

THE PROCESS OF COMMUNITY:  
Class, Culture, and Ethnicity  
in Nineteenth-Century Newark

*Charles Stephenson*

Charles Stephenson is Assistant Professor of History at the State University College at Brockport, New York. He has written numerous articles, most recently "Approaches to Social Science History: Quantification in the Classroom," which appeared in *Teaching History: A Journal of Methods*.

THE PRECISE CONTOURS of the relationship between class and ethnicity in the working class in the nineteenth-century American city are uncertain. Though class distinctions have been fully evident throughout most of our history, American historians and social scientists have much more readily recognized and studied ethnic and national distinctions. This paper, in introducing the study of ethnic structure in Newark, will consider the most common definitions of ethnicity and class in order to point the way, I hope, toward more profitable ones. I do not expect to clarify the relationship between class and ethnicity here, but I will raise some questions and some possible solutions to set the direction for future research.

Between 1850 and 1910 Newark ranged in size between the thirteenth and seventeenth largest cities in the nation. Despite its position in New York's shadow, it made a continuing claim on the nation's attention and imagination. In part, of course, this claim was due to Newark's growth as a major industrial and manufacturing center. By 1880 a majority of its workers were employed in industry; companies dealing with chemicals, electrical machinery, and smelting and refining were establishing themselves strongly. The center of the economy was moving from workshops and individual crafts to factories and mass production.<sup>1</sup> But Newark owed part of its fame to less benign attributes. Though no American city was distinguished for high health standards or decent working-class housing, Newark had perhaps the worst of each. In 1890 the United States Census Bureau labeled it "the nation's unhealthiest" city. It was first among major cities in infant mortality, deaths of children under five, and deaths from scarlet fever; it ranked among the top ten cities in typhoid fever, malaria, tuberculosis, and diphtheria.<sup>2</sup> Though its housing was not abnormally bad, crowding and incredible squalor were commonplace. By 1890 Newark had the seventh largest number of persons per dwelling (7.81) among major American cities. In the first part of this century the New Jersey Board of Tenement House Supervision—established as a result of the nation's first statewide tenement legislation—offered this description of conditions in Newark:

Foul malodorous privy vaults, filled to the yard level and, in many cases, overflowing into the yards and draining into adjacent cellars; the floors and even the walls, covered with an accumulation of fecal matter; dark unventilated cellars,

partially filled with garbage and refuse of all kinds and littered with heaps of discarded bedding, rags, paper and other inflammable material; broken soil and waste pipes discharging into the cellars; sleeping rooms so dark that even in broad daylight objects at a distance of only a few feet were indiscernable; broken and dilapidated stairs holding out no means of escape in case of fire, were among the features of the problem.<sup>3</sup>

A great many vagrants, day laborers, and other poor persons lived in conditions much worse, though not so well recorded.

In ethnic and occupational structure, Newark was a fairly typical medium-large city in the America of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Though immigrants themselves were never in a majority in the city—the percentage of foreign-born persons between 1850 and 1910 ranged from 29 to 34—the foreign-born plus their children composed almost half of the city's population and predominated in several wards.<sup>4</sup> The Irish had arrived first and established themselves in the "malaria-infested" Down Neck area (later called the Ironbound section), which lay between the Passaic River and the Newark salt meadows. This area continued as a center for the city's immigrants. Germans, who would be the largest single immigrant group, followed; in the 1890s Italians, Slavs, Russian Jews, and other eastern and southern European groups began arriving. Large-scale movement from the southern United States did not reach major proportions until somewhat later in this century.

The occupational structure was also typical. Native-born whites filled the more "desirable" positions while immigrants fought for unskilled and manual jobs.<sup>5</sup> Throughout the nineteenth century, Germans and Irishmen predominated as laborers. They moved into skilled trades as the proportion of unskilled workers began to fall, but few job changes reflected the mythical rags-to-riches jump to factory owner—or even to factory manager. Advancement occurred primarily within occupational categories, and only as a predictable function of large-scale economic growth and smaller-scale individual cycles.<sup>6</sup>

The history of ethnic groups in America has been written from at least five differing points of view, which Robert Swierenga has enumerated. The oldest, the *nationalist-nativist* ("a product largely of Anglo-Saxon New England"), was a staunchly negative perspective which denigrated immigrants and their abilities, called them disruptive, and charged that they had brought "disease and pauperism . . . lawlessness, religious bigotry, race hatreds and 'the vendettas of the Old World.'" The second wave of interpretation, the *filiopietistic*, was the work largely of historians who were themselves immigrants. These historians had

nothing but praise for immigrant groups; they helped to counterbalance the jaundiced nativist approach but did little for a thoroughgoing analytical perspective. The third point of view, the *progressive*, carried the study of ethnic groups in America one step further by viewing immigrants as part of the larger society; its proponents purveyed the idea of assimilation, believing either that it was true or that it should be. These first three historical schools were based on basically romantic ideas which made little effort to deal with the texture of ethnic life. The fourth group, which Sweringa and others have labelled the *scientific* school, "rescued immigrant studies from racists, filiopietists, and moralists, and elevated it to a respectable field of research within the profession"; even so, this group's own stress on the theme of assimilation led to skewed results. The most recent group, the *ethnocultural*, has approached ethnic-immigrant studies on a sounder, "less sentimental and more sociologically-oriented" basis, although "the assimilation theme . . . continues to dominate ethnic scholarship."<sup>7</sup> Some antidote to this may be found in the work of Rudolph Vecoli and other more recent authors.<sup>8</sup>

The concept of assimilation has dominated ethnic analysis. Assimilation, adaption, accommodation, and acculturation are all variants of one basic doctrine about what happens between immigrants and their 'host' country and their 'host' community. Perhaps the strongest version appears in the genre that began with Handlin's *The Uprooted*: culture that is clearly ethnic is "a transient phenomenon," and "Americanization" is "its inevitable if often tragic outcome."<sup>9</sup> This predominant view (like, as I shall argue, some later views) defines the "ghetto process of assimilation," which has three phases. As Rudolph Vecoli has shown, "assimilation in this model represented the victory of the American environment over the immigrant's cultural baggage."<sup>10</sup>

Recently this model has been modified from two separate directions. On the one hand, studies of voting and political participation have revealed the tenacious continuity of "unassimilated ethnic communities a half century after the end of mass immigration." Such communities have survived in Newark and elsewhere in New Jersey.<sup>11</sup> It is not necessary to deny the existence of class in order to recognize the presence of division based upon ethnic, religious, and cultural differences. These ethnically derived divisions dominate existing analysis because the political system has tended to restrict political expression to an ethnic or other interest-group context. As David Montgomery has suggested, "the two-party system was splendidly adapted at the local level to serving the needs of the upwardly mobile of each ethnic group . . . and thus to preserving a vertical, rather than class division of loyalties, which



attracted the electorate of each ethnic bloc to its own middle-class leaders through cultural issues of intense and intimate importance to daily life."<sup>12</sup> The political use of such patterns helps greatly to institutionalize them and makes not only possible but likely their repetition and perpetuation. Thus by appealing to self-interest or to disgruntled negativism among ethnic, religious, or other cultural groups, a limited political system can significantly truncate expressions of class—of mutuality—and encourage expressions which gravitate against cohesiveness based on class. Studies such as Montgomery's seem to have refuted the ghetto model and to have shown the vitality of ethnic-group identification.

The other source of dispute with the ghetto model has been the "new urban history," which analyzes geographical migration as well as social mobility. Study after study seems to have confirmed that the larger part of a population found in a city in one year cannot be found there several years later. In places as diverse as Newburyport (Massachusetts) and San Antonio, Boston and Poughkeepsie, San Francisco and Kingston (New York), Philadelphia and Trempealeau County (Wisconsin), in large urban complexes and small rural towns, the same pattern has emerged. At the end of a period of analysis, generally a decade, from 30 to 70 percent of the original population is no longer resident.<sup>13</sup> Canadian studies confirm the pattern, sometimes with even lower rates of persistence. According to David Gagan's study of rural Peel County, Ontario, 95 percent of those resident in the first year left over the following twenty years. In a study of Hamilton, Ontario, between 1850 and 1860, Michael Katz discovered that 25 percent of his population had left after only three months!<sup>14</sup> The pattern appears time after time, in study after study. Rates of persistence have proven to be particularly low among the working class; "in no American city," concluded one investigator, "has there been a large lower-class element with continuity of membership." But the lower class can make no exclusive claim on transient behavior. In Boston, for example, "roughly a quarter of the population at any one date had not been living in the community 365 days before!"<sup>15</sup> That included members of all occupations and all classes.

The actual rate of change was considerably higher than even these figures suggest. Thernstrom's figures for Boston confirm a pattern that may not have differed greatly for Newark or other American cities.<sup>16</sup> He tells us that "the number of newcomers entering the city" in the 1880s, for example, "was several times larger than the net migration calculations suggest," so that "the actual number of separate families who lived in Boston at *some* point in between 1880 and 1890 was a

staggering 296,388, more than three times the total number residing there at any one time in this ten-year period!"<sup>17</sup> If we can apply the principle to Newark, the comparable figure is over 100,000 families in ten years. If we apply Katz's figures from Hamilton, where in three months 25 percent of his population apparently departed from the city, we come up with a much higher figure.

Thernstrom and others have seen American migrants as "a class of permanent transients who continued to be buffeted about by the vicissitudes of the casual labor market." They formed a "permanent floating proletariat" that was "alienated but invisible and politically impotent."<sup>18</sup> The adherents of this approach most often brand migrants "failures" and "weaklings." Perhaps the best expression of this view is in Katz's new book. Katz makes explicit the often-implicit views of others who have done similar studies. He, too, brands migrants (his term is "transients") "failures." Indeed, "two social structures" coexisted "within nineteenth-century society," he believes:

one relatively fixed, consisting of people successful at their work, even if that work was laboring; the other a floating social structure composed of failures, people poorer and less successful at their work, even if that work was professional, drifting from place to place in search of success.<sup>19</sup>

Katz finds that "the continual circulation of population prevented the formation of stable and closely integrated communities," and he concludes that "the facts of transiency destroy any further illusions about community; the population simply changed too rapidly."<sup>20</sup> At the same time, Katz found a highly stratified social system. "The central intellectual task for the student of past societies," he says, "is to find a satisfactory way of interrelating structural rigidity and personal transiency."<sup>21</sup> Katz believes he has found such a method: "Persistent patterns of inequality preserved social stability and assured the continuity of social forms," he argues, "by staving off the chaos and anomie that otherwise might have accompanied a population moving with such astounding rapidity."<sup>22</sup> Rowland Berthoff believes that the migration of nineteenth-century Americans "produced an American social disorder without parallel in the modern world," and he and others have agreed that "mobility and stability were incompatible."<sup>23</sup> In Katz's model, the majority of people roamed about the landscape looking for success, usually economic success, while at the same time a privileged and largely "stable" few preserved a system of rigid social and economic inequality not only for the good of the "community" but also for the good of the migrants themselves.<sup>24</sup>

Are we to suppose that these two lines of investigation—ethno-

cultural voting analysis and mobility study—leave us with the image of the ghetto restructured and adapted to their findings? Not necessarily: what in fact we are left with is a revised view of ethnic and class culture, and a need for redefinition of the concept of the ghetto. To begin with, there is little doubt that ethnically determined enclaves existed in virtually all major American cities, and certainly, as evidenced by census records, in Newark. Though we do not need to set a quota that would qualify a neighborhood as a “ghetto,” we may need to point out that the term has hardly ever been intended to mean an entirely homogeneous section of residence. Such places have rarely, if ever, existed. Nor is a “ghetto,” or ethnic enclave, necessarily composed of the same people from year to year.

Voting studies, then, tell us two things: first, that homogeneous groupings were rare; second, that political and cultural affinities existed among ethnic and religious groups, virtually regardless of physical proximity.

Milton Gordon, in offering a seven-part model of the process of assimilation, has noted that the primary method by which newcomers have been brought together into a common national identity has been to mold them into dominant cultural patterns, while continuing to exclude them from significant participation in economic and political structures. This is “the most essential sociological fact of that experience.”<sup>25</sup> Thus if we are to find a substitute for the model of ghetto-assimilation we will have to account for the large number of factors that have led to the formation of differing types of structures among ethnic groups, and analyze the relation of these structures to the question of assimilation into the larger culture and the question of apartness from it.<sup>26</sup> Within this context we should be aware of Colin Greer’s argument that a concentration upon “pluralism,” and by implication also an emphasis upon social mobility, “is a red herring.” Greer believes that “what we must ultimately talk about is class. The cues of felt ethnicity turn out to be recognizable characteristics of class position in this society.”<sup>27</sup> Kathleen Conzen believes that “this was indeed what was happening in early Milwaukee. Irish culture was defined in class terms and ‘expelled its more successful members’ while this was not the case in the first generation of German settlement.”<sup>28</sup> Information remains incomplete in this regard on Newark, and it is essential in future research that we be aware of this argument and find out whether it applies here. An early, and obvious, priority in that process of discovery is to confront the still amorphous concept of class.

Achieving a workable definition of class, which is a prerequisite to the successful completion of the task of redefinition, has long presented

a formidable obstacle to American historians and social scientists. The most important recent reconsideration of the concept of class is that begun by E.P. Thompson in *The Making of the English Working Class*. In an effort to break away from the stifling idea of class as a rigidly defined, readily apparent, and seldom changing category, Thompson emphasizes the dynamic nature of class and insists on considering the historical context in which a class emerges. "Emerge," in fact, is a useful term for the development of class; class, Thompson has suggested, can be defined only "in the medium of *time*—that is, action and reaction, change and conflict."<sup>29</sup> He distinguishes between "class *experience*," which "is largely determined by the productive relations into which men are born—or enter involuntarily"—and "class *consciousness*," which is "the way in which these experiences are handled in cultural terms: embodied in traditions, in value systems, ideas, and institutional forms."<sup>30</sup> Such a reorientation has proven invaluable to research in the history of the American worker and the American community. We might, however, attempt to go a step beyond Thompson's definition. Much of the work following Thompson has identified workers as immigrant peasants and artisans who are carriers of pre-industrial values and culture. Many historians have therefore failed to look at them in the context of their own communities and social structures. We must ask if the much-used distinction between nonindustrial "premodern" work habits and industrially adopted work habits is as useful as we have believed. Certainly it is useful in analyzing social change and necessary in analyzing the nonindustrial or preindustrial people who came to the United States. It should not, however, be used in predicting opposition to an industrial-capitalist order. Indeed, we may well find that opposition to industrialization stemmed as much from Americans born into an industrial society as from people who had never known one.<sup>31</sup> Clearly Thompson's recognition of a dynamic element in class formation is important, but we must ask what (if any) preconditions must exist in order for a situation to produce a class reaction.

It is here that the usefulness of the rather amorphous term "group" becomes apparent. Regardless of the circumstances, class does not spring full-blown from a condition of conflict; that was one of the points of *The Making of the English Working Class*. It is my contention that most collections of people in America are not classes but groups—bands of people drawn or thrown together for particular purposes. American workers in the aggregate are a group; in particular categories they are groups. People collected together because of common ethnic backgrounds are groups. Group action and group dynamics are often found

in America; class, however, develops only rarely. One distinction between group and class involves intent or self-conception. According to Thompson, "class happens when some men . . . feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and as against other men whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs."<sup>32</sup> The salient phrase in this instance is "*against* other men whose interests are different from and usually *opposed to* theirs." Class-informed action, therefore, is action in which opposition is recognized, expressed, and converted to action designed to alter the existing production relationship. Thus a narrow, but proper, definition of class would require that those involved in any class action want to alter their own social situation. The distinction can readily be seen in working class action throughout the history of Newark, action which has been forthright and courageous, but which has operated mostly within the parameters set by the industrial capitalist structure. Such action should be called militant rather than radical. The distinction between militant and radical action, between group and class action, is based on the workers' conceptualization of their own intentions, the kind of goals held or developed by the collectivities involved. Is the group being defined seeking an alternative set of arrangements? Is it rejecting the concept of "mutuality of interests"? Most often, in America, the answers to these questions are "no."

Why is this an important distinction? and why should we go out of our way to proffer a restrictive definition of class? Simply in order to analyze the ground from which class consciousness and class action grow, and thus to be able to distinguish between ethnic and class identifications. Class springs from group identity or participation. And it is at this point that ethnicity plays a crucial role, for any group identification can either prompt or impede the growth of class feelings.

Perhaps we should append a critical view of this new direction in working-class studies as well, and briefly propose a reorientation. Much of the emphasis in the social history of the working class has been placed on the effort to ferret out worker radicalism. We have moved away from the study of unionism toward concrete radical evidence of worker opposition and resistance to establishment of the hegemony of industrial capitalism. We have moved our focus from the union hall to the work place, the fraternal order, and the saloon. But we have not generally progressed beyond episodic analysis, and we have limited ourselves to the study of attitudes and occurrences which demonstrate incipient anti-capitalist action or feeling. Certainly I do not wish to discourage such studies, for the study of lost protest and ignored or defeated alternatives is essential. Yet we are still concentrating on protest, and it is time to



consider what we are missing by doing so. Social history claims to attempt to recapture and investigate the everyday life of the ordinary man and woman, yet clearly it can go further than it has done so far. Perhaps the best example of the direction we should take can be found in the literature on American slavery. After dealing with institutional (and "business") history and with real revolts, then moving (with Kenneth Stampp) to the study of incipient revolt, this literature has finally brought the focus down to culture. Eugene Genovese, Herbert Gutman, John Blassingame, Robert Starobin, and others have offered us detailed and sophisticated analysis of the adjustments people made in their lives. It is from everyday life that all other realities, and all movements, spring.<sup>33</sup>

Gutman has proposed a definition of "a model subculture" through which to analyze everyday life. Such a subculture would include friendly and benevolent societies, friendly local politicians, community-wide holiday celebrations, an occasional library, participant sports, churches, saloons and beer gardens, concert halls and music halls, and perhaps trade unionists, labor reformers, and radicals.<sup>34</sup> We would also study the particular patterns of family and kinship networks and customs; sometimes we would add the perceived hierarchies within the community. Other aspects of a model subculture will be added later. Such a list of elements shows us the matrix in which community develops and culture changes in America. It offers the historian a concrete beginning point for the study of the rich heritage of the diverse peoples who have populated this nation and its major cities, and puts the lie to schemes which prate of cultural anarchy and chaos. "It is time," says Gutman, "to discard the notion that the large-scale uprooting and exploitative processes that accompanied industrialization caused little more than cultural breakdown and social anomie." Though "class and occupational distinctions within a particular ethnic group made for different patterns of cultural adaptation," he notes, "powerful subcultures thrived among them all."<sup>35</sup> It was the strength of these powerful subcultures, and the particular types and limits of assimilation and acculturation in America, that furnished the peculiar adaptation of the working class to the pressures and challenges it experienced in the American city. Clearly, different ethnic and class groups were "assimilated" into the operational framework of the United States. Yet we now have accumulated sufficient evidence to discard the popular notion of "the melting pot" and to replace it with an understanding of the cultural diversity which has characterized our past.

In urging a concentration on issues which transcend episodic occurrences, I do not wish to remove consideration from labor organi-

zation, striking, and the entire history of trade unions, which remain essential areas of research. It is easy to see why strikes and other such episodes draw such attention from scholars. Not only are they intrinsically exciting, but they serve as a focus for everyone involved in them: although the business of organization ordinarily went on well before work stoppages and continued long afterward, many working-class movements were made—or, more often, broken—by one climactic strike.<sup>36</sup> The study of such efforts cannot be disparaged, especially since they also served as teaching grounds for many workers. And we can see in the battleground of the boycott and the picket-line many of the ethnic conflicts that we must continue to analyze before we can make firm statements concerning the relationship among ethnic groups, both at the work place and away from it.

One of the most useful and profitable new approaches we can take, however, is to analyze voluntary associations, which have been most neglected. The potential areas of research are numerous; voluntary associations include trade unions, reading clubs, volunteer fire departments, neighborhood councils, church groups, chautauquas, workers' cooperatives, and many others. The importance of fraternal organizations should be obvious. Indeed, considering the importance that such groups have had in working-class life, the lack of substantial research into them is startling. Viewing such groups from the perspective of social history rather than considering them merely as manifestations of urban structure can be most revealing. The function and influence of fraternal orders varied greatly in different places. In the working-class community, fraternal orders served as meeting places away from the intrusions of middle-class values, and they gave workers sustenance to challenge the middle class at the work place and on the meeting ground of culture. On the other hand, some associations served the interests of the larger society instead: society used them to influence the behavior of those whom it had chosen to raise a step or more out of the working class. Thus one fraternal order (or other voluntary organization) may have strengthened a distinct working-class culture and another may have weakened that culture.<sup>37</sup> In some cases, of course, the same organization may paradoxically have filled both functions.

In addition to the better-known fraternal orders such as Masons and Odd Fellows, there were large numbers of other organizations that deserve study. Many apparently nonsocial organizations, such as volunteer fire departments and societies providing insurance to their members, also served social functions.<sup>38</sup> Organized, if informal, sports clubs and recreation teams offer another hardly mined area of promise.<sup>39</sup> In each instance the scope of our research can be expanded in valuable



ways. We would do well to remember that only when we have attempted to move toward analysis of the texture of everyday life will we have made any progress, as E. J. Hobsbawm has phrased it, "from social history to the history of society."

Perhaps this paper has helped point in that direction in addressing briefly the ethnic and occupational structure in Newark, and in discussing the need for revising some of our basic definitions. The relationship between class and ethnicity remains complex, and we will have to complete and begin much more work before we can begin to perceive its outlines.

## Notes

1. See the appropriate census volumes, and Stuart Galishoff, *Safeguarding the Public Health: Newark, 1895-1918* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1975), pp. 3-13.
2. Ibid.
3. N.J., Board of Tenement House Supervision, *Annual Report, 1904*, p. 35.
4. See tables 1, 2, 5, 8.
5. See tables 9, 11, 13, 14.
6. For an expansion of this theme see Charles Stephenson, "The Cultural Context of Social Change: Social Mobility and the Contours of Community in America," forthcoming in *Societas—A Review of Social History*, [1978]; and Stanley Aronowitz, *False Promises: The Shaping of American Working Class Consciousness* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).
7. Robert P. Swierenga, "Ethnocultural Political Analysis: A New Approach to American Ethnic Studies," *Journal of American Studies* 5 (April 1971): 59-79.
8. See, for example, Rudolph J. Vecoli, "Contadini in Chicago: A Critique of *The Uprooted*," *Journal of American History* 51 (December 1964): 404-417; and Vecoli, "Prelates and Peasants: Italian Immigrants and the Catholic Church," *Journal of Social History* 2 (Spring 1969): 217-268.
9. Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted* (New York: Little, Brown, 1951); Handlin, "Immigration in American Life: A Reappraisal," in *Immigration and American History: Essays in Honor of Theodore C. Blegen*, ed. Henry Steele Commager (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961), pp. 8-24; and Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants, 1790-1880: A Study in Acculturation* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1959). For an excellent discussion of this question see Kathleen Neils Conzen, "The Ethnic Community in America: The German Example," unpublished paper presented at the Brockport Conference on Social-Political History, Brockport, New York, 1975.
10. Much of this discussion is drawn from and informed by Conzen, "The Ethnic Community." See also Rudolph J. Vecoli, "Ethnicity: A Neglected Dimension of American History," in *The State of American History*, ed. Herbert J. Bass (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970). See tables 15-23 for information on housing and other indices of assimilation.
11. See *ibid.*, and see also: Paul Kleppner, *The Cross of Culture: A Social Analysis of*

*Midwestern Politics, 1850-1900* (New York: Free Press, 1970); Richard J. Jensen, *The Winning of the Midwest: Social and Political Conflict, 1888-1896* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971); Ronald P. Formisano, *The Birth of Mass Political Parties: Michigan, 1827-1861* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971); Michael F. Holt, *Forging A Majority: The Formation of the Republican Party in Pittsburgh, 1848-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969); Frederick C. Luebka, *Immigrants and Politics: The Germans of Nebraska, 1880-1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969). For New Jersey in particular, see Samuel T. McSeveney, *The Politics of Depression: Political Behavior in the Northwest, 1893-1896* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).

12. *European Labor and Working Class History Newsletter* 8 (November 1975): 47.

13. For an overview see Stephan Thernstrom and Peter R. Knights, "Men in Motion: Some Data and Speculations About Urban Population Mobility in Nineteenth-Century America," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 1 (Autumn 1970): 7-35.

14. Michael B. Katz, *The People of Hamilton, Canada West: Family and Class in a Mid-Nineteenth-Century City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); David Gagan, "Geographical and Occupational Mobility in a Nineteenth-Century Rural Canadian Community," unpublished paper presented at the Great Lakes Regional History Conference, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1975.

15. Stephan Thernstrom, "Working Class Social Mobility in Industrial America," in *Essays in Theory and History: An Approach to the Social Sciences*, ed. Melvin Richter (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), pp. 227-228.

16. Stanley Engerman points out that rates may have been higher in Boston because it was a port city; by implication, therefore, they may also have been higher in Newark, since many immigrants moved through it. Comparing rates for other cities, however, reveals a general pattern apparently unaffected in significant proportion by such considerations. Engerman, "Up or Out: Social and Geographic Mobility in the United States," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 5 (Winter 1975): 469-489.

17. Howard M. Gittleman finds an even higher rate of turnover. At one point, for example, he believes that in-migration exceeded that recorded by 55 percent, while out-migration exceeded that recorded by 119 percent. (Out-migration rates are not simple rates of disappearance, of course—deaths must be figured in). Gittleman, *Workingmen of Waltham: Mobility in American Industrial Development, 1850-1890* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), pp. 23-49.

18. See Stephan Thernstrom, *Poverty and Progress: Social Mobility in a Nineteenth Century City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964); Thernstrom, "Urbanization, Migration, and Social Mobility in Late Nineteenth Century America," in *Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History*, ed. Barton J. Bernstein (New York: Pantheon, 1968); also Thernstrom, "Working Class Social Mobility," and Thernstrom and Knights, "Men in Motion," as cited above.

19. Katz, *People of Hamilton*, p. 47.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 42. In this view Katz is echoing David Gagan (see above), who believes that "for those people who dwelt only fleetingly in Peel County, as they must have done in other communities, 'community' could have no more meaning than simply the next place they came to as replacements for those who had just left." He continues, "at the very least there were two 'communities' in nineteenth century Peel County, a small community of itinerants, who, in any case, were merely a fragment of an even larger community for whom all of Ontario was their 'community'" (p. 14).

21. Katz, *People of Hamilton*, pp. 17, 24, 42.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 44. Katz favorably quotes Peter Laslett, *The World We Have Lost* (New York: Scribner, 1965), p. 148: "An unchanging, *unchangeable* social structure may well be essential to a swiftly changing population." (Italics mine.)

23. Berthoff, "The American Social Order: A Conservative Hypothesis," *American*

*Historical Review* 65 (April 1960): 495-514.

24. I should emphasize that I disagree with the thrust of Katz's analysis. We must recall Amitai Etzioni's observation that "*a group can maintain its cultural and social integration and identity, without having an ecological basis.*" As Patrick J. Gallo adds, "the sub-community is not necessarily a geographical location but rather a social construct in the minds of its residents." Human beings grow up into and assimilate a culture, and from that point on they carry it inside whether the original changes or not. Clearly immigrants to the United States did not leave their values behind or exchange one set of "cultural baggage" for another upon stepping off the boat. Instead they carried the "cultural baggage" with them, whether they were immigrants who had moved as communities from Europe or foreign- or native-born American workers who had moved from city to city throughout this country. Culture was not ecological, but social, in nature, and was transportable. Patrick J. Gallo, *Ethnic Alienation: The Italian-Americans* (Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1974), p. 117; the Etzioni quote, taken from Gallo (p. 117), is in "The Ghetto—A Re-Evaluation," *Social Forces* 37 (March 1959): 255-262.

25. Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964). My discussion of Gordon is informed by and drawn from Colin Greer, comp., *Divided Society: The Ethnic Experience in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), especially Gordon, "The Nature of Assimilation," pp. 39-51; Greer, "Remembering Class: An Interpretation," pp. 1-35; and Conzen, "The Ethnic Community in America," especially pp. 4-5, and throughout.

26. Conzen, "The Ethnic Community in America."

27. Greer, "Remembering Class," p. 34.

28. Conzen, "The Ethnic Community in America," p. 36.

29. E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd., 1963), p. 939.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

31. *Ibid.*

32. *Ibid.*

33. See especially Eugene D. Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll, The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Pantheon, 1974); Robert S. Starobin, *Industrial Slavery in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); John W. Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972); and Herbert G. Gutman, *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom, 1750-1925* (New York: Pantheon, 1976). For an impressive effort to develop a theory of intergroup relationships, see Ira Harkev, "Reference Group Theory and Antebellum Presbyterian Schisms," unpublished paper delivered at the Social Science History Association meeting, Ann Arbor, 1977.

34. Gutman, "Work, Culture, and Society," p. 564.

35. *Ibid.*

36. It is interesting to note, by the way, that workers in the United States were responsible for more strikes in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries than workers in any other nation in the world. Between 1881 and 1900, some 33.6 workers per thousand in American industries went on strike each year, in contrast to 27.6 per thousand in Great Britain. And it must be added that workers in America went down to defeat more often than workers anywhere in the world. See Clifford Yearly, *Britons in American Labor: A History of the Influence of the United Kingdom Immigrants on American Labor, 1820-1914* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1957), p. 166; and John T. Cumbler, Jr., "A Question of Class," unpublished paper.

37. See especially Brian Greenberg's pioneering "Worker and Community: Fraternal Orders in Albany, New York, 1845-1885," forthcoming in *Life and Labor: Readings in the Social History of the American Worker*, ed. Charles Stephenson (Grand Rapids,

Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, [1978]); John T. Cumbler, Jr., "Continuity and Disruption: Working Class Community in Lynn and Fall River, Massachusetts, 1880-1950" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1974); Cumbler, "Transatlantic Working Class Institutions: Uprooted or Transplanted?," unpublished paper. Valuable information on the role of workers' cooperatives in Newark may be found in the yearly reports of the New Jersey Bureau of Statistics of Labor and Industries.

38. See, for example, Bruce Laurie, "Fire Companies and Gangs in Southwark: The 1840s," in *The Peoples of Philadelphia: A History of Ethnic Groups and Lower-Class Life, 1790-1940*, eds. Allen F. Davis and Mark H. Haller (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1973).

39. Very little work of substance has been done on the class basis of sports before the mid-twentieth century. Interesting (but nonanalytical) comments regarding the participation of immigrant workers in soccer and boccie, for example, may be found in pp. 61-65 of the otherwise very limited *Black Coal for White Bread (Up From the Prairie Mines)*, by Maurice R. Marcello (New York: 1972). Several recent articles and the recently established *Journal of Sport History* offer some possibilities, at least, for the expansion of this important area. For English and European views see two papers presented at the joint session on "International Approaches to the Study of Labor History," held by the Group for the Study of European Labor and Working Class History and the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association at the 1975 meeting of the latter: Charles P. Korr, "Working Class Football in London: The Founding of West Ham United"; and Robert Wheeler, "Sport and Society: Teaching Comparative Social History"; and refer to Joseph White, "Work Experience of Textile Workers in England," and a brief response to it in *Newsletter: European Labor and Working Class History* 7 (May 1975): 5. For suggestive works of fiction see David Storey, *This Sporting Life* (New York: MacMillan, 1960) and *The Changing Room* (New York: Random House, 1972).

TABLE 1. NATIVE- AND FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION, 1870-1890

WARD	1870			1880			1890		
	Total	Native-born	Foreign-born	Total	Native-born	Foreign-born	Total	Native-born	Foreign-born
All	105,059	69,175	35,884	136,508	96,178	40,330	181,830	126,259	55,571
1	9,599	7,584	2,015	7,616	.....	.....	7,595	5,866	1,729
2	7,334	5,058	2,276	8,187	.....	.....	7,151	5,307	1,844
3	7,624	5,885	1,739	6,572	.....	.....	6,404	5,064	1,340
4	5,890	3,882	2,008	6,745	.....	.....	5,946	3,847	2,099
5	8,771	5,692	3,079	5,343	.....	.....	5,403	3,991	1,412
6	10,240	6,018	4,222	15,784	.....	.....	25,830	16,393	9,437
7	11,987	7,443	4,544	8,183	.....	.....	9,288	6,422	2,866
8	6,840	4,558	2,282	12,025	.....	.....	19,575	14,908	4,667
9	5,458	4,391	1,067	6,793	.....	.....	7,084	5,846	1,238
10	9,229	6,455	2,774	11,321	.....	.....	13,897	10,277	3,620
11	3,677	2,393	1,284	6,140	.....	.....	11,784	8,952	2,832
12	4,582	2,416	2,166	12,977	.....	.....	19,616	12,009	7,607
13	13,828	7,400	6,428	18,260	.....	.....	27,600	16,673	10,927
14	.....	.....	.....	3,670	.....	.....	5,700	4,743	957
15	.....	.....	.....	6,892	.....	.....	8,957	5,961	2,996
16	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

NOTE: Tables are derived from various federal census volumes, 1850-1910. All apply to Newark, New Jersey.

TABLE 2. NATIVE- AND FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION, 1900, 1910

WARD	1900			1910		
	Total	Native-born	Foreign-born	Total	Native-born	Foreign-born
All	246,070	174,707	71,363	337,742	227,087	110,655
1	13,805	10,787	3,018	....	....	....
2	13,670	10,590	3,080	....	....	....
3	21,370	12,078	9,292	....	....	....
4	11,111	8,113	2,998	....	....	....
5	15,103	9,886	5,217	....	....	....
6	17,821	12,923	4,898	....	....	....
7	14,531	10,655	3,876	....	....	....
8	13,551	11,255	2,296	....	....	....
9	12,086	10,134	1,952	....	....	....
10	18,313	13,871	4,442	....	....	....
11	18,632	14,901	3,731	....	....	....
12	16,912	10,699	6,213	....	....	....
13	21,194	14,617	6,577	....	....	....
14	23,359	14,598	8,761	....	....	....
15	14,612	9,600	5,012	....	....	....
16	....	....	....	....	....	....

TABLE 3. POPULATION BY BIRTHPLACE, 1850, 1870, 1880

	1850	1870	1880
United States	26,561	69,175	96,178
Connecticut	533	1,006	1,053
Maryland	111	227	279
Massachusetts	277	769	755
New Jersey	21,477	55,673	79,536
New York	3,239	8,252	9,787
Ohio	41	208	271
Pennsylvania	504	1,547	2,231
Virginia, West Virginia	43	301	589
Vermont	45	127	....
New Hampshire	45	130	....
Illinois	....	....	148
Maine	....	....	154
Other countries	12,322	35,884	40,330
Austria	6	261	274
Bohemia	....	184	258
Canada	....	264	331
British America	....	39	87
France	240	710	764
Germany*	3,818	15,873	17,628
Great Britain, Ireland*	7,953	17,456	19,075
Switzerland	....	613	637
Prussia	4	....	....
Spain	8	....	7
Italy	....	....	407

\*See table 4.



TABLE 4. GERMAN- AND BRITISH-BORN  
POPULATION BY BIRTHPLACE, 1850, 1870, 1880

	1850	1870	1880
Germany	3,818	15,873	17,628
Baden	....	3,111	2,670
Bavaria	....	2,473	2,313
Brunswick	....	9	26
Hamburg	....	69	74
Hanover	....	363	389
Hessen	....	1,891	1,565
Lübeck	....	2	....
Mecklenburg	....	81	53
Nassau	....	75	34
Oldenburg	....	15	25
Prussia	....	2,788	2,383
Saxony	....	1,010	1,027
Weimar	....	27	6
Württemberg	....	2,402	2,115
Not specified	....	1,557	4,948
Great Britain	7,953	17,456	19,075
England	2,124	4,041	4,478
Ireland	5,564	12,481	13,451
Scotland	265	870	1,090
Wales	....	64	56
Not specified	....	1	....

TABLE 5. PERSONS OF SCHOOL, MILITIA, AND VOTING AGE, 1890

WARD	5 TO 20 YRS						18 TO 44 YRS (MALE)			21 YRS AND OVER (MALE)		
	Native-born White		Foreign-born White		Black		Native-born White	Foreign-born White	Black	Native-born White	Foreign-born White	Black
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female						
All	24,549	25,440	3,620	4,044	543	697	23,510	15,520	1,040	25,081	23,771	1,281
1	856	938	68	99	24	38	1,291	447	62	1,651	701	73
2	840	847	64	120	49	63	1,144	498	122	1,312	803	156
3	751	763	40	91	56	88	977	285	127	1,171	510	155
4	617	607	178	159	22	26	967	718	55	1,068	976	70
5	692	750	45	60	7	9	826	405	18	928	682	16
6	3,861	3,867	675	691	14	12	2,769	2,735	30	2,487	4,114	36
7	1,410	1,491	152	162	37	50	1,188	746	62	1,135	1,240	78
8	2,574	2,763	307	407	53	83	2,815	1,173	123	3,372	1,814	145
9	769	903	38	102	50	66	1,190	263	95	1,544	493	104
10	2,037	2,013	218	230	98	118	1,891	929	141	1,929	1,567	196
11	1,625	1,741	101	207	21	41	1,757	577	45	1,974	1,150	48
12	2,852	3,001	533	496	4	5	1,953	2,504	12	1,725	3,449	13
13	3,790	3,795	911	889	82	67	2,651	3,150	96	2,317	4,644	128
14	724	790	39	90	11	22	933	170	21	1,225	356	24
15	1,151	1,171	251	241	15	9	1,158	920	31	1,243	1,272	39

TABLE 6. EMPLOYED POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX, 1870-1890

	1870	1880	1890*
All	37,468	49,066	74,133
<i>10-15</i>			
Male	1,146	1,276	
Female	578	932	
<i>16-59</i>			
Male	27,873	35,171	
Female	6,361	9,655	
<i>60 and over</i>			
Male	1,398	1,815	
Female	112	217	
<i>10-24</i>			
Male			16,249
Female			10,135
<i>25-44</i>			
Male			27,483
Female			5,051
<i>45-64</i>			
Male			11,776
Female			1,418
<i>65 and over</i>			
Male			1,823
Female			198

\* Age groupings for 1890 differ from those of earlier census reports.

TABLE 7. EMPLOYED POPULATION BY BIRTHPLACE, 1870-1890

	1870	1880	1890
United States*	18,759	29,228	33,040
All other countries	18,709	19,838	41,197
Germany*	8,439	9,104	13,923
Ireland*	6,702	6,461	7,254
Great Britain	2,376	2,541	3,954
Sweden, Norway, Denmark	44	67	....
Sweden, Norway	....	....	162
Denmark	....	....	69
British America	193	156	....
Canada (English)	....	....	238
Canada (French)	....	....	13
Other northern European countries	289	....	....
Other southern European countries	220	....	....
Other countries	417	1,509	4,217

\*See table 8.

TABLE 8. EMPLOYED POPULATION, 1870-1890 (SUPPLEMENT)

	1870	1880	1890
Native-born (percentage)	5.0	59.5	44.5
German-born (percentage)	22.5	18.5	18
German-born (percentage of foreign population)	45.1	45.8	33
Irish-born (percentage)	17.8	13.1	9
Irish-born (percentage of foreign population)	35.8	32.5	17.6

TABLE 9. PERSONS IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS BY BIRTHPLACE, 1870

Occupation	Total	United States	Germany	Ireland
<i>All</i>	37,468	18,759	8,439	6,702
<i>Professional &amp; personal services</i>	8,416	3,069	1,538	3,297
Domestic servants	2,680	933	334	1,286
Hotel & restaurant keepers, employees	530	120	301	67
Laborers	3,249	734	621	1,688
Teachers (not specified)	264	200	32	15
Physicians, surgeons	122	94	19	2
Lawyers	118	109	5	2
<i>Trade &amp; transportation</i>	5,932	4,002	921	560
Traders, dealers	1,828	964	443	215
Clerks, salesmen, accountants	2,035	1,726	151	62
Railroad officials, employees	249	192	1	30
Carmen, draymen, teamsters	608	314	120	155
<i>Manufacturing &amp; mining</i>	22,829	11,588	5,864	2,799
Boot & shoe makers	1,417	492	507	217
Brick & stone masons, cutters	968	411	295	182
Carpenters, joiners	1,568	999	314	113
Cotton & woolen mill operatives	1,469	804	245	241
Curriers, tanners, leather finishers	785	343	147	227
Hat & cap makers	1,567	858	234	302
Milliners, dress & mantua makers	672	508	52	64
Tailors, tailoresses, seamstresses	2,315	1,069	771	277
Iron & steel workers	492	206	94	104
Blacksmiths	430	189	141	69
Harness & saddle makers	561	254	191	68
Machinists	583	290	122	39
Painters, varnishers	457	227	111	33

England, Wales	Scotland	Sweden, Norway, Denmark	France	Other Northern European Countries	Italy	Other Southern European Countries	British America	Other & Unknown Countries
1,994	382	44	412	289	5	220	193	29
246	20	9	68	51	1	43	65	9
50	10	6	11	8	....	17	23	2
18	....	1	9	7	....	4	2	1
111	7	2	29	19	1	12	25	....
5	1	....	4	1	....	1	4	1
2	1	....	2	2	....	....	....	....
1	....	....	....	....	....	....	1	....
216	46	3	66	39	....	41	32	6
94	17	1	43	19	....	19	13	....
57	11	2	4	9	....	2	9	2
16	5	....	2	....	....	....	3	....
10	4	....	1	2	....	2	....	....
1,519	311	32	274	196	4	135	93	14
151	15	1	14	8	....	5	6	1
44	22	1	6	2	....	4	1	....
71	19	4	9	19	....	3	15	2
88	60	1	13	11	....	4	2	....
46	11	....	2	4	....	4	1	....
110	3	2	31	10	2	6	9	....
30	3	....	6	3	....	4	2	....
87	23	3	34	20	....	19	10	2
51	22	....	6	4	....	....	2	3
17	5	....	6	2	....	1	....	....
27	7	....	8	1	....	4	1	....
92	18	3	7	6	....	4	2	....
57	6	8	2	10	....	3	....	....

TABLE 10. PERSONS IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS BY AGE AND SEX, 1870

OCCUPATION	TOTAL	10-15 YRS	
		Male	Female
<i>All</i>	37,466	1,146	576
<i>Professional &amp; personal services</i>	8,416	153	150
Domestic servants	2,680	7	145
Hotel & restaurant keepers, employees	530	1	....
Laborers	3,249	30	3
Teachers (not specified)	264	....	1
Physicians, surgeons	122	....	....
Lawyers	118	....	....
<i>Trade &amp; transportation</i>	5,932	192	13
Traders & dealers	1,828	....	....
Clerks, salesmen, accountants	2,035	118	13
Railroad officials, employees	249	....	....
Carmen, draymen, teamsters	608	29	....
<i>Manufacturing &amp; mining</i>	22,829	794	415
Boot & shoe makers	1,417	34	28
Brick & stone masons, cutters	968	4	....
Carpenters, joiners	1,568	7	....
Cotton & woolen mill operatives	1,469	175	104
Curriers, tanners, leather finishers	785	31	....
Hat & cap makers	1,567	53	26
Milliners, dress & mantua makers	672	....	35
Tailors, tailoresses, seamstresses	2,315	12	97
Iron & steel workers	492	19	....
Blacksmiths	430	5	....
Harness & saddle makers	557	18	....
Machinists	583	3	....
Painters, varnishers	457	5	....



16-59 YRS		60 YRS AND OVER	
Male	Female	Male	Female
27,873	6,361	1,398	112
4,689	2,975	370	79
14	2,333	5	41
457	51	20	1
2,939	30	244	3
69	186	8	....
101	4	17	....
109	....	9	....
5,235	263	221	8
1,582	130	110	6
1,753	126	25	....
243	....	6	....
558	....	21	....
17,714	3,118	763	25
1,135	129	91	....
921	....	43	....
1,512	....	49	....
745	430	14	....
725	4	25	....
1,136	281	70	1
....	635	....	2
1,173	943	74	16
458	1	14	....
397	....	28	....
521	....	18	....
567	....	13	....
439	....	13	....

TABLE 11. PERSONS IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS BY BIRTHPLACE, 1880

Occupation	Total	United States
<i>All</i>	49,066	29,228
<i>Professional &amp; personal services</i>	9,118	4,626
Domestic servants	2,882	1,412
Hotel & restaurant keepers, employees	211	122
Laborers	2,465	711
Launderers, laundresses	587	252
Lawyers	166	153
Officials, gov't employees	385	261
Physicians, surgeons	158	123
Teachers	445	382
<i>Trade &amp; transportation</i>	9,409	6,274
Clerks, salesmen, store accountants	2,528	2,204
Traders, dealers	2,838	1,545
Draymen, hackmen, teamsters, etc.	895	571
Railroad officials, employees	445	329
<i>Manufacturing, mechanical work, mining</i>	29,983	18,113
Bakers	502	160
Blacksmiths	533	239
Boot & shoemakers	1,762	770
Brick & stone masons, cutters	766	362
Butchers	596	279
Carpenters, joiners	1,309	875
Cotton, woolen, silk mill operatives	703	509
Employees in manufacturing (not specified)	822	601
Iron & steel workers	797	435
Leather curriers, dressers, finishers, tanners	1,161	487
Manufacturers, officials of manufacturing companies	636	438
Painters, varnishers	689	463
Tailors, dressmakers, milliners	3,960	2,548

Ireland	Germany	Great Britain	Sweden, Norway	British America	Other Countries
6,461	9,104	2,541	67	156	1,509
2,550	1,278	344	20	32	268
995	287	112	14	8	54
25	41	17	....	2	4
1,160	389	83	3	6	113
180	111	14	....	....	30
....	7	5	....	....	1
29	70	18	....	4	3
5	22	6	....	1	1
23	26	6	....	3	5
903	1,530	347	11	29	315
54	151	74	3	11	31
360	665	114	4	8	142
148	124	27	1	2	22
79	12	20	....	1	4
2,938	6,097	1,813	34	95	893
38	258	25	....	3	18
90	145	40	....	2	17
205	511	195	....	5	76
158	169	63	....	1	13
16	235	17	....	....	49
88	242	70	....	7	27
73	32	57	....	3	29
54	99	47	....	3	18
154	110	85	2	3	8
356	236	43	1	5	33
32	99	51	....	2	14
27	126	48	14	1	10
279	830	134	3	7	159

TABLE 12. PERSONS IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS BY AGE AND SEX, 1880

OCCUPATION	ALL AGES		
	Total	Male	Female
<i>All</i>	49,066	38,262	10,804
<i>Professional &amp; personal services</i>	9,118	5,177	3,941
Domestic servants	2,882	193	2,689
Hotel & restaurant keepers, employees	211	182	29
Laborers	2,465	2,428	37
Launderers, laundresses	587	42	545
Lawyers	166	165	1
Officials, gov't employees	385	376	9
Physicians, surgeons	158	155	3
Teachers	445	75	370
<i>Trade &amp; transportation</i>	9,409	8,682	727
Clerks, salesmen, store accountants	2,528	2,261	267
Traders, dealers	2,838	2,601	237
Draymen, hackmen, teamsters, etc.	895	895	....
Railroad officials, employees	445	445	....
<i>Manufacturing, mechanical work, mining</i>	29,983	23,870	6,113
Bakers	502	491	11
Blacksmiths	533	533	....
Boot & shoe makers	1,762	1,525	237
Brick & stone masons, cutters	766	766	....
Butchers	596	596	....
Carpenters, joiners	1,309	1,309	....
Cotton, woolen, silk mill operatives	703	216	487
Employees in manufacturing (not specified)	822	655	167
Iron & steel workers	797	780	17
Leather curriers, dressers, finishers, tanners	1,161	1,124	37
Manufacturers, officials of manufacturing companies	636	632	4
Painters, varnishers	689	688	1
Tailors, dressmakers, milliners	3,960	1,111	2,849

10-15 YRS		16-59 YRS		60 YRS AND OVER	
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1,276	932	35,171	9,655	1,815	217
104	182	4,708	3,629	365	130
9	170	....	2,450	6	69
....	1	182	28	....	....
35	....	2,161	37	232	....
....	3	41	501	1	41
....	....	158	1	7	....
1	....	354	9	21	....
....	....	137	3	18	....
1	2	70	366	4	2
206	65	8,135	628	341	34
102	39	2,118	228	41	....
....	....	2,447	216	154	21
8	....	869	....	18	....
2	....	423	....	20	....
949	683	21,866	5,381	1,055	49
10	1	468	10	13	....
2	....	493	....	38	....
48	31	1,356	206	121	....
....	....	717	....	49	....
6	....	575	....	15	....
1	....	1,231	....	77	....
22	68	181	415	13	4
60	22	579	144	16	1
54	....	694	17	32	....
40	3	1,054	33	30	1
....	....	576	4	56	....
8	....	655	1	25	....
36	274	948	2,542	127	33

TABLE 13. MEN IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS BY BIRTHPLACE, 1890

Occupation	Total	United States	Germany	Ireland
<i>All</i>	57,403	32,870	12,074	5,103
<i>Professional &amp; personal services</i>				
Physicians, surgeons	228	175	36	3
Laborers (not specified)	4,499	1,134	696	1,528
Restaurant & saloon keepers	756	204	341	110
Servants	305	135	83	46
Apprentices	752	625	78	8
Engineers, firemen (not locomotive)	727	392	140	106
<i>Trade &amp; transportation</i>				
Agents, collectors, commercial travelers	1,061	818	126	26
Bookkeepers, clerks, etc.	3,959	3,451	222	84
Draymen, hackmen, teamsters	1,957	1,022	284	176
Merchants, dealers, peddlers	4,486	2,608	1,027	260
Salesmen	1,189	992	92	33
Steam railroad employees	718	488	55	116
<i>Manufacturing, mechanical work, mining</i>				
Bakers	664	164	422	27
Blacksmiths, wheelwrights	732	346	201	84
Boot & shoe makers, repairers	1,670	513	589	147
Butchers	802	411	313	13
Carpenters, joiners	2,567	1,619	547	114
Cotton, woolen, textile operatives	553	288	123	26
Gold & silver workers	578	364	122	9
Harness & saddle makers, repairers	728	412	182	46
Hat & cap makers	2,058	930	437	154
Iron & steel workers	1,336	718	263	182
Leather curriers, dressers, finishers, tanners	1,995	855	550	392
Machinists	1,810	1,102	315	87
Manufacturers, publishers, etc.	1,105	747	183	55
Masons (brick & stone)	1,088	525	269	179
Painters, glaziers, varnishers	1,524	985	311	91
Plumbers, gas & steam fitters	592	450	68	30
Printers, engravers, book binders	818	574	135	16
Tailors	1,214	344	546	46
Tool & cutlery makers	726	432	184	28
Trunk, valise, leather-case makers	757	450	260	24

Great Britain	Canada (English)	Canada (French)	Sweden, Norway	Denmark	Other Countries
3,251	187	12	117	57	3,732
7	4	....	....	1	2
154	3	....	4	6	974
41	1	....	1	2	56
16	1	....	9	....	15
23	2	....	....	....	16
71	3	....	2	....	13
50	8	1	....	....	32
134	14	1	1	3	49
97	2	....	3	....	31
237	10	....	3	3	338
46	8	....	1	....	17
33	5	....	....	1	20
18	1	....	1	....	31
59	7	1	2	....	32
180	4	....	8	3	226
18	1	....	....	....	46
186	13	1	9	6	72
85	2	....	....	....	29
58	2	....	2	1	20
36	6	3	2	....	41
99	6	....	6	....	426
141	1	....	6	....	25
65	4	....	7	7	115
237	10	1	6	2	50
88	4	....	....	1	27
80	2	....	....	1	32
82	5	....	10	4	36
27	2	1	1	1	12
53	3	....	1	....	36
49	3	....	9	6	211
65	....	....	3	....	14
9	1	....	....	....	13



TABLE 14. MEN IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS BY MISCELLANEOUS CATEGORIES, 1890

OCCUPATION	TOTAL	NATIVE-BORN WHITE		
		Total	Having Native-born Parents	Having Foreign-born Parents
<i>All</i>	57,403	32,870	15,688	15,888
<i>Professional &amp; personal services</i>				
Physicians, surgeons	....	352	229	123
Laborers (not specified)	4,752	1,134	367	767
Restaurant & saloon keepers	764	204	69	135
Servants	549	135	71	64
Apprentices	758	625	159	466
Engineers, firemen (not locomotive)	746	392	235	157
<i>Trade &amp; transportation</i>				
Agents, collectors, commercial travelers	1,065	818	590	228
Bookkeepers, clerks, etc.	3,976	3,451	2,061	1,390
Draymen, hackmen, teamsters	1,957	1,022	475	547
Merchants, dealers, peddlers	4,515	2,608	1,469	1,139
Salesmen	1,190	992	624	368
Steam railroad employees	723	488	340	148
<i>Manufacturing, mechanical work, mining</i>				
Bakers	664	164	53	111
Blacksmiths, wheelwrights	734	346	206	140
Boot & shoe makers, repairers	1,674	513	214	299
Butchers	805	411	146	265
Carpenters, joiners	2,573	1,619	1,127	492
Cotton, woolen, textile operatives	554	288	59	229
Gold & silver workers	582	364	155	209
Harness & saddle makers, repairers	735	412	176	242
Hat & cap makers	2,060	930	310	620
Iron & steel workers	1,339	718	222	496
Leather curriers, dressers, finishers, tanners	2,009	855	216	639
Machinists	1,812	1,102	575	527
Manufacturers, publishers, etc.	1,106	747	530	217
Masons (brick & stone)	1,097	525	297	228
Painters, glaziers, varnishers	1,531	985	494	491
Plumbers, gas & steam fitters	596	450	142	308
Printers, engravers, book binders	820	574	275	299
Tailors	1,217	344	112	232
Tool & cutlery makers	729	432	155	277
Trunk, valise, leather-case makers	757	450	117	333

SINGLE & UNKNOWN	MARRIED	ILLITERATE	UNABLE TO SPEAK ENGLISH	UNEMPLOYED
22,302	33,202	2,571	4,214	9,554
60	159	....	5	....
1,739	2,804	1,179	874	1,175
85	645	19	37	8
308	226	36	25	27
757	1	8	22	105
111	598	14	28	56
316	700	2	13	72
2,511	1,400	3	27	195
737	1,164	104	72	219
1,189	3,158	241	459	499
640	522	4	11	67
225	480	32	19	45
220	431	18	109	78
177	538	19	52	105
478	1,113	93	235	440
299	497	19	58	50
752	1,706	31	152	571
313	231	11	32	98
244	322	6	17	144
286	407	8	34	170
746	1,240	180	382	984
639	664	28	63	215
827	1,125	73	266	492
678	1078	22	65	248
198	860	8	11	34
332	725	31	76	367
554	930	25	61	456
333	250	4	8	81
380	420	5	23	132
302	860	79	252	341
328	384	11	28	147
383	350	10	50	221

TABLE 15. DWELLINGS AND FAMILIES

WARD	1870		1880		1890*		1910†	
	Dwellings	Families	Dwellings	Families	Dwellings	Families	Dwellings	Families
All	14,350	21,631	18,796	28,386	23,296	38,906	38,693	77,039
1	1,211	1,613	....	....	....	....	....	....
2	1,052	1,496	....	....	....	....	....	....
3	1,104	1,541	....	....	....	....	....	....
4	766	1,102	....	....	....	....	....	....
5	1,255	1,013	....	....	....	....	....	....
6	1,304	2,224	....	....	....	....	....	....
7	1,431	2,589	....	....	....	....	....	....
8	1,018	1,250	....	....	....	....	....	....
9	891	1,059	....	....	....	....	....	....
10	1,381	1,994	....	....	....	....	....	....
11	551	707	....	....	....	....	....	....
12	693	1,905	....	....	....	....	....	....
13	1,693	13,828	....	....	....	....	....	....
14	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....
15	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....

\*See table 17.

†See table 18.

TABLE 16. DWELLINGS AND FAMILIES, 1890 (SUPPLEMENT)

Size of Dwelling	Number of Dwellings	Number of Families
All categories	23,296	38,906
1-family	13,703	13,703
2-family	5,992	11,984
3-family	2,376	7,128
4-family	575	2,300
5-family	370	1,850
6-family	180	1,080
7-, 8-, 9-family	81	616
10-family or larger	19	245

NOTE: There was an average of 1.67 families per dwelling.

TABLE 17. PERSONS PER DWELLING  
AND FAMILY, 1910

	Total	Number of Persons (average)
Dwellings	38,693	9.0
Families	77,039	4.5

TABLE 19. PERSONS IN SCHOOL  
IN CENSUS YEAR BY PERIOD  
OF ATTENDANCE, 1890

Number of Months	Male	Female
1 or less	2,580	2,419
2-3	190	203
4-5	155	177
6 or more	10,998	11,170

TABLE 20. POPULATION 6-20 YEARS OLD BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, 1910

	Total	Number in School	Percentage in School
All	97,544	61,916	63.5
Native-born white with native-born parents	30,348	20,460	67.4
Native-born white with foreign-born parents	48,836	32,846	67.3
Foreign-born white	16,256	7,283	44.8
Black	2,087	1,318	63.2

TABLE 21. FOREIGN-BORN WHITES BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE DURING SELECTED CENSUS YEARS

	5 YRS OR LESS		5-9 YRS		10-14 YRS		15-19 YRS		20 YRS AND OVER	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<i>1890</i>										
Number in school	1	.....	488	459	816	776	54	44	13	6
<i>1910</i>										
Total	.....	.....	1,422	1,401	2,008	2,006	4,246	5,173	.....	.....
Number in school	159	183	1,281	1,238	1,828	1,791	641	504	274	198

TABLE 22. POPULATION TEN YEARS OLD AND OVER BY LITERACY

	Total	Number Illiterate	Percentage Illiterate
<i>1890</i>	142,347	6,844	4.81
Male	69,192	2,924	4.23
Female	73,155	3,920	5.36
<i>1910</i>	275,974	16,553	6.0
Male	137,545	6,836	5.0
Female	138,429	9,717	7.0
Native-born white with native-born parents	71,790	220	0.3
Native-born white with foreign-born parents	89,737	553	0.6
Foreign-born white	106,316	15,131	14.2
Black	7,888	589	7.5

TABLE 23. POPULATION BY ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH, 1890-1910

	TOTAL	NON-ENGLISH - SPEAKING PERSONS	
		Number	Percentage
1890	142,347	9,413	6.61
1900	246,070	9,616	3.91
1910	275,974	25,285	9.16