

BLACKS IN CARLISLE, 1870-1880

by

Susan Cavenagh

Submitted in partial fulfillment of Honors Requirements
for the Department of History,
Dickinson College, 1977-1978.

Charles A. Jarvis, Supervisor
Dale Light, Reader

April, 1978

Introduction

The makeup, stability and persistence of the American black family have received attention resulting in two schools of thought. The writings of E. Franklin Frazier, and Daniel Moynihan set forth the proposition that the historical antecedents of the black family led it down a path to self-destruction. In contrast, the works of W.E.B. Du Bois, Theodore Hershberg, Elizabeth Pleck, and Herbert Gutman support the notion that the black family not only survived slavery, but was strengthened by the experience. Local data information from Southern cities and towns, and from Philadelphia and Boston, have provided a background for analysis, reconstruction and discussion of actual black families. These two schools of thought will serve as background material for the study to follow, which deals with Carlisle, Pennsylvania and its black population in 1870 and 1880.

Review of Research and Methodology

E. Franklin Frazier is a proponent of that argument which views the black family as disintegrative. In The

Negro Family in the United States, he viewed migration to

the city as one of the destructive influences in the lives of Southern migrants. This change from a rural to an urban environment brought about a withering away of the features associated with family stability (households having two parents and with the male as head). "The mobility of the Negro population which began as a result of the Civil War and Emancipation tore the Negro from his customary familial attachments. As the old order crumbled, thousands of Negro men and women began to wander aimlessly about the country or in search of adventure and work in the army camps and cities." (1) "As these men and women wander about, they slough off the traditional attitudes and beliefs that provided a philosophy of life in the world of the folk." (2)

Daniel Moynihan, in a controversial study of a different type, incited much later research in the 1970's by writing in a Federal report in 1965 that the matriarchal, one-parent family was responsible for the "tangle of pathology" which he held to be at the root of the economic problems faced by present-day blacks. Writing twenty-six years after Frazier, Moynihan stated that the family structure of lower-class Negroes is highly unstable and in

many urban centers is approaching complete breakdown." (3) He asserted that "the slave experience left as its most serious heritage a steady weakness in the Negro family." (4)

Frazier and Moynihan both discussed the black family in terms of the city experience and its effects on the family. They cited destructive influences: the trauma of migration and adjustment failure; slavery and its innate eroding legacy.

An earlier opposing view is taken by W.E.B. Du Bois, who edited (in 1909), a short collection of essays as The

Negro American Family. It was an unusual study for its time,

but what is more interesting is that, aside from the detailed first-hand accounts of the daily lives of the thirty families, it discussed the same problems which historians, political scientists, and sociologists of the 1970's discuss - family disorganization, the trauma of transition from a rural to an urban culture, and the stresses which faced marriage and the family. It was an in-depth ethnography of black culture, traced from the African heritage to the urban instability. (5) Du Bois said "family disorganization was an effect and ...these things all go to prove not the disintegration of Negro family life, but the distance which integration has gone and has yet to go." (6) He concludes his study by questioning whether or not the Negro-American has emerged into twentieth century

civilization. He left the question unanswered.

In a more recent and highly numerical study, Theodore Hershberg suggests that the black person born a slave was more 'successful' in his attainment of worldly goods and respectable employment than the freeborn black. In his article, "Free Blacks in Antebellum Philadelphia: a Study of Ex-slaves, Freeborn, and Socioeconomic Decline," he states that "by almost every socio-economic measure the ex-slave fared better than his freeborn brother ...we find the ex-slaves with larger families, greater likelihood of two-parent households, ... sending more of their children to school... generally wealthier, owning considerably more real property and being slightly more fortunate in occupational differentiation."(7) These findings came to light when an attempt was made to find an underlying cause for the socio-economic decline of Philadelphia blacks from 1830 to the Civil War. Few studies have been conducted about free blacks in Northern cities, and Hershberg carried his research one step beyond his predecessors by including a slave-born population as a means of comparison.

The "legacy of slavery" is often misrepresented as the cause for economic decline. While exploring this theory, Hershberg found that the slave-born black was less likely than the Northern-born black to be caught up in this deterioration, but that the most significant reason for the deterioration came from the city itself. Those "forces

which shaped modern America - urbanization, industrialization, and immigration - operated for blacks within a framework of institutional racism and structural inequality." (8)

Hershberg based his conclusions on three detailed household censuses of Philadelphia families taken in 1838 and 1856 by the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, and in 1847 by the Society of Friends. These censuses provided information of unusual depth, such as status at birth, whether slave or free, church affiliation, and how freedom was obtained. Through these documents, a fairly reliable study could be conducted and inferences made.

It is possible to reconstruct a community's framework through the census, tax rates, court records, and local birth, marriage, and death registration records, but it is time-consuming, and allowances have to be made for inaccuracies from one section to another, and he was spared this difficulty. Hershberg's conclusion, is that the slave-born black fared better in his attainment of those success factors he deemed important. In spite of this difference, blacks as a group faced economic decline as a result of inequality of urban opportunity.

In another discussion of the black family, this time in nineteenth-century Boston, Elizabeth Pleck, points out that she was limited in her prognosis of the success or failure of the black family unit because she studied their

structure at only one point in time - 1880. "Subsequent studies must trace the family over the years in order to fully comprehend changes in the household." (9) She does discover in the one-census study that the basic family pattern was that of father, mother, and children, and that the notion of the 'black matriarchy' was not one of the features of nineteenth-century Boston blacks.

The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom 1750 - 1925,

by Herbert Gutman is another major work which delves into numerical records: plantation records, the Federal Census, and records of the Freedmen's Bureau. He found, in his lengthy path from early slavery to Emancipation, that in Southern cities and towns, "the 1861 - 1868 sources detailed the powerful expression of effective Afro-American familial and kin beliefs and behavior in the wartime and immediate post-war years." (10) Gutman attempts to explain the survival of cultural beliefs during the oppression of slavery, the story behind the supposed disintegration of the black family, and he refutes the usual notion that slave marriages and slave families were a myth, and impossible in a slave society. Again, the urban experience, and not slavery, was responsible for the weakening of family structure.

From the preceding background of studies, came some ideas around which a study of Carlisle in 1870 and 1880 could be based. The authors cited arrived at the many and

varied conclusions which were noted: it seemed important to attempt a similar study with the information available for Carlisle.

Carlisle History - a perspective of the era

Carlisle, Pennsylvania has been a popular town as a focus for historians. There have been numerous histories written about the founding of the town in the mid-eighteenth century, how Carlisle fared in the Revolutionary War, Molly Pitcher, and the McClintock Riot. The Civil War left memorial scars on the surface of the Old Courthouse, the Iron Furnaces produced cast iron stoves and firebacks of local fame, and Jim Thorpe and the Indian School were famous nationally.

There has been little written about the time frame 1870 - 1880. Little occurred during this period that historians thought to include in the local histories. One local source, when confronted with the question about the lack of information, said "Carlisle made a lot of money during those years." (11)

As an example of the improvements and opportunities available in the town: The Carlisle Gas and Water Company was chartered in 1853, using water from the Conodoguinet Creek. (12) This was regarded as the beginning rung up the ladder of civic improvement. Electricity was introduced to the town in 1887 by the use of a Pennsylvania Railroad electric car in a local display. (13) The Carlisle Shoe Company began in 1869, and the Beetem Carpet Company in 1875. These were followed by the Carlisle Manufacturing Company, Frog, Switch Manufacturing Company (under John Hays

and son), and the reorganization of Franklin Gardiner's iron manufacturing company into the Letort Axle Works in 1883. By 1878, business had increased in the downtown market to such a point that a "more commodious and comfortable hall was needed." (14)

Three other sources provide informative, if shallow, glimpses of the past: The Cumberland County Atlas of 1872, shows the location of various businesses, and the location of each deedholder's property at specific plots in town; two weekly newspapers(not published concurrently, but overlapping between 1874 - 1876) - the Carlisle Herald, and The Valley Sentinel; and the Carlisle City Directory published by Boyd's Printers, 1876(the earliest available, and the only one in the period 1870-1880).

The Newspapers from 1870 -78 were a vital organ for the people of Carlisle. A perusal through random issues of the two newspapers(1870-78) supplies the twentieth century reader with an insight into the important issues of the time, and a cursory acquaintance with the town and its people. There were many ads for bonds and stocks of the various companies in town, with the captions "Business is Booming." (15)There are many references to the 'colored' people of the community, with the reference to their newly acquired right to vote and the education which should be granted them if they are to be knowledgable about the

democratic procedure. In 1872 the general conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church convened in the Bethel Church on East Pomfret Street, with upwards of one hundred ministers in attendance. (16) Local, black-run barbershops were redecorated, and this was duly noticed, and in 1875, the Jolly Negro Favorite (troupe), under the management of George Foulke (included in the 1870 census) gave one of their entertainments in Rheem's Hall. (17)

Carlisle, as seen from its two newspapers, was a busy town, economically and socially. Railway transportation was an important means of travel to other cities. There were daily runs to Chambersburg, Shippensburg, Hagerstown, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg. The churches were active. If the weekly notices are any indication of their schedules. Dickinson College was important to the community in terms of educational prestige, and as a source of income in two ways: through student and faculty purchasing power, and through its employment of town people.

The numbers of classified columns increased over the years: there probably was a considerable market for manufactured goods, advertisers being unlikely to spend money year after year without lucrative responses to what were often blatant and explicit ads. There seemed to be a broad economic base in Carlisle, which would have made it a likely target for settlement by whites as well as blacks. New industries required laborers, the local industrialists

needed household help, barbers were always necessary, and the agricultural prospects for the surrounding area were good. All these factors added up to a town with what appeared to be more than average advantages. According to one source, the 'colored' population already had a large base population on which to grow as "500 fugitive slaves were added to the permanent inhabitants in 1864." (18) This group from North Carolina and Virginia furnished the base of the larger population which was yet to arrive.

Approaching the Topic

Carlisle possesses a number of 19th century records - tax rolls, death certificates, birth registries, almshouse records, deeds of various sorts, and it is listed in the Federal Manuscript Census. I determined to use Carlisle information to examine the issues raised by Hershberg et. al., and to use the 1870 and 1880 Manuscript Census as the first basis for research. The following study is the result of this effort; it appears to be structurally valid in its own right. Later, supplemental data can be added to expand and refine.

Hershberg used statistics from the Pennsylvania Society for the Abolition of Slavery to support his theory that the slave-born black fared better in society, than did those who were freeborn. These statistics were amazingly complete, and provided a wealth of information which is not available to the casual observer thumbing through census material. Since the federal census does not provide the same information, one must ask if its information allows research similar to that of Hershberg. Is it possible to answer similar questions without manumission statistics, such as "I purchased my freedom in 1835 from Mr. Lee in Spotsylvania County, Virginia, with \$80.00 and three chickens?" The answer remains to be seen: obviously, the findings can not be so personal or have the depth possible through more complete information. One uses what is

available and accessible.

The Federal Manuscript Census for Carlisle, Pennsylvania for 1870 and 1880 was selected for several reasons. The 1870 census enumerators asked questions about personal and real property held by the individual enumerated, and the answers were given in terms of hundreds of dollars; a black holding property would be construed as "successful" using Hershberg's determinants. The 1880 census asked the questions that have enlarged the scope of immigrant history in the last twenty years: Where was your father born, where was your mother born? Books and monographs have appeared purely on the strength of the answers to these questions. These two censuses were also chosen because the number of people involved in them totalled approximately two thousand, which is a manageable limit of for entering data into the computer and withdrawing information.

The one constraint that appears when attempting to evaluate Hershberg's theory of the success-oriented slave-born black for Carlisle, is the absence of a former-slave status category in the Federal census of 1870 and 1880. That leaves one with the question of how to deal with a 'flaw' in the research. It cannot be assumed merely by time of birth(pre-Emancipation) or location(Southern state) that a person was once a slave. A person born before 1865 in the South can be 'presumed' to have been a slave,

but it cannot be proven. It is impossible to predict or identify slave status on an individual basis from the census material. As an operational strategy, slave-status can be postulated among those born in the South before 1865 once the aggregate statistics are tabulated. This is not a foolproof assumption but it is a useful tool in the attempt to equate Hershberg's findings with those of Carlisle. It seems to make little difference whether one calls those people slave-born or Southern-born, for the purposes of this study, the results from the statistical evaluation being the same. The aggregate figures for those who were Southern-born would contain more ex-slaves than would the Northern-born figures. (19) While this numerical strategy is valid in the aggregate, it does not follow that any Southern-born individual can be assumed to have been a slave.

Elizabeth Pleck discusses the ex-slave and her solution to the need to identify them, in the article previously cited, "The Two-Parent Household: Black Family Structure in Late-Nineteenth Century Boston." Her solution is somewhat specious - she asserts that it is possible to identify a person with slave background through the literacy question which was asked on the 1880 census. She asserts that most slaves were illiterate. Aligning that information with a Southern-place of birth, one would appear to have solved the problem of affixing slave-status to those blacks

born before Emancipation in the South. This is an oversimplification of the problem, and one which appears too elementary. It would be difficult to support or refute this strategy, but it does seem lacking in evidence.(20)

For this study of Carlisle blacks, all the census material from 1870 and 1880 is included in an effort to ensure thorough results. There is no sampling. Each name is included in this study in as correct a form as was possible. There were spelling variations, which for reasons of consistency are standardized in the final lists. Some of the names are almost illegible, and a certain amount of fabrication was required to reconstruct those names in a logical spelling. There is also the question of duplicated names, which appeared twice or more on a census. Duplicated names, where verifiable, are an error in enumeration. To eliminate redundancy from the statistical analysis, all clearly established duplicates were eliminated. It is necessary to relate this for purposes of legitimacy only.(21)

Explanation of Method and Approach

The initial phase of this computer-study begins with the actual entering of the data into the computer. The 'data' refers to all that information which is printed on the Manuscript Census Schedules pertaining to blacks in Carlisle 1870 - 1880. The pages of the census were photocopied from microfilm; and then used for the actual data entry.

The two censuses provided the following information:

1870

1. Name - head of household - distinguished as first person listed.
2. Age
3. Sex
4. Color - w - white, b - black, m - mulatto.
5. Occupation - thirty categories (see occupation tables at end of study)
6. Values in \$100.units - real estate and personal property.
7. Place of birth - (parents of foreign birth - yes, no).
8. Literacy option - inability to read/ write - or both.
9. School attendance within the last year ?
10. Citizen ? (Male 21+).
11. Other information - deaf, dumb, idiotic ?

1880

1. Street/House number(in sequence)

2. Head of Household/ or relationship.
3. Color (w, b, mu).
4. Sex.
5. Age.
6. Relationship to head of household.
7. Marital Status/ date of marriage if within the census year.
8. Occupation - of months unemployed during this census year.
9. Disabled, blind, dumb, deaf, idiotic, maimed, crippled, bedridden ?
10. School attendance within the census year.
11. Literacy questioned.
12. Place of Birth.
13. Place of birth of father/mother.

The information of both censuses is consistent in some areas, and inconsistent in others. Name, age, sex, color, occupation, place of birth, literacy, various infirmities, and school attendance are consistent in the two censuses. The 1870 census gives real estate and property values for various individuals. The accuracy of these figures depends on the source of the information: a comparison with the tax rates might prove productive, as it is doubtful that each head of household would have been able to remember his material worth. The town may have been so organized in its bureaucracy that the figures of material

worth were noted in the tax office and distributed to the populace, but this seems unlikely. Since 1870 followed on the heels of Emancipation, and was considered the era of Reconstruction, a citizenship question was asked of all males twenty-one years of age and older.

In 1880 the information asked by the enumerator was, again, essentially the same. The street address was more clearly marked, the relationship of family members to the head of the household was noted, and marital status was given. There was also a greater distinction made between black and mulatto. (22) In the 1870 census, there were very few mulattoes enumerated. The 1880 census provided columns for the place of birth of the father and mother of each person enumerated. This unique feature during the time of large-scale immigration gave demographers and other quantifiers an opportunity to chart immigration patterns and geographic mobility of these migratory people. It was a primary source of information for countless historians once it was released to the researching masses. The immigrants, black or white, became less "faceless" once their heritage was established in another state, or country.

Each piece of information for each black in the study is entered into the computer by a coding scheme. It is possible to enter the raw data into the computer as it reads on the schedules, but this has its disadvantages. It is time-consuming, spelling mistakes are more likely, and

the computer would eventually re-convert the alphabetic data into numbers once data retrieval began. To many, the coding scheme may seem awkward at first, but with familiarity, it became quite efficient. Each person's name is entered as it appeared on the Census, and a relationship is assigned to it (in the case of the 1870 census - where no relationship was indicated - it could be inferred, but the category was then called 'presumed wife etc.'). Fifteen spaces were allotted to the last name, and eight spaces to the first name. The remaining information was converted into the numerical code as it was entered:

ex. Jones Mary 121210400013010000

code breakdown

1 head of household
 21 age
 2 female
 1 black
 04 laborer
 00 property
 01 born in Virginia
 3 can neither read nor write
 1 1870 census
 00
 00) birthplace of parents in 1880 census

The seemingly meaningless string of numbers contains important information about the person enumerated. The

information for each person was entered into the computer in the same manner. The '0' indicated 'not identified', rather than being left a blank. Once all the information was entered, corrected and culled, the computer is instructed as to the code translation, so that it is then prepared for the questions to be asked. (See tables for further code breakdown). The raw data entered on the computer terminal is stored in the computer, but a printout is also obtained at each entering session, which facilitates the later visual scanning and culling. The list is then alphabetized to further ease the finding of duplicates. Many blacks were counted twice in the final tally. They were listed once with their families and then listed later with their 'employer' family. Again, these names were culled by hand. The blacks counted twice remained on the lists as members of their families, rather than as employees of other families. Although this meant that the final figures would not tally with the census statistics printed by the federal government in its aggregate lists, it would provide more accurate results.

Questioning Strategy

The questioning possibilities are almost limitless in a study such as this, especially when the other member of the questioning team is a computer. One program that deals with this type of questioning is known in the parlance as SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). In this

particular study, there are two questioning parameters necessary: within census information, and census-census information. For example - a 'within' census question: How many blacks attended school in 1870 ? in 1880 ? A census - to - census query might be : How many blacks who were in Carlisle in 1870, were also in Carlisle in 1880 ? This means that three separate series of questions and answers have to be asked - 1870 questions, 1880 questions, and 1870-1880 questions.

It is important to realize that the possibility for error does occur. The census enumerator was not a professional statistician, and was faced with an awesome task of compiling each decennial census. The 1870 census appeared to be the work of one individual, as the handwriting and spelling anomalies are consistent throughout. The 1880 census looked to be the work of two people, as there were two distinct handwriting samples evident. The information given to the enumerator could also have been faulty. A person's age was not consistent from one entry to another.(23) In the instance where a person appears on both censuses, a ten-year lapse in the information often added fewer or more than the requisite ten years to the person's age. The most reliable ages appear to be those of the babies born within the census year: the month of their birth was indicated. Later censuses, such as 1900, gave detailed day-month-year birth information for

everyone enumerated.

Other possibilities for error may have entered into the census process which would have skewed the data in one direction or another. Recent arrivals to Carlisle were not 'street wise' to the questions of the enumerator, and could have been both reticent and/or over-anxious in their answers. The reverse may have been true for the resident who had experienced the questions of the 1860 census-taker. This may be pure speculation, but it is not entirely implausible, and, for this reason, any statistics must be viewed with a not insignificant amount of suspicion.

Some historians bemoan that it is sterile history, and, in a sense, that is true when one is dealing with aggregate data. Yet, the figures which enter into this type of study comprise all the non-identities whose 'faces' would never have reached the volumes on the library shelves. Now they have been represented, in the often-used phrase, as history "from the bottom up." (24)

Table 1

Household Structure

	1870		1880	
	N-B	S-B	N-B	S-B
% Male-headed	73	82	72	70
% Female-headed	27	18	28	30

Two-parent Families

	1870	1880
% Male-headed two-parent	80%	72%

Research Results

Household Structure

In Philadelphia, Hershberg found in the Abolitionist and Quaker censuses, and the U.S. Census of 1880, that two-parent households were characteristic of 78% of black families. (25) Similarly, in Carlisle in 1870, 80% of the black families were headed by two parents, while by 1880, 72% of the families were classed as two-parent. In 1870 there were 46 families headed by females, and in 1880 there were 72, which was a sizeable increase. In terms of Northern versus Southern-born households: in 1870 73% of the Northern households were headed by males, and 27% were headed by a female; 82% of the Southern households were headed by a male, and 18% were headed by a female. By 1880, the figures were somewhat closer: 72% of the Northern households were headed by a male, and 28% by a female; while, in the Southern households, 70% of the families were headed by a male, and 30% by a female. These percentages were higher than those found by Hershberg at mid-century, where, roughly one family in three was headed by a female. (26) (See Table 1)

There was a definite increase in the number of households headed by women in Southern households from 1870 to 1880 in Carlisle. The proportion of male to female heads was still considerable, but the increase is an obvious sign of change in the structure of the Southern family. This

change is not a definite sign of family disintegration, but within the context of Hershberg's criteria for a stable family, it is a definite decline in numbers. Hershberg notes this difference in the male to female sex ratios: "between 1838 and 1860 the number of black females per 1,000 black males increased from 1,326 to 1,417. The remarkably high excess of females over males throughout the period probably reflects poor employment opportunities for black men(while the demand for black female domestics remained high)accentuated by net out-migration of young black males.

Thus,if more Northern households were headed by a male, by the criterion decided above, the families headed by a Northern- born male are the more successful, even in a limited way.

Education

One household in four among the freeborn population sent children to school in Philadelphia during the period 1850-1880. (27) In the ex-slave households, the figure was more than one in three. Ex-slave households had slightly fewer children, but sent a larger percentage to school. (28) In the freeborn households 55% of the children went to school, whereas, in the ex-slave households the figure was 67%. (29) "To the extent that education was valuable to blacks, the ex-slaves were better off." (30)

In Carlisle, in 1870, there were 140 children indicated as having attended school within the census year.

Table 2

Children in School (Education)

1870

%Northern-born	39
%Southern-born	61

1880

	7-10	11-15	16-20
#of Northern-born	57/98	52/96	4/44
#of Southern-born	1/5	7/20	1/44

Children in School by Birthplace of Parents - 1880

	N-B	S-B	
Fathers	42	93]	of 137 children in school
Mothers	50	87]	

Of that number, 39%(ages 7 - 20) were Northern-born, while 61% were Southern-born. More children from the South attended school in 1870.

By 1880, there were very few Southern-born black children in Carlisle, and, therefore, there were almost no Southern-born black children in school. Of the 137 in school, 126 were Northern-born, and 9 were Southern-born. In the age bracket 16 - 20, there were only 5 children in school. The majority attending school came from the age group 7 - 15. Since nothing can be said about the importance of 9 Southern-born children, the correlation is used of Northern versus Southern-born parents whose children were in school. It appears that of the parents with children in school, 50% more Southern families were represented as were Northern families. Southern-born parents thus placed greater importance on schooling for their children, than it seems did Northern-born parents. This comparison provides another indicator in the comparison of Northern-born to Southern-born blacks in Carlisle, and, although the percentages differ from those of Hershberg, the tendencies of the slave-born and the Southern-born black are similar.(See Table 2).

Property

Hershberg found that in Philadelphia "the most significant differences in wealth occurred in real property holding. One household in 13 or slightly less than 8 per

Table 3

Property- 1870

Northern-born

10/67 (15% of all N-B heads of Household)

Southern-born

31/155 (20% of all Southern-born heads of Household)

cent among the freeborn owned real property. For all ex-slave households the corresponding ratio was one in five." (31)

Since the 1870 Federal Census provided columns for the reporting of property valuation, given in terms of hundreds of dollars, it is possible to compare the property figures of the Northern-born and Southern-born for Carlisle. (The 1880 Census supplied no information on property valuation.) In 1870, there were 41 heads of household (out of 222) listed as holding property which valued \$100. Of these 41, 10 (15% of all Northern-born heads of household) of the property holders were Northern-born, and 31 (20% of all Southern-born heads of household), were Southern-born. Although it appears from the raw figures that twice as many Southern-born owned property as the Northern-born, the figures when computed with respect to the numbers of individual heads of household per area, show that 33% more Southern-born owned property. Owning property was a major step into what an ex-slave might term the civilized world, since it had only been a few years earlier that he had been considered property himself. To own property, to be on the other side, to be known as a property holder, may have been fundamental to his sense of self-worth. Hershberg concludes his discussion of property by stating that "owning their own (referring to the ex-slaves) home or a piece of land must have provided something (perhaps a stake in society) of

peculiarly personal significance." (32) (See Table 3).

Table 4

Occupation - 1870/1880

	1870		1880	
	N-B	S-B	N-B	S-B
skilled	2%	5%	3%	3%
commercial	.5%	3%	2%	1%
domestic	13%	27%	14%	20%
laborers	13%	28%	19%	28%
driver/carter	1%	3%	1%	4%
agriculture	.5%	3%	1%	3%

Occupation

The finale area of comparison between ex-slaves and the freeborn which Hershberg deals with is occupation. "Five occupations accounted for 70% of the entire male work force: laborers(38%), porters(11.5%), waiters(11.5%), seamen(5%), and carters (4%); another 10% were employed in miscellaneous laboring capacities. Taken together, eight out of every ten working men were unskilled laborers. Another 16% worked as skilled artisans, but fully one half of this fortunate group were barbers and shoemakers: the other skilled craftsmen were scattered among the building-construction(3.2%), home-furnishing(1.3%), leather goods(1.2%) and metal work(1.2%) trades." (33) There were few differences in the occupational structure of ex-slaves and the freeborn, but "male ex-slave household heads were more likely than the freeborn to be employed as porters, carpenters, blacksmiths, preachers and clothes dealers." (34)

Carlisle's black residents in 1870 listed 30 occupations, and in 1880 27 occupations were added to the list. These 57 occupations are listed at the end of the study. A group of categories was used to collapse this group into a workable, less cumbersome number. The six groups, for both censuses, are : skilled, commercial service, domestic service, laborers, driver/carter, and agriculture.

In 1870, there were more Southern-born workers employed in a skilled trade, than there were Northern-born workers. This may be indicative of slave heritage. Some slaves were given specific, and perhaps unique, tasks to perform on the plantation, and it is likely that they would have utilized these skills once they migrated North. It is also possible that occupational pride could have been a factor: a Northern-born black might answer 'laborer' when asked his type of employment; whereas, a Southern-born black, not familiar with the census procedure, and proud to delineate his exact occupation would differentiate between laborer and 'stone mason.'

The Southern-born members of a skilled trade outnumbered the Northern-born skilled workers by more than half in 1870. In 1880, the number of skilled workers who were Northern and Southern-born was the same. Those employed in commercial service (waiters etc.) were mainly Southern-born in 1870, but in 1880, the figures reversed, and there were more Northern-born employed in commercial service. There were 50% more Southern-born domestic servants in 1870, as there were Northern-born, but by 1880, with the Northern figure remaining the same, the number of Southern-born domestic servants had been reduced by 25%. There were 50% more Southern-born workers who were classified as laborers in 1870, as there were Northern-born laborers. (35) In 1880, there were more Northern-born

laborers, and the number of Southern-born laborers decreased somewhat. The driver/carter occupation category is, along with the agriculture group, one of the only areas where the southern-born worker was in the majority in both census years. There were over 50% more driver/carters and agricultural workers who were Southern-born in 1870 and 1880, as there were Northern-born workers in the same areas. The essentially agrarian economy of the South was responsible for this disparity in numbers, and would account for the wide separation in numbers between the Northern and Southern-born blacks, who were classified as drivers and agricultural workers. Farming pursuits played a major part in the life of the plantation black, and this, again, alludes to a slave-heritage as the causative factor in this difference in numbers. (See Table 4).

Thus it seems that Hershberg's theory is supported by the Carlisle data for 1870 in terms of the increased number of Southern-born workers who were employed in a skilled trade, and the larger numbers who were employed in all the other occupations. By 1880, the figures are more balanced: the Southern-born worker appeared in greater numbers only as domestic servants, laborers, driver/carters, and agricultural workers. The number of skilled workers is the same for both groups while the the number of Northern-born commercial workers, and driver/ carters is greater than the number of Southern-born drivers.

Initial Conclusions

The results have been assessed, and digested, and it can be said with reasonable confidence that the southern-born resident of Carlisle in 1870 and 1880 had a greater chance of success in his lifetime than did the Northern-born black, if one bases this success on the following criteria which Hershberg devised: households headed by males with two parents; the sending of children to school; the acquisition of property; and having greater diversity (and skill) in their occupational category. In all categories, with small differences in the 1880 household structure, and the decreased numbers of Southern-born skilled workers in 1880, the Southern-born black proved to be more capable in whatever area he was tested. In the final section of this study it will be shown that the Southern-born black had another quality not common to the Northern-born black in Carlisle: persistence.

Peripheral Research Results.

What began as an attempt (via Carlisle census information) to support or refute Theodore Hershberg's theory that a black with slave heritage was more 'successful,' than a freeborn black, has evolved into a census probe which has led to additional questions about Carlisle blacks in 1870 and 1880:

Property and Literacy

The apparent success of the Southern-born

Table 5
Literacy - 1870/1880

Property and Literacy - 1870

XR/Wr

N-B	1(9 presumed literate)
S-B	24(7 presumed literate)

Literacy

1870

%Northern-born	22%] considered illiterate
%Southern-born	78%]

1880

%Northern-born	27%] considered illiterate
%Southern-born	73%]

Literacy by Birthplace of parents- 1880

Of the 306 people who could neither read nor write:

S-B Father	115
S-B Mother	113
N-B Father	19
N-B Mother	21

property-holder is offset by the fact that 24 of the 31 could neither read nor write, whereas, only one of the Northern-born property-holders could neither read nor write. This may or may not be a significant fact, since old habits under slavery die hard. During slavery, it was considered a safety risk to encourage literacy in blacks. After the Nat Turner Rebellion in Southampton County, Virginia, in 1831, white owners policed each other to preclude another rebellion of this magnitude (Nat Turner was an 'educated' black). (36) It can be surmised, in the case of Southern born blacks, that slavery had taken its toll, and that those of question-able literacy were examples of the mania to keep the slaves uneducated. It may have been difficult for an ex-slave to reveal that he could read and write, when he knew that in earlier days, this knowledge would have caused retribution. (See Table 5).

The Literacy Question in General

Literacy, or non-literacy, was another form of determining future prospects of the people in question. The definition of literacy: "the ability to write in some language (irrespective of ability to read) and the inquiry was confined to persons ten years of age or over. Persons of that age who, as reported by the enumerator, were able to write, whether in English or some foreign language, were classed as literate, while those who could not write, even though they could read were classed as illiterate." (37)

This illiteracy standard might be more properly phrased 'literacy questioned.' How was the answer to the question of literacy determined? Carlisle blacks fared rather better than the national average (70% illiterate). The term 'illiteracy' is used because the census asked the question in a negative manner. The column read "cannot read" etc.

Literacy as Applied to Carlisle - 1870-1880

In 1870 there were 807 blacks over the age of ten in Carlisle. Of that number 411, were classified as being neither able to read or write. To break down the figures even more: 92 Northern-born could not read or write(22%); 319 Southern-born blacks could neither read nor write(78%).

Many more Southern-born blacks could neither read nor write than Northern-born, and, again, using this factor in evaluating a group's success, the Northern-born group may be termed more successful. However, these figures do not take into account the bias of the enumerator, or the willingness or reticence of the individuals in question.

By 1880, the figures are somewhat different, though not totally skewed one way or another. There were 755 blacks over the age of ten in Carlisle. 306 were indicated as neither being able to read or write: 83 were Northern-born(27%); 223 were Southern-born(73%). Of these 306 who could not read or write, irrespective of their place of birth, 19 had Northern-born fathers, and 21 had Northern-born mothers; 115 had Southern-born fathers, and

Table 6

Occupation by Property - 1870

	N-B	S-B
Skilled	2	4
Commercial	1	0
Domestic	1	3
Laborers	-	13
Driver/carter	-	2
Agriculture	2	2
Keeping House	1	3

Occupation by Illiteracy - 1880

Those workers who could neither read nor write.

	N-B	S-B
Skilled	-	2%
Commercial	3%	1%
Domestic	10%	13%
Laborers	13%	45%
Driver/carter	1%	6%
Agriculture	2%	4%

113 had Southern-born mothers. (See Table 5)

There were fewer Southern-born blacks who could neither read nor write by 1880, but their incidence of questioned literacy was still higher than that of the Northern-born blacks. The number of Southern-born who could neither read nor write decreased by 15% from 1870 to 1880. It would be gratifying to be able to state unequivocally that this was based on greater numbers of children attending school, when, actually, the number attending school decreased by 10 from 1870 to 1880. The turnover in the population (which will be discussed in a later section) from 1870 to 1880 is another factor not represented in these figures. Literacy, still lower among the Southern-born, appeared to be increasing in blacks in general by 1880.

Occupation by Property

Since the information was available in 1870 for those persons declaring property, it seemed opportune to see if those holding the most property in terms of number of dollars were also those with the most skill, and how the occupations and property values coincided. The Southern-born laborers held half the property which belonged to the Southern-born workers, while the workers in a skilled trade accounted for only four property holders, or, approximately one-fifth of the property which belonged to the Southern-born. Six workers of the Northern-born group owned property: 2 - skilled, 1 - domestic service, 1 -

commercial service, 2 - agriculture. In addition to this group, one Northern-born woman who kept house held property, three Southern-born women had property, and two Southern-born Ministers of the Gospel. This cross tabulation was performed merely for comparison purposes. (See Table 6)

Occupation by Literacy.

The Southern-born worker was well represented in terms of occupation and property, but if literacy is used to determine success, the Northern-born worker is the more successful. This criterion is again questionable when the credibility of either the enumerator, or the individual is suspect. With this in mind, it appears that there were no Northern-born skilled workers whose literacy was questioned, while 27% of the Southern-born skilled workers were termed illiterate. The Northern-born driver/carters and the laborers were less illiterate than the Southern-born members of the same professions, while the Southern-born members of the domestic service, the commercial service, and agriculture were less illiterate as a group than the Northern-born members of the same trades. (See Table 6)

It seems unusual that the workers in what are considered the more menial occupations appeared to be the better educated, or, rather, less illiterate. It would seem more likely that the reverse have been true. In any event, there seemed to be no prerequisite for literacy in any of

00 the occupations discussed.

1870 - 1880 Results - Persistence

In the introductory section of this study, it was indicated that once the information had been obtained for the 1870 and 1880 censuses, separately, that a series of questions would be posed to the total information: the combined 1870 and 1880 censuses. These two censuses were concatenated, and those names which appeared on both were to be the basis of this census to census questioning. The names which did not appear on both (variation was allowed) censuses were scratched out. I checked as precisely as possible all variations in spelling, took into account the discrepancies in age, the changed occupations, and the variations in place of birth. The names that remained were so few in number that a census to census study seemed insignificant. This finding in itself is worthy of attention. Who remained and why? Where did this mass of people go in the intervening ten years, and why did a group of almost identical size arrive to replace it in Carlisle? Some of the answers are obvious, especially when dealing with individual families and their children. Many children died and were replaced in numbers. Young families who were newly-formed in 1870 increased their ranks in the ten years. Older people died and were not replaced. New people arrived, and old people left, but the size of the black population remained at a constant figure of about one thousand. There is one group which remains hidden in the

Table 7

Persistence 1870 to 1880

68 heads of household

	N-B	S-B
Skilled	1	7
Commercial	-	-
Domestic	-	6
Laborers	7	35
Driver/carters	-	2
Agriculture	-	4
Property holder	1	8
Keeping House	1	3

1880 census - the young women who had married and changed their names. It would be arduous, and not very rewarding, to search via first names and the possible age spread for these women, but this will not be done.

A list was made from the joint file of those who remained, and the information of all the heads of household common to both groups was noted. There were sixty-eight heads of household common to both censuses. Of these, fifty-eight were Southern-born blacks, and ten were Northern-born blacks. Eight of the Southerners owned property, seven were skilled workers, two were drivers, six were domestic servants, thirty-five were laborers, four listed agricultural occupations, and three women who were heads of household kept house. Of the ten in the Northern-born group, one held property, one was a skilled worker, seven were laborers, and one woman who was listed as the head of the household kept house. (See Table 7).

These findings alone were worth pursuing this study. Why were these the people who stayed? They were, for one thing, the more skilled (in proportion), and they held a fair amount of property. If they were more skilled in proportion to the Northern-born blacks, could their expertise have driven the less-skilled away - to less competitive towns? This sounds relatively convincing if the Northern versus Southern-born figures in 1880 are not consulted. How does this theory of more Southern-born blacks remaining in

Carlisle hold up when it is obvious that there were more Northern-born blacks in Carlisle in 1880? This is where statistical errors are made - it would be easy to say that obviously the joint figures were incorrect, if there truly were more Northern-born blacks in Carlisle in 1880. The answer to this riddle is that the bulk of the Northern-born blacks in Carlisle in 1880 were the children of Southern-born blacks who had lived in Carlisle for, at least, the preceding ten years.

The main research results gave minimal results that the Southern-born blacks were the more successful of the two groups in question. The information gleaned from the two joint censuses, and those heads of household who were common to the two censuses, provides the keystone in a study that hinted at success. This finding verifies the results of the 1870 and 1880 censuses.

Those who remained, who stayed, whose relatives are living in Carlisle now, were mainly Southern-born. I cannot speak of the general deterioration which Hershberg alludes to about ante-bellum Philadelphia's situation, with reference to Carlisle. The 'success' of Southern-born blacks in Carlisle does agree with Hershberg's findings: the families were two-parent and headed by males for the most part; they appeared to prosper in a limited way, they educated their children, and they endured.

Further Coding Breakdown

Dollar values - personal and real added together -
indicated in terms of hundreds of dollars.

Occupations

1. Carter
2. Keeps house
3. At home
4. Laborer
5. Domestic Servant
6. Waiter
7. Bootblack
8. Barber
9. Black Smith
10. Cooper
11. Minister of the Gospel
12. Hostler
13. Coachman
14. Stone Mason
15. Hotel Porter
16. Barber's Apprentice
17. In School
18. Cook
19. Cobbler
20. Carpenter
21. Farm Laborer
22. Hotel waiter

23. Broom Maker
24. College Janitor
25. Cabinet Maker's Apprentice
26. Gardener
27. Tinner
28. Farmer
29. Brick Layer
30. Plasterer
31. Trucker
32. Boarder
33. Day worker
34. Hand work
35. Livery Stable Hand
36. worker in Foundry
37. Hotel Cook
38. Driver for Undertaker
39. Store Driver
40. Nurse
41. U.S. Army
42. Hairdresser
43. Groom
44. Attendant
45. Truck Gardener
46. Doctor's Driver
47. Stone Quarrier
48. Cart Driver

49. Washerwoman
50. wood Chopper
51. washer-ironer
52. Chambermaid
53. Brick Mason
54. Foundry Driver
55. Coalyard Driver
56. At Nurse
57. waggoner

Place of Birth

1. Virginia
2. Maryland
3. Pennsylvania
4. Tennessee
5. South Carolina
6. North Carolina
7. District of Columbia
8. New York
9. Guinea
10. Louisiana
11. Georgia
12. Alabama
13. France
14. Mississippi
15. New Jersey
16. Delaware
17. Ohio
18. Kentucky
19. West Indies
20. West Virginia

NOTES

1. E. Franklin Frazier, The Negro Family in the United States (Chicago :The University of Chicago Press, 1939),
p. 271.

2. Frazier, p.271.

3. Lee Rainwater, and William L. Yancey, The Moynihan

Report and the Politics of Controversy(Cambridge: The

M.I.T. Press, 1967), p.6.

4. Rainwater and Yancey, p. 6.

5. W.E.B. Du Bois, ed., The Negro American Family

(Atlanta: Atlanta University Press, 1909).

6. Du Bois, p. xiv.

7. Theodore Hershberg, "Free Blacks in Antebellum
Philadelphia: A Study of Ex-slaves, Freeborn, and
Socioeconomic Decline," Journal of Social History,

5(Winter 1971 - 1972), pp. 183 - 209.

8. Hershberg, p.203.

9. Elizabeth Pleck, "The Two-Parent Household: Black
Family Structure in Late-Nineteenth Century Boston," in
The American Family in Social Historical Perspective,

ed. Michael Gordon(New York: St. Martin's Press,
1973, p. 152.

10. Herbert G.Gutman, THE Black Family in Slavery and

Freedom, 1750 - 1925 (New York: Random House, 1976), p.

433.

11. Warren Gates.

12. Milton E. Flower, and Lenore E. Flower, This is

Carlisle (Harrisburg: J.H. McFarland, Co., 1944),

p.63.

13. Flower, p. 64.

14. Flower, p. 59

15. The Valley Sentinel 22 November 1878, p.1.

16. The Carlisle Herald, January 1872, p. 1. There were

three black churches in Carlisle at the time. The first black church was a small stone building on Chapel Avenue, between Pitt Street and Hanover Street. It later moved to Dickinson Avenue, and then to West North Street. A piece of property was eventually purchased on South West Street (present site of AME Zion Church), which had been used as a hospital during the Civil War.

17. The Carlisle Herald, April 1875, p. 1.

18. Guy Carleton Lee, "Negroes Under Northern Conditions,"

Gunton's Magazine, (January, 1896).

19. Courtesy - Dale Light.
20. I have been told that these findings are essentially plausible - the notion is still unsatisfactory.
21. Duplicate names were counted in the original tabulation. 1870 Census - 1057(my figures - 975), 1880 Census - 1017(1049).
22. The Bureau of Census volume, Negro Population: 1790 -
1915, states that the 1870 census results regarding

race were defective, which would account for the disparity in the numbers, p. 211.
23. I found little evidence that the ages had been rounded of to the nearest five or tenn years.
24. Stephan Thernstrom, Poverty and Progress (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 7.
25. Hershberg, p.198.
26. Hershberg, p. 190.
27. Hershberg, p. 196.
28. Hershberg, p.p.196.
29. Hershberg, p. 196.
30. Hershberg, p. 196.

31. Hershberg, p.198.
32. Hershberg, p. 198.
33. Hershberg, p. 199.
34. Hershberg, p. 199.
35. The term 'laborer' was a catchall category for many
unspecific occupations.
36. Lecture Notes, M.E. Connors, Fall, 1977.
37. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Negro

Population: 1790 - 1915 (Washington: Government

Printing Office, 1918), p. 403.

Introduction

The makeup, stability and persistence of the American black family have received attention resulting in two schools of thought. The writings of E. Franklin Frazier, and Daniel Moynihan set forth the proposition that the historical antecedents of the black family led it down a path to self-destruction. In contrast, the works of W.E.B. Du Bois, Theodore Hershberg, Elizabeth Pleck, and Herbert Gutman support the notion that the black family not only survived slavery, but was strengthened by the experience. Local data information from Southern cities and towns, and from Philadelphia and Boston, have provided a background for analysis, reconstruction and discussion of actual black families. These two schools of thought will serve as background material for the study to follow, which deals with Carlisle, Pennsylvania and its black population in 1870 and 1880.