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INTRODUCTION

One of the most exciting concepts emerging from the Paterson Salvage Archeology Project is the holistic study of a 19th-century industrial city. Being recorded are not only patterns of technological and industrial growth but also the cultural struggle of a newly migrated populous. The interaction of a study of Paterson's Irish working district, "Dublin," with studies of the city's industrial growth in textiles, locomotive building, and silk weaving, illustrates an interesting aspect of the evolving culture of a 19th-century city.

In July 1973, a precedent was set when an "archeologist-observer" was included in the Paterson archeological salvage contract work negotiated between Federal and State Departments of Transportation (D.O.T.) and Great Falls Development, Inc. (G.F.D.). The archeologist-observer, N.J. Historic Sites Section archeologist Charles "Budd" Wilson, was empowered to work outside the boundaries of the Historic District on the drain right-of-way and on the Route 20 extension as well, covering the entire highway area (see Figs. 1-1 and 1-2, and Article 4).

One area of the highway right-of-way explored by Wilson involved property behind houses on south Mill Street, on sections of land acquired by the D.O.T. for access roads to and from Routes 80 and 20 into the city. The property most specifically dealt with included 25 by 25-ft. lots behind the ten house-lots on Mill Street between Slater Street and Route 80. The houses on two adjoining streets to the east, Jersey and Pine Streets, had been bought by the State and demolished for the highway access before Wilson's study commenced. This left the ten house-lots on Mill Street exposed, cutting lot size from 25 by 100 ft. to 25 by 75 ft. (See Fig. 4-3.)

Archeological survey of the area purchased for highway access revealed 19th- and 20th-century surface debris, evidence of settlement on those lots during that general period of time. Grading of the same area unearthed stains in the ground, which Wilson identified as privy sites. Consequently 15 features, including nine privies, were excavated behind lots 188 through 198 on Mill Street. In the privies and cisterns, Wilson uncovered a storehouse of 19th-century domestic cultural material: numerous glass bottles and fragments; ornately decorated clay pipe bowls and pipe stems; articles of clothing; and a variety of ceramic material, marbles, and lighting device fragments (see Fig. 4-4). The material culture found coincided chronologically with historical analysis of the houses, and began to whet our interest in the 19th-century worker's society that surrounded the locomotive works.

According to local oral tradition, the ten house-lot area was included in the part of the city known as "Dublin," so-named for the Irish immigrants who had settled there in the 19th century. Although the landmarks guiding Dublin's boundaries have changed in the past 125 years—e.g., the Morris Canal has now been replaced by Interstate Route 80 (Bergen Passaic Expressway), the area itself is still very much intact physically (Fig. 1-1). The architecture of the housing still reflects its 19th-century origins. A twofold research project was thus begun—one that would generally recreate the Dublin worker's district as well as closely examine the structures on the ten house-lots under study, charting deed ownership, occupational trends, and census data, and leading eventually to the study of the social and physical mobility of these families. Some preliminary findings on these topics are reported here.

It is our anticipation that a study of the Irish migration into Paterson, particularly in the Dublin area, will correlate with industrial growth in the city.
during the 19th century, especially within the locomotive works. The impact of this ready supply of manpower, examined both economically and culturally, would complete the story emerging from excavations in the Historic District at the Grant and Rogers locomotive works (see Article 1). A brief sketch of Paterson's industrial beginnings points out the importance of such an available work force.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Paterson's industrial history began in 1792 with the inception of the Society for the Establishment of Useful Manufactures (S.U.M.), which planned to utilize the tremendous power source of the Passaic Falls by channeling water from the Passaic River through raceways to industrial sites. It was for this purpose that the Society purchased 700 acres of land above and below the Falls for $329s 8s. 3d. (approximately $30,000 or $40/acre) from its Dutch owners (Shriner 1890: 53-53). According to 19th-century historian W. Woodford Clayton, the S.U.M. purchase included "... all the land south of the river west of Prospect Street and north of Slater Street, to a line some distance west of the rocks; ... on Market Street between Main and Madison Avenue, and south to Slater Street; ..." (Clayton and Nelson 1882: 406).

But the land, the power, and the possibility of a product still needed an ingredient--people. To man the early textile mills, S.U.M. directors first sought skilled native workmen. Finding none, they imported workers from England, Scotland, Ireland, and other European countries (Clayton and Nelson 1882: 406). This early experiment into industrialization seemed plagued with problems, however, and resulted in the decision to "... abandon the manufacture and discharge their workmen ..." by 1796 (Archdeacon 1853: 3). The endeavor was labeled premature since there was neither industrial experience within the country nor any preparation for the exportation of trade. Not least among the reasons for failure were "the large sums wasted by the engineer" (Pierre L'Enfant) and the fact that "the machinists and manufacturers imported were presumptuous and ignorant of many branches of business they engaged to conduct ..." (Archdeacon 1853: 3).

Despite this initial setback, S.U.M. continued to lease land and water rights to manufacturers through the beginning of the 19th century. By 1829, the Morris Canal had been opened for navigation through the city, following the transportation corridor along the base of Garret Mountain (Archdeacon 1853: 8). This produced two factors conducive to increased industrialization in the city: a means of receiving raw materials and exporting finished products; and a new source of labor in the unskilled Irish canal workmen who remained and settled there (Diocese of Paterson 1963: 18). A third factor was the influx of ambitious young semiskilled men, like Thomas Rogers of Groton, Conn. (later founder of Rogers Locomotive and Machine Company), who with their natural ability and acquired skill, developed into a new manufacturing elite (Trumbull 1882: 111).

In 1839, Michael Chevalier, a Frenchman traveling across the United States, quoted an American writer who depicted the character of Americans of the time:

We are born in haste, ... finish our education on the run, ... marry on the wing, ... make a fortune at a stroke and lose it in the same manner, to make and lose it again ten times over, in the twinkling of an eye. Our body is like a locomotive, going at the rate of 25 miles an hour, our soul, a high pressure engine; our life like a shooting star and death overtakes us at last like a flash of lightning. (Chevalier 1839: 286)

Paterson, and well the whole of 19th-century industrial America, might easily be characterized in much the same way. As the first planned industrial city in the United States, Paterson became a hub of activity--in building, engineering, and people. Its fortune was made and lost numerous times, in cotton textiles, in locomotive building, and in silk manufacturing. The pressure of its economical engine fluctuated with the times and continues to do so today. What Chevalier recorded in 1839 was the strongest vibrating fiber of the new industrial nation: the people, who with their skill, labor, and ingenuity sought a new world and built it in these new industrial cities.

By 1850, the three companies that would become Paterson's 19th-century locomotive industry were already producing an annual product in locomotive machinery worth $850,000 and employing a total of 1001 hands (United States Census of manufactures 1850). With the problems that had plagued the earlier S.U.M. attempts surmounted, the city began a period of industrial growth and prosperity which would last until the end of the silk era in 1919 (Garber 1968: 276). Thus it was
with good reason that the merchants of the city boasted of its advantages:

The advantages which Paterson possesses for a manufacturing town are obvious. An abundant and steady supply of water—a healthy, pleasant and fruitful country supplying its markets fully with excellent meats and vegetables—its proximity to New York, where it obtains the raw materials and sale for manufactured goods and with which it is connected by the Paterson and Hudson River Railroad, by a Plank Road, Morris Canal, and Sloop Navigation, rendering it one of the most desirable sites in the Union. (Archdeacon 1853: 5)

POPULATION EXPANSION

The resulting growth of manufacture in the city, paralleling economic depression and famine across the Atlantic, led to tremendous bursts in immigration. By 1850 Paterson census population figures totaled 11,334, one-half the total population within Passaic County at that time. By 1860 the young city (organized in 1851) had nearly doubled in size, with a population of 19,588, and it continued to increase with figures reaching 33,572 in 1870 and 51,031 in 1880 (Passaic County Planning Board 1964).

In breaking down those figures for the area including Dublin, we find a total of 4291 people in the 1855 state census abstract of the south ward. Of this number, 2029 were white native born, 2239 white foreign born, and 23 black native born (N.J. Census for 1855: 24). The south ward abstract for the state census in 1865 shows an increased population figure totaling 7841 in the Dublin area: native-born males and females—3157 white and 33 black; foreign-born males and females—3038 white and 1 black; and children between 5 and 16 years of age—1610 white and 2 black (N.J. Census for 1865: 57).

It was not until 1870 that a population breakdown by nationalities was published, recording a total population in the city of 33,579, with 20,711 native born (this included native-born children of foreign-born parents) and a foreign-born population of 12,868. Of the total foreign born, there were 5124 Irish, 3347 English, 1429 German, 1360 Hollanders, 879 Scottish, 237 French, 170 Swiss, and 322 belonging to smaller ethnic groups. Thus, the Irish are the dominant foreign-born population in the city in 1870 (Clayton and Nelson 1882: 406).

A breakdown of population or ethnic statistics within the Dublin area becomes impossible after 1867. In that year, Paterson was redivided into five wards with portions of Dublin being included in four (Charter, Supplement, ... 1867: 2, 3). In 1872, the city was further divided, this time into eight wards, with Dublin being nearly equally divided between the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth wards (Charter of the City of Paterson 1872: 5, 6, 7; Atlas of Passaic County, New Jersey 1877: Wards 7-8). Thus, no specific figures exist for the Dublin area after 1865. A survey of 100 houses in the Dublin neighborhood between 1860 and 1880, which is still now in its early research stages, may well provide some interesting statistical information for this period.

Between 1880 and 1890, Paterson's population increased from 51,031 to 78,347; by the turn of the century this figure rose to 105,171 (Passaic County Planning Board 1964). Of that 1900 population total, 36.9% were foreign born—immigrants from all over Europe (Abstract of the Twelfth Census ... 1902: 104). Included among the total 38,791 immigrants were 9140 from England, Scotland, and Wales; 6714 from Ireland; 6584 from Germany; 4266 from Italy; 1672 from Russia; and fewer amounts from Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, Canada, Poland, and elsewhere (Abstract of the Twelfth Census ... 1902: 107).

TEN HOUSE-LOT AREA

Settlement Patterns. This same kind of population expansion and migration influx became evident in the study of the microcosmic ten house-lot study area. Data from the 1850 thru 1880 U.S. censuses were used to reconstruct the number of residents in the study area and their nativity. A number of factors became evident, substantiating the existence of a dominant Irish community. Settlement of the study area began before 1850 and became most intense between 1850 and 1870, as Table I shows. Although the first family to occupy the ten house-lot area was native born in New Jersey, immigration became evident by 1860 with 38.6% of the residents being foreign born. This figure rose to 40% by 1870. As the settlement rate of the lots leveled off and the number of families increased, the number of New Jersey-born residents increased to over 50% in both 1870 and 1880 (U.S. Census 1850; 1860; 1870; 1880; see Table I).
A definite immigration pattern was established during the 1860-80 period, when the majority of the foreign-born population was Irish. In 1860, 47% of the foreign-born population and 13.6% of the total population were born in Ireland. With increased settlement, this figure rose also, so that 71.8% of the foreign born and 27% of the total population in 1870 were Irish. By 1880, a leveling off occurred in both settlement and immigration into the study area, which was reflected in the 60.6% figure of Irish-born immigrants--21% of the total population. The influence of Irish immigration into the area is still evident, however, in the 1880 census figures, with parentage nativity from Ireland equaling 52%.

As Paterson's population continued nearly to double with each decade, the number of dwelling houses rose to meet the demand for living space. Settlement increased from 10 houses at the time of the S.U.M. initial purchase of land in 1792 to 74 houses by 1815 (Dickerson 1856). According to Reverend Fisher, in 1832 there were 839 dwelling houses in the then township; Mill Street itself had 22 (Fisher 1832: cxlvi). The 1840, 1850, and 1860 city maps show that these property lots developed first in the immediate area surrounding the industrial district and then fanned southward toward Garret Mountain and eastward toward Main Street (Map of the Town of Paterson, New Jersey 1840; Map of Paterson, N.J. 1850; Map of Paterson, New Jersey 1860; see Fig. 5-1).

Purchase of lots from S.U.M. by individual owners in the study area began when George Glass bought the corner lot at Mill and Slater Streets (Map of Paterson, N.J. 1850). According to an 1849 deed, the transfer of a 50 by 100-ft. lot was made between George Glass and the S.U.M. for the consideration of $1000 (Passaic County Deeds Book N: 559).

Census data for 1850 reveal Glass to be atypical of those studied for several reasons, however. First, he was native born in New Jersey, whereas all other initial purchasers were foreign born. Second, Glass was a mason and his neighbors were mostly unskilled laborers. Finally, his house-lot was twice the size of his neighbor's 25 by 100-ft. lots, and his personal and real property, totaling $2200 in 1860, was considerably more than that of his fellow householders (U.S. Census 1860: 61).

Settlement had seriously begun in this study area by 1860, by which time seven lots had been purchased and a total of seven houses had appeared (Map of Paterson, New Jersey 1860). The initial purchasers included the Trustees of the First Presbyterian Society in 1852, and four Irish unskilled laborers and their families: Thomas White and Daniel Burchell in 1853, Lewis Decker in 1854, and Richard White in 1858 (Passaic County Deeds Book R: 578; Book T: 1; Book W:

---

**TABLE I: NATIVITY OF RESIDENTS IN THE TEN HOUSE-LOT AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>1850 Resident</th>
<th>1860 Resident</th>
<th>1870 Resident</th>
<th>1880 Resident</th>
<th>Resident’s Father</th>
<th>Resident’s Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Foreign&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in</td>
<td>American water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data are taken from the U.S. censuses of 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880. To analyze the census data by the table's categories for 1860, it was necessary to compile data also from the New Jersey Census for 1855.*
Figure 5-1. This ca. 1860 photograph looks north down Spruce, Pine, and Jersey Streets toward the growing industrial district. Housing developing immediately adjacent to the mill area became part of the neighborhood still known today as Dublin. (Courtesy of G.F.D. and the Paterson Museum.)

346; Book V: 590; Book D-2: 461). One house had been added to the northwest section of the Glass lot, which five years later (1865) was subdivided and sold to John Dawson (Passaic County Deeds Book S-12: 168). By 1870 the three remaining lots had been sold to two more Irishmen: Michael Smith in 1866, and two lots to Francis Devlin in 1867 (Passaic County Deeds Book Z: 565; Book D-3: 328). In a deed of the same date, Devlin sold one lot to Peter Kelly (Passaic County Deeds Book Z-3: 415).

Later additions to the larger Glass property occurred in the construction of two additional houses, the first evident in the 1877 Atlas of Passaic County, New Jersey and the second appearing in the

Figure 5-2. Settlement of the ten house-lots reached its peak by 1884, as shown here in a blown-up section of the Atlas of the City of Paterson, N.J. for that year. Only one structure, 200 Mill Street, was radically altered after this date. Other houses underwent facade alterations and the additions of back sheds.
Family Structures and Occupations. An examination of the house-lots in the study area through the 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880 U.S. censuses reflects not only the physical expansion evident in population figures and architectural growth but also the assimilation of these immigrants into the city's economic and social spheres. The breakdown of household units in the study area, as Table II shows, clarifies the family structures within them. In the 1850-80 period, the greatest change occurred between 1860 and 1870. Within this decade, the number of families living in the house-lots increased by 100%, whereas additional housing increased by only 43%. This factor was further reflected in the doubling of the number of families within the study area and the movement from single-family dwellings to an increased 1.8 families per house. This trend was confirmed by the 1880 figure of two families per house, along with an increased number of boarders in the houses. Future architectural analysis of the houses should also substantiate this growth by dating additions to the original structures.

Age distribution and its relationship to a possible work force in the city became particularly significant, again during the 1860-70 period (see Table II). Population had begun to increase by 1860, with the U.S. census of that year recording a total of 44 residents in the ten house-lot area. Of that 1860 total, only 25% were among the working force, and 41% were nonworking children under 16. Statistics show that 46% of the 84 total residents in 1870 were working. In this year, the number of children under 16 had decreased to 32% of the total residents, with 14.7% of that number also being among the working force. This shift to a larger percentage of working members within the community continued in 1880, when 50.5% of the total 95 residents were among the working force. Again following the trend set in 1870, only 26% of the total residents were children under 16; 24% of that number were among the working force.

Although this brief sample does not statistically reflect figures for all of Dublin, or all of the city, it does show that for the ten house-lot study area the greatest work force became available during the period of greatest industrial growth in the city. Annual production figures for the three Paterson Locomotive works—Rogers, Grant, and Danforth & Cooke—substantiate 19th-century historian Levi R. Trumbull's date of 1873 as a height of that industry's production in the city (United States Census of Manufactures 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880; Trumbull 1882: 123, 131, 144). In the 1870-80 decade, the annual Paterson silk production figure increased from $3,998,964 to $14,164,465, with 31% of all the country's silk workers employed in Paterson (Garber 1968: 197-98).

Data charting occupations of individuals within the study area during this 20-year period (1860-80) are indicative of the work force's composition. Though taken from the 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880 censuses, the figures for the three Paterson Locomotive works—Rogers, Grant, and Danforth & Cooke—substantiate 19th-century historian Levi R. Trumbull's date of 1873 as a height of that industry's production in the city (United States Census of Manufactures 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880; Trumbull 1882: 123, 131, 144). In the 1870-80 decade, the annual Paterson silk production figure increased from $3,998,964 to $14,164,465, with 31% of all the country's silk workers employed in Paterson (Garber 1968: 197-98).

Data charting occupations of individuals within the study area during this 20-year period (1860-80) are indicative of the work force's composition. Though taken from the 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880 censuses, the figures for the three Paterson Locomotive works—Rogers, Grant, and Danforth & Cooke—substantiate 19th-century historian Levi R. Trumbull's date of 1873 as a height of that industry's production in the city (United States Census of Manufactures 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880; Trumbull 1882: 123, 131, 144). In the 1870-80 decade, the annual Paterson silk production figure increased from $3,998,964 to $14,164,465, with 31% of all the country's silk workers employed in Paterson (Garber 1968: 197-98).

Data charting occupations of individuals within the study area during this 20-year period (1860-80) are indicative of the work force's composition. Though taken from the 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880 censuses, the figures for the three Paterson Locomotive works—Rogers, Grant, and Danforth & Cooke—substantiate 19th-century historian Levi R. Trumbull's date of 1873 as a height of that industry's production in the city (United States Census of Manufactures 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880; Trumbull 1882: 123, 131, 144). In the 1870-80 decade, the annual Paterson silk production figure increased from $3,998,964 to $14,164,465, with 31% of all the country's silk workers employed in Paterson (Garber 1968: 197-98).
of the growth of particular industries as well as occupational mobility within certain family units. This latter topic will be dealt with more specifically in future studies.

In the 1850 U.S. census, one common laborer was listed along with one mason in the occupation breakdown (Table III).

### TABLE III: OCCUPATIONS OF RESIDENTS IN THE TEN HOUSE-LOT AREA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1880</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton mill worker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax mill worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk mill worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone cutter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone cutter's apprentice</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House carpenter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter's apprentice</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber's apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning shop worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass finisher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timekeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dye house worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea peddler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Work Force</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data are taken from the U.S. censuses of 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880. The data for 1860 are incomplete because the U.S. Census of 1860 neglected to list two families out of the nine who actually lived in the area, as substantiated by The Paterson City Directory (1857: 18); also the city directory of 1860, p. 52) and the deeds to the properties [Passaic County Deeds Book V: 19 (Mar. 16, 1854); Book U: 461 (Mar. 14, 1854)].

By 1860, a variety of occupations show workers involved in two major areas—cotton manufacturing and machine shops, spurring the growth of iron-working in the city. Numerous machine shops for building and repairing textile machinery had sprung up in the Paterson industrial district. As in the cases of Rogers, Grant, and Danforth & Cooke, it was this initial business that turned to locomotive building (Trumbull 1882: 118, 128, 136).

Figures for 1870 reinforce the importance of iron-working as an occupation, with 23% of the total 39 working residents employed in trades directly related to iron (U.S. Census 1870: 3-5). Those same 1870 figures introduce silk as the occupation of 31% of the study area working force; there had been no indication of silk as a trade of study area residents in the preceding ten years. Of the total 47 working residents in 1880, 34% were involved in the production of silk; the number working in the locomotive and iron-working trades had increased as well, to a total of 37% of the total work force.

Another interesting factor to arise between 1870 and 1880, evident in Table III, was the emergence of individual skilled occupations and private businesses, which reflected specialized training and education. This substantiates the theory of Herbert Gutman, who in his economic studies of 19th-century Paterson has found "... that the more ambitious and able workers found expanding opportunities outside the factories in small retail businesses, politics, and city employment ..." (Gutman 1968: 281). This occupational mobility becomes even more interesting when compared within the framework of individual families in the study area, between two and sometimes three generations. It is this more specific emphasis on individuals, in conjunction with their society, that will provide the bulk of future study in this project. At that time a particular emphasis will focus on the material culture found in the archeologically excavated features, relating it to the findings made through documentation.

**Architectural Design.** In 1792, the S.U.M. directors resolved that 50 houses be built to accommodate the workmen they were seeking, designating that the material used should be stone or clay and pointed, unless the expense would exceed by 30% that of a house with the same dimensions in wood. Houses were to be 24 ft. long, 18 ft. wide, and 12 ft. high from lower floor to the plate, each having a cellar and a garret (Nelson and Shriner...
A title search of the ten house-lots back to S.U.M. revealed no evidence of any of the 13 houses in the study area being built either by the Society or by individual manufacturers. These houses are primarily of frame construction on brick or brownstone foundations. Several of the earliest houses do nearly conform to the 18 by 24-ft. dimensions dictated by the Society in 1792.

House roof styles are either flat, reflecting the expansion of an attic level, or standing seam tin and pitched. Additions to the original houses consist mainly in one-story, unsubstantially built extensions attached to the rear of the houses. Only one house, at 200 Mill Street, has been drastically altered for expansion, the earlier structure being either torn down or incorporated into the newer, larger house. A complete architectural analysis is planned for this area; such findings should prove invaluable in further charting the settlement of lots.

Even a very cursory analysis of the outside of these structures reflects the changing idea of "home beautiful" in Dublin during the past 125 years. The mid-19th-century homeowner in the study area embraced, even within his limited means, the then popular Greek revival era. Door transoms and side lights, as well as sills and lintels, were small, inexpensive, yet definitive aspects of this period. Twenty-five years later, Victorian architectural style, epitomized by the nearby manufacturers' mansions with their neo-Gothic arches and elaborate full porches decorated with scroll trim and bracketing, was reflected in the simpler Dublin worker's housing by use of single-row bracketing under eaves and cornices (see Fig. 5-3).

As the houses in the study area were sold by their initial purchasers to a second group of immigrants early in the 20th century, the Italians, other decorative styles developed. During this period, wooden siding disappeared beneath asbestos shingles. Today, the most recent, Hispanic immigrants are following the pattern by adding their own cultural changes, as pastel-colored paint covers century-old clapboard and coats new aluminum siding. Aluminum siding often encloses the late 19th-century eave bracketing as well, presenting a modern-day adaptation to the original design. Patterns of architectural adaptation, coupled with analysis of particular individual owners of houses, their economic status, and desire for social mobility, may provide the basis for still another future study.

CONCLUSIONS

Within the next year, continued analysis will focus not only on the microcosmic scale of the study area, but on an analytical study of the greater Dublin community within the framework of 19th-century Paterson as well. In determining this social organization, two particular areas will be examined—management and the labor force. The former will review the culture of locomotive works owners and include social mobility patterns, housing, and material culture. This will be paralleled by a study of the Dublin worker's culture, and will include a breakdown of community structure. Particular emphasis will be placed on the institutions that acted as vehicles for the immigrants' social mobility and economic success—i.e., the church, fire and police departments, and social and athletic groups. Other areas for comparative analysis will be the growth of unions and labor history, as well as the changing patterns of political participation.
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