor but in the long run proved to be very important. Many thesis have been built in this paper on the basis of what can be inferred from a bit of information here and there. When this information is inferred from courthouse records there is little doubt of accuracy of the report. However, when the

information is received from a secondary source and transmitted from memory then there should be serious questions in the mind of the historian on what should be taken as fact. The key is to be able to separate out the certainties and for various reasons I believe that I have done that in this report.

Another problem encountered in this report falls along the same lines as mentioned above--dealing with people. There are five different little caches of historic documents at this university that may never be fully exposed to public view because of the personality of the persons directing them. One individual from archive A does not like something an archivist from archive B has done. Therefore, if someone is referred from archivist A to archivist B then archivist B may not be willing to help the person being referred. It is incredible, but true.

The Laws --

The Antiquities Act is the first of a long line of laws that serve as "paper tigers" passed in an effort to protect the archaeological sites on federal lands. This 1906 law states that anything on federal land belongs to the people and therefore protected by federal law. This includes areas under federal jurisdiction such as National Parks, National Forests and Military Installations. The next law to be passed authorized the National Park Service (NPS) to make an effort to recover the sites on federal land. The 1966 Historic Preservation Act was a giant step forward for conservation of sites of federal

land. This law created the National Register of historic places and established criterion by which individuals could qualify to receive Federal aid in protecting a given site. Liberty Hall Academy has already received their state historic landmark papers, I believe, and may now be qualifying for their Federal papers. If this is done the farmhouse should be qualified as being connected with an important historic figure and because of the potential to yield information on the history of the area.

In 1969 Executive Order 11593 addressed the problem of why the inventory called for in past laws had not been made yet. At this point the Secretary of the Interior was made responsible to check into these sites before a destruction process is done; even if an inventory had not been made yet. Executive Order 11593 also established the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation to aid the Secretary of the Interior. The Moss Bennett Bill mentioned earlier in this paper extended E.O. 11593. It required the federal government to allocate 1% of

of a contractor's budget for historic and archaeological survey. The bill also held the contractor responsible for having the survey conducted. The problems with this bill are mentioned in the early part of the paper. In 1977 an amendment to the 1966 law was passed stating that any site that is eligible has to be investigated. It also created the State Historic Preservation Offices (S.H.P.O.) in an effort to get the inventory made of every site. The problems in this office is the influx of trivial information and the request for assist-

ance on salvage work.

On the state level most of the organization was passed in 1976. Senate Bill No. 271 made amendments to the Virginia code and started the Virginia Antiquities Act which created the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission. The Virginia Antiquities Act also stipulated that: no one person may survey without permission of the state office; such survey must be in the best interest of the state; all artifacts are the property of the state; and the knowledgeable destruction of an historic site is a class one misdemeanor. However, this law has also become a "paper tiger" and subsequently difficult to enforce. The state also requires that a copy of all survey reports be sent to the Research Center for Archaeology, Wren Building, Williamsburg, Virginia, c/o Commissioner of Archaeology.

Federal Agencies --

There are several federal agencies that offer support to archaeological research but only a few will be mentioned here. The Smithsonian Institution first organized an office in 1965 to aid in special types of archaeological study. As has been mentioned above, the N.P.S. was required to take part in archaeological research in 1935 with the Historic Sites Act. In 1945 the Committee for the Recovery of Archaeological Remains (CRAR) was formed as a coordinating group between the NPS and the U.S.A. Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation developing the Inter-Agency Archaeological Salvage Program (IAASP). The Department of Housing and Urban Development offers

matching grants for archaeological survey and so does the
National Trust for Historic Preservation.