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Abstract

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) have demonstrated their utility in predictively modeling the location of archaeological sites, and providing a framework for cataloging sites eligible for heritage management status. The intent of this GIS-based study is to begin to create a geohistorically organized database of information culled from historic documents and archaeological excavation. In this case study of postbellum land tenure in Hillsborough County, Florida, a GIS-based approach is used to demonstrate the impacts of federal and state land ownership policy decisions during the Reconstruction Era and beyond. GIS data are also used to reveal information about how people use their allotted environment to non-verbally communicate their perceptions of the world and their place in it. Finally, GIS are shown to be ideally suited for allowing multi-scalar, diachronic comparisons of archaeological sites and materials.

This research was conducted according to the concepts of Actor-Network-Theory (ANT), which assumes there is a generalized symmetry between the agency of human actors and non-human actants (i.e. it does not assume the primacy of human intentional action). ANT accepts that materials can carry non-verbal messages (e.g. colors, aromas, tactility), which affect how humans interact, communicate, and organize themselves in space. ANT allows for the use of scales based on human action, and analyses that are based standardized
metrologies. Finally, ANT obviates being limited to strict categories of macro- and micro-, by accepting that networks may bridge both.

This research shows that two rural communities have undergone similar growth trajectories, with a historically black community having experienced some setbacks in the early 20th century. However, the results show that the rural African American community was not more subdivided than the neighboring Euro-American community, contrary to initial expectations. Additionally, there is a suggestion that communities may move socially important buildings such as churches schools to the community center or periphery, depending on the intended recipient of the message. The study also documents the centralization, concentration, and clustering of the county’s African American population through time.
Chapter 1:

Introduction

The research presented in this document is a comparative study of spatial relationships in the built environment, between a rural community settled by freed slaves (Bealsville, Florida), the neighboring settlement of their former owners (Springhead, Florida), several historically black urban neighborhoods (Tampa, Florida), and a company town that provided onsite religious and educational services for its African American employees (Willow, Florida). The comparison of a small number of settlements, in a restricted geographic area, is only a beginning. However, it is assumed here that “[s]ignificant patterns or ideas will not emerge without comparison of differences over time or space (Kowalewski 1997:291). The reason to incorporate a GIS approach into such a study is that it allows for data, from both historical and archaeological sources, to be easily integrated into a body of research, and for those data to be examined at multiple scales, allowing the researcher to avoid the “tendency to compress spatial and/or temporal diversity,” while still permitting the “careful juxtaposition” (Feinman 1997:369,372) of both the historical and archaeological records. Thus, we are not limited to simple descriptions of culture history; we can also call upon patterns that may not have been observed by those that created them, “not by abandoning the comparative method, but by applying it critically and rigorously at all scales at which the pattern can be recognized” (Marquardt 1992:126).
This research started with an electronic version of the General Land Office (GLO) map, used by the state office's salespeople (Figure 1). The GLO was formed in 1812, and "it supervised the use and disposition of the huge federal landholdings until 1946, when it was combined with the Grazing Service to create the Bureau of Land Management (Thompson 2000:289-290). Although the GLO map is a two-dimensional representation of land ownership, the deed recipients
had met requirements to improve that land by building dwellings and planting crops. Ultimately, the units of analysis for the rural areas of eastern Hillsborough County, during the earliest period of settlement, are the deeded property owners shown by the sales plat map of the GLO that was used to record legal public property transactions from 1825 until 1907 (Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of State Lands, Board of Trustees Land Document System 2007). The GLO map, in conjunction with GIS software, offers an opportunity to explore the hypothesis that the original settlers of Bealsville placed the edifices of their built environment purposely to express their strength, ideationally, as a community based on the explicit virtues of agriculture, religion, and education.

This research suggests that the built environment is a form of non-verbal communication, and that by analyzing the patterns of central tendency and variation found in measurements of distance, taken from a series of historic maps, between residences and structures that provided services to settlement residents, we will be able to document a means of differentiating similar communities that were founded by Baptists from different socio-economic backgrounds. We also suggest that by understanding the patterns of use and ownership of particular properties, whether as rural farmsteads or urban house lots, we can better understand the shape of those settlements in the present. Finally, we also attempt to resolve the usefulness of a GIS as a framework for creating a geohistorical, spatially organized, database of multiple documentary forms. As a whole, this paper is a lengthy suggestion of how those data might be collected,
how they might be analyzed, and how they might provide a basis for further research that includes descendant communities.

To move the study of a local community forward with GIS maps and other records, it is necessary to build a holistic profile of the people that originally settled that community. Creating a GIS version of the GLO sales plat for Township 29 South, Range 22 East (T29S, R22E), as reckoned by the Public Lands Survey System (PLSS), offered the opportunity to compare an historically black settlement, dating to the early the Reconstruction Era, with a white “parent” community where the slaves had been held in captive. The initial allocation of properties provides insight to a particular period of time, so the divisions of properties were evaluated for later periods, whenever comparable records were available. The rural settlements discussed here were compared with similar settlements found through literature review, to consider how local patterns of property ownership and the use of space may have differed from elsewhere in the South. The study also considers several historically black urban neighborhoods and a nearby company town, to better understand local patterns in the allocation and use of space where the material inertia of the built environment and/or lack of property ownership may have constrained the ability of people to physically reconfigure their settlement.

However, the ultimate success of GIS-based approaches depends on researchers including data that go beyond the individual project’s research design, to incorporate all the information that has been compiled for a particular locale into a scalable framework. Researchers must also be willing to share
geospatial data, to begin to confront the “distortion of perspective that comes from tracing phenomena back in time until they disappear from view over a temporal horizon that lies beyond the interests of the observers or their preferred techniques of observation” (Bailey 2008:25). There are, admittedly, issues that could arise from sharing accurate information about the location of archaeological resources indiscriminately, but the increasing prevalence of mapping technologies that are accessible to the general public should also facilitate information sharing. For the security of the archaeological resources, the proper use of the asymmetry of knowledge would allow for interested stakeholders to share intersite and intrasite geospatial locations that allow archaeologists to develop accurate depictions of archaeological contexts, to provide a basis for all stakeholders to assess ongoing heritage management needs.

The need for greater time depth in studying the patterns of history was certainly understood by Marc Bloch when, for example, he chastised those who claimed to understand “the contemporary economic system on the basis of observations limited to a few decades,” and yet that is still frequently the time scale that is considered in policy-making decisions (1992:42). It is a shame that Bloch did not survive World War II because his own insistence that “a historical phenomenon can never be understood apart from its moment in time” had brought him to the conclusion that archaeology had to be included in any useful study of history, even relatively recent history (1992:29,44). This was most eloquently stated in *The Historian’s Craft* (written during the war):
Successive technological revolutions have immeasurably widened the psychological gap between generations. With some reason, perhaps, the man of the age of electricity and of the airplane feels himself far removed from his ancestors. With less wisdom he has been disposed to conclude that they have ceased to influence him (Bloch 1992:30).

Beyond any value as an archaeological project, or as an ongoing anthropological study of how people engage with their local community histories, one of the most startlingly clear trends in the following research is that policy is often made without considering any advice at all from historic trends, of insufficient time depth or otherwise.

The reason that Marc Bloch gave for historians to more closely adhere to methods of archaeologists is one that any archaeologist should quickly recognize: history, as it is recorded, is unreliable enough that it must be independently confirmed, especially through the interpretation of the material residue of past actions. The recognition is that the error is inherent in the recording process, although errors may also be introduced or compounded by the interpretation process. Worse yet, the error only becomes more entrenched with the passage of time, and with each inveterately recited “fact” called forth from some past educator’s checklist. All of that considers only chance errors in statements of fact, not the errors of omission.

Written history provides no defense at all against whole groups of people being consciously and systematically excluded from history’s records altogether. We know that the preservation of material is neither consistently representative,
nor necessarily a complete picture of all past behaviors and full range of attitudes toward those behaviors, even given an ideally representative sample of all archaeological deposits. Furthermore, historical records are replete with examples of marginalized people living on the periphery of a neatly stereotyped “normal” society, and those records make clear a consistent pattern of “making do” with materials that were unlikely to be preserved in any primary contexts due to ongoing reuse, with materials that were of substandard durability given the expected relative conditions of a specific time and place, and with materials that are likely to accumulate more rapidly at certain locales because socio-cultural conditions were imposing boundaries over territories that may not be expressed in standard geo-political maps from historic periods.

In an article entitled “Saving a Few, Before Losing Them All: A Strategy for Setting Priorities,” a GIS approach was used to organize information about properties from different time periods, to characterize the environment in which those properties are located, and in setting preservation priorities for a property that is already under management by an agency with some agenda for interpreting the past for the benefit of the public (Osman 2002). The use of a GIS is commendable for organizing spatial data at different temporal scales, and for combining both environmental and cultural elements into a single database, to frame interpretive goals. Unfortunately, beyond the bounds of the properties which have already been designated as eligible for general preservation, such as the National Recreation Area (NRA) discussed in the aforementioned article, are many properties that are equally deserving of being preserved. However, many
are not being managed at all, either because they have not been identified as having sufficient ecological or historical significance, or because they are not located where regulations mandate the development of a management plan.

Even beyond preservation, many properties are not being considered as eligible for conservation of historical resources, because there are insufficient tangible remains associated with those properties presently to engender professional interest, unless an interested group has mobilized to publicize their objection to a perceived threat. Therein lies the source of the problem; those who were marginalized in the recent past stay marginalized in the present and into the foreseeable future because the rules regarding the identification and designation of historic sites are not met by sites where there have been undeniable palimpsests created by the very policies of denial and exclusion that have continued unabated precisely because of the refusal to acknowledge that there are lessons to be learned from the sites in question. One promising approach may be to consider such places as Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), since that allows for people to articulate why a place is important to them, cultivates a conservation ethic, and stresses partnerships between interested stakeholders, cultural resource managers, and agencies of change (King 2003). However, to be truly effective, there needs to be a more proactive approach to identifying potential TCPs well before there are proposed changes to those properties.

The use of GIS in predictive models to locate areas with a high probability of containing archaeological sites, according to some formula of what types of
environmental features one expects to find at a given site type, has been sufficiently demonstrated. Zehra Osman’s article illustrates another use for GIS as a planning and management tool for sites that are already managed, but perhaps it is also a use that illustrates greater possibilities for using GIS in cataloging and analyzing both localized individual sites and diachronically varied networks of sites across regions (2002). It should not require a last resort prioritization of what can be preserved, and what must be let go, to suggest that there is a value in gathering together contemporary socio-spatial information, with historic socio-spatial data reconstructed from material deposition, and also spatial data drawn from deeper time structures. The use of GIS should be widespread as a tool for bringing together data from “the study of objects and their [spatial] relationships,” and also from the “investigation and interpretation of what may be called the ‘cultural matrix,’” which includes both the geographic and the temporal dimension of those features across the environment (Taylor 1983:175). Taylor’s conjunctive approach was not a sterile comparison of empirically categorized materials, “but rather [a comparison of] cultural contexts and/or broad cultural complexes as wholes,” (1983:168-169) along with the use of quantitative analysis to reduce warping and errors in data.

As a tool for organizing and representing spatial information in three dimensions, it seems clear that GIS are an excellent tool for evaluating local cultural matrices in fine, diachronic detail. More importantly, they seem ideally suited to assessing culturally appropriate (as opposed to the manufactured empirical categories of the researcher) boundaries at and above the level of
regions. Another positive benefit of using a GIS is that large portions of a site’s history can be established through non-invasive methods, such as magnetometry, ground penetrating radar, electrical resistivity, georeferenced historical maps, historical aerial photography, and even through surface survey data. That is yet another indicator of a deeper use for GIS, as means for bringing the full “culture matrix” to bear on a site’s evaluation for historical significance. Along with the proven record of utility in modeling probable sites, that should also make GIS a useful tool for taking a more cooperative approach to heritage management.

It is imperative to identify potentially significant local sites by compiling all available data, then match those sites with extant public and private special interest groups that could be mobilized to advocate for specific sites to be brought under some form of heritage management. The increasing availability of internet-based mapping sites (e.g. Open StreetMaps, Google Earth) should provide a means of connecting archaeological professionals with an interested public. That is not to suggest that every location that is identified needs to be automatically accepted as an archaeologically significant entity. A collaborative, computer-based environment does not eliminate any individual’s biases, whether professional researcher or public participant. It does offer a space for negotiating the identification process, and for assessing the data that are potentially available for inclusion in a particular study. Moreover, the data can be separated into thematic layers that can be added, removed, or modified to include only what is relevant to a particular line of research. The important point is that the emphasis is on providing a contact point for communicating areas of potential interest.
This isn’t simply a call to some sort of “activist” archaeology to right the wrongs of past social injustices by putting them on trial in the present, and it is not being suggested that archaeological interpretations should be fitted to an assumed public good. Although, the purpose of choosing the particular case of African American settlements throughout the American South, from the Reconstruction to the present, is precisely because the economic disparity between the South and the other economic regions of the U.S. still exists, and is mostly due to more than 145 years of policy-makers putting political and personal enmities above the well-being of the people living in their various constituencies. The cost of passively waiting to be asked where the archaeologically important resources are before taking action to officially recognize, interpret, and preserve those resources, is not just the loss of those resources before they become eligible under some arbitrarily assigned requirement, but in the long-duration and systemic breadth of the negative ramifications of not sooner recognizing the deleterious social trends. If Marc Bloch had survived World War II, then perhaps we would have sooner realized that the reaching out to understand history in its own contexts to, “in one way or another, aid us to live better” (1992:9). In other words, we are not stewards of some discrete and “dead” past; we are servants to the extant communities in which we live and work.

We, as archaeologists and other stakeholders, are still stewards of the material expression of past human behaviors, to whatever extent they are identifiable, interpretable, and eligible for preservation. However, especially with more recent historic sites, a large part that chain of materiality includes
documentary evidence, which often has similar preservation issues and biases. As material culture, many documentary historical records are perhaps not faring so well. In many cases, the historical records are ultimately being stored in some type of electronic format, essentially in a condition of “pre-materiality” ready to be brought into the material world again only when they are printed out by an end user. Indeed, the singular documentary historical record that served as the initial focus of this paper entered into the research as an electronic document, and throughout the course of working with the GIS software that was used to catalog spatial information represented on a map, several failed stages existed briefly only in a non-material state within the software environment (that immateriality precludes those images from ever being made material in exactly the same way again).

O.V. Burton has identified GIS as “a vital area where rural historians need to use the computer” to build a diachronic community history on the local level, through maps (2002:651). Computer generated maps offer myriad possibilities for visually representing, three-dimensionally, everything from past built environments to past natural environments. In fact, they offer an ability to visually drive home, for the viewer of the resulting image, many things that were not readily conveyed by two-dimensional, paper maps. While one of the outcomes of this research is the creation of a database of paper maps converted to electronic GIS layers, there are ramifications to leaving behind more permanent paper maps. Unfortunately, that may also mean that the easy manipulation of locational data, and the representation of limited aspects of a
geographic area’s physical reality, must always create maps that are intentionally biased by emphasizing where the map creator wants the reader to focus his or her attention.

The listed properties on the east-central margin of the county contain several properties listed in an unincorporated portion of the county that is referred to here as Bealsville. Although the community of Bealsville has never been officially incorporated, it has existed as a historically black community since the 1860s. However, the community also has a connection to the historically white community of Springhead, just to the north of Bealsville, as many of the former slaves had been owned by the founders of Springhead. In an effort to start building an inventory of culturally and historically significant sites, with specific relevance to the African American community both in Hillsborough County and more generally to Florida and beyond to postbellum African American settlement patterns, we must first ascertain how the settlement pattern seen in rural Hillsborough County compares with other postbellum settlement patterns.

One commonly asserted pattern in postbellum settlement, for recently freed people in the South, is that they preferred highly dispersed settlements during the early years of the Reconstruction (especially the late-1860s to late-1870s) with a tendency toward settlement nucleation only after the turn of the 20th century (Aiken 1985:387-392). Notable exceptions to the pattern occurred in areas of Gulf Coastal Louisiana where sugarcane agriculture had dominated (Aiken 1985:387-392). Since the physical structures reflecting the built
environment of the original settlement at the location now known as Bealsville no
longer exist, the location of the settlement’s original structures can best be
understood through historic land ownership documents, historic maps, and
historic aerial photography. In the case of the Bealsville settlement, oral history
was informally supplied by information booth attendants and other attendees of
an October 2007 reunion at Bealsville’s Historic Glover School. If the African
American settlement pattern at Bealsville reflects the trends seen throughout the
South during the Reconstruction Era, then the settlement should be at least as
dispersed (if not more dispersed) as the associated Euro-American settlement of
Springhead. In any case, the data considered here will form the basis of a GIS
catalog of the Bealsville site to be used as a preliminary guide for “ground
truthing” these locations for archaeological significance, and also serve as a
record of some of the earliest African American settlers in Hillsborough County to
be granted a legal deed representing ownership of land that had been improved
for use as agricultural and domestic residential purposes.

Bealsville is also an ideal location for demonstrating what can be
accomplished through an equal partnership between a university-centered
anthropology department and a knowledgeable descendant community.
Moreover, Bealsville is a consummate example of a community that has
independently taken collective control over their heritage resources. Thus, they
are already in a position to be full partners in an ongoing program of research. In
fact, the community has already formed a not-for-profit group under the name
Bealsville Incorporated. Through that organization, they are currently administrating their known resources within the community.

Ultimately, the questions being addressed here are about the spatio-temporal nature of historically black settlements, whether in urban or rural contexts. However, the answers are not expected to be simple, because the socio-cultural norms, active behaviors, and material inertias all change at different speeds. Moreover, community connections are not easily traced solely within settlements, and with greater time depth associations become more elusive. It is assumed that settlement co-residents do form a community, based solely on the need to negotiate the use of space. However, the definition of community is much broader than a spatial configuration of the built environment, which should not be prefigured, and people may be members of multiple, overlapping communities.

In this particular case, the units of analysis in the rural areas of eastern Hillsborough County are, at first, defined by the properties deeded to settlement founders (which, in some cases, are from the generation after those who initially settled a particular location). The urban settlements being addressed here have been defined on the basis of later historic reports and, in any case, do not reflect the founders of a settlement, but rather the recipients of properties that had already been divided into small house lots. Despite those apparent incongruities, settlers in both types of settlement shared connections to settlement co-residents, as well as socially important structures such as churches and schools. So, the research presented here must go beyond simply mapping relationships between
structures in the built environment, to determine that non-verbal messages may be encoded in the measurable relationships of those structures.
Chapter 2:

Physical Setting

The sites discussed herein are scattered across Hillsborough County, hence most of the county’s physiographic features are included in the study (Figure 2). The rural study area is, mainly, the eastern 18 Sections of Township 29 South, Range 22 East (T29S, R22E), and both of the East Hillsborough settlements discussed herein are in the Polk Upland, which is separated, by a scarp, from the Gulf Coastal Lowlands to the west and the DeSoto Plain to the southwest (White 1970:132-133). The high ground in the rural study area is around 30.5 meters above mean sea level, and the low ground created by water features is around 21.3 meters above mean sea level. The present-day Bealsville location sits primarily over poorly drained Scranton and Portsmouth sands; however, the earliest town location, just to the south, sits over a large exposure of well drained Norfolk fine sand (Hillsborough County 1941:56). Even though the town location did shift slightly northward, later in the history of the community’s development, the entire study area is situated over the Bone Valley Member of the Peace River Formation, which underlies most of the Polk Upland (Campbell 1984:1-2).

The Bone Valley formation is highly siliclastic, and resistant to loss to solution in groundwater. This is the reason for the prevalence of stream branching seen throughout the study area (White 1970:133). The Bealsville
Figure 2. Physiography of Hillsborough County, Florida

Note: Physiographic data digitization based on Florida Geological Survey Bulletin 51 (White 1970)
community location corresponds to the southeastern quadrant of T29S, R22E, and the Springhead community location corresponds to the northeastern quadrant of T29S, R22E. The entire study area’s main natural community is pine-dominated Scrubby Flatwoods, but there are also Spring Run channels created by springheads originating in both quadrants of the map discussed in this study. The eastern half of T29S, R22E is geographically circumscribed by a natural chain of lakes to the north and west (which actually deflected the placement of the Central & Peninsular Railroad to the western half of T29S, R22E); to the east and south of Bealsville, the area is geographically constrained by the North Prong of the Alafia River (including Howell’s Creek, Howell’s Branch, and English Branch).

Tampa, Florida is, primarily, located in the Gulf Coastal region of peninsular Florida and the Western Valley through which runs the Hillsborough River. The historically black neighborhoods under discussion here sit astride Township 29 South, Range 18 East, and Township 29 South, Range 19 East, in Sections 12-14, 23-24 of the former, and Sections 7-8, 17-19 of the latter. The neighborhoods listed as West Tampa sit just above the waterline of the Hillsborough River. The neighborhoods of Dobyville/West Hyde Park, the Garrison, West Palm Avenue sit about 4.5 meters above mean sea level. The neighborhoods of the Scrubb and Ybor City sit about 7.5 meters above mean sea level; and, the neighborhoods of College Hill and Robles Pond are just below 15 meters above mean sea level. The neighborhoods are underlain by rubble fill,
and relict marine terraces; the terracing is more developed to the south of the Hillsborough River (White 1970:144).

The remnant of the company town of Willow is located on the DeSoto Plain, at Township 30 South, Range 20 East (T30S, R20E), Section 31, which is underlain by the same Bone Valley Member of the Peace River Formation that rests beneath the Polk Upland (White 1970:133). Only a small portion of the northern reaches of the DeSoto Plain extend into Hillsborough County. In this area, elevations average to about 23.7 meters above mean sea level, and the tendency is toward being extremely flat overall (White 1970:140). The channel of the Little Manatee River runs along a northwest-southeast axis, approximately 200 meters to the east of the town. A small, unnamed linear water feature forms runs along the northeast boundary. The town’s structures are built on a gentle rise, from northeast to southwest, of 9-14 meters above mean sea level.
Chapter 3: Historic Background

Prior to the Civil War, most of the American South was inclined toward the plantation being the economic focus for the wealthy land-owners, and both free, white workers and owned, slaved labor. As a consequence, the South’s major urban centers were located on its coastal periphery, and those cites were focused on exporting the South’s main cash crops of tobacco, rice, sugarcane, and cotton (Hilliard 1994:115-117). The resulting distinction between rural settlements being focused on the plantation, and the urban settlements being focused on primary trading centers, encouraged the slaveholders to increase the profit realized from their slave holdings; and, “especially during the last two antebellum decades,” this led to a policy of “hiring out” slaves (Goldfield 1991:130). The fine details of “hiring out,” were left to the slave-holder, the person renting the slave’s labor, and possibly the slaves themselves; slaves that had been “hired out” often made their own living arrangement for at least part of the year, even where this was technically against local laws (Goldfield 1991:137-140). The combination of having little in the way of money to rent nicer properties, and the fact that “hired out” slaves weren’t legally entitled to “living out,” pushed the population to the periphery of the urban centers “outside of areas controlled by fire codes that prohibited the erection of flimsy wooden structures (Goldfield 1991:140-141). However, that move toward peripheral
settlements was itself a change from the pattern that had been more typical “during the height of urban slave holding,” before the practice of “hiring out” became more common (Groves and Muller 1975:173). In Southern cities that were prominent long before the Civil War, the earliest settlements were more likely to have been integrated, to facilitate “the efficacy of slave control” (Groves and Muller 1975:173). On the large plantations that comprised large areas of the inner American South, the antebellum trend had been toward large fields for planting, with nucleated habitation areas; during the postbellum period many former slaves rejected nucleation of their habitation structures, and many houses were moved closer to a tenant farmer’s assigned parcel of the now subdivided plantation properties (Hilliard 1994:122-124).

Postbellum Settlement Patterns in the American South

Following the Civil War, there was an overall shift in population demographics; generally, people were moving into urban areas, with a concurrent tendency to move out of the American South. The American South is often defined differently by different researchers; unless otherwise noted, the region includes Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The perceived emigration of African Americans, from the South, varies depending on how one defines the South, and whether one treats the South as a totalizing region, or considers differential rates of migration for internal sub-regions of the South. In particular, high levels of postbellum emigration amongst
African Americans, during the 19th century, only holds true for the “Atlantic seaboard states” (Roback 1984:1189).

Moreover, in the two decades following the Civil War there were high levels of immigration, for blacks and whites, to the southwest of the cotton growing heartland, especially into Arkansas and Texas. For Florida, immigration of black and white settlers remained high into the 20th century (Roback 1984:1188). In 1870, 85.3 percent of all African Americans resided in the South, by 1910 that number was down to 82.8 percent, by 1950 only 61.5 percent of African Americans lived in the South, and by 1990 that figure had dropped to 46.2 percent (Shelley and Webster 1998). In part, the retention of existing African Americans, or the attraction of new immigrants, may be related to “federal land sales and not the breaking up of plantations” (Parker 1980:1034). However, Florida may have been attractive to recently freed people due to the generally sparse population, especially outside the main cotton producing counties in the extreme north-center of the state, and also the parity between black and white settlers entering Florida (African Americans were 48.9 percent of the population in 1870, and 41 percent in 1910), although that balance would shift heavily in the favor of whites during the second half of the 20th century (Shelley and Webster 1998:168).

The earliest shift of populations was not from South to North or West, but from rural areas to urban areas; by 1870, urban areas “with populations of more than four thousand in 1870 saw their Negro population increase by an average of 80 [percent] over 1860 levels” (Kellogg 1977:312). Relative to the total
populations throughout the South, native blacks and whites moved to the cities at comparable rates. For 1870 (7.7 percent whites/8.8 percent blacks), 1880 (8.3 percent whites/9 percent blacks), 1890 (12 percent whites/13.5 percent blacks), 1900 (14.2 percent whites/15.5 percent blacks) and 1910 (19.5 percent whites/19.7 percent blacks) African Americans were moving into the cities at slightly higher rates, but by 1920 (25.4 percent white/23.5 percent blacks) the trend changed, with more whites moving into the cities (Roback 1984:1190). However, in terms of overall population, there were compositional difference between North and South. “Before 1900 blacks rarely formed as much as 5 percent] of the total population of Northern cities, whereas they comprised more than 40 percent] of the populations of Southern cities” (Groves and Muller 1975:176). If Oklahoma is included in the South, and immigrant populations are considered, then the South’s residents were 31.4 percent urban in 1930, 36.7 percent urban in 1940, 44 percent urban in 1950, and 57.7 percent urban in 1960 (Nicholls 1964:27). By 1970, 74 percent of all African Americans in the U.S. lived in urban areas; and, by 1980, that number increased to 85 percent (Aiken 1985:383; Bryce et al. 1977:158). Furthermore, the trend was for African Americans to move into the older city centers of urban area. During the decade from 1960-1970, “[b]lacks increased as a percent of central city populations from 16.4 percent] to 20.5 percent],” and “for central cities whose metropolitan areas had a population of one million or more, the percent of blacks increased from 18.8 percent to 25.2 percent (Bryce et al. 1977:158).

Overall, there were four main settlement patterns in the urban South:
1. alleys and central courts,

2. highly dispersed residences in predominantly white residential areas,

3. urban clusters, and

4. “shantytown settlements near the city’s edge, [that] became widespread during 1850’s” (Kellogg 1977:311).

The initial settlement was typically followed by newcomers “crowding into existing black residential areas,” which would eventually become overcrowded and dilapidated; with the increased stress of high population densities and deteriorating material conditions, there was a frequent pattern of abandonment in contiguous neighborhoods, which created opportunities to expand existing areas (Groves and Muller 1975:178). Thus, the two primary means of increasing residential areas were to acquire recently vacated housing along the boundaries between existing neighborhoods, and to build “first-occupancy housing adjacent to the outer fringes of the core urban clusters;” in the case of new growth, “these communities take the form of sectors bounded by highways and, more frequently, railroad tracks” (Kellogg 1977:320). In Florida, “[b]arriers to expansion could be natural features such as lakes and swamps or cultural features such as canals, railroads, and highways;” but, occasionally, if the growth of black residential enclaves threatened to encroach on white residential areas, then physical barriers, like walls, were sometimes erected to separate the communities, such as seen in Boca Raton (Lee 1992:382). Prior to the turn of the 20th century, the division and sale of house lots was typically left to the discretion of the property owner; however, from 1910 to 1917 racial zoning was employed to create racially
homogenous neighborhoods, and until 1948 homeowner associations were allowed to utilize racially exclusive covenants to racial homogeneity (Gotham 2000; Silver 1997). Thus, the patterns of residential centralization, seen in the present, can often be attributed to “the coalescence of enclaves,” as historic settlements become aggregated through steady accretion (Groves and Muller 1975:190).

**Historic Context for Using GLO Records in Florida**

Much of the land that was claimed on the eastern half of T29S, R22E, by people of any race, was purchased under the 1866 Southern Homestead Act, from the Florida Internal Improvement Fund’s 4 million acres (at $1 per acre), or under the 1869 Act to Establish a Uniform System of Common Schools and a University (at $1.25 per acre), in several cases (Gates 1940:326). On a national level, the Southern Homestead Act of 1866, which excluded the cash sale system from the public lands of five Southern states (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi) was meant to address several concerns, including an attempt to prevent the postbellum South’s black population from becoming heavily reduced to tenant farming as had been seen in Kansas and Nebraska, after wealthy land barons had acquired vast territories (Gates 1936:670-671). The major proponent behind the passage of the 1866 Southern Homestead Act was a Congressman from Indiana named George Washington Julian. The Act was quite intentionally meant to prevent the old landed aristocracy from buying all the public lands in the South after the Civil War, leaving the newly freed slaves with only migration or tenant farming as options (Pope 1970:201-203). The Act
was, ultimately, not very successful at establishing widespread African American land ownership due to strict regulations about how much land could be claimed (based on “service” to the Union during the war), and also because being granted the deed to the land required an expensive trip to the closest GLO regional office, which meant Tallahassee for homesteaders claiming land in Florida (Pope 1970:206-207).

Of the estimated 400,000 blacks living in the 5 states affected by the 1866 Southern Homestead Act, only 4000 blacks had made homestead claims by late 1869 (Pope 1970:205). However, just over 75 percent of those 4000 claims were made in Florida (Pope 1970:205). To have been granted deed to property, the grantee had to have both made the journey to Tallahassee, and have improved the property to be granted. One reason given for the success of freedmen in Florida, compared to the other states affected by the 1866 Southern Homestead Act, was that extra relief was provided by the Freedman’s Bureau starting in October of 1868 (Pope 1970:206). The distribution of relief supplies to freed people that were not land claimants was not necessarily unique to Florida, but the disproportionately high number of land claims made in the state does seem to support Pope’s assertion.

The 1866 Southern Homestead Act was in effect for 10 years; although its socio-political intent was to place emancipated African Americans on arable farm land in the South, there were constant problems with dummy claims registered by proxies operating on behalf of lumber companies and sales instabilities due to railroads (e.g. the Central & Peninsular Railroad, later Seaboard Airlines, had
extensive land holdings throughout the eastern half of T29S, R22E) and other land speculators (Gates 1940:327-328). The final version of the bill allowed for 80 acres to be claimed for the first two years, and 160 acres thereafter. The purpose for making such limitations was to discourage Northern whites and newly arriving immigrants from making claims in the South, along with former Confederate whites being entirely restricted from claiming land in the South, was to make it more attractive to the freed slaves (Pope 1970:203). General Oliver Howard, commissioner of the Freedmen’s Bureau made a report to congress a month prior to the passage of the bill; in his report, Howard explicitly said, “if this goal were to be realized freedmen must be furnished with transportation, food, shelter, and farm implements” (Pope 1970:204). That recommendation was not given much consideration, as Congress focused on punishing the new representatives from the former Confederate states; however, in the sites under direct study here and the case studies used to support the study, wherever adequate supplies were afforded the new property claimants, those settlements were far more likely to survive into the present. Ultimately, another reason that Florida may have seemed particularly attractive to African American settlers is because, here, “cultivators of 10 acres or more of land,…were made eligible for monthly rations until their first crop was harvested” (Pope 1970:206).

**Settlement Histories of Bealsville and Springhead**

The two rural communities under study here, Bealsville and Springhead, share many aspects of historical development, as well as other socio-cultural
factors, that connect them from the antebellum period onwards. The original founders of Bealsville were freed slaves, many of whom had been brought to Florida by the families operating plantations and/or cattle ranches around Springhead and other communities in northeastern Hillsborough County. Initially, the Bealsville community consisted of 19 households. However, the cook for the Sistrunk family and daughter of Claracy Stevens, Rosa Stephens (or “Rosina” in other documentation), was one of the earliest African Americans in the area to be granted deed to property in the area in July of 1881 and should be included among the community founders (Brown and Brown 2003:238).

By the time the property of the study area was sold off to private owners, the Central & Peninsular Railroad, or the Plant Investment Company in the mid-1890s, there were 19 households, headed by African Americans, in the Bealsville community. There were also 17 households headed by Euro-Americans in the southeastern quadrant of T29S, R22E, who are considered residents of Trapnell. In the northeastern quadrant of T29S, R22E, there were no African American property owners, only 24 white property owners, 4 of whom are considered part of Trapnell. In fact, the northeastern quadrant of T29S, R22E is conspicuous for being the only quadrant not to have a school for black students (indeed, no services for African Americans) during the Reconstruction Era, with Turkey Creek covering the northwest corner and Hopewell covering the southwest.

In 1870, there were 546 African Americans living within the boundaries of Hillsborough County, and there were only 5345 acres under cultivation by all residents of Hillsborough County (Landry et al. 2004:20). A decade later, in 1880,
there were 757 operating on 13,383 acres across Hillsborough County (Landry et al. 2004:21-23). Among the majority of land owning whites in rural, agricultural areas cattle ranching was dominant from the end of the Civil War (Landry et al. 2004:20). In 1888, large concentrations of pebble phosphate were discovered in the soils of the Alafia River drainage basin; the discovery of phosphate spurred development of the Port of Tampa, and fueled the rampant land speculation that sought to foreclose on impoverished farmers throughout Hillsborough County, especially following the severe frosts of 1895 (Landry et al. 2004:28). W.E.B. DuBois asserted that the typical sharecropping relationship that dominated African American life, throughout the “Reconstructed South,” at best lead to a form of “semi-proletarianism” that approximated wage labor, and implies that many communities failed because a strong, land-owning, black bourgeois class failed to materialize throughout most of the South (Marler 2004:125-126).

Bealsville represents an area where African American ownership of farmland was a factor.

The original settlement at Bealsville had been called the Howell’s Creek settlement, followed by Alafia, followed Lil’ Alafia (after a white settlement about 3 miles down the Alafia River got a post office under the name Alafia), and it was not until the mid-1920s that the community was finally named Bealsville to honor one of the earliest settlers, one who had a policy of buying what land he could afford during the “land grabs” of the late 19th and early 20th centuries and repatriating that land back to descendants of the original settlers, sometimes with no charge to the recipient (Brown and Brown 2003:18). Alfred Beal was not the
only resident that took responsibility for helping to keep the community intact as a viable socio-cultural economic unit as a Hillsborough County farming settlement. Oral history provided by Herman Hargrett, suggests that his father had a similar policy on a slightly smaller scale than Beal (Klugh 2004:132). By the early 1920s, the community of Bealsville’s residences had shifted just far enough north that it warranted that the church building from the late 19th century had to be physically moved northward to preserve the building’s place at the center of the community. The schoolhouse that was initially paired with the church building was not moved; however, the present-day historic property of the Glover School is on land donated by one of the founding settlers, William Glover (Brown and Brown 2003:125).

The connection between the two communities goes back to the earliest days of antebellum settlement in this region of Hillsborough County. Apparently one of the Bealsville founders, Peter Dexter, was responsible for saving the life of two children from the Howell family of cattle ranchers living just to the west of the spring feature in the northeastern quadrant of T29S, R22E; it is the same Peter Dexter that allegedly had acquired survey skills during the slavery period to be able to plat the Bealsville properties accurately enough to satisfy the GLO (Brown 1997:42; Klugh 2004:109). In any case, both communities were united by the same Baptist denomination of Christianity; it has been noted by previous research that there were fewer and/or less severe episodes of racial tension where associated but segregated African American communities had organized
Baptist rather than African Methodist Episcopal (AME) denominations early in the
development of the community (Klugh 2004:118).

Despite connections through history and religious denomination, there
was still some evidence of distrust, regarding the surrounding white settlers, by
the African American community, and two founders may have also been
instrumental in setting up more remote African American settlements towards the
state’s interior, even though the settlements were never fully realized, as severe
racial tensions never materialized for Bealsville’s earliest residents (Brown
1997:43). The configuration of the Bealsville settlement was impacted by severe
winter freezes in the mid-1890s; some residents had planted orange groves,
which ended up being hit the hardest by freezes (Brown 2000:167). Furthermore,
the discovery of phosphate in this region of the county also had land speculators
in the area looking to buy property at bargain prices. The end result was that
modern Bealsville is slightly farther north than the original community (although
the territories overlap) (Klugh 2004:135). Both the South Carolina settlement of
Promiseland and the Florida settlement of Zion listed sugarcane farming and
cane syrup production as major economic contributors to property owning
agriculturalists (Bethel 1981:70; Brown 1994:176). The Promiseland settlement
is even geographically circumscribed by the same Seaboard Airline Railroad as
ran to the along a north-south axis on the western side of the lakes that bisect

Hillsborough County seems to have had numerous integrated spaces for
religious practice and, even theatre attendance, dating back as far as 1838
(Brady and Brown 1997:15). However, the Springhead and Bealsville were well separated in regard to the community services that were available to their respective populations. Both communities developed a Baptist Church in the earliest phase of community growth, but the major non-religious community services were a gristmill (later, it included a sawmill) run by the English family of Springhead, whereas the for the Bealsville community it was the Cane Press that was brought down from Wakulla County in the early 1890s, by O.V. Hargrett (Hillsborough County 1998:37,98; Klugh 2004:132). African American residents of Hillsborough County even had some representation in local politics, with both Mills Holloman Jr. and his son Adam Holloman serving as County Commissioners within the first 20 years after the Civil War ended (Brown 1998:97). The elder Holloman had his term suspended for a brief period, and there is some evidence that his reported illiteracy was a problem for white constituents (Howe 1997:84). Another of the other subtle connections between the two communities, is that aside from those born here in Florida, both the white and black settlers were predominantly from coastal Georgia and South Carolina before settling T29S, R22E; one of the few exceptions was Mills Holloman Jr., who originally came from Virginia (Brown 1998:97; Brown and Brown 2003:3,17,67,89,119,163,226,237; United States Census Bureau 1958).

Another building at the core of the Bealsville built environment, was the log cabin schoolhouse known at first as the Antioch School, and later as the Jameson School (Hillsborough County 1998:40; Klugh 2004:141). School was originally held within the structure of the Antioch Baptist Church; however, there
are some discrepancies regarding the schoolhouse’s construction date. One recent report suggests that the original Antioch School was built in 1873, and that the building was moved from its initial position to its later position on Sam Hicks Road; however, Elgin Klugh’s doctoral dissertation research seems to indicate that a new Antioch school was built around 1891, and only after a later room addition was that building called the Jameson School. There have also been orally communicated reports that the log cabin schoolhouse burned down in 1899, but that date is not otherwise indicated by any evidence; however, this could be explored archaeologically by relocating the original and second positions of the Antioch Baptist Church and the Antioch School. Destruction by fire would provide a better explanation for the schools name change, which can otherwise only be weakly explained by the addition of a second room, in the 1920s; establishing the archaeological integrity of any deposits associated with the original (group ritual/group service) edifices will be the first step in modeling the spatial relationships of the other structures distributed throughout the built environment and landscape of Bealsville.

Comparing Local Rural Sites with Other Areas of the American South

One of the enclave communities in the literature that is comparable to Bealsville is a community that developed in the Piedmont region of South Carolina during the Reconstruction Era, was the community known as Promiseland. The location of Promiseland, on 2742 acres, was originally part of a sales scheme geared to African Americans living in South Carolina; the property was a private holding that was ultimately sold off in small farm lots
following the death of the original white plantation owner. Unlike Bealsville, where the land was acquired from government holdings through the Southern Homestead Act of 1866, the land at Promiseland was sold by private agent for a down payment and 3 annual follow-up payments (Bethel 1981:27). The Promiseland settlement did have a high density of occupation; in 1897, there were 289 households living on 2742 acres, with a mean property size of 34.8 acres (Bethel 1981:98-99). Promiseland also offered some comparisons in regard to the number of female-headed households, with the South Carolina community reported having around 17 percent of all households being headed up by females (Bethel 1981:122). Of the 39 original, deeded property owners on the eastern half of T29S, R22E, that were assigned to the communities studied here, 4 were female-headed households; the small sample size makes statistical comparisons difficult, but it is notable that similar frequencies of female-headed existed for both racial classifications (i.e. white and black), with 2 out of 20 white, and 2 out 19 black households having female heads (United States Census Bureau 1958, 1965, 1978). The number of female-headed households is also comparable to other Baptist settlements in Florida; for example, the Marion County “Afro-Baptist” settlement of Zion listed 2 female-headed households among their earliest homesteaders (Brown 1994:176).

The development trajectories of the Florida and South Carolina communities ended up diverging radically during the late decades of; Promiseland’s population lost control of enough farmland that the entire community eventually shifted to wage labor outside the community, whereas the
Florida communities of Bealsville and Zion continued to exist as subsistence truck vegetable farmers, rather than in purely commercial crop like cotton that is essentially what killed Promiseland as an agricultural community (Bethel 1981:173-175). It wasn’t geographic territory circumscription that killed Promiseland, because it was situated in the same pine dominated upland scrub that was endemic to both Florida settlements. There was roughly 3 times the acreage, around the turn of the 20th century, at Promiseland (approximately 2700) for 289 households, as the approximately 900 acres at Bealsville for 19 households, compared to Zion’s approximately 300 residents spread out over 1700 acres (Brown 1994:176; Hillsborough County 1941:56). It does seem that what sustained the Florida communities was the reliance on pure subsistence level truck vegetable farming that helped to sustain them as agricultural communities; however, no black bourgeois emerged among the Afro-Baptists of the Zion settlement, and it ultimately did not survive into the late 20th century, whereas Bealsville is still a tightly knit community.

In a 1985 article, Charles Aiken addressed the question of postbellum settlement throughout the South, from the period of Reconstruction and into the 20th century; the most important assertion made by Aiken is that freed blacks immediately began to reject the nucleated settlement pattern that had been imposed on them when they lived in the slave pens near the “big house” under the old Plantation System (1985:389). Aiken also suggests that the one place where the old nucleated settlement pattern did continue was the sugarcane plantation of Louisiana (1985:367). The Bealsville area did have a good deal of
sugarcane production, as suggested by a quote from Stephen Harvell in *Slavery in Florida: Territorial Days to Emancipation*, “that just about everybody in the region ’raised a heap of [sugar]cane and boiled it in vats and kettles at different places’” (Rivers 2000:74). Canter Brown also noted the impacts of sugarcane for local freedmen agriculturalists, along with potatoes and corn, in advertisements from a small local newspaper called *The Newnan Herald*, that “laborers receive from $25 to $30 per month, or when hired by the day $1.50 a day” (1997:47).

For Hillsborough County, specifically, the 1880 census reports that 556 acres were used for cotton, and 238 acres used for sugarcane production; in comparison, 4968 acres were used to grow corn (Smith 1884:184).

Comparable settlement patterns also exist elsewhere within the state of Florida; for example, a mosaic of small African American settlements along the Atlantic Coast of Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties. The black settlements of Florida’s Atlantic Coast were more likely to be territorially circumscribed by white neighborhoods to industrial/transportation boundaries such as road systems or railroad tracks, or geographically circumscribed by scrub or other undesirable land types (Lee 1992:376-377). Most strikingly, Lee notes that Florida’s black population on the Atlantic margin had two-thirds of their population (about 450,000 people) confined to 97 tracts; whereas, white populations along the Atlantic margin of south Florida, spread two-thirds (about 2.1 million people) of their population spread across 234 tracts (1992:378).
Settlement History of Tampa’s Historically Black Neighborhoods

The original town of Tampa grew up around the military Fort Brooke, and was far from the representation of an urban built environment that it has become; the original fort was constructed in 1824 (Brown 1999:14-17). The fort itself is often remembered as the point of origin for Major Dade, whose ill-fated expedition to Fort King touched off the Second Seminole War on December 28, 1835 (Brown 1999:50). The fort would also serve as a temporary interment facility for Indians awaiting transport to Indian Territory in what is now Oklahoma (Brown 1999:48). By the end of the 1830s, several lots, including 3 on Tampa Street near Whiting Street, had been sold to private citizens, and the stage was set for a burgeoning civilian population (Pizzo 1969:7). The town of Tampa was finally incorporated in 1855, only 10 years after Florida was established as a state (Dunn 1977:16). Tampa’s growth progressed slowly through the next 30 years; it was hampered by an outbreak of Yellow Fever in 1858 that reduced the town’s population by one quarter, and by the decommissioning of Fort Brooke in 1859, though some troops remained stationed there until 1882 (Panamerican Consultants 2001:4; Pizzo 1969:81).

The 1880 census records that Tampa’s population was 720 people. Only 5 years later, after Vicente Martinez Ybor agreed to move his cigar manufacturing industry to Tampa, the population tripled to almost 2,500 (Dunn 1977:19,21). One traveler described the unpainted houses and dirt roads of Tampa. She called particular attention to several dominant features of the town, including 2 saloons and 2 lumber mills (Hewitt 2001:23). It was in the vicinity of
one of those lumber mills that one of the Tampa areas earliest recognized
neighborhoods, the African American enclave known as the Scrub, sprang to life;
this neighborhood, “bounded by Scott [Street] on the north, Cass [Street] on the
south, Central Avenue on the west, and Nebraska [Avenue] on the east” housed
the highest “concentration” of blacks in the Tampa area, and was described as
‘impenetrable and serv[ing] to remind one of a walled city’ (Howe 1999:5;
Panamerican Consultants 2001:4). The neighborhood is also mentioned during
an outbreak of Yellow Fever in 1887, when “the ‘Scrub’ and Ybor City were
brought under the supervision of the local board of health’s inspections” (Barker
1984:48). The household organization of this period tended towards inclusion of
the extended family, and perhaps boarders as well; in 1880, about half of
Tampa’s 178 African American run households were “male-headed nuclear
families” (Howe 1999:6-7). In about 64 percent of those 178 households, a male
was the sole money earner of the house; however, the 1880 census did list, for
the first time in Tampa, the profession of laundress (Howe 1999:11-12).
However, there had certainly been laundresses working in the area for quite
some time; shortly after emancipation a woman named Dorcas Bryant had
“homesteaded a 60 acre tract” here, and she supported herself by taking in
laundry (Hewitt 2001:26).

By 1900, there were 4,382 African Americans living in Tampa, comprising
almost 30 percent of the total population. Over the next 30 years, a disparity in
population growth would lower this to closer to 20 percent of the total population
(Howard and Howard 1994:2). The African American community thrived in some
areas, as evidenced by the numerous black owned businesses that grew up on Central Avenue. The strength of this neighborhood was in its cohesiveness, and ability to mobilize as a community; much of daily life was organized around family, school, and church, but there were also a number of more civic-minded enterprises and service organizations. Among those organizations, the Tampa Urban League, founded in the 1920s, would be instrumental in the community; also important were the Clara Frye Hospital for blacks, and a weekly periodical called the *Tampa Bulletin*, founded in 1910 and 1915 respectively.

In 1880, county census records indicate that there were only “two black teachers” (Howe 1999:23) living in Hillsborough County, and they were not listed on any official county payrolls. However, due to a drive within the community, sufficient money was raised to open Tampa’s Harlem Academy in 1889 (Howe 1999:23). The first few decades of the 20th century saw the number of schools grow to “eight public and nine private institutions by the mid-twenties” (Howard and Howard 1994:6). Churches also flourished over this time period; “the city’s four oldest black churches” all dated to the second half of the 19th century, but by 1926, there would be 42 black churches in Tampa (Howard and Howard 1994:6).

The stability of the family unit among Tampa’s African Americans “kept alive black culture and undoubtedly brought the city’s African American community needed psychological and economic support” (Howard and Howard 1994:3). The census of 1900 records that 75 percent of “black families with children were two-parent households;” additionally, the divorce rates also seem to have been low—“in 1930, for instance, there were 2,010 married women
between 25 and 34 years of age compared to only 103 divorced females in the same age range” (Howard and Howard 1994:3-4). Although the strength of the family was undeniable, few of these families could afford to own their homes, and “by the 1920s over 75 percent of the city’s African Americans resided in rental housing units located in all of Tampa’s black neighborhoods” (Howard and Howard 1994:4). A growing and prosperous Tampa was attracting an influx of predominantly unskilled workers, around 40 percent of whom were coming from outside Florida (Howard and Howard 1994:2). These newcomers inevitably found themselves crowded into neighborhoods like “The Scrub [which] stood out as a blighted collection of cheap rental units” (Howard and Howard 1994:3). The cost of these rental units were disproportionately higher (averaging $5.38 per week) than many other Southern urban centers, such as New Orleans ($4.52 per week), Memphis ($3.73 per week), Louisville ($4.54 per week), Charleston ($3.11 per week), and Richmond ($4.46 per week) (Raper et al. 1927:18). However, these prices were somewhat lower than those of Northern industrialized urban centers, such as New York-Harlem ($7.16 per week), Dayton ($6.00), Philadelphia ($7.95 per week), and Indianapolis ($5.48 per week), although wages may have been correspondingly higher there as well (Raper et al. 1927:18).

The residents of these neighborhoods could look forward to the assistance of their own community, if not from offices of the larger city, through the many service organizations initiated by and maintained by Tampa’s African American citizens. Tampa’s African American community has a strong tradition of female
activists such as Dorcas Bryant and Blanche Armwood, both of whom were active both in their neighborhoods and in greater Tampa itself. A large number of women’s organizations and “sororities rendered important civic services that include charity work, social improvement, building homes for orphans and single working women, and encouraging” appreciation of the fine arts (Howard and Howard 1994:4). With strong community support, areas like Central Avenue began to prosper.

In 1927, the Urban League commissioned a study of African American life in Tampa, which remains the authoritative source for information about Tampa’s African American communities in the 1920s. The study was nominally conducted under the supervision of Arthur Raper, but the research was in actuality conducted by, and the report written by Dr. Benjamin E. Mays with the assistance of his wife Sadie. Around the time of Mays’ research, “the black business community consisted of some 185 various African American commercial establishments that employed about 400 men and women” (Howard and Howard 1994:8). Some of the notable businesses include the Central Life Insurance Company, which eventually became “one of the state’s largest black enterprises,” and the previously mentioned *Tampa Bulletin*, which was not just “black-owned and operated, [but also] employed only black typesetters and linotype operators” (Howard and Howard 1994:8). The Tampa Urban League provided a number of services to Tampa’s African American community including “two day-care nurseries for working mothers, alternative home placements for juvenile
delinquents, family case work, the organization of clubs and recreation for black youth, and even employment placement” (Howard and Howard 1994:9).

The 1927 study examined every aspect of African American life in Tampa, including education, social services, religion, housing, employment, and population statistics; officially the report was titled “A Study of Negro Life in Tampa: made at the request of the Tampa Welfare League, the Tampa Urban League, and the Tampa Young Men’s Christian Association,” however it has become colloquially known as the “Raper Report.” The report included, under the description “Tampa Proper,” both the upscale Central Avenue and the impoverished neighborhood referred to as “the ‘Scrubbs;’” however, the report also stated explicitly that the neighborhoods were “a unit only in that [they occupy] contiguous territory” (Raper et al. 1927:5). This area was home to more than a third of Tampa’s 23,323 African Americans (Tampa’s total population at the time was around 150,000), with a population of 8,362 people; the majority of structures in the neighborhood were white-owned rental properties consisting mostly of “1 story frame buildings,” with the “‘Shotgun’ type [being] the most prevalent” (Raper et al. 1927:5,11). The study evaluated the living conditions of 326 of these rental houses, reporting that 146 had “Bad” interior conditions, and another 127 were listed as only “Fair;” additionally 259 of these structures had no bathing facilities, and only 114 had an indoor toilet (Raper et al. 1927:11). Outdoor toilets serving multiple families accounted for another 136 properties, leaving 76 with only privies to serve one or more families.
Additionally, only 144 of the houses had an indoor source of water; the remaining households were served by either an outdoor spigot (85), or a well (97) for their freshwater needs (Raper et al. 1927:11). The City of Tampa claimed that these neighborhoods were served with refuse removal several times per week, everyday in the case of some neighborhoods. However, 44 families reported receiving no refuse removal service, and were likely to have disposed of their own refuse by either burning or buying it in the backyard (Raper et al. 1927:11). Each family averaged about 4.5 people living in an average of 4 rooms, and roughly half of those families had children under the age of 15; many (31 percent) of those families subsidized the cost of rent by taking in “lodgers” (Raper et al. 1927:11). In all, Dr. Mays named eight separate African American enclaves: The Scrubb, Ybor City, Garrison, West Hyde Park (Dobyville), West Palm Avenue, College Hill, West Tampa, and Robles Pond (Howard and Howard 1994:3) (Figure3).

Quality of life was indeed problematic for the African Americans in Tampa; there was insufficient hospital space available for the size of the community; during the 1920s, the population was dwindling by sheer attrition, with few births than deaths (Raper et al. 1927:23). Furthermore, due to the lack of hospital space expectant mothers had to rely on the skill of under-trained midwives to assist in childbirth. Of stillbirths recorded in 1926, about 47 percent were attributed to African American mothers; with the black community accounting for only 20 percent of the total population, there would appear to have been a definite disparity (Raper et al. 1927:22). Additionally, “50 [percent] of Negro
Figure 3. Tampa’s Historically Black Neighborhoods
deaths were individuals aged 15-44,” of the 534 deaths (in 1926) in this age group, 42 were directly caused by homicides (Raper et al. 1927:23). Infants suffered from the squalid living conditions as well; “81 [percent] of deaths caused by diarrhea and enteritis occurred between birth and 1 year of age” (Raper et al. 1927:26).

There was little available to Tampa’s African Americans for recreation; blacks were barred from enjoying the city’s parks “except in the capacity of servants” (Raper et al. 1927:27). There were 2 theatres on Central Avenue, but both had “extremely bad ventilation and sanitation; less wholesome entertainment was available in places like the Lafayette Dancing Academy, and the various pool halls that could be found at the back of some of the neighborhood’s barber shops (Raper et al. 1927:27). Dr. Mays summed the situation up quite succinctly when he wrote:

For a colored population of 23,000, Tampa provides a Branch Library and a salaried playground supervisor. The City of Tampa provides no public park for Negroes: it provides no playgrounds, except unequipped school grounds: it provides no public pool or beach. The private recreation and amusements are of such a nature that the Negro public receives no benefit therefrom. The Commercial recreation and amusement is of such a nature and so poorly supervised, that it perchance is more harmful than beneficial” (Raper et al. 1927:32).
Despite being virtually ignored by the City of Tampa, these neighborhoods did thrive in some cases; for the most part there was work available, and there were strong community ties to the churches and schools.

Large portions of Tampa’s African Americans were employed in unskilled trades, such as laborer, janitor, maid, or bellboy; however, there were also professionals such as physicians, dentists, pharmacists, undertakers, and at least one lawyer. There were also a number of African Americans employed in skilled trades; conditions varied for skilled workers, some, like the “brick layers” were joined with fellow white workers in a union, and received the same pay for the same work (Raper et al. 1927:42). Other skilled workers, such as the carpenters and painters, were not allowed admittance to the unions of the white workers; however, there were also non-union jobs where black workers could expect to be well, if not equally paid, including the cigar making operations in Ybor City (Raper et al. 1927:42-43). Additionally, there was the building that housed the Longshoreman’s Local 1402 whose one time leader, Perry Harvey Sr., gave his name to the park where the current study is located (Howard and Howard 1994:9). Tampa’s utility departments did employ black many black workers, but in many cases, it was their policy to “lay off” black workers when whites were in need of employment (Raper et al. 1927:46).

At the time of the Tampa Urban League study conducted by Dr. Mays, there we “3322 colored children enrolled in the public schools,” and another 610 youths enrolled in various private institutions (Raper et al. 1927:53). However, this meant that about a quarter of the school-aged children were not enrolled in
any school; furthermore, on any given school day, fully 20 percent of students did not attend classes (Raper et al. 1927:53). The schools that catered to African American students, in most case, lacked sufficient size or other accommodations for the size of their student body; there was also precious little space dedicated to recreation, and only the Harlem Academy had any type of playground equipment (Raper et al. 1927:55). A 1925 study, conducted by Columbia University, determined that almost 85 percent of Tampa’s African American students were “over age” for their grade level; Mays attributed this fact, in part, to irregular attendance and students who got a “late start” (Raper et al. 1927:55). The schoolteachers responsible for were poorly compensated for their efforts, with salary ranges from $60 to $100 for female teachers and $65 to $167 for male teachers; out of those salaries, teachers were expected to keep themselves attired with “good clothes,” to attend summer classes for self-improvement, and often felt compelled to provide supplies for their students (Raper et al. 1927:55).

The church also played a large part in the life of Tampa’s African American citizens; even during the late 19th century, Tampa’s churches were “a major source of news and inspiration, [they] served as a kind of town hall with the minister as publicist and exhorter (Howard and Howard 1994:5). Mays asserted that, “aside from the home, the church is the most important factor in the life of the Negro” (Raper et al. 1927:48). The churches took on a prominent role in uniting the communities, and a number of ministerial alliances provided a voice for African Americans in the political sphere of greater Tampa (Howard and Howard 1994: 5-6). Among the most well attended were Baptist and Methodist
churches, as well as “small storefront-like churches that sprang up in those years;” however, “lower income blacks” were more likely to become congregants in the Catholic and Episcopalian churches than middle-class or affluent African Americans (Howard and Howard 1994:6). The churches also served as focal points for community action and social interaction; additionally, the churches were supporters of education, directly sponsoring some private schools (Howard and Howard 1994:6).

From the 1940s to the 1970s, Tampa aggressively pursued expansion, and various urban renewal projects; however, going back to the 1930s “the Scrub” neighborhood was targeted for clearance (Panamerican Consultants 2001:6). The city annexed a significant portion of the suburbs surrounding old Tampa in 1953, and began acting on a 1952 ruling in the state legislature that allowed the city to pursue urban renewal projects (Kerstein 1998:77-78). Many of Tampa’s impoverished neighborhoods were targeted for demolition; moreover, private housing, rather than public housing, was expected to cover almost all the residents that were displaced by these projects (Kerstein 1998:79). A group of Tampa’s prominent African American businessmen, including Perry Harvey Sr., managed to bid successfully for a contract to build housing; their organization, Tampa Park Apartments Inc., “developed about 370 subsidized rental units” (Kerstein 1998:80). “The Scrub” (reported by Mays as “Scrubb,” which is preferred here for clarity in mapping) neighborhood itself was partially cleared in 1954; the 1968 “construction of the Jefferson Avenue approach to I-275,” and other projects in 1970 and 1972 removed the last vestiges of the once
prosperous Central Avenue, and the dilapidated structures of “the Scrub” (Panamerican Consultants 2001:6).

**Settlement History of Willow Company Town**

The final site type to be discovered here is a company lumber town that included both white and black employees. The town of Willow, in south central Hillsborough County, housed the employees of McGowin-Foshee Lumber Company beginning in 1924, although the Foshees sold their share of the operation to the Robbins family in 1926 (Duncan n.d.:1-2). The mill ceased production from 1929 to 1931, but remained in operation until 1936. The town site included just over 80 hectares, with 75-80 residences, a doctor’s office, a commissary, a boarding house for single employees, and the buildings of the milling operation (Duncan n.d.:1).

The residential areas were segregated, with the white employees living closer to the main road, and the black employees living closer to the creek that delineated the northeastern boundary of the town. The “black quarters” also included a church, and a schoolhouse (Duncan n.d.:43). The white employees attended churches and schools in the nearby community of Wimauma (Duncan n.d.:43). The commissary served as a social center, with both white and black employees congregating there outside of work hours (Duncan n.d.:44). There was, reportedly, a juke joint somewhere between the black residences and the creek (Duncan n.d.:42). The owners maintained residences in the white section of the town and a small garden that provided fresh produce to sell at the commissary.
The town received electricity from a generator on the grounds, and it provided power from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m (Duncan n.d.:43). The residences were provided with outside water spigots, unless individual owners opted to run pipes into their own home (Duncan n.d.:37). The three houses occupied by the owners and their kin all had indoor plumbing. The houses were reputedly of good quality, and were likely sold off to local buyers after the mill ceased operating (Duncan n.d.:36).

The majority of the laborers were paid daily, in time checks, which could be exchanged for goods from the commissary or babbitt-type company scrip, which are a “token” used in lieu of legal tender (Drobney 1996:138). The use of babbitt scrip was typical for company towns throughout Florida, but “[p]ayment of wages exclusively in the form of scrip was not common” (Drobney 1996:138-139). The employees of the commissary, and those who worked in the office, were paid on a monthly basis. All employees had the option to exchange their company scrip for U.S. currency, during one hour, one day per month (Duncan n.d.:40). In fact, companies were legally obligated “[u]nder Chapter 6914 of the Acts of the Florida Legislature of 1915” to exchange scrip or merchandise checks for U.S. currency, starting 90 days after issuance (Drobney 1996:140). The wages for laborers “were from eight to ten cents an hour” (Duncan n.d.:40).

The use of company scrip is typically thought of as a type of corporate paternalism that serves to reduce overhead by overcharging for merchandise that might be available more cheaply to consumers in a competitive market. According to a 1935 study by the U.S. Department of Labor, “it was found that
the aggregate average prices charged by company stores were from 2.1 percent to 10.4 percent higher than those charged by independent stores” (Drobney 1996:137). The same study indicated that, “by 1933, over 40 [percent] of the annual payroll of Florida lumber companies was recovered through company stores” (Drobney 1996:140). Another means of recovering payroll expenditures was by charging a mandatory flat fee for medical care (Drobney 1996:136).

Aside from controlling access to goods and medical care, the presence of company built schools and churches is generally regarded as an element of corporate paternalism, which served to further encourage the immobilization of the labor force (Drobney 1996:129). At Willow, this may have been true for the black labor force, but white workers availed themselves of the services in nearby communities (Figure 4). The company commissary was a common focal point in Florida company towns, and Willow’s appears to have been a shared social center for both the white and black workers (Drobney 1996:136). Other factors that seem to indicate resistance to corporate paternalism at Willow were the presence of a “bootlegger” that accepted company scrip as payment, an onsite juke joint, and the availability of prostitutes for the unmarried employees (Duncan n.d.:42).

These locations represent three distinctly different site types that were available to Hillsborough County’s early African American settlers. Urban Tampa offered opportunities for property ownership in the earliest stages of growth, and some flexibility to reconfigure the built environment. However, with the growth of Tampa, the built environment became more permanently fixed. The rural,
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agricultural land of eastern Hillsborough County also offered opportunities for property ownership, and flexibility to reconfigure the built environment as the community’s boundaries shifted. The company town of Willow reflects a built environment that was dictated by the owners of a business. Taken together, these sites offer an opportunity to understand how Hillsborough County’s African American residents related to their built environment, especially the structures that house socially important services—churches and schools.
Chapter 4:

Research Background

In *Rethinking Archaeology*, K.C. Chang’s simple explanation of theory, as “[providing] us with a basic framework for operating our methodology and for determining the actual methods and techniques of gathering, ordering, and interpreting data,” should have made it clear that we are ineluctably bound to be guided by theory in our various research domains (1967:128). However, more than four decades later, the discipline still seems mired in an ongoing discourse about the applicability of theory, generally, to the practice of archaeology, or which theories might provide the most epistemologically and ontologically satisfying explanations, for continued archaeological research (Johnson 2010:217-220; Klejn 2001:1-4). We will ultimately let our particular research endeavors define their own scales of analysis, but there does need to be some means of discussing our research in a non-idiosyncratic way. To that end, this approach advocates using the “scales of behavioral analysis” (i.e. interaction, activity, and systemic) recommended by the behavioral archaeologists, LaMotta and Schiffer (2001:18-19).

This research utilizes an Actor-Network-Theory (ANT) approach, which is not a theory of the social, but rather a theory about researcher methodology. It has been most widely criticized for conceding the possibility of agency to non-human actants, but that should not be that alarming for archaeologists, after all
for us the past human actors are gone and we are left with only the material mediators that connected them in their engagement with the living world. What should be the most disconcerting aspect of an ANT inspired research program is its espoused relativism; however, the distinction that must be made is that the type of relativism being advocated is not the researcher’s reflexive, soul-searching moral relativism, but an attempt to keep research constrained by empirically observable associations between agencies in a heterogeneous network. To quote Gilles Deleuze, ‘Relativism is not the relativity of truth but the truth of the relation’ (as quoted in Latour 2005:95). The primary purpose of this section is to confront scale, and to discuss some approaches to working with multiple scales of analysis, including both temporal scales and spatial scales. Our primary interest is in establishing how the material world impacts the ways people interact and communicate, but that does not mean that human impacts on the material world should no longer remain a viable part of archaeological inquiry (i.e. they are not mutually exclusive).

In regard to scale, generally, the ANT position is that “[s]cale is the actor’s own achievement” (Latour 2005:185). The archaeological ramifications of letting actors define their own scale should be immediately seen. We typically define a scale of analysis in advance, and this can obfuscate patterns that are not visible within the scales we have pre-selected. Furthermore, there is the issue of forcing evidence into a scale that seems well established; a scale (whether temporal or spatial) which is based on physical evidence of relationships between people and
a specific institution may not be coterminous with the boundary of the same people’s relationship with a different institution.

As we shift between households (possibly including multiple structures), settlements, regions, and supra-regions, we must be prepared to accept that associations with different institutions are not likely to create well defined composite groups. The obvious answer is to use scales that are generalized to be flexible in their use, such as the aforementioned scales of behavioral analysis at the level of individual human-material interaction, at the level of building interactions into the behavior chains of activities, and at the level of reassembling behavior chains into systems of behavior. However, in an ANT approach, micro-scales cannot simply be subsumed into macro-scales, although both share the familiar network shape comprised of nodes and edges. Taken to an extreme, any individual person or object would be a node amidst an array of edges connecting it to a larger scale. With the line between what constitutes a micro-scale or a macro-scale growing ever fuzzier, it might be more useful to think of the micro in terms of how it attempts to “disconnect” itself from the macro, and to think of the macro in terms of how it attempts to keep the micro “attached” to itself (Latour 2005:180). Since we cannot guarantee that complete past networks will be made visible by any single program of research, we may benefit from considering the “effective scale at which pattern may be comprehended or meaning attributed” (Marquardt 1992:107).

Another proposition of ANT that bears on the determination of scale, is that actors should be allowed to define, for themselves, the existence of groups
both through declarations of membership in such groups, and through delineation of “anti-groups” that constitute what is outside the member group (Latour 2005:32). For example, the rural settlements under discussion here could have been defined by quadrants of a particular PLSS township and range, with any settler within a quadrant (possibly based on an assumed propinquity of structures expressed in a specified spatial distance and temporal concurrence) lumped in as part of a settlement. To some extent that may have been sufficient to define a spatially related community; but, it would have denied how past actors, from the accounts of actual settlers to outsider accounts (such as newspaper articles from the period, or family histories committed to writing after the period in question) culled from historical documents, defined their own membership in a particular community. The earliest attempts at defining the founding residents of these rural communities was based on such a scheme, which created a basis for comparative regularity; however, following more research, historical resources showed that some of the originally included settlers declared themselves (or contemporaneous sources declared them) members of other settlement communities (Hillsborough County 1998; Robinson 1928).

So, using a “cartographic scale” based on the way GLO maps were officially recorded by PLSS units, or a “geographical scale” based on an “overarching conceptual abstraction lain over these scaled landscapes,” such as the footprint of a house compared to the total catchment area of the North Prong of the Alafia River, could lead to manufactured settlement boundaries that do not reflect the way the space was viewed by settlers (Harris 2006:41). Analyses may
be performed at those scales to answer some research questions, but our “methodological scale” should not be a single, universal scale and it should allow for past actors’ description of their own relationship to metric space (Harris 2006:41). Thus, when conducting excavations it makes sense to use a standard unit, such as the square meter, to assess the intensity of testing as a ratio of the excavated units (where the grain would be the square meter) to the arbitrary boundaries of the tested area (where the total squared meters would be the extent) (Burger and Todd 2006:238-239). However, in a GIS analysis based on historic documents, aerial photographs, and human recollections, it may not be possible to fully reconstruct all the dimensions that would allow for a comparison of standard units.

This brings us back to the notion of interaction scale, activity scale, and systemic scale; and, the interactions those the scales are based on include person-material, person-person, and potentially material-material interactions. However, ANT reminds that interactions are not “isotopic” in that all the impetuses of action are not necessarily present at the locus of the action, not “synchronic” in the sense that what is co-present at the locus of action may have begun acting at different times (including a past which is beyond the discursive consciousness of sentient actors), not “synoptic” in the sense that not all of the participants in the interaction are visible to all the other participants, not “homogenous” in the sense that multiple categories of people (e.g. living and dead, present or remote) and things (i.e. multiple types of materials), and not “isobaric” in the sense that different participants may exert different pressures on
the interaction (Latour 2005:200-201). ANT provides procedures for examining how the local articulates with the global; for example, when assessing how individual interactions articulate with the conceptual core of an activity, applying an “oligopticon” means to limit observations to those interactions that connect an individual node to other nodes in the network (Latour 2005:181).

However, interactions may well shift through multiple localities before they can be combined into an activity. Moreover, activities may shift through multiple locations before they can be viewed together as part of a system (Rapoport 1990). Thus, when we bind time and spatial movement to bring more of the participants into view, what we get is not a demystified view of a unified structure, but a “panorama” that coheres a specific moment in the ongoing system of activities (Latour 2005:187). What is most important is not how much of the total system can be brought into view, but rather the number of connections that is shown by temporarily taking a wider viewpoint. Conversely, we must also be aware, at each interaction, of how actors are differentiating themselves from the generalizing effects of institutional engagements; this is the variation of practice, by agents who have variable received views of their own connections with institutions, in what ANT would call “subjectifiers, personnalizers, or individualizers (or plug-ins)” (Latour 2005:207).

ANT is, in reality, not so much a theory, as it is a set of methodological propositions that attempt to resist being overly constrained by theoretical commitments; its strength is in providing a rationale for not using theory to redefine aspects of a research universe, but it does not provide much guidance
for understanding the thought processes behind the actors’ actions. For that, we
turn to the concept of the “semiosphere,” as the cognitive space within which “it
[is] possible for communicative processes and the creation of new information to
be realised” (Lotman 2005:207). We also see the network shape in the
recognition of sign systems, at both the level of culture and the individual, with a
“cultural nucleus” of core institutional attachments connected to a “peripheral
space” that engenders a “semiotic individuality” that allows the differential
adoption of non-core institutional attachments (Lotman 2005:209,212-213).
“The semiosphere has a diachronic depth, since it is allotted by virtue of a
complex memory system without which it cannot function;” this is what allows for
both longer-term stability of core “mental-ideological structures” to persist, and for
variable idiosyncratic engagement with peripheral ideas or resistance to the core
ideas that provide the basis for change of the long-term (Lotman 2005:215,219).
This “internal diversity” allows for the group interpretation of relationships
between signs and what they signify to be contested as a “dialogue” between
“substructures” that nested into a semiotic hierarchy, with relationship of “vertical
isomorphism” to a higher level of cognitive domain (Lotman 2005:216,218).

The highest levels of cognitive domains are themselves differentiated by
“five main modes of equivalence: perceptible [i.e. perceived by the senses],
functional, affective, nominal, and by fiat, that is, arbitrary” (Rapoport 1982:119).
However, it is at the level of sign-signified relationships that changes are made,
by the virtue of the interpretant; while the sign may be iconic (“based on formal
resemblance”), indexical (based on “some kind of existential relation with their
referent”), or symbolic (an arbitrary connection between sign and signified), it is
the fluidity of establishing new interpretants that allows for variation at the level of
replicating sign-signified relationships (Preucel and Bauer 2001:89-90). The
crucial aspect of the sign-signified relationship is that the changes within the
semiosphere, whether verbal or merely ideational, do not necessarily occur at the
same rate. This means that no mental state can be taken as a synchronic
representation of the thinker’s reality, rather “[t]he structural heterogeneity of
semiotic space creates reserves of dynamic processes and represents one of the
mechanisms for the creation of new information inside the sphere” (Lotman

So, to contend with multiple levels of signs-symbols, changing at differing
rates, we must posit more than one way to perceive reality, as multiple
ontological orders. To that end, we might accept hierarchy of ontology
subsumed under the unifying category of a “ethological order; based in a realist
ontology [that] implies a research strategy taking account of the fact that all
human activities have a biological/genetic dimension;” but within that cognitive
domain, there exists an “operational order” that presents itself in ways that are
accessible to quantitative, functional analyses that do not depend on verbal or
textual declarations, a “discursive order” that does consider how people’s reality
is engendered by “the communicative interaction of an array of people using
language and language-like types of codes,” and a “iconic order” that “concerns
iconic codes and their use in the visionary building of possible worlds…beyond
language and alien to verbal communication” (Aijmer 2000:4; 2003:3). This
conceptual step precedes the actors’ perception of a “unitary text,” where “meaning does not reside in artifacts or people but in the moment of interaction between the two; and, “symbols’ meanings do not exist outside of the moment in which people apprehend them and assemble them into meaningful formations” (Lotman 2005:218; Robb 1998:337-338).

Of course, this line of thinking further problematizes the researcher’s selection of “analytical scales,” since the scales we select inevitably “determine the characteristics of the patterns inferred” from our collected data; moreover, the “lived scales” of past actors occurred at multiple, and multiply overlapping, spatio-temporal scales (Burger and Todd 2006:236; Lock and Molyneaux 2006:8). Thus, the incorporation of GIS analysis does “facilitate an almost effortless integration and display of multi-scale data and aggregation of areal units;” but, we must also remember that when we bind time and space with a GIS, we are simply creating various panoramas of possibility, or focusing an oligopticon to follow specific connections. Moreover, while a GIS can be made to reflect both the vertical and horizontal dimensions of recovered data, representation of palimpsest deposits may be difficult to realize, even when the data are separated into different layers. This requires that spatial scales be reported in terms of absolute units based on the metrics of recovery, along with comparisons of patterns at different scales with a rationale for what makes the comparison meaningful; however, we must also accept that this requires the “critical procedure of suspension, preservation, and transcendence” that allows us to take analysis at one level as far as possible, and hold that understanding while
also allowing us to shift to other scales to follow meaningful patterns (Marquardt 1992:108). The major difficulty with that approach, assuming that researchers present their procedural steps transparently, is the expectation that we will produce coherent, unified narratives that represent the totality of past reality; but, “there can be no single unified history of the world or even of some restricted place or period, only a multiscalar history written from many different points of view” (Bailey 2008:24).

The concept of scale, in both space and time, does not lend itself to convenient, universal classificatory units. Cartographic scales, expressed as a ratio of metric map units to metric units of physical space do offer a definite distance, but also rely on generalizing abstraction. Defining a predetermined extent of an area to be studied, a uniform sampling size as a grain that can be related back to the extent, and an intensity of sample, is another means of expressing the researcher’s analytical scale; however, regardless of which scales are used to make inferences about perceived patterns, it seems unlikely that patterns associated with people’s associations with particular institutions will be coterminous for every institutional attachment. This has led to the perception that cultures can be neatly bracketed, in terms of time and space; an individual researcher may relate to such conceptions as simplifications that convey a general sense of boundary, but those classifications become more inveterately rooted with ongoing research, eventually becoming fixed in the wider public’s understanding of the past. Furthermore, there is the danger of making definitions so general that they cease to be useful, such as defining a region as “smaller than
half a continent but larger than a community and its immediate catchment area” (Kowalewski 1997:291); or, so specific that an overabundance of categories must be created to deal with differences non-meaningful differences, such as defining a hamlet as “five or more houses, none of which is more than two-tenths of a mile from another” (Aiken 1985:394).

From an ANT perspective, every individual is being individualized by any number of attachments, at both the macro- and micro-scale; we can deploy an oligopticon to examine all associations in a geographic area, or we can deploy an oligopticon to investigate attachments to particular institutions, but neither will lead to a firmly bounded locale. With the locations under consideration here, there are a number of records that allow groups and anti-groups to define the settlement boundaries; however, as research moves outward, there can be no expectation that such records will surface to define other settlements. For the urban neighborhoods, it is reasonable to equate house with household; however, for the rural areas of the study, a household may not be “coresident in a dwelling or residential compound,” although the members of an extended household are likely to reside in a dwelling that is situated on property with a single legally-defined owner (Blanton 1994:5). Households, in these cases, may include not only consanguine and affinal kin, but also borders and hired laborers that reside within the bounds of the household, whether farm land or urban dwelling (although apartments or other multi-family dwellings, where there is no indication of intention for form a collective unit, should be treated separately). Unless otherwise stated, the term region is meant to entail 12 states: Alabama, Arkansas,
Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia: any area beyond a settlement, but somehow differentiated from the region as a whole, would be termed an infra-region. It is assumed that a settlement is, at the level of being co-residents of a collectively negotiated space, a community; the definition of community transcends both temporal and spatial boundaries. Specifically, to provide a comprehensive definition:

By community [we] mean small groups, such as households, bands, or tribal organisations, but also imagined groupings that may never meet yet hold some interests in common. Communities may be embedded one within another, overlap, and differ in importance, duration, interests, and internal structure. Their borders may be firm or porous (Gudeman 2005:95).

Thus, settlement co-residents may be members in many different communities, possibly including attachments that supersede those that connect them to others of the settlement. The key to evaluating such associations is whether they meaning can be transformed by the articulator, as mediators, or simply transport meaning, unchanged, from another node in the network (Latour 2005:39).

In regard to temporal scale, the first step is to acknowledge that the recovery of archaeological materials is limited by the “time depth,” to which a given assemblage of materials (including documentary evidence) can inform us, and also the “time resolution,” in terms of dating those materials and inferring temporal changes within a deposit (Bailey 2008:14). Fernand Braudel illustrates
the diachronic impacts of history on any moment in time. In his view, changes occur at different temporal scales; the “longue durée” is the scale of geological and many biological changes, “conjonctures” are the intermediate scale of changes in demography, political boundaries, and economic patterns, and “événements” are the scale at which individual interactions occur, as well as the scale at which many documentary records are published (Bintliff 2004:176). The intermediate scale can be further subdivided into conjunctures on the “geographical” scale of the “long-term demographic movements [and] the changing dimensions of states and empires,” and the shorter term conjunctures of the “economic” scale of “rates of industrialization, the fluctuations of state finances, and wars” (Braudel 1995:899).

Braudel’s categories are meant to reflect patterns of change over thousands of years, hundreds of years, decades, or the ‘quick time’ of events as they happened; this has led to questioning the utility of those scales to archaeology, where the pattern in the process of individual activities may not be discernable on the scale of “ethnographic time,” but only on the long-term scale of “archaeological time” (Smith 1992:26). Unlike anthropological work among living populations where the “ethnographer and event are isochronic” (Deetz 1988:16), even if the record of the event is put into a finalized written state after the event has occurred; however, the ultimate pursuit of archaeology is analyzing changes over long periods of time, and no matter how discontinuous, it is a largely record of the accumulation individual events that provides the archaeological record. The next question is whether or not the archaeological
record is a “distortion of the past,” only “because we do not accurately understand the relationship between statics and dynamics” (Binford 1981:200); again, this is the reason why the “synchronic statement” must be a “prelude to a diachronic explanation,” as the individual interaction communicates only an individual’s personal connection with whatever institutions have associations an activity system, and because “proceeding to diachrony without acknowledging synchrony is impossible” (Glassie 1975:8).

This study began with the creation of a synchronic depiction of the structures of the built environment or patterns of property ownership, for particular urban and rural settlements in Hillsborough County. More specifically, it is a statement about the metric distances between structures recorded by static documents, especially between residences and structures that are purported to be of particular importance to the coresidents of each settlement. The ideal would be to have structures that were still standing, but the vast majority of the original structures are long gone. That makes the use of historic documents (including oral histories and non-verbal means of documenting history), and GIS analyses, the only means of evaluating the diachronic development of these settlements.

As a study of the overall pattern of human settlements, this is certainly well within the tradition of settlement archaeology; but, we are going a step beyond that, in the assumption that the “position, arrangement, and orientation” of structures “examined at a range of scales constitutes a form of non-verbal communication, and “that spatial patterning of individuals, or of the material
component of behavior, is an ancestral trait that must predate the evolution of hominids” (Ashmore 2002:1173; Fletcher 2004:116). Most importantly, the approach of the study allows for the actors of the past, as well as the descendant communities of the present, to have a voice in the construction of the narrative about the diachronic changes shown by the documents of the historic record. In that sense, this does not represent the final report of a completed study; this is simply a necessary step, in an ongoing process that uses historic records as companions to the archaeological record, to mitigate the loss of impermanent architecture, in support of the idea that “the federal government should recognize this land as African American heritage land” (Mitchell 2000:578).

**Settlement Archaeology**

An effort to understand how small, seemingly isolated (both geographically and socio-culturally) communities integrate into larger regional settlement systems needs a methodological and theoretical organization that is capable of analyzing the household as the basic unit of a settlement, and the settlement as the basic unit of a regional distributions of loci of intensified human material behaviors. The objective is to understand how human settlements articulate with each other at differing scales, so a broadly-focused “Settlement Archaeology” will be used to determine the boundaries of multi-scalar analyses of human occupations of various landscapes throughout time. However, studying the distribution, nature, and extent of human settlements has found broad application among archaeologists, so it is necessary to state clearly both how settlements have been factored into archaeological interpretations generally and how they
will be used within this study. The temporal orientation of this study is primarily
diachronic, in the sense that it is intended to understand the nature of settlement
changes over time, and to explain which socio-cultural aspects motivate different
changes in the way humans organize themselves across the landscape (Plog
1973).

One detail shared in most of the literature regarding settlement
archaeology as a “focused methodological concept of archaeological research” is
a professed gap, covering most of the first third of the 20th century, in any
demonstrable archaeological concern for house forms, compositions, or
distributions (Chang 1972:1; Parsons 1972; Trigger 1967). It seems most typical
to credit Julian Steward, not so much for his own work during the mid-1930s, but
for “suggest[ing] to [Gordon Willey] the lack of, and necessity for, settlement
pattern studies in archaeology,” in 1945 (Willey 1953:xviii). It is Willey’s
*Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in the Virú Valley, Perú* that is generally regarded
as the seminal work “concerned with locating and mapping archaeological sites
on a regional scale with the express purpose of inferring sociological processes
from changes in site patterning through time” (1953:xvii), although Robert
Braidwood appears to have also used settlement pattern surveys as part of his
research in Syria, during the mid-1930s (Parsons 1972:128).

In later writings, Willey would state that “all-inclusive settlement pattern
study was an attempt to prepare a groundwork for an archaeological
reconstruction that would approximate a total society, not just an elite segment of
that society” (1989:170). Chang referred back to “Willey’s settlement pattern
study,“ as being the “first time” anyone had “offered a systematic methodological framework for a ‘conjunctive’ approach” that could be used for “cultural reconstruction as well as cultural relationships” (1972:2). In this study, we will be adopting the simple levels of analysis of Trigger; specifically, the 3 levels of analysis regarding settlement pattern studies are: “the individual structure, the settlement, and the settlement distributions,” which we note “includes an inquiry into both the synchronic, or structural, and diachronic, or developmental aspects” of the social relations that we are studying through settlement patterns (Trigger 1967:151). Chang adds that, on each of the 3 levels of analysis, the units of analysis represent ‘nodes’ in a network, and that “a study of the interrelationship of (‘network’) of settlement units may be said to shift up and down among these three levels” (1972:6).

This study accepts Chang’s definition of component for use in settlement pattern studies, namely “an archaeological entity within a continuous space and within a meaningful time period, and also consider the component as the “basic articulatory unit” (1972:9-10). This study has also adopted Willey’s use of “‘micropattern’ and ‘macropattern,’” as related to defining cohesive ‘community’ and interrelationships between ‘communities;’ however, here the terminology is applied to settlements rather than ‘communities’ (1989:173). The choice to use pattern is based on a desire to avoid using structure; however, we retain Chang’s understanding that macropattern involves considering “a larger sphere of time and space—to relate a number of different settlements (from two to all that have existed on earth) in many different ways for different objectives” (1967:93-94).
Thus, we retain the use of “micro-articulation” when discussing how networks are perceived and maintained within individual settlements, and “macro-articulation” when discussing how networks are perceived and maintained beyond the individual settlement (Chang 1967:94).

**The Built Environment as Non-Verbal Communication**

Amos Rapoport has contended that the environment, while not deterministic, does provide contextual cues that function to reduce the range of possible reactions to external stimuli; in short, a wide variety of environmental cues, not only the built environment, operate on humans in their environment, and they constrain culturally appropriate choices (1982:83). Specifically, since all behavior occurs in some context, and that context is based on meaning, it follows that people behave differently in different contexts by decoding the available cues for their meaning—and these cues may be in the physical environment (Rapoport 1982:69).

Within the overall environment, there are multiple elements that convey meaning; in Rapoport’s approach, the three elements are fixed-feature elements, semifixed-feature elements, nonfixed-feature elements. The fixed-feature elements are comprised of things that either do not change, or change so slowly that those changes often go unnoticed within a human lifetime, such as the natural environment or durable structures; semifixed-feature elements correspond to features that change fairly rapidly, such as decorative elements, and the nonfixed-feature elements correspond to things that are continually changing, such as a person moving around an environment (Rapoport 1982:87-
Of particular interest to this study is the concept that sites closer to the community core, “in most traditional societies,” reflect greater social status within the communities of those societies, whereas in “contemporary societies like the United States,” the opposite is more often the indicator of higher status within the society (Rapoport 1982:111).

In a chapter entitled “Building and Dwelling,” Tim Dant asserts that:

> The material form of housing reflects the cultural boundaries between different dwelling activities—working, resting, eating, sleeping, bathing, defecating. In this sense, the building contains the customs and conventions of a particular culture as well as the people who dwell together and their belongings (1999:65).

It seems that worship and formal learning need to be added to the aforementioned list of activities, at least in regards to the spatial arrangement of the buildings that represent the ideological core values that were explicitly stated at the time the community was founded (i.e. agriculture, education, and religion); however, the buildings themselves appear to have had an importance that required centrality in relationship to the surrounding agricultural properties. O.V. Burton was careful not to call for environmental determinism in looking at the development of rural agricultural communities, but he suggested that there is a need to understand the “size, spatial organization, degree of urbanization, rate of growth, economic function, voting behavior, and even different ideologies” for a sample of all known types of rural, agricultural settlements (2002:648). However, that also entails a willingness to understand the organizational development of
settlements that were initially rural, and only later engulfed by the outward spread of a growing urban center; for example, at both Alexandria, Virginia, and at Augusta, Georgia, that the “communities were formed with churches at their center, and that these communities were more likely to survive the encroachment of Euroamerican settlement in the previously peripheral locations” (Joseph 2000:111).

David Lee’s work in southeastern Florida indicated a separate, but parallel, system of central places expressed with Thiessen polygons (1992); presumably this network of nodal centers, through which knowledge-based capital and other material and non-material forms of wealth were moving, extended beyond southeast Florida. However, commercially produced goods were widely available to any area where there was a demand; so, unlike differences in consumer goods distributions which may be useful for settlements of known composition, and material representations of ideology which may be stronger for uniting all types of settlements as American, the spatial arrangement of community structures may offer insights into differences that were not drawn from the discursive consciousness of those who initially settled the community. Roland Fletcher has done some intriguing work analyzing the patterns in the use of community space, viewing the built environment as non-verbal communication; this research applies Fletcher’s models of settlement growth to an historic site in rural Hillsborough County Florida, especially attempting to find common spatial distances being used in the built environment through the multiple phases of community occupation, particularly as the community shifts to the north (Fletcher
At the scale of postbellum African American sites throughout Florida, other territorial pressures may have been brought to bear that affected how people and information moved through the physical world. Bealsville may have had particularly little boundary traffic, and relatively few interconnections with relatively few nodes beyond the community. Thus, even continuous occupations of space do not indicate the dynamics of social interactions within that space, and people may have more connections of community with other groups, at a distance, than with those that are nearer to them in space; this would reconcile the idea that African Americans moved across the landscape, between rural and urban areas, and yet still “live in areas so intensely segregated that they are almost completely isolated from other groups in society” (Mitchell 2000:535). In other words, the distances spanned by micro-articulations internal to a community cannot automatically be tallied up and transformed into macro-articulations of distant settlements, in a larger network. Moreover, buildings such as schools and churches may provide both micro-articulations that bind a settlement together as a community, and macro-articulations that signal, to outsiders, that the settlement as a whole is a member in group formations and communities beyond the physical extent of the settlement itself.

The point of taking the built environment as a form of non-verbal communication is to allow the setting of human interactions and communications to “guide, constrain, and limit behavior without being determining” (Rapoport 1982:83). The meaning communicated by each setting, as a context of action, may vary depending on reconfigurations at the level of semi-fixed features, or
depending on how the non-fixed features (i.e. humans) present themselves within the setting; these differences may radically change the meaning of fixed features of the setting, and such variations may not be readily apparent in the archaeological record. For example, a particular setting may have been used by one group during the day and another group at night; however, the palimpsest nature of the archaeological record may compress those two separate uses into one interpretive signature. At the level of fixed features, we are more likely to recover cues that suggest appropriate behaviors for all uses of a particular location, to “routinize behavior, reserving cognitive channel capacity for more important matters;” although, “before cues can be understood they must be noticed, and after one has both noticed and understood the cues, one must be prepared to obey them” (Rapoport 1982:59,236).

Thus, “environments both communicate meanings directly and also aid other forms of meaning, interaction, communication, and coaction;” in fact, the non-verbal messages (i.e. meaning) received from the environment is a source of non-human agency (Rapoport 1982:50). Furthermore, those messages may not convey the meanings intended by those originally constructed the fixed features of the built environment; and, that “inertia of the material framework” can become a source of negative feedback at the levels of the operational ontological order, and practical consciousness, long before settlement coresidents become aware of spatial disorder at the level of the discursive consciousness (Fletcher 2004:130). The built environment, then, is an important source of organizing space, time, communication, and meaning (Rapoport 1982:178-182). The
organization of space is likely to be the most visible, even archaeologically; this is the reason that the space between activity areas is so useful, because it presents a view of the overall use of the space within a site. The organization of time may be less reliably perceptible; for example, a “major through-route” may reduce the density of social interactions on the narrower roads of a neighborhood, and “speed the transmission of information and resources,” by forcing “route differentiation” choices on travelers (Fletcher 1995:138-140). From a geohistorical perspective, the routes outside a particular boundary (e.g. settlement or region) may have “conditioned the routes inside the region” (or settlement), according to the long-term levels of traffic, in people and goods, along a particular route (Kinser 1981:79).

The organization meaning and communication may be the most difficult aspects to apperceive archaeologically, in the sense that discernable patterns, as messages, are more culture specific than patterns that attest to the organization of space and time. Moreover, the messages from the material can be polysemous, conveying “high-level (ideo-technic), middle-level (socio-technic), and low-level (technomic) meanings;” most importantly, all the instrumental and latent meanings of the three levels must be considered, as “they are complementary rather than conflicting or competing” (Rapoport 1982:221-223). It may be easier to establish means of restricting, or dampening, means of communication, especially where time was influential on the overall organization of communication in an area; for example, an unbroken wall reduces the signal capacity of information from beyond the wall, although extreme noise or a
tapping code may be able circumvent those dampening effects. Furthermore, personal decorations of non-fixed features, or familiarity that mitigates the need for “locating people one does not know in social space,” may not be visible in the archaeological record at all, and environmental cues are likely to be of less importance in situations where mechanical solidarity reinforces expectations of individual behavior through commonality of expected behaviors among all actors (Rapoport 1982:183-184). In any case, since “[d]ifferent cultures have different institutions for similar activities,” the boundary of a setting (e.g. household or settlement) cannot be defined a priori, but should be based on all identified activities being “distributed’ among settings,” as an open “system of settings” (Rapoport 1990:16).

Material as Behavior

Roland Fletcher has suggested that there is a connection between the use of material behavior, including the built environment, and the mitigation of interaction stress that may prevent increasing urbanization due to lacking a previously existing communication assemblage (1995). Fletcher has pointed out repeatedly that archaeologists’ explanations of past human behaviors will not be truly satisfactory until the discipline has developed its own social theory, and that theory will have to consider the long term effects on decision making that are created by their material world (1989; 1995; 2004). This ‘material as behavior’ approach should consider metrological consistencies empirically, and consider the possibility that mathematical regularities exist in those metrologies that can contribute to understanding how the more durable materials created by humans
can affect their decisions over longer spans of time than are revealed by the short timescales of activities and speech acts; thus, the material becomes ‘an actor without intent’ (Fletcher 2004:112). The spatial messages of the built environment are a “class of slow behaviour that has effects over a wider range of timescales than active behaviour;” and, while they are learned, the complete message is not normally in view to an individual human actor, hence the message is partially perceptible and also partly an “electrochemical version of the material message” (Fletcher 1995:20,47). This should not be taken as a muddled position between humans as biological entities in the long-term, and social actors in the short-term; but, the nest building habits of higher primates, such as gorillas, does suggest “that spatial patterning, whether of individuals or of the material component of behavior, is an ancestral trait that must predate the evolution of the hominids” (Fletcher 2004:116).

The generation and maintenance of such spatial messages from the environment does not depend upon actors being conscious of the spacing used, or upon exacting measurements in normal interaction; however, “the structures of a settlement act as a communication device transmitting a message about a way in which space can be arranged in the horizontal plane” (Fletcher 1984:197). The attempts to interpret these non-verbal, material messages have primarily taken two forms, and both are selectionist premises; in short, there is no assumption that deteriorating material conditions, or the negative effects of material inertia, will be corrected through conscious changes, although existing material and social behaviors may be used innovatively to contend with a milieu
that does not satisfactorily meet existing needs. The first use has been to assess “all the types of spacings we can identify in a settlement;” and, once all identifiable measurements have been taken, to look for clustering in measurements of each specific type of feature (e.g. room lengths, or doorway widths), and to consider how nonconforming measurements might signal material dissonance as spatial disorder that has a deleterious effect on the normal conduct of social action and verbal meaning (Fletcher 1984:197; 1991:37-38; 2004:133). The second use has been brought to bear on the topic of urbanization, as an indicator of interaction-communication stress; the underlying premise of this use is that compact settlements (i.e. above 10 people per hectare) are constrained by the area that can be adequately covered by the existing communication assemblage, in an environment of increasing stress from a high density of social interactions (Fletcher 1995). The interaction-communication stress model assumes that as settlement “density ceiling decreases with an increase in community size” that allows for “more space per person because they increasingly subject to more interaction effects which increase exponentially” (Fletcher 1995:71).

In the first use, the basis for interpretation is “the simple, hypothetical description of a spatial message [that] provides a succinct paradigm for the relationship between variation and the pattern of central tendencies in a material message system” (Fletcher 1995:40). In the cases under study here, we do not have sufficient preservation of the built environment, from the period of initial settlement, to analyze spatial utilization for specific types of structures; however,
we do have two rural settlements that are similar in every respect, except for the race of the residents. The existence of a series of maps showing the locations of structures, in each of the rural settlements, provides us with an opportunity to study the central tendency and variation in measurements between structures in those communities, especially between domestic structures and those that were the site of providing group services (i.e. schools) or group rituals (i.e. churches). In the study of urban uses of space, we have the opportunity to study the effect of population density on neighborhood development; and, in one case, we are able to examine a rural settlement that was absorbed into an urban periphery, and compare its spatial signature to that of the communities that remained rural. The comparison between the rural settlements does provide “equivalent cases which can be consistently defined;” but, the singular distinction of race, between two settlements formed by connected groups of Baptists, allows us to “study the relationship between dissimilar, linked entities” (Fletcher 1977:67). The use of the interaction-communication stress model, on neighborhoods within a single urban setting, is somewhat different than the original use; however, it should be noted that the social restrictions on relocation did create firm boundaries for the neighborhoods, and the model is useful as a means of estimating interaction stress within crowded neighborhoods, and suggesting a means of understanding the ongoing expansion of the original neighborhoods, including their present configurations.

Another possible difference in understanding, due to the novelty of uses for these models, is that there may well be a “direct correlation between variation
and population size,” which is not expected in the typical uses (Fletcher 1977:79). One factor that might impinge on the normal growth of African American communities, especially after 1877, might be the loss of land due to poor climatic conditions leading to failure to remit mortgage payments, with subsequent loss of property; if new properties cannot be acquired outside the existing settlement, then the only option may be to subdivide properties that have remained under the control of settlement residents, and that would lead to a steady decrease in variation. This study does consider overall differences in the number of times an original property has been subdivided, and the mean size of lots created by such divisions; but, a reduction of variation might provide a different insight, based on structures being built to house people separately, on land that has not been legally transferred to a new owner. Simply put, the number of property subdivisions in the rural communities could be similar, masking the possibility of informal transfer of property between family members; thus we must consider both the number of subdivisions, and the reduction of variation in the spacing of structures within each community. To some extent, the centrality of socially important structures depends on visual inspection of the resulting maps, although the visual perception of centrality should be taken in conjunction with changes in central tendencies.

**Research Design and Meta-Design**

Given that a unified narrative is not always an expected outcome, it may be prudent to discuss this project in terms of its final outcomes, and research design. The following sections should not be regarded as a finished project, to
be shelved prior to moving on to a new project. In taking an ANT approach, it would seem disingenuous to suggest that research grants, contractually obligated scope of work agreements, and the requirements of academic programs do not create boundaries that constrain what will be included in an individual report; but, each report is simply a new staging point for planning the next phase of research, as boundary object between research opportunities and community objectives. The final report will seldom provide closure, only a “reflection space” that “communicate and facilitate shared understandings across spatial, temporal, conceptual, or technological gaps” between “Communities of Practice” and “Communities of Interest” (Fischer 2000:531; 2004:156-157). This is where the concept of meta-design comes to the fore, and the report becomes a “seed” to share with our research partners in descendent communities; if our fellow researchers are to become equal contributors, then they must be included before the first phase of “evolutionary growth,” and they should be empowered to share in the direction of “reseeding” rather than just correcting the potential misperceptions of the earliest phases of research (Fischer 2007:197, 202).

The truly critical phase of this research cannot begin until this first phase has been approved by an academic committee (as a Community of Practitioners), and subsequently presented to the various descendent communities documented by this phase of the research (as Communities of Interest). However, those communities cannot be the only ones involved. To become truly useful, this program of research must seek out, and engage, similar programs of research and similar descendent communities (even those that now only exist in the
memories of descendents). The larger questions of how historically black settlements, both rural and urban, are patterned across ever vaster territories, to what social and economic extents were people incorporated into neighboring communities, and to what extent their material environments have been preserved, whether as contemporary built environments or in maps and primary documents, oral traditions, or only in the archaeological record, can only be answered by creating partnerships between descendent, academic, and governmental agencies.

Our meta-design has to create both “an immersive environment [that] allows stakeholders to become deeply engaged in problem solving in the context of information, action, reflection, and collaborations relevant to the situation,” and also “an emergent environment [that] addresses the need for this context to grow and evolve based on ongoing problem-solving activities (Fischer 2000:533). One of the issues with many studies of African American history is the bias of the literature, and that cannot be allowed to perpetuate an analysis based on “failure studies” (Woodson 1989:1028). The point is not to “highlight the most extreme and unusual aspects…as seen from outside and above,” and report to governmental agencies as paternalistic benefactors to be brought in to fix problems (Wacquant 1997:342). These areas cannot be “analyzed wholly in terms of lack and deficiencies (individual or collective) rather than by positively identifying the principles that underlie [their] internal order and govern [their] specific mode of functioning;” for the settlements that still exist, there must be far
more right than wrong, for them to have continued to function (Wacquant 1997:342).

The advantage, and the burden, of working with recent spatial patterns is that they can be used to explain, and ameliorate any deleterious effects that are associated with the development of those patterns. There are negative issues, but we must also consider how communities sustain themselves despite such issues. One such issue that has long been a focus of urban economics is the impact of residential segregation and job decentralization on unemployment. Such studies normally emphasize the use of dissimilarity indices that reflect how many people would need to move from their present location to create an even distribution for a given administrative area, and isolation indices that reflect how the concentration of a specified group into a particular subsection of an administrative area (Boustan and Margo 2009; Glaeser and Vigdor 2001; Massey 2001). Urban economists frequently do a thorough job of tracking historic changes, but often cover so many administrative areas that illustrative maps are not feasible (Bailey 1973; Weinberg 2000; Wright 1987).

In a study of 195 metropolitan statistical areas, including 34 with populations over 1 million, it was suggested that “[a] one standard deviation reduction of black centralization would reduce the black-white employment gap by 17-22 [percent] for the average individual 18-30” (Weinberg 2000:126). If the dissimilarity indices of those same metropolitan areas was reduced to almost zero, meaning that the demographics of any subsection in an administrative area reflected the overall demographics, then the black-white employment gap could
be reduced by roughly half for most age ranges and education levels (Weinberg 2000:126). Tampa did see some reduction in overall residential segregation during the 1970s, but the trend slowed in the 1980s (Massey 2001:402). The three main trends are “clustering” which occurs when neighborhoods coalesce, “centralization” which occurs when a particular population lives primarily in the urban center, and “concentration” into relatively small geographic sections of an administrative area (Massey 2001:409). The reasons for a black-white employment gap range from prejudices in hiring policies, to poor availability of public transportation between residential areas. At this stage, the goal is to determine the level of clustering, centralization, and concentration of black residential areas, which can then be used as the basis for bringing together government administrators and residents to develop mutually agreed upon goals.

One of the most promising means of building cooperative heritage management plans, between Communities of Practice and Communities of Interest, is to establish potential TCPs before they are threatened with a proposed change. TCPs are all places that are important to at least one person that claims an affiliation between the place and some traditional, cultural value, and that affiliation is reflected by at least one of the following: spiritual power, practice, stories, therapeutic quality, and remembrances (King 2003:100-105). All of the places be discussed here have in common a minimum of complete structures that might be eligible as historic properties, but they do a have a place in the memories of living descendants. However, it is not necessary to wait until they are further threatened by development to become the subjects of local
ethnographies that serve to establish their “traditional cultural
significance…derived from the role the property plays in the community’s
historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices” (Parker and King 1998:1).
There may well be cultural properties that have significance to a specific group’s
traditions that are not likely to be shared with outsiders until some proposed
change would affect that locale, but many properties that could be included are
frequent subjects of local stories, which is one way to identify possible TCPs
(King 2003:102).

In the case of Bealsville, “the patterns of land use reflect the cultural
traditions valued by its long term residents” (Parker and King 1998:1). Moreover,
there are numerous cases where property is owned by descendants of the
community’s founders. In the cases of Willow and urban Tampa, there have
been previous archaeological studies which suggest they be eligible on the basis
of academic value (Panamerican Consultants 2001; Weisman and Collins 2004a,
b). By creating a spatial database of these areas, in a GIS format, we can
continue documenting the areas as potential TCPs. The key is to tie together all
information, spatially, so that as future changes are proposed they can be met
with areas of potential effect for which alternative plans might be developed.
This sort of proactive scoping could prevent needless stress on those who hold
places to be traditionally significant, and reduce needless expenditures on
redesigning plans and court appearances when partially completed projects are
contested by public stakeholders.
Chapter 5:

Research Methods

Studying built environments that often no longer exist as standing structures is decidedly the province of archaeology. However, studying the environment as a means of non-verbal communication opens up a means of connecting the environment of the past and the environment of the present, with the continuity of an ongoing discourse. Unfortunately, this study does not include subsurface exploration of the archaeological properties within the rural communities under study; however, this is seen as the first step toward filling in enough gaps in the information to allow for minimally invasive future explorations. The bulk of the information in this study, at least to this point, has been the result of reviewing historic documents regarding early land tenure in eastern Hillsborough County, Florida.

Throughout the course of research, many different types of documents have been reviewed, including county tax rolls going back to 1883, United States Census Bureau records, and Florida census records; however, the key to understanding the earliest phases of property ownership in the communities of Springhead and Bealsville, stems from the General Land Office (GLO) records for properties that were actually deeded to settlers in T29S, R22E. Fortunately, the records are accessible online through the Land Boundary Information System (LABINS); the same website also supplies the original color plat maps used by
GLO available, true color Digitally Orthorectified Quarter Quads (DOQQs) from 2004, and Digital Raster Graphics (DRGs) of United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5' topographic quad maps (Florida Department of Environmental Protection 2007; Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of State Lands, Board of Trustees Land Document System 2007). Once distances were calculated, consideration was given to normality of the distribution figures; however, since the presented samples are not randomly selected, only the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was considered to compare the distance found in the rural communities. The normality of distance distributions were tested with SPSS; however, all further statistical analyses were conducted, and associated figures were created, with PAST (Hammer et al. 2001).

The distances to a theoretical community center, in the preliminary research phase, were calculated based on known residents of the eastern half of T29S, R22E and were accurate for a basic breakdown of white versus black residents in the area; however, some of the white property owners, while sometimes related to residents determined to be part of the Springhead community, were later determined to have been residents of Trapnell, Hopewell, Turkey Creek, or even the southern edge of Plant City (Robinson 1928:81-82). Furthermore, a few of the known founders of the Bealsville community were discovered to have been granted deeds to properties in T30S, R22E. The GLO records for Hillsborough County include information about the recipient of the deed for each parcel of land, and also a text description of where that land was located; using that information, it was possible to georeference the GLO color
plat map to an actual physical location on the Earth’s surface, and associate those property records with the names of the deed recipients. A number of other historical maps were also georeferenced, including county road maps from 1934 and 1958 (Publication of Archival Library and Museum Materials 2007), and each of those contributed to an understanding of property ownership, and/or changing land uses. Ultimately, due to lack of evidence for where actual structures were located, the GLO records primarily served to confirm information from other historic sources about the identity of the early settlers of both rural settlements.

For 1916, the Dixie Survey Company map was available to show the positions of houses in the rural study area, along with names of property owners and the acreage they owned; for later structures, the ArcGIS software was used to digitize the structures shown on the USGS 7.5’ topographic quad map (University of Alabama 2007). For the 1947 and 1984 structures, there were no maps available that showed the locations of residences specifically; therefore, it was decided to digitize the structures shown on the 1955 USGS 7.5’ Nichols Quad topographic map, with structures from 1947 aerial photographs shown in black and structures from 1984 aerial photographs shown in purple. The earlier location of the Antioch Baptist Church was confirmed by the oral testimony of G.S. Cunningham, who was young church member when the building was moved, and the stated location was consistent with the land use depicted in the 1938 aerial photographs showing cleared land across from the Pine Hill Cemetery and the apparent trail that was used to move the building over Howell’s Creek to the church’s present location on the west side of Horton Road.
(Hillsborough County and City of Tampa Water Atlas 2007). The locations of the Baptist church in Springhead were reconstructed from historical maps, historical aerial photographs, contemporary color DOQQs, and contemporary Hillsborough County property appraiser land ownership records. Due to the restrictions of the license for the available version of ArcGIS, the data were exported to Quantum GIS to calculate distance matrices between all structures, and between general structures and the proposed socially important structures of churches and schools (Quantum GIS Development Team 2010). The results are reported as both summary statistics, which are used as a convenient indicator of overall variation in the built environment through time.

The locations of the historically black neighborhoods of urban Tampa were digitized according to the descriptions of the Raper report; however, the boundaries of Dobyville were defined according to a St. Petersburg Times newspaper article, and the boundaries of Ybor City and the Scrub neighborhoods were defined according to a map in More Than Black: Afro-Cubans in Tampa (Greenbaum 2002:86; Tubbs 2008). All structures in Tampa locations were digitized on the basis of Sanborn maps; the maps were acquired in PDF format, from the Tampa-Hillsborough Public Library, converted to JPG images, and georeferenced within ArcGIS (Tampa-Hillsborough County Public Library System 2007). Since some road routes have changed throughout the period under study, and the roads themselves may have been widened to accommodate more traffic, the measurement function of ArcGIS was used to ensure that the proper scale of the Sanborn maps was maintained. Most importantly, the Robles Pond
neighborhood is used to represent a community that was originally rural in character, and outside the Tampa city limits; moreover, the community had a documented schoolhouse, and both Baptist and A.M.E. churches, to provide community focal points. In the case of Robles Pond, the 1922 and 1931 Sanborn maps were used to digitize structures, and as the basis for distance calculations between domestic structures and the proposed socially important structures.

The populations recorded by Dr. Mays, in 1927, were used along with the total areas of the respective neighborhood, as a measure of historic population densities. For comparison, and to document neighborhood coalescence, the 2000 U.S. census block groups were used, along with demographic data, to show the current distribution of African Americans. The demographic data was appended to the spatial data using the official block group codes as a primary key. The same information was also utilized at the county level, for the 795 census block groups from the 2000 U.S. Census.

For Willow, the structures were digitized based on a hand-drawn map from an unpublished manuscript of oral histories that has been preserved by the descendants of the mill owners, and from a visual inspection of a georeferenced 1938 aerial photograph. The boarding house for single men was not used in conducting spatial analyses because it remains uncertain as to whether it was inhabited by both black and white employees. The owners’ houses were also excluded because some family members appear to have only been in Willow on weekends, returning to Tampa during the week so that the children could attend school there. The commissary, and the various buildings associated with the
operation of the mill would have been socially important buildings, but their location was likely to have been highly affected by access to transportation networks.
Chapter 6:

Results

The initial settlement of Bealsville remained close to the tributaries of the North Prong of the Alafia (Figure 5). Of the rural settlements considered here, the level of settlement nucleation was greatest at Bealsville, and the residents of the town were clearly willing to expend a great deal of time (~3 weeks) to move the existing Antioch Baptist Church, on log rollers (over a creek), from where it had ended up on the periphery of the community, to a close approximation of the mid-1920s center of town. Roughly a decade later, more community activism would lead to the community’s new schoolhouse being built at that same central location (Klugh 2004). There definitely appears to have been a consideration of centrality in the placement of the Baptist churches in both communities; however, in Bealsville, the Baptist church occupied a central position early in the community’s history, then found itself on the periphery, and was physically moved back to a more central location (Figure 6). Early in the history of both communities, drastic weather conditions placed an extraordinary strain on the abilities of the residents of both communities to retain possession of their land; the severe winter frosts of the mid-1890s forced many of those residents to sell off their properties and move on to greener pastures, so to speak.

The earliest properties of Springhead were also located near the tributaries of the North Prong of the Alafia (Figure 7). The Springhead Baptist
Figure 5. GLO Locations of Bealsville Founder Properties
Figure 6. Growth of Bealsville’s Built Environment
church was originally on the property of the Howell family, who constitute one of the elite families of that community; however, the position of that church was on the western edge of that community (Figure 8). That might reflect a connection with the families of Trapnell. For example, the Sparkman family had large land holding in both Trapnell and Springhead. In 1948, the property of the Springhead Baptist church was sold to a Methodist church, and a new Baptist church was built on the northeastern edge of that community; however, in 1979, the Baptist church was rebuilt toward the center of the community, and that ushered in a period of community growth. In truth, the present community that is in the location where the Springhead community (which sometimes appears on maps as Springhead Park) was initially sited does not have much of a connection to the original founders of the community, whereas the Bealsville location has been a fairly stable community, and many of the current property owners are consanguine kin of the settlers that were originally deeded the property. The earliest locations of Bealsville’s Antioch Baptist church remain something of a mystery, including a “brush arbor” church that is commonly reported as serving as the earliest church for the community.

Interestingly, beyond the impacts of weather, and the ever present land speculators looking to acquire land for either the Seaboard Air Line Railroad, or various phosphate mining interests, the building of State Road 60 separated the southern third of the Bealsville community from the properties to the north. State Road 60 was laid down in the 1920s-1930s, and it appears to have hastened the loss of property to the south of that major road. As that property was lost, new
Figure 7. GLO Locations of Springhead Founder Properties
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Figure 8. Growth of Springhead’s Built Environment
property was gained to the northwest, bringing Bealsville into closer contact with the boundary for Trapnell. For a period of time, that left the Antioch Baptist Church on the southern edge of the Bealsville community (Table 1). For Table 1,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>169.52</td>
<td>54.68</td>
<td>54.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>2866.54</td>
<td>2437.16</td>
<td>2460.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>963.48</td>
<td>963.51</td>
<td>1015.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1178.73</td>
<td>977.79</td>
<td>1030.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>792.58</td>
<td>460.58</td>
<td>479.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“number” represents the number of structures measured from, and the summary statistics represent distance in meters. In Springhead, the movement of the Baptist church to the settlement perimeter seems purposeful, possibly to signal community values to drivers on the road to Mulberry (Table 2). For Table 2, “number” represents the number of residences in the community, and the summary statistics represent distance in meters. For Bealsville, the earlier location of the Antioch Baptist church would not have fronted on the newly created State Road. However, if that had been desired, then it would have been
easier to move in that direction than over Howell’s Creek and farther north. This seems to support that the buildings were socially important for both communities; but, in Springhead it was used to communicate to people outside the community, and in Bealsville it was used to communicate community cohesion to settlement residents.

Since residential locations were only confirmed for the 1916 community extents, those are the only structures where the names of property owners are known. However, the spatial relationships of all structures to the Baptist churches, for each community, were analyzed through the Quantum GIS software, and the PAST statistical package. The mean distances of each community’s residence, to their respective Baptist churches, were compared statistically. Due to the small, non-randomly selected sample size, they were, once again, compared using a Mann-Whitney U test. With the adjustments made to exclude settlers that were later attributed to other communities, to include more Bealsville founders, and with residences being compared to known structures for each community’s focal point, the results were much different. Moreover, with residents definitely assigned to specific communities only distances to the individual community’s church was measured, instead of considering distances to each separately.

The results indicated that the 2 communities were not statistically different, at least in terms of the 1916 mean distances between residence and local Baptist church (for 1916, $U=158$, $p=0.286$), but they are different for the 1947 and 1984 distances (for 1947, $U=7570$, $p<0.001$; for 1984, $U=59293$, $p<0.001$). The two
settlements were also distinct in terms of distance to school, in both 1947 (U=11351, p=0.010) and 1984 (U=64361, p=<0.001), which are the two dates for which the school locations are definite (Table 3). For Table 3, the “number” indicates the number of structures from which measurements were taken, and the summary statistics represent distance in meters. However, there do seem to be some consistencies in residence locations at both communities; specifically, the majority of the 1916 residences were placed at or above the 100-foot contour interval indicated on the 1955 USGS 7.5’ topographic quad map, and they also seem to indicate a preference for “somewhat poorly drained soils” (Figure 9). For the Bealsville community, there does seem to be a tendency to place houses closer to the dominant linear water features of Howell’s Branch of the North Prong of the Alafia River, and Howell’s Creek; and, although the residence sitings are still at or above the 100-foot contour, there is a greater likelihood that the house was situated over “poorly drained” soils.

The population densities of both rural communities are below the 10 people per hectare density threshold, where communication systems might limit the growth of the settlement, although the distances between all structures show

Table 3. Bealsville and Springhead Distances to Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bealsville Distances</th>
<th>Springhead Distances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>102.02</td>
<td>102.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>2461.27</td>
<td>2482.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1005.02</td>
<td>1018.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1023.14</td>
<td>1062.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>503.16</td>
<td>520.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9. Soil Drainages for Bealsville and Springhead
change over time (Table 4, Table 5). For Tables 4 and 5, “number” reflects the number of measurements from structure to structure, and the summary statistics represent distance in meters. Figure 10 depicts the comparative development trajectory for both communities, according to measurements of distance between every structure. For 1916, the mean distances between structures are almost the same, and there is actually less variation between structures in the Springhead settlement; however, in 1947 the mean distances in Bealsville are roughly 78 percent of those in Springhead, and in 1984 the mean distances in Bealsville are about 75 percent of those in Springhead. Similarly, the variation in distance between structures, in terms of standard deviation, in 1947 Bealsville is about 79 percent of that in Springhead, and in 1984 it is about 75 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bealsville Structure to Structure Distances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 4</strong>. Bealsville Structure to Structure Distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bealsville</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 5. Springhead Structure to Structure Distances |
|                                           |
|                                           |
| **Table 5**. Springhead Structure to Structure Distances |
|                                           |
| **Springhead**                             | 1916 | 1947 | 1984 |
| Number                                     | 306  | 45156| 243542|
| Minimum                                    | 114.88| 19.15| 18.25 |
| Maximum                                    | 3068.27| 4440.10| 4655.76|
| Median                                     | 1481.29| 1606.24| 1757.45|
| Mean                                       | 1515.39| 1664.51| 1821.80|
| SD                                         | 677.15| 835.10| 938.58 |
Interestingly, both settlements show a similar increase in distance between structures; however, in Bealsville, it appears that structures were being built in between existing structures, creating a new starting point before the community started to spread out again. This may well reflect a point in time where the community was not able to acquire new property at its outer boundary, although normal outward growth does appear to have resumed.

The data regarding the number of property subdivisions were also gleaned from the Hillsborough County property appraiser’s records for the current, through 2008, properties within the boundaries of the properties that were originally deeded to the founders of the Bealsville and Springhead communities (Figure 11). The only comparison made herein is between those original
property boundaries and the current number of separate tracts that cross a given property. As a consequence, it is possible that properties being considered were aggregated and disaggregated numerous times, during the intervening years. For example, it can be seen on the 1916 Dixie Survey map that the lands originally deeded to Bryant Horton and Elias Dexter were consolidated into the holdings of the Coronet Phosphate Company; later, many of those same lands were reacquired by the wealthier Bealsville residents, such as Alfred Beal and O.V. Hargrett. It is precisely that pattern of reacquiring lost properties, and keeping them within the Bealsville community that formed the basis of renaming the settlement, in 1923, to honor Alfred Beal’s part in securing a continued existence as unified community. However, it should be remembered that what is important here is how the cycle of property loss and reacquisition affected the size of available properties across the settlement, and the position of new residences.

Subdivisions were recorded by number, without differentiating the size of the component properties. However, along the northern boundary of the Springhead community and the southern boundary of the Bealsville community, several properties were actually integrated into larger parcels rather than subdivided. Generally, in the cases of both communities, properties that were integrated into larger properties were never reacquired from phosphate mining interests, and they are currently either still held by phosphate mining companies
Property Divisions
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Figure 11. Subdivision of Founder Properties Through 2008
or are being used as agricultural land outside the present-day community of Bealsville. The properties that were integrated into larger parcels were considered to have been removed from their respective communities, for purposes of comparing the extent to which the original properties were divided.

For the Springhead community, given a hypothetical equal division of all properties, there would be an expected lot of around 2.48 acres. However, the former property of Joseph Howell was sold to a planned subdivision; and, if that property is removed from consideration, then an expectation of equal division would yield an expectation of 3.11 acre lots. For the Bealsville community, given a hypothetical equal division of properties, there would be an expected lot of 3.9 acres. However, if the properties that were integrated into larger parcels are removed from consideration, then there would be an expected lot of 3.32 acres. The calculation of divided acreage is based on the actual divisions of the original GLO deeded properties. When corrected for properties that are no longer within their respective communities, they seem to indicate that the original Bealsville properties were less divided than the Springhead properties. Tables 6 and 7 show that name of the person to whom properties were initially deeded, the number of acres they were deeded, the number of separate properties on that land in 2008, and the mean acreage based on the original acres and total number of subdivisions.

One consequence of dividing farmland into smaller residential lots, especially given the poor soil drainage conditions in the area, has been an increased prevalence in flooding following any substantial rain; since Bealsville’s
general elevation is lower than Springhead, it has affected the former community
to a greater extent. The reported flooding is attributable to the poor drainage of

Table 6. Property Dispositions of Bealsville Founders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Deed</th>
<th>Original Acres</th>
<th>Subdivisions</th>
<th>Mean Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Eva</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beal, Alfred</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry, Isaac</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyatt, Bacchus</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter, Elias</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter, John</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter, Riley M.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover, William</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes, Edmund</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry, Neptune</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloman, Mills</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton, Bryant</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton, Samuel</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segenger, Abraham</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons, Newton</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Roger</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens, Bryant</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens, Rosa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story, Robert</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Consolidated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the soils; however, before the properties were divided into so many house lots
and before there were so many paved roads running through the area, local
residents Andrew Williams and Samuel Berry had been responsible for deciding
when it was time to manually dig drainage ditches through the farmland, to drain
into the natural linear water features of the area (Brown and Brown 2003:269-
270). Unfortunately, it has not been possible to document the flooding, so that
Hillsborough County could be informed of the worst areas for flooding and
develop an action plan for mitigating the local flooding problems. It should not
come as any great surprise to Hillsborough County that there is flooding in the
Table 7. Property Dispositions of Springhead Founders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Deed</th>
<th>Original Acres</th>
<th>Subdivisions</th>
<th>Mean Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell, Charles H.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan, Nathaniel C.</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemons, William</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devane, Mary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Andrew</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Cornelius</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, William</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrell, Arrindy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrell, Benjamin T.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell, Cornelius R.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell, Joseph</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell, Sarah</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell, T. J.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClelland, Silas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Daniel R.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring, William H.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears, Hiram</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sistrunk, Moses H.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sistrunk, William H.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkman, Bird</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

area, not only due to recent changes in land use, as they first noted that the area was prone to drainage issues in a 1941 County Land Use Planning report (Hillsborough County 1941:56-57).

The urban Tampa neighborhood of Robles Pond presents an interesting contrast to the Bealsville settlement, although the position of proposed socially important structures is not definite for the period when it was a rural settlement well outside the boundary of Tampa, in the late 19th century. Table 8 shows the "number" of residences in the Robles Pond neighborhood for 1922 and 1931, and the summary statistics represent distance in meters. Robles Pond was still outside the boundary of Tampa proper, although the town had
Table 8. Robles Pond Distances to Community Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Robles Pond School</th>
<th>AME Church</th>
<th>Baptist Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>19.79</td>
<td>47.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>313.49</td>
<td>233.69</td>
<td>418.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>147.57</td>
<td>126.16</td>
<td>241.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>160.96</td>
<td>128.37</td>
<td>243.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>76.79</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>94.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

grown out well beyond the settlement; the 1922 Sanborn map is actually a supplemental volume that documents the growth of Tampa’s built environment, and the need to determine fire hazards in the growing town. In 1922, there were 55 residences in the Robles Park neighborhood; and, by 1931, the number of domiciles had grown to 139 (Figure 12). The most striking change is in the positioning of what is, here, being termed socially important structures; in this case, a school, a Baptist church, and an A.M.E. church. The school was toward the center of the community in 1922, but the churches were both at the boundary of the neighborhood; as in Springhead, this may mean that signaling community values to those outside the settlement was more important than centrality to the early residents of Robles Pond. Still, the school was moved to an even more central location during the intervening decade, and both churches were either moved or rebuilt in more central positions; in all 3 cases, the mean distance and standard deviation of residence to church or school was reduced, due to both residential in-filling and structure repositioning.

Using residential density as a measure of interaction-communication stress was a bit more problematic. Although opportunities to live outside the
Figure 12. Robles Pond in 1922 and 1931
eight neighborhoods were restricted, at least 200 black Tampans lived outside those neighborhoods. Moreover, while none of the neighborhoods exceeded postulated interaction limits as a whole, it is not clear how a bounded neighborhood might deal with such stresses (as opposed to discrete settlements). As an individual block within a neighborhood, the 44 Quarters reached 518 people per hectare (0.41 hectares in area), which would put it near the interaction limit. There is no indication of how that borderline stress manifested explicitly negative living conditions, though it was eventually demolished and replaced by a Catholic church.

Looking at the contemporary population demographics of the 2000 census, it is clear that residential segregation is still an issue in Tampa; the 2000 census lists Tampa as having a population that is 26.1 percent African American, and only 112 out of 336 census block groups have at least that composition (Figure 13). The neighborhoods that exceed the total population, by 2-3 times the overall percentage, appear to have developed by aggregation of neighborhoods that bordered the original eight neighborhoods listed by Dr. Mays. The data from Ybor City should be excluded because the population density is misleading, as the demographics of that neighborhood would have included many Cubans that were not counted in the population estimates (Table 9). There is a similar level of residential concentration for Hillsborough County, although the countywide African American population was 14.8 percent of the overall population in 2000. Only 205, out of the total of 795 in Hillsborough County, block groups were occupied by at least the expected average number of African American
Figure 13. Black Residential Centralization in Tampa (2000)
(Figure 14). A quick estimate of the general level of isolation can be ascertained by deducting the overall percentage from the actual percentage of African American in any given concentration of block groups.

Table 9. Neighborhood Population Densities in Tampa (1927)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Pop. (1927)</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Hill</td>
<td>4094</td>
<td>118.81</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobyville / West Hyde Park</td>
<td>2835</td>
<td>66.21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robles Pond</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scrubb</td>
<td>8362</td>
<td>33.36</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Avenue</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tampa</td>
<td>3331</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ybor City</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>148.83</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Willow are quite dissimilar, due to only the white workers traveling away from the town to attend churches and/or school. In both cases, the distances are reported in meters, but it may be more convenient to convert the figures to kilometers for the white workers. Table 10 shows the distances of black residences, in meters, to the church and school provided by the lumber company, while the distances for white residences are simply the distance to Wimauma. This does suggest that, overall, macro-articulations with other local

Table 10. Distances to Group Services for Willow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willow</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Wimauma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>62.94</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>7888.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>529.21</td>
<td>524.00</td>
<td>8355.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>189.95</td>
<td>180.90</td>
<td>8011.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>246.41</td>
<td>242.36</td>
<td>8037.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>151.22</td>
<td>151.32</td>
<td>126.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14. Black Residential Concentration in Hillsborough County (2000)
communities were more extensive among the white employees of Willow.

However, since there do not appear to have been any official restrictions on black employees movements away from company property, it is entirely possible that there were macro-articulations with other African American communities.
Chapter 7: Discussion

The level of nucleation at Bealsville does seem incongruent with the dominant pattern of the Cotton Belt throughout the agricultural South. Bealsville was even more nucleated than comparable Florida sites like the Zion settlement in Marion County, Florida. The white settlers of Springhead also worshipped together, and sent their children to school together; however, their settlement pattern was clearly more dispersed than seen at Bealsville. There are some consistencies between Bealsville and reported settlement nucleation in other sugarcane producing areas; this issue must be addressed, so that an adequate regional distinction can be made between Florida and other cane-producing regions of the South. The obvious community-oriented structures, such as the Antioch Baptist Church or the Historic Glover School, appear to have represented ideational attitudes toward the place of Christian religion and public education in the development of their community; the centrality of the buildings, relative to the surrounding agricultural demesnes, seems to have been important enough for a small, agricultural community to use a few weeks worth of the community’s aggregate “leisure” time (although they did play several baseball games over those few weeks, so they didn’t entirely abandon leisure) (Klugh 2004:125). Based on comparisons with the Robles Park neighborhood, the placement of socially important structures, during and immediately following the
Reconstruction, may have been based more on signaling participation in American life generally; however, following the inception of Jim Crow laws, and their subsequent entrenchment and expansion, African American communities that were able to expend the resources may have seen those structures as more important to providing intra-community focal points.

One of the saving graces for the Bealsville community seems to have been its isolation, more than its geographic territory circumscription from surrounding water features, and unusable scrub lands. The isolation factor, in conjunction with a reliance on subsistence-level truck vegetable agriculture, allowed the original settlers of Bealsville to survive through lean years. They also required the contribution of a “homegrown” bourgeois class to ameliorate living conditions for the poorer members of the community, and even to preserve the contemporary existence of the community; in the earliest phase of settlement, the Bealsville settlers did benefit from initial neo-paternalistic ties, from their slavery-era owners-turned-benevolent caretakers, at least until selected properties had been surveyed and begun to show a return on labor investment. Ultimately, the conditions that prevailed at Bealsville did not force the geographically circumscribed residents to abandon the site of their community; although, negative environmental impacts on crop production, the discovery of pebble phosphate, and in the case of Bacchus Clyatt the decision to move out of the area, did contribute to the changing configuration of Bealsville’s built environment. Even more remarkably, much of the land is still in the hands of the descendants of the original settlers, many of whom still live on the same land that was
originally settled by their direct ancestors (e.g. the recently deceased Dr. Sam Horton, former president of the local chapter of the NAACP, owned the land that was deeded to his grandfather, and his great-grandfather). Instead of the more commonly asserted “wanderlust,” that allegedly preceded the mass-scale migrations of African Americans from the South, at Bealsville we see a commitment to band together as a unified community, one that was fairly self-contained until well into the 20th century. Still, the contacts between the two rural communities appear to have been based on negotiating shared use of boundary space (e.g. springs as swimming holes); in terms of population movements, the closest options for Bealsville residents were toward contacts in the highly segregated neighborhoods of urban Tampa, or toward other rural African American sites.

In regard to the division of properties, from founding to the present, eastern Hillsborough County does not provide evidence that African Americans subdivided property due to an inability to acquire new property through purchase. However, the existence of Springhead to the immediate northeast, and Trapnell to the immediate northwest, would have made southward the only direction open to regular outward expansion; while there were no nucleated settlements to the immediate south of Bealsville, the 1916 Dixie Survey map shows that phosphate companies had a strong interest in that area, and those properties may not have been available in the early decades of the 20th century (Figure 15). The change in variation of measurements, between 1916 and 1947, suggests that there was
a significant change in the number of structures on each property; in Bealsville, there is a drop in both central tendency and variation, from 1916 to 1947, before Figure 15. 1916 Dixie Survey Map Showing Property Owners returning to what appears to be a normal growth trajectory. As this research progresses, it will be valuable to get insight from community members regarding
the informal allocation of property. If there was no formal change in documented ownership, then the properties would appear to have remained aggregated in primary documents, such as tax rolls; so, there may have also been an informal division of other assets, as resources were pooled between property coresidents, to make payments to external governmental entities. This would be difficult to ascertain through archaeological evidence alone, and will depend on personal recollections.

There are a few broad trends in the transfer of properties that are made clear through the available historic maps. Through the 1880s, only the Plant Investment Company, the Central & Peninsular Railroad, and the Florida Internal Improvement Fund held title to the land around the founders of Bealsville and Springhead. By 1916, the Euro-American settlers in the southeastern quadrant of T29S, R22E had sold off their properties to a variety of new owners, including some private purchasers who became part of the Bealsville settlement. However, there was also a complete turnover of non-resident investors, with the Virginia Trust Company, the Barlow Land Company, the Coronet Phosphate Company, and the Polk County Phosphate Company acquiring vast tracts of land in and around Bealsville and a few small tracts in and around Springhead. The owner of a turpentine still in nearby Lithia, Norman Smith, acquired 380 acres of land in and around Bealsville (Hillsborough County 1998:74). Interestingly, the 1916 Dixie Survey map shows that Alfred Beal’s property was divided among other members of the Beal family (the Holloman and Horton parcels were transferred to married Beal women), and the Virginia Trust Company. On the other hand,
property that had been held by the Florida Internal Improvement Fund, the Sistrunk family (Springhead founders), and Mills Holloman’s land was acquired in 20 and 40 parcels by Bealsville founding families like Horton, Glover, and Dexter.

The Coronet Phosphate Company seems to have acquired most of its land from the Florida Internal Improvement Fund and Plant Investment Company, although it also purchased the northern half (40 acres) of Bryant Stephens and a small portion of the property that was originally deeded to Eva Allen (13 acres). The Virginia Trust Company purchased the majority of the property that had originally been granted to white owners in the southeastern quadrant of T29S, R22E, acquiring only 35 acres from Beal and 40 acres of the property that originally deeded to Newton Simmons. Of the 120 acres that Simmons had been deeded, only 39 acres remained, but 20 acres had been acquired by Bealsville residents O.V. Hargrett and William Glover. Norman Smith almost exclusively purchased property that was originally held by the Central & Peninsular Railroad, except for the 40 acre parcel that had originally been deeded to Charles Blackwell.

In urban Tampa, the overlap between the neighborhoods in 1927, and the present clustering of African Americans, clearly shows that coalescence has occurred. Furthermore, Tampa shows a significant level of black residential centralization and concentration. Certainly where there are fewer African Americans than the city-wide percentage, there is not the same level of segregation that was prevalent in 1927. However, for the residents in those neighborhoods, there is likely to be a great deal of time lost to commuting to and
from work, as well as to areas of commerce. The level of isolation, in terms of interactions with people who reported themselves as other than African American in the federal census of 2000, appears to be the more definite issue. Future research will have to address that concentration, in terms of access to housing, and transportation to commercial centers and available jobs.

The population densities of those neighborhoods, as a whole, do not appear to have been unsustainable. Still, there was also a substantial amount of variation between blocks, with places like the 44 Quarters part of “the Scrub” coming close to the range of interaction densities that would be noticeably problematic. It is also interesting to note that only Dobyville has received any notice as a neighborhood with historic value to Tampa; there is currently a marker at the corner of Willow Avenue and Platt Street acknowledging the historic value of the neighborhood, and some descendants of earlier residents still live there. The overall demographics of the neighborhood have changed, and it now blends seamlessly with the rest of Hyde Park.

The value of using a GIS to gather data from various sources, and organize them spatially, is readily apparent. Furthermore, the comparison between Robles Pond and the rural sites of eastern Hillsborough County, suggests that communities will muster resources to move, or rebuild, structures that do not meet the needs of the community as whole. Although, more sites must be included before we will be able to determine whether that is a matter of spatial needs, or socio-cultural needs. From recent census records, it does not appear that there is a significant concentration of African Americans in the vicinity
of Willow. In Bealsville, there is an extant community with historical ties to the area that is already engaged in historic preservation. In urban Tampa, there is a significant concentration of African Americans, with neighborhood clusters having expanded from historically black neighborhoods.

In terms of what would qualify these properties as TCPs, it seems clear that stories and remembrances are what primarily delineate the boundaries of these settlements. For the two rural communities in eastern Hillsborough County, there is not much of a perceptible difference to the outsider passing through. The things that distinguish the communities are the affective, nominal, and arbitrary cognitive domains. A local resident likely perceives indexical interpretants that communicate boundary information from geographic features like streams and perhaps man-made features such as roads that are part of the operational and discursive ontological orders. However, it is the iconic order that allows for a church to communicate the values of a community to those who are not part of the community, although the interpretant is symbolic rather than iconic.

For the Willow site there are perceptible and functional differences between the past and the present, at least for the area that is owned by the county. The iconic ontological order conveys they message of ecological preservation, and any connection to the past must be brought into being through the discursive order. The same may be said for the urban neighborhoods of Tampa, where operational order is not significantly different despite changes in the configuration of the built environment, and the iconic order still conveys a sense of urbanization. However, there are still affective, nominal, and arbitrary
distinctions that divide the neighborhoods of Tampa, and the bounds of those neighborhoods may be distinguished by residents through a symbolic message from associations with the built environment.

With that said, it would be erroneous to claim that only one ontological order was involved with any of the settlements, or individual structures within settlements. Moreover, it would be a mistake to claim that there was only one interpretant associated with a settlement or building. For example, within the symbolic order, a church may represent a spiritual connection with a deity and a human connection with distant communities united by the ecumenical body of a particular denomination. Furthermore, to extend the example of the church, a single building may be perceived through the lens of symbolic (e.g. as a place of worship), indexical (e.g. doors as appropriate points of ingress and egress for congregants), and iconic interpretants (e.g. a cross-shaped floor plan).

It seems reasonable to expect that residents of Bealsville will be the most knowledgeable about and the historical development, and likely to provide immediate refinements to the results reported here. In urban Tampa, it may be necessary to present these results, along with the results of previous research, to develop a core group of public stakeholders that will have knowledge to contribute to an improved understanding of the full time depth of those communities. For Willow, focusing on the site’s contribution to African American history in Hillsborough County may or may not be successful in identifying a core group of public stakeholders that could provide refinement of our knowledge about those aspects of Willow. However, by escalating our search for such
interested public stakeholders to a broader area, such as countywide or west-central peninsular Florida, the descendants of Willow employees may still be able to contribute firsthand knowledge about life at that particular company town. It may be more productive to research spatial data from comparable company towns, and seek out interested public stakeholders on that front.

One outcome of this research that has not been fully realized is the value of the maps as tangible objects that can be taken back to the descendent communities and used as the basis for future work. Since there has almost certainly been information that was not recorded on maps, or in other primary documents, the maps can provided a starting point for redefining the uses of the represented space through time. In the settlements discussed here, there are many options available for bringing Communities of Interest into the sphere of participatory design of future research. It may also be prudent to include Communities of Interest that are drawn from stakeholders with interests other than heritage management, such as urban economists and community planners. In particular, the information regarding residential centralization, concentration, and clustering should be connected with planning for public transportation, with special attention to any job centralization that has not been covered here.

The more typical approach of presenting research results to an audience that is brought together temporarily, to be told the results of a researcher’s particular program of research is not going to be entirely eliminated; but, those lectures must be used as a basis for developing interest, enrolling active participants in future research, and mobilizing those people toward interaction,
both between themselves and researchers and among themselves. Given the availability of internet connections in these communities, whether on the campus of the Glover School or in the neighborhood public libraries of urban Tampa, a publicly viewable forum is a simple means of creating discussion space that can be implemented as open to all who are willing to contribute. As the research grows, collaborative collections management software can be designed to allow participation, with varying levels of permission to upload contributions that bring together multiple lines of research and public interest. This does not negate the importance of ethical collection of materials, or rigorous analytical procedures; but, it does open up the processes of data collection and analysis to a wider group of research partners. We do not need to give up our position as experts in a particular style of research, or reduce the importance of scholarship. However, we will need to accept a role as facilitators of the development of a common understanding between practitioners and interested non-specialists from multiple communities.
Chapter 8:

Conclusion

Although the two rural populations do appear to have had other considerations in mind when placing the earliest house sites, with agricultural potential being a greater concern than church buildings as social focal points. However, as the communities grew, there do seem to have been some differences in preference for church locations. In particular, the Springhead community did appear to experiment with more edge-focused locations for their Baptist church; this would seem to relate to better access to transportation networks leading to more contact with surrounding communities, such as Mulberry, Coronet, and Plant City. On the other hand, Bealsville's Baptist church was moved back toward the center of the community, after much of the land on the southern boundary of the original community's extent was lost to land speculation. Undoubtedly, the Baptist church is a focal point of the community, as indicated by their recent celebration of their 140th anniversary, in November 2008; however, that may be attributable not only to being a social focal point of the community, but also a reflection of the isolation experienced by an historically black community surrounded by white communities. The isolation of the community was not entirely undesirable during the oppressive years of the Jim Crow South, for reasons of both safety and personal liberty (Bethel 1981:95; Klugh 2004:114).
The work that been done on urban Tampa, preliminary though it may be, should be used as a basis for further study of the effects of residential centralization on employment, and the suitability of mass transit in Hillsborough County. It should also provide a basis for identifying more areas of historic value within the city, and offer some potential areas for further archaeological exploration. Due to urban renewal the built environment has changed substantially, and continues to be altered. One of the advantages of having a permanent GIS database of historical changes in the built environment is that archaeological exploration can be matched with planned construction. Tragically, successive episodes of construction may have been conducted in an area before it was the value was realized; but, by keeping track of the spatial locations of those areas, we may be able to take advantage of the regular cycle of demolition and construction.

The level of property division seen at Bealsville, although less than seen at Springhead, is still consistent with what is reported for other historically black communities (Bethel 1981), and it does likely reflect limited property ownership opportunities, following the brief period of the Reconstruction. With fewer opportunities to acquire new lands, there was some migration away from the rural community of Bealsville, presumably toward urban centers such as Tampa; however, Bealsville is also remarkable in the sense that, in at least one case, descendents of the original GLO deed recipients still hold part of the properties that were originally deeded to family members. So, in the case of Bealsville, the level of property division is probably just as attributable to the pattern of land loss
and reacquisition that community founders like Alfred Beal struggled to maintain. Future comparisons between communities from other areas, with other economic bases, will likely provide insight into environmental and economic reasons for differences in the way property becomes subdivided; of course, each new location will also have to account for socio-cultural differences that may have impinged on people’s ability to acquire new land, beyond general availability of land.

A GIS approach makes for a good foundation, but it is better at handling data that are stable over long periods of time, such as long-term environmental data. However, it is also quite useful for representing both types of conjunctures, whether tracking patterns of population increases and declines, the material inertia of a settlement’s built environment, or the aggregation and division of land as property. GIS can be employed in representing events, but it is far more suited to singular, major events than it is to the mundane events that occur in daily life. The representation of overlapping data is highly dependant on available data and methods used to collect that data.

We can see the remnant path of church moved from the perimeter of a town to the center, but we cannot distinguish where the mule that pulled the building rested. We can see the linear ditches that have served to drain excess water from agricultural fields, perhaps even periods when the ditches were allowed to fill with sediment, but we cannot represent Andrew William’s grubbing hoe or trace the order in which he cleared roads and ditches. Through the course of collecting data, it has been the remembrances of people that provided
a sense of boundary and motion. In some cases, those remembrances were written down; but, in other cases, it has been chance encounters with living people that provided insight into how people perceived and used their built environment. As examples, when Bealsville residents knew that this study was also considering life in urban Tampa, they would mention the Garrison neighborhood or recount a memory of riding the train into Tampa to attend school at higher grades than were available at the Glover School.

Thus, what is presented here is a good understanding some of the nodes in a county-wide network, and a basis for continuing research on how people moved through those nodes. The data that has been collected and stored through GIS can form the basis for filling in information about the physical world between the dates that have been used here because there was comparable information for all settlements. However, the resulting synchronic maps can also be used to elicit more personal recollections from interested stakeholders. Those remembrances may be used as oral histories, but a creative use of GIS might also allow researchers to create data layers that reflect the semiosphere of individual informants. Each layer might represent one person’s perceptions, during one particular time period, but they may also be used comparatively to better understand how people perceived their world differently. We must still overcome the limitations of how to represent brief events, but that still leaves perceptions of long-term trends. However, that makes GIS a viable tool for reflecting not only physical space, but also cognitive space.
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