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The idea of America as a land of opportunity in which
merit was the sole determinant of social position has long
been a central belief in a culture which praised "success"
and idealized the "self-made man" who rose from "rags to
riches." Until recently, however, few historians have dis-
cussed the validity of these ideas, described their social
consequences, or related them to the social and economic
changes transforming American society in the nineteenth and
twentieth centuries.

These ideas formed the basis of the ideology of mobility.
In order to compare them with social reality, the author
studied social mobility in the town of Greenfield, Massachu-
setts, from the years 1850 to 1970. To avoid the limitations
of earlier studies, a new methodology was devised. Cohorts
of resident males married in Greenfield in the years 1850-57,
1880-86, 1910-12, and 1940-41 were traced through census
records, town directories, and tax assessment records to determine whether these persons remained in the community, achieved occupational mobility or acquired property. Since marriage records listed place of birth and name of the officiating individual, it was possible to determine the ethnic origins and religious affiliations of cohort members, and to assess the impact of ethnicity and religion on social mobility.

In Greenfield, all cohorts experienced high levels of out-migration. Few in any cohort rose from working class origins to professional, managerial, or proprietary positions. A sizable majority in each cohort acquired property. Contrary to expectations, ethnicity and religion had generally little effect on social mobility when class was held constant. But immigrants were more likely to acquire property than native-born; and Catholics, in the 1940-41 cohort, experienced a slightly higher degree of upward social mobility than Protestants.

Besides describing the social mobility patterns in Greenfield, the author also tried to relate the emergence of the ideology of mobility to the social and economic changes taking place in the community, and to describe the social effects of this ideology.

In Greenfield, the ideology of mobility assumed major importance with the industrial revolution. The factory
created a new class of businessmen who reaped the profits of an expanding economy. Industrialization also created a new lower class of workers and laborers (mostly immigrants) whose social and economic distress gave rise to many social problems. In this context, the ideology of mobility emerged as a means of creating a self-disciplined, sober, industrious, and frugal work force reconciled to the new social order.

(The ability of the workers and immigrants to acquire property and to achieve some degree of social mobility led the working classes and the community to accept the ideology of mobility. This acceptance resulted in such social consequences as general political conservatism, widespread political apathy, working class indifference to unionism, political parties which cut across class lines, and a strong tendency for political conflicts to focus on personalities and status issues like local prohibition.) The great stress which the ideology of mobility put on self-discipline and self-control also led, in the nineteenth century, to an increased emphasis on compulsory education, a strong Temperance movement, and a growing prudery.

(This general conservatism persisted long into the twentieth century -- modified by the impact of economic change, technological innovation, mass consumption, mass media, and the depression, but not abandoned.)
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

As early as 1844, Horace Greeley voiced the commonly shared belief in one of America's most celebrated myths:

Ours is a country, where men start from a humble origin and from small beginnings rise gradually in the world, as the reward of merit and industry, and where they can attain to the most elevated positions, or acquire a large amount of wealth, according to the pursuits they elect for themselves. No exclusive privilege of birth, no entailment of estates, no civil or political disqualifications, stand in their path; but one has as good a chance as another, according to his talents, prudence, and personal assertions. This is a country of self-made men, than which nothing better could be said of any state or society.¹

About one hundred and thirty years later, historians began to question the historical validity of these values. As one noted, "American legend has it that the United States has long been the land of opportunity for the common man. No other society has so often celebrated social mobility, none has made a folk hero out of the self-made man..." nor made a national obsession out of the fact of a fluid social order.²

In talking about a social myth, a historian must ask two questions: To what extent does social reality conform to the myth, and; what social functions does it serve?

Concerning the first question, there exists much literature but little insight. Sociologists have conducted numerous studies relating to the American social structure
and to the amount of social mobility, but their findings give little information about earlier eras. The only historical studies which do cover both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries deal with the social origins of members of the American upper class, particularly the business elite. This research has also been limited, telling little about social mobility within the social structure as a whole. The self-made man ideal embraces not only the poor boy who becomes wealthy, but also the one who achieves middle class status. Moreover factors affecting mobility into the elite may differ from those affecting mobility into the middle class. Since the elite represents a much smaller proportion of the total population than does the middle class, it follows that it is more difficult to enter the elite. Thus the fact that most elite members come from old stock, Protestant, urban, and business backgrounds while few arise from poverty says little as to whether the social system as a whole is "open" or "closed." The middle class could contain a sizable proportion of self-made men therefore giving credance to the Horatio Alger myth. Consequently, any discussion of the validity of the Horation Alger myth must consider mobility at all levels of the social structure and not just as its apex.
Previous Studies of Mobility

A few studies have been done on social mobility in the nineteenth century. In Poverty and Progress, Stephen Thernstrom studied the social mobility of unskilled manual laborers in Newburyport, Massachusetts between 1850-1880. He saw pre-industrial Newburyport as being a compact hierarchical community with a web of institutions, interpersonal relationships and values, which made all subject to the "vigilant surveillance of the dominant class." But a combination of population increase, immigration, an emerging market economy, and an emerging religious pluralism (including a large influx of Irish Catholics) broke down this social structure. The result was a loss of social control. In response to this, the community created new institutions and values which could restore the social control which formerly existed. Chief among these were compulsory education, a network of voluntary associations, and the ideology of a social stratification system in which one's place was the reward of one's abilities and hard work. The significance of the ideology of mobility lay in its social consequences. Acceptance of the ideology would serve to integrate workmen into the social order, thus promoting social stability by minimizing discontent and directing it against targets other than the Society itself. Asking how the claims of the mobility ideology compared with the actual mobility
of unskilled manual workers, Thernstrom discovered that most remained unskilled laborers, although some achieved non-manual status. Yet despite the relative lack of occupational mobility, anywhere from 1/3 to 1/2 acquired property within a ten year period of residence. Yankees had greater occupational mobility than foreign born; but foreign born, especially Irish, were more likely to acquire property. The sons of these unskilled laborers were generally semi-skilled laborers by 1870, and 11% became non-manual workers. Thernstrom reported that the acquisition of property often hampered inter-generational occupational mobility since it often required taking children from school and forcing their early entry into the labor force at an unskilled level. In addition, Thernstrom found a high level of geographic mobility; less than 40% of the laborers in town in 1850 remained in 1860. While few of Newburyport's unskilled laborers rose from "rags to riches", most succeeded in some way in bettering their lot. Consequently, they accepted the ideology of mobility and became a basically stabilizing and conservative group within the community. 8

Thernstrom's work made two major contributions toward an approach to the study of social mobility in Nineteenth and Twentieth century America. First, he showed that there are several dimensions to social mobility -- namely, occupational, property, and geographic. Second, he used the
concept of "social control" as a device for explaining the social changes which took place in mid-nineteenth century Newburyport. But while he gave examples of specific controls and showed how these controls broke down under the impact of immigration and industrialization, he never explicitly defined the concept of social control. In addition, he specifically related it to only one factor affecting social mobility -- namely, the ideology of mobility. Moreover, the social mobility of only the unskilled manual laborers tells little about mobility in the social stratification system as a whole. Special factors, such as the need of the father to take children out of school to help supplement the family income, obviously operated much more heavily on this class than on skilled workers or even semi-skilled workers.

In a subsequent study of social mobility in Boston between 1890 and 1940, Thernstrom reported that native Americans or native-born parents were more likely to achieve upward social mobility and less likely to suffer downward social mobility than either foreign-born or Americans of foreign parentage. He also found that British, Western European, and Eastern Europeans (mostly Jewish) immigrants and their children were more likely to achieve upward social mobility and less likely to suffer downward social mobility than Irish and Italians and their children. Thernstrom concluded his study by asking three questions: Did some ethnic groups have life styles and values which impeded
their mobility in American society? Did American society welcome some ethnic groups and place obstacles in the way of others? Did the relationship between ethnicity and mobility stem from religion, a variable correlated with national origins? Noting that the less mobile groups were also Catholic, Thernstrom suggested that the Weber Thesis of the Protestant Ethnic possessed some validity.

Richard J. Hopkins studied occupational mobility in Atlanta during 1870-1896. Among manual laborers, he found that 57% of the immigrants and 48% of the native-born whites, but only 7% of the Negroes, achieved non-manual positions. Among non-manual workers, he found that 23% of the native whites, but only 13% of the immigrants moved from white collar to higher level professional, proprietorial, or managerial positions. Hopkins noted that race, rather than national origin, was the basic determinant in job mobility at the blue collar level. At the non-manual level, where there were few Negroes, differences among whites became more significant. Nevertheless, the race consciousness of the South served to temper the prejudice of natives toward foreigners. Hopkins found a very high level of geographical mobility among all classes, but the persistence rates increased as one moved from low-level jobs to high-level jobs. With class held constant, Negroes showed higher persistence rates than either native whites or immigrants.
Hopkin's study suggested a definite relationship between occupational mobility and social group conflicts. Implicit was the notion that white hostility toward Negroes prevented Negro mobility, but fostered immigrant mobility as a necessary condition for the creation of white solidarity against the Negro.

Stuart Blumin studied occupational and residential mobility in Philadelphia during 1820-1860. Blumin found that upward occupational mobility remained constant, but that downward occupational mobility seemed to gradually increase. After the 1830's, craftsmen comprised a larger and larger proportion of both the upwardly and downwardly mobile. Blumin related the increase in downward occupational mobility to critical changes in Philadelphia's economic life in the 1830's and 1840's. In 1820, master craftsmen composed 34.3% of the work force, and journeymen craftsmen 21.9% (a ratio of 2 journeymen to every 3 master craftsmen). In 1860, master craftsmen constituted 16% of the work force, and journeymen about 32% (a ratio of 2 journeymen to 1 master craftsmen). Between 1820-1860, non-manual proprietors and master craftsmen combined declined from approximately 56% of the labor force to approximately 32%, while manual earners increased from 38.6% to approximately 55%. Blumin saw the change in the occupational structure as the result of the emergence of "merchant
capitalism." With the improvement of transportation and the expansion of potential markets, merchants became wholesalers of craft made goods. By organizing large-scale production of goods through hiring of journeymen to work on specialized tasks under one roof, the merchant gained control of the market and drove the independent master craftsmen out of the craft. This changed the occupational structure and led to an increasing magnitude of downward occupational mobility.

Blumin's study made a significant contribution by showing that occupational mobility was related to the occupational structure of the economy, and that changes in the latter caused changes in mobility. But he did not relate occupational mobility to ethnicity.

Structural changes in the economy affected more than just craftsmen, and overall, created upward as well as downward occupational mobility. Joseph Kahl argued that technological change reshaped the occupational distribution system by creating new jobs at the upper levels. As the economy became more complex, a higher proportion of men worked as technicians, professionals, and administrators and a lower proportion as unskilled workers. Leonard Reissman noted that mass production increased the proportion of trade, service, and sales personnel needed to distribute and sell the goods produced. Consequently, between 1870 and 1950, the proportion of professionals in the work force
increased from 3% to 8.5%, clerical-sales personnel from 4% to 18.9%, and skilled workers and foremen from 9% to 13.8%. On the other hand, farmers decreased from 24% to 7.3% and farm laborers from 29% to 4.3%.  

The changing occupational structure, noted by Blumin, Kahl, and Reissman, obviously had a profound effect on the level of social mobility, both upward and downward. New higher level white collar jobs were created; many traditionally skilled jobs became simple machine operations. But of the three, only Blumin tried to relate these large scale changes to the lives of individual persons.

Clyde Griffin studied the differences in the social and property mobility of workers within different crafts and from different ethnic groups in Poughkeepsie, New York during the 1850-1880. Griffin, like Thernstrom and Hopkins, found a high degree of geographic mobility. This was particularly pronounced among unskilled workers, craft workers whose skills were being diluted by mechanization, and those without property. Griffin reported that different ethnic groups tended to cluster in various crafts; and the Irish and Germans showed a definite tendency to accumulate property. As in Thernstrom, "the Irish and their American born children advanced more slowly into skilled and clerical work than the English and Germans and had more difficulty holding their positions during contractions in the workforce."
Richard Sennett, in his study of middle-class residents in the Union Park section of Chicago in the 1880's, found that members of small nuclear families in which the father was the sole breadwinner, were less likely to be upwardly socially mobile or geographically mobile, than members of large nuclear or extended families in which there were more than one breadwinner. In the small nuclear family, the fact of family dependence made the father unwilling to risk job changes or make speculative investments. This resulted in social immobility. Lacking the sense of satisfaction and security that came from occupational success, the fathers withdrew from the outside world, and focused their emotional energies on extensive family relationships. The intensity of the family relationship poorly prepared the child for the impersonality of bureaucracy and city life. The tendency of the father not to discuss his job, and the anxiety and inadequacy that he consciously or unconsciously communicated about it, left the son without the knowledge or self-confidence necessary for either geographic or upward mobility.²¹

In the extended family with more than one wage-earner, there occurred greater risk taking for the sake of gain, and also increased tendencies to talk shop and to compare work experiences. The greater upward mobility (resulting from increased propensity to take risks) led fathers to communicate their ambition and self-confidence to their sons.
Armed with job knowledge, self-confidence, and ambition, these sons achieved greater geographic and upward social mobility than their counterparts from small nuclear families.

The middle-class life-style in Union Park stood in sharp contrast with the life-styles of both the lower and upper classes. On one hand, lower-class workers did not withdraw from contacts in the community, but instead sought friends in bars and on street corners. Unlike the middle-class father, the working class father dominated his family, even to the extent of ruthlessly sacrificing his children's educations so that he could achieve home ownership. On the other hand, the upper class elite lived a luxurious, ostentatious, cosmopolitan style marked by extensive activities and interpersonal contacts outside the home. Sennett saw the middle class' valuation of stability and worldly asceticism as psychological defenses against the "sting of having not succeeded in gaining material success." By making self-conscious inhibition of enjoyment a virtue, he could turn ego-damaging feelings of inadequacy into ego-boosting feelings of self-righteousness.

Sennett made a major contribution by showing the impact of family structure and family socialization on social mobility. Nevertheless, his study raised a few problems. Contrary to Sennett, most contemporary sociologists see the middle class as more active in community associations and
activities than the working class. This raises several questions: 1) Were Sennett's Union Park residents atypical of the Nineteenth century American middle class? 2) If not, could the Twentieth century working class have adopted the patterns of the Nineteenth century middle classes?

Issues Raised in Previous Studies

The aforementioned studies observed various factors which influenced social mobility, namely, social control, the relationship of ideas and values on the one hand and socio-economic structure on the other, the Weber Thesis of the Protestant Ethic, social conflict, and immigration. But no study, except perhaps Thernstrom's, took them all into account. Before they are considered in the concrete historical situation of Greenfield, Massachusetts, it is desirable to define and discuss these factors in greater detail.

a. Social Control

Joseph Roucek defines "social control" as the processes by which individuals are taught, persuaded, or compelled to conform to the practices and norms of the group. Without social control, the behavior of the group becomes unstable and unpredictable. "Social control occurs when one group determines the behavior of other groups, when the
group controls the conduct of its own members, or when individuals influence the response of others. 28 There are numerous types of social control, but four types particularly relevant to any discussion of social mobility. The first is use of legal sanctions. If a person violates the law, he suffers the penalties. He pays a fine or goes to jail. The second is use of economic sanctions and rewards. If a person violates the norms of the group, community, or company, he subjects himself to economic penalties. The boss can fire him; customers or clients can boycott him; the bank or merchant can deny him credit; and co-workers or colleagues can refuse to provide necessary assistance. If he conforms to group or community norms, he may receive rewards in the form of occupational and social advancement. This makes occupationally ambitious individuals especially vulnerable to social controls. 29

The third mode of social control is group or community pressure. According to Roucek, "Normal development of personality and enjoyment of life depend upon participation in group activities, a degree of sympathy and understanding from others, and a fairly definite identity and status." 30

A person's image of himself reflects to a large extent his group status. If the group likes him, he likes himself. If the group dislikes him, he dislikes or hates himself. Consequently, any perceived change in his group status will
affect his self-image. Thus to meet needs for companion- 
ship, affection, status, and self-esteem, the individual 
must conform to established or acceptable modes of behavior 
and avoid actions which incur group displeasure. If he 
violates group norms, the group may ridicule him, gossip 
about him, or isolate him from participation in group 
activities. La Piere notes that those who have at one time 
incurred group or community displeasure are more likely to 
conform to group norms.31

Finally, the fourth mode of social control is the 
inculcation in internalization of group or community beliefs 
and values. Since social controls must operate on individuals 
when absent from the group, groups try to make their members 
internalize beliefs and norms which will control their be-
havior. These beliefs provide a frame of reference with 
which to define personal and group experiences, and instill 
a set of norms which dictate "right" and "wrong" behavior. 
They condition the members to desire those things which the 
group values and to dislike those things which the group 
does not value. Accordingly, group norms like commitment to 
"temperance" can persuade a person to like coffee or tea, 
but to dislike alcoholic beverages. Beliefs also teach 
members to value the approval of persons with high esteem 
(like the minister or banker) and to discount the approval 
of persons with low esteem (like the town drunk). Inter-
 nalization or group ideas and values turns social controls
into a mechanism of self-control so that violation of group norms incurs not only group disapproval but also personal guilt.32

Social controls affect social mobility by making mobility in part a function of conformity to group, company, or community values and behavior patterns. To climb the social ladder, one must conform. If one does not or cannot conform, then the chance for upward mobility will suffer.

b. Ideology and Social Structure

Thernstrom's Poverty and Progress and the discussion on social control make it clear that ideology, an integrated set of emotionally held beliefs and myths that account for social reality,33 has definite social functions. By accounting for or explaining reality, ideology enables individuals to define personal and group experiences, and to decide how to react in order to meet individual and group needs. Human needs are both material and non-material. Men need material goods and services for survival and pleasure, but they also need such intangibles as self-esteem, and status. Out of a continuous and patterned constellation of needs arises interests. As Otto Hintze stated, "Whenever interests are vigorously pursued, an ideology tends to be developed also to give meaning, reinforcement, and justification to these interests."34
One interest in any society is the desire of certain groups to preserve the prevailing social stratification system. In all societies, social inequality has been a source of social strain. Vernon Dibble noted that "those who do not possess power and rewards call into account those who do" so that those who have power and rewards must "legitimize their position in the eyes of those who do not." By legitimizing the system, the ideology of the prevailing stratification system reduces the desire to change the system, and thus promotes stability.

Dominant social groups have no monopoly on ideology. Sub-groups which seek to improve their relative position can also have an ideology, one which often contradicts the prevailing or public ideology espoused by the dominant classes. If the aspiring social group gains power, then the prevailing public ideology will change.

Socio-economic change can also bring about a shift in public ideology. As the economic interests of dominant groups change, the interests and values which the old ideology defended also change. Old values may be socially harmful to new interests. New interests may demand behavior patterns and values which are disfunctional or irrelevant to former interests. As a result a new ideology arises. A comparison of pre-modern or pre-industrial society with industrial society illustrates how socio-economic change affects prevailing ideologies.
David Potter noted that in societies of economic insufficiency, only a few could enjoy leisure and abundance. To minimize social competition for high status positions and to enable the poor (the vast majority of the population) to accept their fate as inevitable, societies resorted to, and ideologically defended, an arbitrary system of assigned or ascribed status. Thus a man was assigned the status of either noble or serf, or master or slave. He did nothing to earn this status; he could do nothing to change it.

An industrial society found ascribed status disfunctional. With industrialization came economic growth, and growth resulted in an increased number and proportion of skilled, semi-skilled, and non-manual positions. Economic efficiency demanded personnel recruitment on the basis of achieved competence to perform the task. This resulted in the substitution of achieved status (status earned through work, experience, or education) for ascribed status.

Historically, the relationship of social mobility to ideology has been very close. Ideology could either give or take away the incentive to strive. Ideology could also decree that certain social groups (because they conformed to certain ideologically defined criteria of acceptability) should be allowed mobility into high status positions while other social groups should be barred from these positions.
c. The Protestant Ethic

In his study of mobility in Boston, Thernstrom suggested that the Weber Thesis of the Protestant Ethic might have some validity. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism,* the sociologist Max Weber sought to define the "spirit of capitalism". What distinguished capitalist from pre-capitalist societies was not greed or avarice (which existed in all societies), but three following characteristics: 1) the belief that work was a duty and source of satisfaction in its own right, and not merely a means toward acquiring wealth; 2) the idea that economic judgments should be made on purely rational grounds without regard to traditional criteria; and 3) a distaste for personal indulgence. Having defined the "spirit of capitalism," Weber then argued that it was an unintended by-product of Calvinism and Puritanism, whose theology contained the seeds of a radical re-orientation of the prevailing economic ethics. Weber argued that the Calvinist doctrine of Pre-destination created within the believer a dreadful anxiety as to whether or not he was saved. Operating on the basis that God would reward His elect, the Calvinist sought to alleviate his anxiety by successful work in a calling. By succeeding in his calling, the Calvinist made sure of his "election" and glorified God through his labor and success. Along with a glorification of work went a spirit of worldly asceticism. To waste time was a sin, for man should serve the glory of
God. Indulgence in any form of pleasure glorified the flesh rather than God. This combination of success-striving in a calling and worldly asceticism fostered a spirit of economic rationality and the accumulation of capital. If the accumulation of wealth was a good in itself, then a pious man should direct his economic activity toward this end, and judge his actions by their economic success. Thus out of Calvinist-Puritan doctrines eventually emerged the full-blooded spirit of capitalism.41

The Weber Thesis provoked torrents of historical literature pro and con.42 But these studies discussed the historical validity of the Thesis rather than its implications for social mobility. Recently, numerous sociological studies have sought to test the validity of the Thesis by comparing the social mobility of Catholics and Protestants. Gerhard Lenski, in his study of Detroit, concluded that "Protestants are more likely than Catholics to rise in the economic system, and these differences are especially pronounced at the level of the upper middle class."43 Some studies have agreed with Lenski,44 while others have found no difference between Catholics and Protestants in their social mobility.45 In some of these latter studies some researchers have argued that such factors as urbanization, secularization, bureaucratization, and assimilation of immigrant groups have eroded original Catholic-Protestant differences.46
While such studies have contributed a great deal, they suffer like other contemporary sociological studies from a lack of historical perspective. If the Weber Thesis was valid, then its effects on mobility should have been more pronounced in the past. In addition, Calvinist Protestant valuation of upward mobility and success in one's calling should have been a variable independent of any changes in the socio-economic structure per se. Thus the only way to test the validity of the Weber Thesis is to study Catholic-Protestant differences in social mobility over a long period of time. No study has done this.

d. Social Conflict

A fourth issue raised by the study of mobility is social conflict engendered by class and status.

The concept of class conflict received its classic exposition from Karl Marx. Marx saw the modes of production (the institutionalized means by which goods were produced and distributed) as dividing society into antagonistic classes. The criteria upon which social classes were based were ownership or non-ownership of the modes of production. Marx saw capitalism as subsuming all other forms of property under the form of capital, so that the social system became polarized into two, and only two, classes: capitalists and proletarian. Marx thought that capitalist modes of production fostered a proletarian class consciousness which led
to the formation of class-based organizations. These organizations would engage in progressively more militant class action against the capitalists until class action finally culminated in revolution. Gerald Rosenblum noted that Marx saw class not in terms of a common position within the stratification system, but as the communal action group arising out of "class consciousness."^48

In contrast to Marx, Max Weber saw stratification as a manifestation of the unequal distribution of power. But power exists under three different orders -- economic, social, and political. Each order has its own separate hierarchy (to which Weber applied the terms -- "class," "status," and "party") with its own peculiar type of power.^49 Weber saw class as a group of economically similarly positioned individuals. Classes are distinguished by the following criteria: ownership or non-ownership of the modes of production; the specific kind of property owned (for the specific kind of property determined the type of economic power that one could exercise); and the kind of services or skills that one can offer in the labor market. Those who hold a skill monopoly or offer services in short supply (such as professionals or skilled craftsmen) possess an economic power which the unskilled proletarian totally lacks.

Weber's distinctions increased the number of classes that existed, and the possible relationships and conflicts
between these classes. Conflict between bourgeoisie and proletariat constitute only one possible source of class conflict. Weber differentiated between class and communal action group. Class presents a possible basis for a communal action group ("class" in the Marxist sense), but this is problematic and not inevitable. Occurrence of class conflicts demands certain conditions, one of which is a popular perception of the class situation as a result of either the given distribution of property or the concrete economic order.

Status groups, as opposed to classes, are communities created by a "specific, positive or negative, social estimation of honor." Any quality shown by a group can be the source of this honor or prestige, including class distinctions. But class is not necessarily related to status, and people in different classes can belong to the same status group. Thus Negroes represent a status group whose members range from high level executives to public welfare recipients. Status groups exhibit a specific style which differentiates one from another and reflects prestige differentials. Styles of life can reflect such common factors as class, educational level, ancestry, occupation, consumption patterns, religion, race, and ethnicity. Status groups foster adherence to life style patterns by facilitating "in group" interaction while limiting interaction with others in lower status groups. Status groups seek to
monopolize goods, privileges, opportunities, and symbols that confer honor or prestige so as to maximize social distance between the self and others. As a means of achieving or protecting this monopoly, status groups often seek legal privileges and political power. They often also try to restrict entry by legally or socially discriminating against newcomers (such as forbidding entry to members of "negative" status groups such as Negroes or Jews), or by establishing prerequisites for entry which are unavailable to newcomers (such as the Daughters of the American Revolution). The tendencies of status groups to seek monopolies of privilege or to become castes provides a fertile source of social conflict. This is particularly true when one status group seeks to protect or extend its privileges at the expense of another, or when non-members of a particular status group seek to break the monopoly of that group upon a given privilege.55

The party represents the source of political power in the political arena. Its position vis-a-vis other parties depends upon its ability to "influence a common action, no matter what its content may be."56 Party actions are goal-directed—aimed at the realization of a particular program or the achievement of securities, power, and honor for party leaders and their followers. Parties represent both class and status group interests, and can recruit a following from either one or the other or both. Thus parties can either reinforce lines of class and status group
cleavage or cut across them.

Weber noted that power in one order often resulted in power in others. Thus a wealthy businessman can possess both high social status (as a result of his occupation, wealth, and consumption levels) and political power, (by his ability to create political obligations through heavy campaign contributions). But power in one order need not result in power in others. Thus, another wealthy businessman can have low social status because of his racial or ethnic origins. While power in one order does not automatically confer power in other orders, it can be used as a means of either opening up channels of mobility or influencing conflicts in them. Thus a group with some political or economic power can use it to raise their low social status or to erase barriers to upward mobility.

The relationship between social conflict and social mobility has been very intimate. Hopkin's study of Atlanta implied a definite relationship between occupational mobility and social group conflicts. In a society which values social mobility, both the failure to achieve mobility, and perceived obstacles to mobility have been a rich source of social conflict. As Robert Merton stated, "When the institutionalized system is regarded as a barrier to the satisfaction of legitimate goals, the stage is set for rebellion. . .".57 The achievement of mobility, however, will foster an acceptance of the status quo.
While barriers to social mobility can be a source of social conflict, the latter can influence the amount of social mobility. Social conflicts can lead groups to try to limit the social mobility of members of other groups. Nevertheless, a desire to avoid conflicts or to seek allies can lead a group or community to keep channels of mobility open.

Thus any study of social mobility must ask the following questions: What social conflicts exist in the community? Do these conflicts serve to open or to close channels of upward mobility? How do the various social groups in the community react to the conflict? What effects do these conflicts have on both the community as a whole and the social groups within it?

e. Immigration

The final issue raised by the study of mobility was the effect of immigration and immigrant status on mobility.

Bernard Barber reported that the immigration of large numbers of lower-class workers increased the mobility opportunities of native-born Americans. Oscar Handlin and Gerald Rosenblum stressed that the vast majority of immigrants were peasants whose traditional way of life in their native societies was being threatened by population growth, land scarcity, small insufficient land for either one's self or for subdivision among one's sons, emergence
of a market economy, and a lack of non-agricultural employment. Consequently, most immigrants came from pre-modern societies, whose social structure and culture differed radically from America's. The desire to recreate the solidaristic aspects of the peasant village, and the need to adjust to a strange environment drove the immigrant to a heightened sense of ethnic group consciousness. The ethnic group served several functions for the immigrant. It gave him a sense of social location and self-identification; it facilitated his adaptation to American cultural patterns; and it provided him with a extensive network of groups and institutions which enabled him to confine his primary group relationships to fellow immigrants. Thus the ethnic group had the paradoxical effect of promoting acculturation or cultural assimilation (acceptance of American ideas, values, and behavior patterns) and hindering structural assimilation (entrance into the primary groups of the host society).

It has been argued that structural segregation, as opposed to structural assimilation, of immigrant ethnic groups hindered the upward social mobility of the group and its members. Rosenblum noted that migrants from pre-modern social structures were generally placed in the least skilled jobs so that ethnic segregation by hampering "the flow of knowledge and experience and thus [impeding] diversification of interests and occupations" fostered group occupational uniformity. Ethnic segregation facilitated stereotyping
of the ethnic group as a (usually negative) social status group, thus leading to the establishment of status barriers and emergence of ethnic group conflicts.

It has also been argued that the ethnic group has given way to the religious community, and that structural segregation based on religious affiliations has replaced that based on ethnicity. But other sociologists have contended that with the decline of the ethnic group, social class and occupation have replaced religion and ethnicity as the foundations on which primary group relationships are formed.

These controversies have raised the questions: What is the relationship between ethnicity, religion, social mobility, structural segregation and social conflict?

f. Theoretical Framework

From the aforementioned studies and discussions, we can formulate a tentative framework in which to study social mobility trends since 1850. This framework would include the following -- all of which are either stated or implied in the above literature: 1) Every society has a public ideology which seeks to justify the prevailing social system. 2) As the social system changes, new ideologies arise to justify the new system. This does not preclude the possibility that religious or ideological factors might in turn bring about certain social and economic
conditions, or affect the social system independently of other variables. Hence the relationship between ideology and social structure must be determined on the basis of historical study. 3) Whatever its ideology, every social system seeks to preserve itself by instituting effective modes of social control. These modes include legal sanctions, economic rewards and punishments, value inculcation, and group pressure. 4) The effectiveness of specific forms of social control will vary according to the prevailing economic, social, cultural, and demographic conditions. Controls effective in one context can prove ineffective in others. 5) Industrialization deeply affects not only the economic and occupational structure of the society and community, but also the prevailing cultural values and social institutions. Often industrialization is disruptive of the latter to the point that traditional social controls seem no longer effective, and traditional ideologies and norms no longer valid. 6) As a result of the social dislocation and anomie caused by industrialization, the society and community attempt to devise new and more effective modes of social control, and to generate new ideologies which can explain the new social reality, defend the newly emerging social stratification system, justify the new forms of social control, and validate the norms and values appropriate to the new socio-economic order. 7) In an industrialized society, large scale social mobility is
necessary for the proper functioning of the economy, but possible only for a minority of individuals. In this context, social stability demands that the prevailing ideology encourage competitive upward striving, and also justify the class and status system in such a way that these who are not successful in the competition either blame themselves (and not the system) or achieve a vicarious feeling of having succeeded. Finally, given the impact of industrialization and its ideological consequences upon social mobility, it is evident that the level of mobility in any society is intimately related to both the structure of the economy, and the ideological defense of the social class and status system.

It becomes clear from the above propositions and the previously discussed literature that the extent of social mobility is determined by several factors, among which are the following: a) the structure of the economic-occupational system; b) the community system of social control; c) the prevailing ideas and values concerning economic activity and social striving; d) the class and status group relationships that exist in the community; e) the level and type of social group conflict; f) the degree to which dominant status groups seek either to promote social harmony or increase social distance; g) the extent to which vacancies are created by emigration from the community, and filled by immigration into it; and h) the amount of ethnic segregation.
Since social mobility is defined and affected by the economic-cultural-social context in which it occurs (a concept that logically follows from the above), it is clear that the historical study of social mobility must include a detailed discussion of the economic and social history of the community and society in which the social mobility takes place.

This dissertation will use the above framework and procedure to investigate social mobility in Greenfield, Massachusetts from 1850 to 1970. By discussing in detail the economic and social history of the town, and describing the prevailing patterns of social mobility, this study will attempt to discover how social mobility affected, and was affected by, the values, social life, institutions, and economic structure of the community, and in this process, determine the validity and social functions of the "ideology of mobility" in one small part of modern America.
CHAPTER I

Footnotes


6 C. Wright Mills, p. 44.

7 Thernstrom, p. 39.

8 Thernstrom, pp. 33-56, 57-59, 85, 100, 106, 117, 154-157, and 166, 191.


10 Thernstrom, pp. 128-154.

11 Thernstrom, p 159.


14 Blumin, p 183, 179, 197, 198, 199.


20 Griffin, pp. 80-81.


22 Sennett, pp. 208-209.

23 Sennett, pp. 225.

24 Sennett, pp. 220-223.


27 Roucek, p. 10.
28 Roucek, p. 9.


30 Roucek, p. 319.

31 Lapiere, pp. 239, 247

32 Roucek, pp. 210, 212.

33 This definition of ideology comes from Joan H. Rytina et al., "Income and Stratification Ideology: Beliefs about the American Opportunity Structure," American Journal of Sociology 75 (January, 1970), 703.


38 Hopkins' study of social mobility in Atlanta indicated the power of racism to reduce Negroes to a low status caste and low class level.


41 Bendix, pp 60-63.

Lenski, p. 357.


Reissman, pp. 46-49. Ownership of different specific modes of production accounted for class divisions between feudal aristocrats (who owned land) and bourgeoisie (who owned capital). The degree of control that each mode demanded of those without ownership differentiated proletarian workers from slaves or serfs.

49 Reissman, pp. 58-59.
50 Rosenblum, p. 28.
52 Reissman, p. 61.
53 Gerth and Mills, p. 184.
54 Gerth and Mills, p. 187.
55 Reissman, p. 65, 66.
56 Gerth and Mills, p. 194.
58 Barber, p. 418.
59 Oscar Handlin, The Uprooted, Grosset's Universal Library (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1951), pp 7-36; Rosenblum, pp. 133-137.
60 Rosenblum, pp 96-97, citing E. K. Francis, "Variables in the Formation of So-Called 'Minority groups,'" American Journal of Sociology 60 (July 1954).
63 Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p 38. Gordon distinguishes between primary and secondary groups. Primary groups are groups in which contact is personal, intimate, informal, face-to-face, and involves the entire personality. Secondary groups are groups in which contact is impersonal, formal or casual, non-intimate, segmentalized, and involving just the periphery of one's personality.

CHAPTER II

PRE-INDUSTRIAL GREENFIELD, 1718-1830

Early Greenfield was a small, isolated, tightly-knit, homogenous, and largely self-sufficient community. Between 1765 and 1790, the population expanded from 368 to 1,498, and during the years from 1790-1820, the town, like other Western New England farming communities, suffered a population decline. Thereafter, it grew very slowly, reaching 1756 people by 1840.¹

Settlement in Greenfield dated back to 1718 when the proprietors of the Pocumtuck lands issued a series of land grants to landless sons of neighboring Deerfield settlers.² Originally founded to protect the inhabitants from French instigated Indian raids, the village served as a force for social control and social improvement. In the words of Timothy Dwight, the village made all people "neighbors, social beings, and... subjects of at least some degree of refinement."³

Economic Structure

Prior to the industrialization begun in the 1830's, a steadily increasing proportion of the population took up residence outside the village. But most of Greenfield's inhabitants were full-time farmers, who conducted their
farming operations on outlying fields and lived on small home lots (approx. 2 to 8 acres) stretched out along the main street.

Greenfield's farmers produced primarily for household consumption rather than for commercial sale or export. Because of inadequate transportation systems and lack of nearby markets, farmers found no demand for their produce except for those few items which the local storeowner could consign to merchants in Hartford and Springfield for subsequent shipment to the West Indies, New York or the South.

Virtually all farms were subsistence operations with family members constituting the bulk of the labor force. Land being cheap, farms tended to be large. Because there were few hands the farmer cultivated only a small proportion of his land. Since the farmer rarely had a source of outside income, he depended upon the farm for most essentials—"food, clothing, house furnishings, farm implements, [and] in fact practically everything." He raised corn, rye, and oats, but only few garden vegetables, since the latter required intensive cultivation. Most farms contained an apple orchard. Most farmers made apple cider and from the cider, distilled brandy. A large portion of the farm consisted of pasture and meadow or "mowing" land, where horses, cattle, sheep, oxen and swine grazed. The cattle supplied beef, milk, cream, butter and cheese; the sheep provided wool from which the women wove the family's "homespun" clothes.
Bees furnished beeswax and honey; and maple trees, maple sugar and syrup. In the farm woodlands, the farmer cut firewood and lumber for constructing (usually with the aid of the local carpenter) his house, barn, and furniture.  

The farmer was not completely self-sufficient as he still had to buy such items as cotton, pewter, tea, coffee, molasses, salt, and glass. Nevertheless, the family farm or the local community met most of the farmers' economic needs.

Aside from full-time farmers, there were a few local professionals (doctor, lawyer and minister), merchants, and artisans. But even these were, without exception, part-time farmers, since non-farming activities alone did not provide enough income to support a family. The merchants were the proprietors of the taverns, saw mills, grist mills, tannery, and country stores.

The tavern served a wide variety of purposes. While it provided hospitality to the occasional traveler, its main customers were the local townspeople. The tavern served as a social center, where people could chat and discuss business. There people could pass along the latest gossip, hear and discuss the news a traveler brought. Social events such as balls, parties, harvest suppers and musical performances also took place in the tavern. Drinking was fairly common, and before 1830 carried no social
stigma. A tavern, owned by one Ahaz Thayer, was located right near the church and during the intermission between the morning and afternoon Sunday sermons, the men (minister included) would go over and "fortify themselves against the rigors or the weather during the afternoon service and the long ride home [afterwards]."

The country stores sold a miscellany of items under the term "European and West Indian goods." These included such items as calicoes, lush linens, muslins, fustians, denims, silk, cotton, tea, pepper, alspice, molasses, brandy, crockery, pots, kettles, mugs, wine glasses, and gin. Customers generally paid by bartering such commodities as grain, furs skins, livestock, garden vegetables, butter, cheese, lard, tallow, beeswax, apple cider, cider brandy, cordwood, staves, hogsheads, barrels, and rags. Often the customers bought on credit, for an advertisement by Beriah Willard contained the notice: "All persons indebted to said Willard are requested to make immediate payment. Those notes and accounts that have lain two or three years, will be put into the hands of an attorney unless settled by the middle of March next."

Like other New England Towns, Greenfield has its small village industries. By the 1790's they included a grist mill, a nail mill, a cooper shop, a potash works, a tallow house, a tannery, a slaughter house, and an iron foundry.
The town also contained a shoemaker, 2 blacksmiths, a carpenter-cabinet maker, and a few other artisans. These industries were small operations whose output was directed to local customers.

The quasi self-sufficient nature of the economy resulted in a low degree of economic efficiency and a standard of living, which seems low to an industrial age. The limited production of goods and a small market made for little difference in the standard of living or lifestyles within the community. Farmers produced just enough to feed themselves and to provide a small surplus, which could be exchanged for a few goods and West India luxuries. Because of a limited labor supply, primitive technology, inadequate means of preservation and storage, and lack of markets, farmers found it impractical to increase production.

There were few landless farm laborers. Farmers could usually accomplish their ends with the help of family members or, in exceptional situations, neighbors. If farm laborers were needed, as in farm families without sons, they were generally relatives or the sons of poorer neighboring families. In the socio-economic context of early Greenfield, social mobility meant either the achievement of farm ownership, or the acquisition of more land. With a lack of full-time economic specialization, there was little occupational differentiation -- all were either full or part-time farmers.
Social Control

The sociologist C. Wright Mills once noted that in an economy of farm owners "the relation of one man to another was a relation not of command and obedience but of man-to-man bargaining." This factor made social control of the population dependent not upon economic sanctions, but upon group pressure and commonly shared values. Thus the problem of the community was to devise institutions which could use group pressure and commonly shared values as mechanisms of social control. The importance of the town meeting, church, and school lay in their becoming the institutional means whereby the community inculcated values into, and exerted group pressure upon its members. Thus the town meeting represented a formal group, created by the community, to use group pressure to enforce social conformity. As a social historian of New England has stated,

The meeting gave institutional expression to the imperatives of peace. In the meetings consensus was reached, and individual consent and group opinion was placed in the service of social conformity. There the men . . . established their agreements on policies and places, and there they legitimized those agreements so that subsequent deviation from those accords became socially illegitimate and personally immoral as well, meaning as it did the violation of a covenant or the breaking of a promise.

In this town meeting context, the extended franchise represented not a commitment to democracy per se, but merely a recognition that effective law-making required
that most men be parties to town meeting decisions. Those not allowed to vote were non-residents, dependents of voters, and tenants or hired laborers. Since they either could be privately compelled or were not truly members of the community, there was no need to include them as voters. The requirements of social control demanded the participation of "all a town's independent men, but, ideally, only of these." Since others could be either controlled or excluded, their participation in community decisions was neither needed nor desired.21

There were few limitations upon the powers of the town meeting. It acted in all phases of Greenfield's political, economic, social, and religious life. It hired school teachers and ministers, elected town officers, made laws, and appropriated money. The extent to which it intervened in community life is illustrated by the following enactments: to permit the Reverend Mr. Billings to have a garden in the street (December, 1755); to require the Reverend Dr. Newton to preach every fourth Sabbath in the northeast part of town [i.e., what is now the town of Gill] (March, 1784); to set up a Committee of Correspondence during the Revolutionary War (March 29, 1775); and to appoint "Agrippa Wells, Ezekiel Bascom, Ariel Hinsdale, and Reuben Wells to tune the psalm."22

The large number and varied functions of the town officials, elected by the town meeting, illustrated the
desire for social control and consensus. Officials, elected in 1753 when the town was incorporated, included a moderator of the town meeting, a town clerk, 3 selectmen, and assessors, a treasurer, a constable, 2 tithing men, 3 fence viewers, 2 highway surveyors, a deer reeve, 2 hog reeves, a sealer of weights and measures, a sealer of leather, and 2 field drivers— all in a town with a population of less than 192. The nature of the town offices indicated that economic life was strongly regulated. The town officials manifested a desire to reinforce the town meeting consensus by involving a large body of the influential men in the community in carrying out town meeting policies. Since group pressure demanded group harmony, policy decisions to be voted on in the town meeting were generally negotiated before hand so as to achieve a unanimity of opinion.

To preserve the community consensus which was the source of community and group pressure towards conformity, the selectmen could order strangers in the community to leave; and often they exercised this power if the newcomers were religiously unorthodox, morally undesirable, likely public charges, or threats to the livelihood of any community residents.

The church represented a strong force for social control. Under the ministry of the Reverend Roger Newton, pastor from 1761 to 1816, "no scandelously ignorant or immoral person
Church members were expected to adhere to rigid standards of propriety. Violators, once their misdeeds were known, suffered the humiliation of having to confess their sins before the congregation and ask for restoration to fellowship. The diary of Roger Newton contained many references to such confessions: "July 2, 1762 - Joseph Denio and Anne his wife made a confession for the sin of fornication."; "June 11, 1769 - June and Elijah Mitchell made confessions for the sins of lying and stealing"; and "June 8, 1777 - Rebekah Smead made a confession in writing for the sin of quarreling. She was abject when the confession was read -- it was accepted and she was restored to charity . . .".

Besides forcing violators to confess publicly their sins, the church could also authorize the deacons to investigate alleged misdeeds and act accordingly. Thus Newton's diary contained the following notation -- "April 4, 1780 - The Church . . . passed the following votes viz: . . . 4) that Deacon Smead and Agrippa Wells deal with Mr. Billings, who is reported to be guilty of Intemperance, 5) that Deacons Graves and Smead deal with the widow Anna Atherton for absenting from Public Worship.".

In addition to using group pressure to punish or deter moral deviance, the Church also sought through the sermons of Dr. Newton, to inculcate common moral values.
The system of common schools was a third institution for the inculcation of values. Schools in Greenfield antedated the town's incorporation. In 1732, the Deerfield town meeting "voted to pay a school dame for keeping a school at Green River [that] summer." In December 1758, the Greenfield Town Meeting "voted that the Selectmen should provide a school dame and a house to keep school in." The aim of these schools was to teach a basic knowledge of the three R's and to inculcate proper moral habits. In the words of J. Merton England, "Education meant indoctrination -- indoctrination in the familiar catalog of moral virtue . . ." In this educational system, the teacher played a subordinate role to the primary reader. The teacher's function was to preserve order in the classroom "while the discipline of the task and the message of the reader worked their magic."

Despite the impact of town government, church and school, the main institution for social control and the inculcation of values and beliefs was the family. In the later industrialized setting work and home were separated, and the main functions of the family were the mutual providing of emotional support and sexual release, and the procreation and socialization of children. In early Greenfield, work and home were not separated. The family was also an economic enterprise responsible for almost all the material goods and services which the family members needed for their subsistence. Each member had tasks and functions whose performance
was necessary for the welfare and comfort of the whole. The men ploughed, planted, and harvested the crops; built implements, utensils, furniture, and buildings; made repairs; milked the cows; sheared the sheep; slaughtered and salted the animals. The boys did chores around the farm, and helped the men perform their tasks. The women cooked the food, spun wool into cloth, made the clothes, cared for the children, and cleaned the house. In the words of John Demos, "work . . . was a wholly natural extension of family life and merged imperceptibly with all of its other activities." In addition to its economic function, the family served as a vocational school. It prepared its young for their future economic roles. By observing his father and helping him perform the various tasks connected with farming, the child learned farming. If the father performed some trade or craft, the child by observing and imitating his father served as an unconscious apprentice. Finally, the family served as a welfare institution. Those individuals, like orphans, juvenile delinquents, the sick, and the aged, were cared for in the family setting. Thus early Greenfield had no orphanages, reformatories, hospitals, old age homes, or jails.

Behavior and Values

Judging from the evidence, Greenfield's early citizens were not an ascetic lot, despite their Puritan orthodoxy.
As an octogenarian the historian, Reverend Preseved Smith, recalled that drinking was common and carried no social stigma:

The period of which I am now speaking was noted for the free use of ardent spirit in its various forms. At funerals, after the exercise, the conductor brought in a great tumbler of rum or brandy toddy . . . At all public occasions, such as ordinations, ministerial associations, conventions, dedications, this part of the entertainment was thought to be indispensable. Weddings and social gatherings were expected to be enlivened by its inspiration. Military trainings and the raising of buildings could not get along without it. Mechanics and common day laborers expected to receive their eleven and four o'clock potations as much as they did their dinner . . . drinking and treating friends was open and respectable.37

Other examples of non-ascetic behavior are to be found in Roger Newton's diary. As noted before, whenever a church member transgressed, he had to confess his sin before the congregation and ask for restoration to fellowship. This restoration to fellowship was not automatically given; the penitent had to convince the congregation of the sincerity of his repentance. Most confessions were for sins of fornication.38 These confessions were all routinely accepted. In addition, the male fornicators, at least, apparently suffered no loss of status or esteem. Ebenezer Wells and wife made public confession for the sin of fornication on March 17, 1769.39 In 1769, he was chosen town clerk and treasurer; and in 1770, he was elected selectman and assessor.40

Ebenezer Graves and wife made public confession for the sin
of fornication on December 27, 1778.\textsuperscript{41} From 1778 through 1780, Graves was selectman and assessor,\textsuperscript{42} and also served as church deacon from before 1777 until 1805.\textsuperscript{43}

Sins involving hostility against one's neighbor were taken more seriously. When Tabitha Coleman threatened to kill Amos Allen and his family for allegedly stealing some of her wheat and corn, and then took a pot shot at members of the Allen family with her rifle, the Church proceeded to ex-communicate her. Her first confession was rejected, and it was not until some time later that a second confession was accepted and she was restored to fellowship.\textsuperscript{44}

Thus in their "operational" values,\textsuperscript{45} Greenfield's citizens placed little moral censure upon sins of the flesh. But acts involving the expression of hostility against neighbors were another matter. This operational sanction against the expression of hostility strongly reflected Greenfield's ideal values. In the words of the Greenfield minister, Titus Strong, the "True Christian" practiced the following:

He rendereth to all their dues . . . He dealeth not falsely nor defraudeth his neighbor . . . He liveth peaceable with all men. He studieth to be quite, and to do his own business. He putteth away all bitterness, and wrath, and clamor, and evil speaking, with all malice. He judgeth not; he avengeth not himself, but forgiveth others . . . He slandereth not his neighbors, nor back-biteth with his tongue, nor imagineth evil against his brother in his heart. He walketh circumspectly and honestly, not in rioting and drunkenness, and wantonness, and strife. He is not slothful in business. He doth all things decently
and in order . . . He abstaineth from every appearance of evil, and withdraweth from every one that walketh disorderly; yet he counteth him not as an enemy . . . Is he rich? He sheweth mercy and compassion, and he oppresseth not the widow, nor the fatherless, the stranger, nor the poor . . . Is he poor? With quietness, he worketh and eateth his own bread; and laboreth night and day that he may not be chargeable to any . . . He doth not steal nor covet, nor take the name of his God in vain. He is content with such things as he hath.

The central theme of these aphorisms is that the "True Christian" avoided any behavior which might engender social strife or hostility. Implicit in these aphorisms was the notion that hostility and aggression were evil. Explicit was the notion that the "True Christian" must repress hostile feelings and refrain from hostile behavior. John Demos noted that the necessity of maintaining family harmony in seventeenth-century Plymouth led to a "strong unconscious restraint on the expression of hostile impulses against members of one's own household."47 If expression of hostility against the family members was disruptive, so were expressions of anger against neighbors in a community whose major means of social control depended upon a degree of consensus. Consequently, repression of hostility was demanded.

Another facet of Greenfield's value system was the necessity for status differentiation and the need to submit to one's status superiors. Max Weber noted that "when the bases of the acquisition and distribution of goods are relatively stable, stratification by status is favored."48
In Greenfield, where the standard of living was relatively the same for all, status distinctions loomed large.

The seating of the church reflected the desire for status differentiation. Each year a committee of reluctant church members proceeded to grade all the pews and all the families (on the basis of age and estate) and to seat families accordingly. While this often created hard feelings due to discontent with assigned statuses, the persistence and the importance attached to these status rankings indicated that the community saw status differentiation as a social necessity.

The importance of status differentiation was underlined by the Reverend Roger Newton who said that the community should cultivate "a spirit of subordination, in the families and societies with which we are particularly connected, by training up those under our care to order and to rule . . ." Community stress on status distinctions reflected an awareness that they fostered status deference, thus enabling the socially privileged to control the ordinary townspeople.

According to both the ideology of mobility and the Protestant Ethic, wealth was a sign of merit and an indication of one's virtue. As Max Weber noted, "The earning of money . . . is, so long as it is done legally, the result and the expression of virtue and proficiency in a calling."
Pre-industrial Greenfield saw little merit in the possession of wealth or the striving after it. Titus Strong's Common Reader had the following to say about wealth:

How much is wealth thought of an desired by the generality of mankind; but how little does it avail its possessor . . . How often do care, ambition, and envy arise in proportion to the abundance of wealth which men possess? What a snare has it often proved? How many on their dying beds may truly say, "This wealth has killed me! . . . my riches, instead of advancing my real happiness, have only served to debase my mind, and to increase my misery." Our blessed Savior informs us, that a man's life does not consist in the abundance of the things he possetheth, and in various parts of Holy Scriptures we are cautioned against the desire of heaping to ourselves unnecessary riches . . . How much oftener has wealth been made the instrument of wickedness than the means of doing good.53

Yet if pre-industrial Greenfield saw little merit in striving after wealth, it did value hard work, a rational approach to life, and some forms of worldly asceticism. Thus Titus Strong's Common Reader devoted chapters to the "Benefits of Industry" and "The Fruits of Extravagance." His work also contained the following aphorisms: "Action keeps the soul in constant health; but idleness corrupts and rusts the mind;" "Custom is the guide of fools; but the wise man follows reason and prudence;" and "Without exemplary diligence you will make but a contemptible proficiency.54 The Reverend Dr. Newton cautioned, "Idleness, dissipation, and sensual extravagances of every kind, should be avoided by us, and a life of industry, temperance, sobriety, and godliness, carefully and perseveringly preserved."55
Because industry, a rational approach to life, frugality, and diligence were valued, pre-industrial Greenfield did show some commitment to what Max Weber defined as the "Protestant Ethic." Judging from the large amount of drinking and the casual attitude toward premarital sex, they placed little emphasis on narrow worldly asceticism, but they did honor such virtues as frugality and avoidance of extravagance. Industry and diligence were applauded not because they enabled the individual to get ahead, but because they kept people self-supporting and out of trouble. Wealth was viewed with suspicion rather than as a sign of merit.

The primary focus of the value system seemed to be on social control and on the virtues and "avoidant behaviors" which fostered it rather than on mere upward striving. The "True Christian" repressed his hostility against others, submitted to his social superiors, avoided any situation which might threaten the peace and order of the community, and refrained from any activities which might arouse the hostility of others (such as non-fulfillment of obligations to others, stealing, fraud, anger, slander, quarreling, and adultery).

Greenfield's values were not unusual for a farming community. Hard work, diligence, frugality, and avoidance of extravagance were necessary virtues in a society where each family had to provide almost everything needed for its
own subsistence. In a society where few could achieve wealth, it would be little valued. After all, why strive for what you cannot get? Where social control depended upon common values and the force of community group pressure, repression of hostility was necessary lest such hostility destroy the solidarity of the community and, reduce power to control deviant behavior. The monotony of, and the repressions demanded by, village life created a need for outlets -- hence, the *de facto* toleration of drinking and premarital sex.

Pre-industrial Greenfield was a community which felt a strong need for social controls and which valued them highly. Why was this so? Here, one can only hypothesize; but the answer probably lay in the most traditional historical explanation -- Greenfield's Puritan heritage. Max Weber's treatment of Calvinism and Puritanism focused on the doctrine of Predestination and its consequences. But Calvinism-Puritanism also emphasized Original Sin. In the state of original sin, man was fundamentally egotistic, anti-social, and aggressive. If this was so, then strong social controls were necessary to prevent man's anti-social impulses from destroying the community. For the social controls that existed in Greenfield (group pressure and common values), a strong repression of any impulses that might destroy community harmony was necessary. Hence, the value system of the community stressed those virtues which fostered
social control.

Socio-Economic Changes Prior to Industrialization

Until the coming of the industrial revolution and the railroad, Greenfield retained the basic homogeneity, social controls, economic structure, and values of the eighteenth century community. Yet, between 1790 and 1830, important socio-economic changes did occur; and while they did not alter the fundamental character of the community, nevertheless, they had an impact and helped prepare the way for future changes.

First of all, the improvement in transportation during the post-revolutionary generation began to break down the geographical and social isolation of the town. In June, 1792 a stage coach line began running from Springfield to Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire.\(^56\) In 1796, another line of stages began running from Boston and Troy, New York.\(^57\) This made Greenfield a stage center. With the coming of stage coaches came efforts at road and bridge construction.\(^58\) But such conveyances as stages and ox carts were a primitive and expensive means of transportation. Greenfield's only cheap means of bulk transportation was the Connecticut River.\(^59\) Yet the Connecticut was not navigable. There were falls at Enfield, Connecticut and South Hadley, Massachusetts. Flatboats weighing less than 12 tons could be poled up the rapids at Enfield, but the
South Hadley falls were not navigable until a canal was opened in 1795. Subsequent canals at Montague and Bellows Falls, Vermont permitted navigation as far north as Barnet, Vermont. In 1826, steamboats were introduced on the Connecticut River, increasing the volume of river trade.

One effect of opening the river to navigation was the making of Cheapside into a major commercial center. Cheapside, annexed to Greenfield on May 2, 1896, was then part of Deerfield, a fact that was the source of considerable ill-feeling between Greenfield and Deerfield. In 1743, the inhabitants of Greenfield asked to be set off from Deerfield as a separate town with the Deerfield River to be the boundary between the two towns. In 1753, the town of Deerfield agreed provided the boundary be, not the Deerfield River, but the boundary of the 8,000 acre Pocumtuck land grant out of which Deerfield was formed (this line being north of the Deerfield River). Greenfield balked at the terms, and an arbitration committee was set up to resolve the dispute. The arbiters decided that Cheapside should belong to Greenfield. But the Deerfield representative to the General Court, Elijah Williams, had enough influence with the "river gods" who controlled the Western Massachusetts delegation to insert a joker in the Act which incorporated Greenfield. His amendment provided that Cheapside revert from Greenfield to Deerfield when "there shall be another district or parish made out of the said town of
Deerfield." In 1767, the town of Conway was formed out of Deerfield, and Cheapside reverted to Deerfield. In 1768, the agents of Deerfield went to reclaim the land and mow the hay which was growing on it. Some of the inhabitants of Greenfield were so outraged that a pitched battle, using clubs and pitchforks, took place between them and the Deerfield agents. Deerfield then prosecuted the rioters from Greenfield for trespassing, and won convictions for which the town of Greenfield paid fines. Greenfield repeatedly appealed to the legislature; but the Governor and Executive Council which were obligated to the legislators controlled by the "river gods" blocked Greenfield's appeals to amend the Incorporation Act of 1753. The result of this episode was the creation of a feud between the two towns which was "carried on with great bitterness for more than a hundred years." 64

The feud was not without historical repercussions. The Williams-Ashley families who controlled Deerfield were ardentlly pro-Tory during the American Revolution since they benefitted from British patronage. 65 Since the inhabitants of Greenfield felt extremely hostile to the Deerfield power structure, they soon came to feel an intense dislike of the British establishment with which the Deerfield power structure was allied. Thus one effect of the Cheapside dispute was to help make Greenfield ripe for the American Revolution. David Willard, the early nineteenth-century
historian of Greenfield, expressed surprise that Tory sentiment was so weak in Greenfield and noted that the inhabitants of Greenfield were "with very few exceptions, ardently engaged in the cause." 66

Another change in pre-industrial Greenfield was economic. With the opening of the Connecticut River, and the development of Cheapside as a trading center, Greenfield began to develop a mercantile class. In 1823, Timothy Dwight noted of Greenfield that "the number of traders and mechanics is considerable, and the town exhibits a general aspect of sprightliness and activity." 67

After the Revolutionary War, farmers and drovers began driving cattle from various areas in New England and New York to the Brighton market outside of Boston for sale. After 1800, they began driving cattle to the river towns in Franklin county for feeding and fattening during the winter months while en route to the Brighton market. 68

The creation of Franklin County in 1811 and the location of the county seat in Greenfield led to the emergence of a small, but relatively well-to-do group of lawyers who made their money by holding court offices such as judge, clerk or recorder, and earning legal and probate fees. As the mercantile class grew and as persons began to resort to litigation rather than informal arbitration as a means of resolving disputes, law became a relatively lucrative profession and lawyers grew in wealth and numbers. As a
result of their wealth, status, education, and professional expertise, lawyers became gradually involved in both business and politics. Thus Franklin Ripley, a lawyer, was also an incorporator and cashier of the First National Bank of Franklin County. Elijah Alvord was President of Franklin Mutual Fire Insurance Company. Hooker Leavitt was Town Clerk and Town Treasurer. The rise of the lawyers was a measure of the decline of traditional modes of community control.

One index to Greenfield's emergence as a commercial center was the establishment of banking institutions. In her earlier, subsistence, agricultural economy, barter had formed the principal means of exchange. But now a market economy demanded that monetization of economic life. Non-farm merchants, artisans, and workers needed cash to purchase goods; businesses needed large-scale credit. Thus, in 1822, the First National Bank of Franklin County was established with a capital stock of $200,000. In 1834, a second bank, the Franklin Savings Institution was established.

The shape and content of religious life was another important change -- in the direction of an emerging pluralism and individualism. In contrast to most townships, the church or meetinghouse was not in the center of the village but about 1 1/4 miles north of it. By 1816, the
church needed major repairs. It was decided that a new church ought to be built, but a dispute arose between the inhabitants of the village and the outlying farmers over where the new church was to be constructed. A committee was selected to find a compromise site, but no agreement could be reached. Finally, it was decided to appoint an impartial committee from outside Franklin County to select a site. It did select a place, but its compromise recommendation satisfied neither side. The dispute got so heated that 115 of the outlying farmers petitioned the General Court to be set off as the separate township of Green Meadows. This petition was rejected. Unable to agree over the location of a new church, the village inhabitants took things into their own hands and organized the Second Congregational Church which was incorporated on December 5, 1816. Although in 1812, five members organized the local Episcopal Church, it was the creation of the Second Church that marked the effective end of religious unity in Greenfield and the emergence of a religiously pluralistic community. In 1825, the Second Church underwent a schism between Calvinists and Unitarians which resulted in the formation of the Third Congregational or Unitarian Church.

These schisms reflected the slow dissolution of a tightly-knit community in which the individual was subordinated to the society. A set of tightly meshed and
essentially undifferentiated institutions was giving way to distinct institutions with clearly defined functions. The town meeting now concerned itself with only secular affairs. The church was no longer a center of community life, but merely a group of individuals united by common needs and beliefs that the rest of the community did not necessarily share. Likewise, the emergence of different economic classes meant the development of both a spirit of individualism and a consciousness of group identity which did not embrace the community as a whole. Thus the Congregationalists split when individuals began to place personal religious needs and interests above community unity and consensus. As people squared off on the basis of outlying farmer versus village inhabitant, and Congregationalist versus Episcopalian versus Unitarian, the sense of the community as a whole began to vanish.

Yet it is easy to make too much of these trends. Social change was limited in several ways. Greenfield in 1830 was still a relatively homogeneous and tightly-knit community with common values and a strong degree of social control. The community was still small enough for the inhabitants to know one another and subject each other to a high degree of group pressure. The extent of social control and social interaction within the community was reflected in the content of the local newspaper. The
June 4, 1795 issue of the Greenfield Gazette, for example, devoted only 35 out of its 256 column inches to either local news or advertisements. The January 11, 1822 issue of the Franklin Herald set apart only 3/4 of 1 of its 20 columns to coverage of a fire that destroyed 3 of the town's businesses. The story gave only a brief description of the events of the fire; most of the coverage consisted of praise for the men and lady volunteers whose efforts in forming a second bucket line succeeded in limiting the blaze. In a community where everyone knew everyone, there was little need to print any local news. Anything that happened passed through the grape vine long before the newspaper could print it. Since the community was isolated from the outside world, there was a demand for foreign and national news. Thus the June 4, 1795 issue of the newspaper devoted about 1/2 of its space to foreign news, and about 1/7 of its space to national and state news.

Likewise, religious pluralism had little effect upon the community's consensus of values. Thus a predominantly Puritan Congregationalist community could easily adopt a school textbook, the Common Reader, which was written by the Episcopal clergyman. Even emerging class differences were muted by the force of mutual economic symbiosis as farmers began to sell surplus products to townspeople in exchange for merchants' goods, craftsmen's products, and professionals' services.
Beginning in the 1840's, the industrial revolution totally changed the economic and social structure of both Greenfield and Franklin County.
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CHAPTER III

THE ECONOMIC AND ETHNIC REVOLUTION, 1830-1910

Beginning in the second third of the nineteenth century, the homogeneous "island" community with its relatively self-sufficient Yankee Protestant farmers and a few part-time merchants, professionals, and artisans rapidly disappeared. As the Connecticut River became navigable, a small number of full-time merchants, professionals, and artisans arose, but this did not alter the subsistence agricultural economy or the tightly-knit social system. Rather, it was the revolutionary change from subsistence to commercial agriculture, the coming of the railroad, the development of industry, and the start of mass immigration -- all interrelated phenomena -- which transformed Greenfield and the entire county.

By 1865, non-agricultural pursuits rivalled agricultural as sources of employment for Franklin County residents. Of 10,572 employed males and females, only 5,100 (approximately 48%) were employed in agriculture.¹ In the newly emerging factory towns, an even smaller proportion worked on farms. In Greenfield, only 24% of the employed were farmers or farm laborers while in Deerfield, only 26% were farmers or farm laborers.²
By 1905, Franklin County had become overwhelmingly non-agricultural. Of its 21,925 males, only 20% were either farmers or farm laborers. Moreover, as a result of the street railway built in 1895, the three interconnected towns of Greenfield, Deerfield, and Montague now made up one economic unit, for workers could now live in one town and work in another. Thus in about a century, the Greenfield area changed from a simple economy of subsistence farmers to a complex industrial economy with highly specialized work roles and consequent economic-occupational stratification.

The Industrial Revolution, the emergence of commercial agriculture, the railroad, and immigration were all interrelated phenomena, but the railroad spearheaded the economic change. Rail transportation provided industry with access to raw materials, and factory and farmer with access to prospective markets and sources of labor. The needs of the railroad stimulated local production: food for workers; wood for fuel, warehouses, depots, cars, bridges, overpasses, railroad ties, and housing; and machine tools for repair work. Concentrations of railroad laborers and industrial workers created local markets for agricultural products and induced farmers to change from subsistence to commercial agriculture. New jobs in railroad construction, commercial agriculture, and industry attracted immigrants and hill farmers to the community. The wages
paid these workers created a flourishing trading center.

The Coming of the Railroad

Although the beginnings of commercial agriculture and industry antedated the railroad, it was the railroad that made them major factors in Greenfield's economy. In 1845, the John Russell Manufacturing Company employed 80 workers and produced $60,000 worth of cutlery. In 1850, four years after the railroad reached Greenfield, the firm employed 200 workers and produced $125,000 worth of cutlery.\(^4\)

This boom was not a coincidence. The railroad gave the Russell Company cheap bulk transportation for both its raw materials and finished products, thus cutting costs and increasing profits. Since other companies also benefitted, all the industries of Greenfield and the neighboring towns avidly promoted the railroads. J. K. Mills and Company of Boston, owner of the Greenfield Manufacturing Company (maker of cassimeres and satinetts), owned 100 shares of stock in the Greenfield and Northampton Railroad. Henry Clapp, Greenfield entrepreneur who provided much of Russell's financial backing, also subscribed for 100 shares. The Russell Company purchased 30 shares. The Lamson and Goodnow Cutlery Company of Shelburne Falls bought 20, and the Griswold Manufacturing Company of Colrain subscribed for 10.

Industrialists were not the only promoters of the railroads. Merchants like Allen & Root, and Ira Abercrombie,
alert to the advantages of cheaper transportation, also invested. The lawyers of Greenfield participated generously, accounting for about 20% of the 419 shares bought in Greenfield. Even the relatively undercapitalized farmers backed the railroad. In Deerfield, where 141 shares were sold, farmers constituted the majority of the investors. So strong was Greenfield's support for establishing railroad links in all directions that the town on July 6, 1859 voted to subscribe for 300 shares of Troy and Greenfield Railroad stock (at $100 per share). 5

While industrialists and merchants saw the railroad as a means of cutting shipping costs, the farmers saw the railroad as a means of protecting one of their lucrative cash markets. By 1840, Connecticut Valley farmers depended in part for their cash income upon the fattening of cattle on their way to market. The farmer purchased cattle in the fall, fattened them on corn and hay during the winter, and sold them at the Brighton market in the spring. The completion of the Boston and Albany Railroad from Boston through Springfield to Albany, threatened this market. Cattle could now be fed on inexpensively produced midwestern corn and then transported to Boston by rail throughout the winter months thus wiping out the fall-spring differentials and taking the profit out of the cattle drive to Brighton. Since it was cheaper to ship cattle by rail,
the only way to keep cattle fattening profitable, or so the farmers thought, was to cut costs by building railroads and eliminating cattle drives. Actually, by supporting the railroads, they hastened their own demise.

Many economic effects of the railroad were immediate. The completion of the railroad to Greenfield on November 23, 1846 "blotted out the staging and boating business" at Cheapside. Stages and teamsters, if not driven out of business, were relegated to feeder status as carriers of passengers and goods on short hauls to and from the depot. Canals and turnpikes were abandoned.

Other rail construction soon followed the completion of the Greenfield and Northampton Railroad. In February 1851, the Boston and Fitchburg Railroad which ran from Boston through Fitchburg to Vernon, Vermont, built a branch line to Greenfield. In 1848, the Troy and Greenfield Railroad Company was incorporated to construct a railroad through the Hoosac Mountain -- one of the most difficult, disastrous, and expensive railroad construction projects in the history of railroad building.

The extension of rail routes leading out of Greenfield, the building of the railroad yards in East Deerfield, and the erection of bridges, depots, underpasses, and overpasses in and around Greenfield provided considerable employment and pumped quite a bit of money into the local
The Gazette & Courier, noting that the Greenfield bakery furnished the boarding-house keepers 1543 leaves of wheat bread a week, concluded that "it takes something to feed the gangs of workmen on the new railroad, and the 'butcher, baker, and candlestick maker' are given quite a lift thereby."

With the completion of the Hoosac Tunnel, Greenfield became a junction and transfer point with railroads connecting it to Springfield, Boston, Albany, and Brattleboro. "The making up and dispatching of freight trains," noted the Gazette & Courier, has now become an extensive business." By 1877, 38 trains, of which 26 were passenger trains, were passing through Greenfield.

In 1880, the Fitchburg railroad began to construct a large freight yard in East Deerfield. There freight cars remained until they could be dispatched to their proper destination. Frequently, 300 or more cars waited in the East Deerfield yards for dispatching. Once, as the Gazette & Courier sarcastically pointed out, "28 car loads of beef cattle and swine were brought to a halt here and the westerners were regaled with a perfume that Lubin has never attempted to imitate." In addition to dispatching, the East Deerfield yard did extensive repair work. About 5% of the cars going through the yards each day needed some repairs, and refrigerator cars needed to be iced. For grain, there
was a grain elevator with a capacity of 125,000 bushels.\textsuperscript{12}

The railroad also helped change life styles -- making possible vacations, day excursions, and week-end trips. By 1880, prosperous Greenfielders could make railroad excursions to Cape Cod, the White Mountains, Saratoga, and Wood's Hole (with connecting boats to Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard). Also many could make day excursions to Lake Pleasant, Mt. Tom, Nantasket, and the Keene, N. H. race track.\textsuperscript{13} The railroad, even helped make Greenfield a vacation resort.

In the summer of 1877, the \underline{Gazette \& Courier} reported an unusually large number of visitors:

There has never been a season where so many strangers have come to Greenfield as this year. We are informed by some of our dealers that some of the best of their trade, of late, has been with summer visitors or people who stop here waiting for trains. The Mansion House for the last month or two, has been filled with boarders or transient visitors. The names registered have averaged upwards of 75 a day.\textsuperscript{14}

If the railroad provided enjoyment and profit for Greenfield's middle class, it provided plenty of hazards for its own workers. Hardly a week passed without report of an accident to one or more of the workmen on the railroad. Especially dangerous was railroad construction which involved extensive blasting. Thus, in April, 1880, as a gang worked on a new road bed near Cheapside,

\ldots an explosion occurred that brought to a sudden end the life of Michael Mullen, foreman of a gang, and badly wounded two others \ldots Mullen was engaged in charging a blast with nitroglycerin which comes in tin cartridges. Mullen had inserted the
charges and took a stick to probe the hole to see if the explosive was at the bottom. The concussion of that simple operation caused the charge to explode. He leaves a widow and two children. . . . The other two workmen will probably recover.

Reports of other accounts of accidents and injuries were numerous: "Michael Fitzgerald had a leg broken while unloading railroad ties . . ."; "William S. Randall, brakeman on a freight train, had his right arm crushed while coupling cars . . ."; and "John Cullen and Patrick Cummings were very seriously injured . . . by the falling of a derrick."  

For working under these dangerous conditions, the railroad men received the following wages in 1870: day laborers, $1.54 per day; mechanics, $2.75 per day; firemen, $2.00 per day; engineers, $3.50 per day; brakemen, $45.00 per month; switchmen, $47.50 per month; and signalmen, $45.00 per month. Some indication of the low purchasing power of these wages was indicated in the Bureau of Statistics of Labor Report for 1870-71: steak per lb - 25¢; corned beef per lb - 15¢; pork per lb - 22¢; butter per lb - 38¢; eggs per dozen - 32¢; coffee per lb - 45¢; cheese per lb - 23¢; men's calf boots per pair - $4.50; and coal per ton - $10.50.  

Besides inflicting dangers on its poorly paid workmen, the railroad often damaged the environment. But such was Greenfield's dependence on the railroad that the town fathers, who lived away from the railroad and its facilities, showed little inclination to protect the environment at the expense of angering the railroad, and giving it incentive to
move its facilities elsewhere. In the words of the Gazette & Courier:

While the West Main Street neighborhood has suffered severely by smoke, further agitation for the removal of the round house from its present location appears useless . . . The town largely depends upon the railroad for its industrial growth, and the removal of the round house would be very costly for the road, and it might have very serious consequences to the town . . . The railroad round house is an exceptional case, where a change would mean the entire abandonment of the plant and possible transfer of its important business. It is not to be compared with other cases where smoke is doing a great deal of damage.17

In stressing the railroad's importance to the Gazette & Courier was not exaggerating. Not only was the railroad a major source of employment, but it was also a necessity for the industries of Greenfield and the neighboring towns. If the railroad moved major facilities, these concerns would also be forced to leave. Extensive rail facilities constituted a major factor in bringing industry to Greenfield and Turners Falls in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Thus the shoe-manufacturing firm of Nahum S. Cutler (later Cutler, Lyons and Field) moved "from Bernardston for the purpose of locating where better railroad and other facilities could be furnished . . ."18

Industrialization

As Thelma Kistler, the historian of Connecticut Valley railroading, pointed out: "the rise of manufacturing encouraged and was in turn encouraged by the spread of
railroads." But what were Greenfield's industries and what course did its industrial-economic development take?

The multiplying effect of machinery and power differentiated industrial from pre-industrial modes of production. These multipliers created a surplus of products that the local population could not consume. Aside from cheap transportation, the new modes of industrial production required capital, markets for surplus products (which railroads helped supply), sources of power, and a competent labor supply.

Greenfield began to furnish many of the above requirements. The rise of a class of merchants and lawyers together with better banking facilities provided sources of capital for potential investments. Moreover, by the 1830's farmers had a surplus they could sell for the goods and services of local merchants, artisans, and professionals, and subsequently for manufactured goods. The tributaries of the Connecticut and Deerfield Rivers like the Fall River and Green River were potential sources of water power.

* * * * * * *

While many concerns played a role in industrializing the Greenfield area, a small number of major firms dominated the local economy. These businesses not only helped bring the railroads; they also attracted rural and foreign
workers who utterly transformed the social, religious, and ethnic patterns of the area. Perhaps, the most important of these enterprises was the John Russell Manufacturing Company.

John Russell, the son of a Greenfield jeweler-smithsmith, was born March 30, 1797. Learning the trade of jeweler-silversmith from his father, Russell went South to Augusta, Georgia where he eventually prospered as a cotton speculator. In 1830, Russell returned to Greenfield. In 1832, Russell came across a book entitled *The Practical Tourist*, a record of the travels of its author, Zacharia Allen, a Rhode Island cloth manufacturer. Allen's description of the Sheffield cutlery works so impressed Russell that he decided to go into the cutlery business. Using the capital gained from his cotton speculation, Russell formed a partnership with his brother, Francis Russell, and built a small factory for the manufacture of chisels. Russell's first products were cast steel socket chisels which were good enough to win a prize in a fair held by the American Institute in 1834. The same year, the proprietors of the chisel factory began the manufacture of common butcher and large carving knives. On March 15, 1836, a fire destroyed the factory. Later on, a spring flood left the second building and its machinery scattered over the Deerfield meadows.
addition to these problems, the company suffered from insufficient capital and a lack of skilled labor. ²⁷

Russell solved his financial problem with the help of Henry W. Clapp. In 1835, Clapp, a native of Springfield who had become wealthy as a jeweler and goldsmith in New York City, retired to Greenfield. In a short period of time, he became a powerful figure in local affairs. At one time or another, he was President of the Greenfield Bank, the Franklin Agricultural Society, the Greenfield Cemetery Association, the Greenfield Library Association, the Connecticut River Railroad, and the Greenfield Gas Company. In 1836, Clapp invested $10,000 in the Russell firm, and his prestige helped carry the firm through the panic of 1837. ²⁸

Cutlery manufacture at this stage demanded a highly skilled labor force. Persons who were blacksmiths had the skills necessary for cutlery making, ²⁹ but it proved difficult to keep them once they came. ³⁰ An article in the Greenfield Gazette and Courier described the labor problems facing the Russell's in the 1840's and early 1850's:

The employees were nearly all Americans, and a fine intelligent lot of men they were, but, only so unstable; here today, gone tomorrow; working with desperate energy for a year or so, and then away; to the West, to business, to farms, to professions, to scatter over the length and breadth of the land. The recruits came primarily from the farming towns around
Greenfield, and grinding was their favorite job, for by hard work a man might save a few hundred dollars the quickest at that work.31

Russell's labor problems not only reflected a lack of skilled workers, but also the fact that the values of the American worker ill-adapted them to factory work. The American ideal prized self-employment over working for another. In pre-industrial America, most men were property owners. Acquisition of property was relatively easy.

Cheap land made the move from farm hand to farm owner fairly simple. An artisan, with a small investment in the necessary tools and materials, could easily start his own business. Consequently, the movement from farm laborer to farm owner and from apprentice to journeyman to master craftsman/shop owner were both ideal expectations and highly probable sequences.32 Thus, "any man of enterprise could take up and become an independent producer; those who preferred to work for others did so because they lacked enterprise."33 Often this transition from economic dependence to independent producer took place within the family setting. With the family functioning as a business enterprise and vocational school, the child could learn his adult work role and eventually take over the business or found one of his own. This was true whether he was a farm laborer on his father's farm, an apprentice in his father's shop, or a clerk in his father's store.
Self-employment thus became synonymous not only with enterprise and self-reliance, but also with full-fledged adult status. Americans viewed working for another as lacking status, and thought it justified only as a temporary means of acquiring the capital necessary to buy a farm or open up a business.

In an industrial setting, these values were obviously disfunctional. An article in the newspaper in 1872 mentioned Russell as claiming that American workers were,

> too 'free and independent' to work long in any factory. . . [and this] was . . . bad for the business. No business could bear such incessant change of help, such spoiling of help by green hands, so a different system was devised. America retired in favor of Ireland and Germany . . .

Consequently, to obtain a more skilled, stable, and docile labor supply, Russell began to import skilled labor from abroad and devise new labor saving methods which would permit relatively unskilled workers to take over functions which previously demanded skilled labor. A description of these new methods helps depict the physical and social costs incurred by the working class of Greenfield.

In Sheffield, England and Solingen, Germany, cutlery manufacture had been the old manual process requiring skilled labor. Sheffield knife-making involved: 1) forging 2) hardening 3) tempering 4) grinding and polishing, and
5) hafting. In the forging process, the metal was heated and hammered into the desired shape by a "striker" who hammerd the metal and a "smith" or "fireman" who held the red hot metal with tongs and guided the blows of the "striker." In the hardening process, the knife was heated to a very high temperature, and then cooled rapidly in oil or water. After hardening, the blade was tempered, to give the metal resiliency and flexibility, by heating it again and cooling it slowly. Tempering was a very difficult process for the blade had to be removed at just the right moment lest the knife become too brittle. Grinding consisted of shaping and smoothing the knife on abrasive stones of successively finer grain. The blade underwent rough grinding on a large soft grindstone, "whitening" on a smaller fine stone, glazing on a wooden wheel dressed with tallow and emery, and buffing on a smaller wheel covered with glue and fine emery. Grinding and whitening shaped the knife; glazing and buffing eliminated grinding marks and polished the knife. Hafting consisted of making the handle, putting it on the blade, and attaching the blade to the handle.36

Russell mechanized most of this process. He mechanized the forging process by installing cutting machines to cut the metal to blade length, trip hammers (power driven hammers) to beat the blades to the required hardness and
width, and power press dies to stamp the blades to the right size and to punch holes so the handle could be attached. Grinding and polishing were done on revolving stones and wheels. Rapidly revolving circular saws cut out the handles. 37

The mechanization which Russell and his competitors introduced into the cutlery manufacture revolutioned production. With mechanization, it was possible for one man to temper 2,500 blades in a day; 38 prior to such mechanization, a skilled "striker" and "smith" could forge 150 blades in a day. 39 In one day, Russell's cutlery produced "84 gross table cutlery, 130 dozen of ivory table cutlery, and 250 dozen miscellaneous goods." 40

Of the 500 workers employed at the cutlery in 1867, 140 were grinders and 102 were polishers. 41 These jobs could be learned in a relatively short period of time by relatively unskilled workers. They were relatively high paying, but they were dangerous. Grinding was done on a huge revolving coarse grindstone, 1 ton in weight and 6 feet in diameter. Occasionally, this stone would explode as a result of defects which made it unable to withstand the combination of friction heat and centrifugal force. Charles Kinney was one of the men killed by a bursting grindstone:
One piece passed up and struck the floor of the second story with such force as to upset a stone standing over where it struck. Another piece was thrown against the heavy stone wall of the building with such force as to bulge it out 3 or 4 inches . . . Mr Kenney was struck under the chin with the iron of the housing over the stone, with such force as to badly fracture both of his jaws and knock out most of his teeth. He lingered in an unconscious state until Friday, when he died.42

Both grinders and polishers faced the strong possibility of contracting tuberculosis, emphysema, silicosis, and other lung diseases. The grinding of the metal, and the polishing of the bone, ivory, and other handles created "an immense cloud of dust" which the workers inhaled despite the steam fans and suction pipes to provide for ventilation.43 A report of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor noted that the "noise of the trip-hammer and smell of the dust were unendurable" with the grinders showing "contracted chests, sharp faces, retreating brows, and sunken eyes."44

Under such conditions, in 1870, the workers labored 6 days a week at 10 hours per day. For their efforts, the forger and temperers received $2.00 per day, the mechanics $1.87, the grinders and polishers $1.75, and the unskilled laborers $1.25. If they lived in the tenements in the neighboring "Tough End" section of Greenfield, they paid $3.50 to $5.00 a month for a 3-room tenement apartment to $12.00 per month for a 5 or 6 room tenement with garden land attached. Recalling the previously mentioned prices in 1870, one could see that the workers enjoyed a less than
affluent standard of living.\textsuperscript{45}

The impact of the Russell cutlery on the local economy was immense. The payroll amounted to $20,000 a month.\textsuperscript{46} To manufacture its cutlery, the company consumed the following: 2 tons of steel per day, 2,500 lbs of brass wire per month; and 304,487 lbs of cocoa and grandilla wood, 112,000 lbs of ebony, 56,792 lbs of rosewood, 36,000 of ivory, 400,000 lbs of grindstones, 44,000 lbs of emory, 2,290 lbs of beeswax, 2,500 gallons of oil, 25,000 bushels of charcoal, and 2,000 tons of hard coal per year.\textsuperscript{47} Besides keeping the railroads busy and happy, the carting of these raw materials from depot to cutlery storehouses gave employment to numerous teamsters, haulers, and laborers.

Through its direct impact on employment, the Russell cutlery operated in three major ways to affect Greenfield's economic development. First, it helped create the conditions for the rise of the machine tool-tap and die industry. Second, it stimulated the growth of both the retail trade, transportation, and construction industry. Third, it played a major role in the development of the neighboring community of Turners Falls.

The Turners Falls enterprise started in 1868 when a group of promoters, led by Alvah Crocker of Fitchburg decided to build an industrial town using the potentially
vast water power resources at Turners Falls. Crocker and his associates purchased the rights to the old canal company stock for the purpose of building a dam so that the water of the Connecticut River could be used for power and industrial purposes. Having done this, they persuaded the Russell Company to move to a site in this projected city and to build a much larger plant with the capital which the promoters contributed. Although Russell's venture ran into financial difficulties, it greatly stimulated the growth and development of Turners Falls. By 1880, the town of Montague (which included Turners Falls) had 37 manufacturing establishments employing 1,302 workers. Of these, 600 worked in the Russell Cutlery. In addition, to the Russell Company, promoters persuaded the Griswold Manufacturing Company of Colrain to build the Turners Falls Cotton Mill where light-weight cottons such as gauze, crinolines, and bunting were manufactured. By 1880, the firm employed 81 workers, and by 1886, it employed 160. Besides inducing firms to locate in Turners Falls, the promoters set about establishing industries and business concerns of their own. Chief of these were Turners Falls' paper mills.

The Civil War and the industrial-commercial expansion which followed it produced a spiraling demand for paper. The increasing volume of business, the expansion of governmental functions, military service, an increasing amount of
immigration and geographic mobility, the development of modern office techniques, the growing number of newspapers, and the growth of magazines -- all had one thing in common: an accelerated demand for paper.\(^5^5\) Paper manufacture demanded plenty of wood, water, and power. These, Turners Falls had in abundance. So, by 1880 the promoters had formed three separate paper companies -- all having interlocking directorates and each specializing in a particular type of paper. The Keith Paper Company was organized in August, 1871, and specialized in the production of high quality bond, linen, ledger, and wedding paper.\(^5^6\) The Montague Paper Company, organized in 1871, specialized the production of book paper and high quality newsprint.\(^5^7\) The Turners Falls Paper Company, founded in 1879, specialized in newsprint.\(^5^8\) The interlocking control of these companies is indicated by the fact that B. N. Farren, a member of the Board of Directors of the Keith Paper Company, was President of both the Montague Paper Company, and the Turners Falls Paper Company.\(^5^9\) By 1880, the three paper companies employed 485 workers.\(^6^0\) Thus, by 1880, Turners Falls had become a thriving industrial town with an economic base rooted in the cutlery, paper -- and, to a lesser extent, the cotton textile industries.

The rise of an industrial town on Greenfield's doorstep, and the removal of the Russell Cutlery from Cheapside to Turners Falls led to the rise of a commuter class who
lived in either Cheapside or Greenfield, and worked in Turners Falls. With the completion of a bridge and road connecting Cheapside-Greenfield with Turners Falls, a ride of only 15 or 20 minutes separated the village (i.e., the developed area) area of Greenfield from Turners Falls thus making Turners Falls almost a part of the community. With Cheapside being even closer, many persons chose to remain rather than move to Turners Falls, and Greenfield began to develop some of the aspects of a suburban commuter community.

Besides helping to develop the neighboring community of Turners Falls, the Russell Company helped form new factories to produce machine tools, taps and dies, and silverware. Industrialization involved, among other things, the mass production of interchangeable products meeting precise specifications. This required machines capable of cutting metal into precise shapes. Metal cutting involved a relatively small number of operations such as turning, boring, drilling, milling, planning, grinding, and polishing. All machines performing such operations confronted similar technical problems (i.e., power transmission, control devices, feed mechanisms, friction reduction, and metal stresses).

As a result, production problems of metal working tended to be similar in differing industries even though
the end products might be as varied as cutlery, drills, lathes, and gun barrels. By solving production problems in one phase of metal cutting, workers developed skills and techniques which were applicable to other industries. One problem which confronted not only the cutlery industry, but also the machine tool industry and other industries as well was how precisely and permanently to fit two separate pieces of metal together. One such way, obviously, was to use a nut and bolt. But until John J. Grant patented a screw cutting device in 1871, screws had to be hand threaded by use of a "jamb plate." This not only made for long and hard labor, but also for non-uniform screw threads which made fitting a nut to a bolt a laborious process. Grant's device made possible uniform and perfect screw threads so that nuts, bolts, screws, threaded pipes, drills, and numerous other items could now be mass produced.

Seeing the implications of Grant's invention, Charles P. Russell, nephew of John Russell, and Solon L. Wiley formed with Grant the firm of Wiley and Russell to manufacture taps (devices for cutting interior threads) and dies (devices for making exteriors threads) at the Green River Plant which the Russell Cutlery Company had formerly used. As time went on, the firm branched out into making such related items as screw plates, bolt cutters, reamers (drills for making tapered holes), countersinks (drills for enlarging the top part of a hole so that the bolt or screw
head will either be flush with or below the surface), and rivet clippers.  

In the early phases the tap and die and machine tool industry, ingenious mechanics could easily devise some patentable innovation or invention, and then go into business on their own making their newly patented device. Thus, in 1874, V. J. Reese and E. F. Reese, two brothers who emigrated from Birmingham, England, invented an adjustable split die, and went into business for themselves.  

In 1876, Elisha Wells, a former worker at the Russell cutlery, and his two sons, Frederick E. Wells and Frank O. Wells, left to manufacture their own improved dies under the name of the Wells Brothers Company.  

This divisive pattern continued so that the tap and die industry ultimately became an eligarchic collection of two large concerns (Wiley and Russell Mfg. Co. and Wells Bros. Co.) and numerous smaller ones, each making their own specific lines of taps, dies, or machine tools. These firms continually split off from one another, underwent mergers, or formed subsidiaries, until 1912 when the Greenfield Tap & Die Company conglomerate was formed.

Since the technology and skills involved in making machine tools and mechanics' tools was similar to that involved in making cutlery and taps and dies, it was not surprising that firms arose which specialized in these areas.
Of these specialty firms, the oldest was the Millers Falls Company. In 1860, Levi H. Gunn and Charles H. Amidon established a factory to make clothes wringers. In 1865, they started making an improved bit brace. In 1868, a fire destroyed the factory, and it moved to Millers Falls (a part of Montague northeast of Turners Falls). In 1872, the firm acquired the Backus Vise Company of Windsor, Vermont, and became incorporated as the Millers Falls Company. Thereafter, it began manufacturing carpentry and machine tools.

The largest of the specialty firms was the Goodell-Pratt Company. In 1892, Dexter W. Goodell and Henry E. Goodell, owners of the Goodell Tool Company of Shelburne Falls, moved to Greenfield and sold a portion of their stock to William M. Pratt to create the Goodell-Pratt which made mechanics’ tools. In addition, Henry E. Goodell and Perley B. Fay, his brother-in-law, created another corporation, the Goodell Manufacturing Company, to make carpenters’ tools.

Although Russell Cutlery left Greenfield in 1870, smaller firms still made cutlery. The Warner Manufacturing Company, organized in 1871 by Henry W. Warner (a former Russell Cutlery worker) made plated table cutlery as a sideline to the manufacture of baby carriage trimmings. In addition, the Nichols Brothers Company, established in 1879,
made butchers' knives and table cutlery, and so did the abortive Greenfield Cooperative Manufacturing Company which was established in 1880, and went bankrupt in 1885.

But Greenfield did not reemerge as a major cutlery producer until the A. F. Towle and Son Manufacturing Company, makers of cutlery and silverware, moved to Greenfield in 1890. This firm, located at Newburyport, moved at the behest of two of its principle stockholders, George C. Lunt and R. N. Oakman (both Greenfield residents) in order to be nearer its principal customer, the John J. Russell Company. The firm prospered until R. N. Oakman, president of the Company, decided to produce the Hertel Horseless Carriage as a diversification venture in 1897. Unfortunately, "the bankers in the vicinity of Greenfield . . . failed to grasp Mr. Oakman's enthusiasm and vision of the future development of the automobile industry." Their refusal to finance such a venture led Oakman to divert so much of the Towle Company's money into the "horseless carriage" project that the firm went bankrupt in 1900. In May 1902, George C. Lunt, assistant to Oakman, joined with George E. Rogers and William C. Bowlen to form the Rogers, Lunt, and Bowlen Company which purchased the assets of the defunct firm and proceeded to manufacture sterling silver tableware and cutlery.
The Growth of Tertiary Industries

Besides helping to condition Greenfield's subsequent industrial development, the Russell Company and the industries it helped foster brought a large number of people to town. This in turn stimulated the growth of the retail trade, transportation, and construction industries. The population increased rapidly with the great wave of industrialization during the second half of the nineteenth century. The demand for housing was tremendous. In the spring of 1870, the Gazette & Courier reported that "carpenters are unusually busy this season" since "the demand for tenements is as brisk as ever and they command almost any price their owners choose to demand." The housing shortage of the 1860's continued into the 1880's. Between 1880 and 1885, 200 houses were built in Greenfield. The large scale construction of housing also created a need for new roads and sewers. In Greenfield, between 1870-1890, 28 streets were either laid out or extended, and 23 sewers were installed. Home and road building in turn required construction workers and related services. In 1875, the Greenfield area had 105 painters, carpenters, and masons. In 1895, as a result of the building boom, employment in the building trades totalled 387. The building boom also led to the manufacture of construction material. In 1835, the Greenfield area had 45 brickmakers.
By 1895, the number of brick and tile makers increased to 57.\textsuperscript{86}

The development of industry and the increase in population created a need for both water and utilities. Greenfield had established a water works as early as 1796.\textsuperscript{87} But industrialization rendered the water supply inadequate, and a new water works, drawing from the Glenbrook Springs in Leyden, was constructed in 1870.\textsuperscript{88} This project involved construction of a dam (35 feet high and 130 feet long) followed by a 4 3/4 mile long pipe from the Glen to the town.\textsuperscript{89} The Green River and Deerfield River, while much nearer, could not be used because of industrial pollution. Thanks to the Griswold Cotton mill in Coleraine, the water of the South River and the Deerfield into which it flowed were "at times discolored" and had an "offensive smell" in "very warm weather."\textsuperscript{90} The Green River suffered from the iron and steel waste, sulphuric acid, lime, and coal tar and waste which 3 machine tool factories, a baby carriage manufacturing factory, a cutlery, and the gas works dumped into it.\textsuperscript{91}

Greenfield's utility sewers were provided by the Greenfield Gas Light Company, incorporated in 1854, and the Greenfield Electric Light and Power Company, incorporated in 1886.\textsuperscript{92} While both these companies provided employment -- laying of gas mains, stringing of electric wire, installation of street lights, and generators -- the main effect of both was on
Greenfield's living standards. In February, 1874, Fransworth and Persons began running ads for gas furnaces, ranges, and stoves. The creation of the electric power company had a three-fold effect: 1) it permitted electric home and street lighting and the use of electrical appliances; 2) it gave industry an alternative source of power besides water and steam power, so that industries were no longer forced to locate only near river banks; 3) it permitted the creation of an electric trolley system of intra-city transportation in 1895 which travelled far faster than the horse drawn trolley and lacked either the noise or the smoke of the steam locomotive.

* * * * * * *

Population growth also stimulated a demand for goods and services. Between 1875 and 1895, the number of merchants and dealers in Greenfield grew from 78 to 116. Industrialization not only created a demand for more goods and consequently more merchants and dealers to sell them, but also changed the nature of retail trade and merchandising. The old style merchants of pre-industrial Greenfield who sold a wide variety of goods, would accept barter items as payment, and advertise only when they received a new consignment of goods. With industrialization and population growth, merchants became more specialized in the products they sold, sold for cash only, and continually advertised
in an effort to create demand for their goods. Whereas the *Greenfield Gazette* of 1795 devoted only 32 of its 256 column inches to advertising (approx. 12.5% of its space), the *Gazette and Courier* of 1870 devoted almost 22 or its 36 columns to advertising (approx 60% of its space). Instead of advertising only sporadically with single ads announcing a new shipment of goods, firms advertised continually, and carried separate ads for each separate product offered for sale. Thus the April 29, 1850 issue of the *Gazette and Courier* carried 11 different ads for S. Allen and Sons -- one each for cutlery, carpets, paper hangings, guns, hardware, gloves and hose, thread and yarn, mourning dress goods, spring prints, manure forks and hoes, and iron and steel goods. As time went, stores became more and more specialized. By 1886, S. Allen and Sons had changed the line of goods to hardware items such as mechanics' tools, builders' supplies, nails, garden tools, housefurnishing goods, cutlery, and iron and steel products. In place of the haphazard merchandising and display techniques of the old country stores, such stores as W. A. Forbes (dealer in dry goods and carpets) contained "elegant counters, show-cases, large French plate-glass show windows . . . artistically arranged . . . for the comfort of customers and the accommodation of the large stock of goods constantly carried. Even the drug store of Charles N. Payne
contained elaborate counters, silver-mounted show-cases, and an elegantly constructed soda-water fountain. 98

Whereas the old country store sold yarn and later cloth for making clothes, clothing stores like Anson Browning specialized in stylish ready-made clothing. 99 Groceries and provisions had always been a main stock in trade of country stores which sold coffee, tea, sugar, salt, and molasses to the farmers, and took their various products in exchange for either sale to local townspeople or consignment to merchant shippers for sale. In view of the perishability of most food and the difficulties in transportation, most grains, meats, fruits, and vegetables which old time merchants sold to townspeople came from local area farmers. With a large non-farm population to feed, merchants could now specialize in selling groceries. With the invention of canning and the refrigerator care in the 1880's, grocers could sell, as did W. W. Partenheimer (wholesale and retail grocer), vegetables of all kinds, foreign and domestic fruits, canned goods, oysters, and lobsters. 100

Perhaps the most important retail trend of the late 1870's was the beginnings of the department store, called in the Greenfield area the "Boston Store." Like the new style retail stores, it advertised extensively and set up elaborate displays. It differed, however, in that it carried numerous lines of merchandise and operated on a
high volume sale -- low unit profit basis. Thus the White Brothers "Boston Store" carried a full assortment of general dry goods, notions, woolens, linens, cottons, lace, embroideries, and novelties.

The effects of these innovations were summed up in a report of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor:

A dealer today, in order to be successful, is obligated to actively solicit customers. This requires a greater amount of advertising, a larger display of goods, a larger number of employees, and more teams. On account of competition, prices must be made nearer to the cost, and thus profits have been reduced.

As noted in the above report, new retailing methods demanded a larger number of employees -- merchants needed people to keep track of business receipts and expenses, to wait on customers, to set up displays, and so on. The number of clerks, accountants, and bookkeepers in the Greenfield area jumped from 52 (45 men and 7 women) in 1875 to 230 (187 men and 43 women) in 1895.

An increasing and more diversified population spreading out over a growing area required cheap and rapid mass transportation. The electric trolley or "street railroad" provided the means. Because of the noise and smoke of the steam railroad, it could not be constructed in residential areas. The street railroad, powered by electricity, could be extended into residential areas and even into rural areas.
Far faster than the horse drawn trolley, far cheaper and more convenient than the steam railroad, the street railroad enabled people to live in the outlying rural towns of Franklin County and still come to Greenfield to either work or shop.

The street railroad also turned outlying farm areas of Greenfield into potentially valuable commercial and residential sites. Real estate values in hitherto remote sections of Greenfield rose so that the large tracts formerly held for farm purposes were divided into building lots at great profit. Finally, the street railroad became a major source of jobs, providing employment in 1895 for 205 people in Greenfield-Deerfield-Montague.

The Agricultural Revolution

All this industrial development could hardly leave agriculture unchanged. The railroad alone introduced the hazards and opportunities of competing in first a national and then a world market, moving the farmer from subsistence to commercial agriculture.

With the rise of a substantial non-farming population, the farmer seized the opportunity to increase agricultural production and sell food to the factory workers, and raw materials to the factories. With his new cash income, the farmer began to buy goods that he formerly made at home. Among the first things purchased were textiles, for the
factory could produce cloth much more efficiently than farm families. As agricultural production and cash income increased, so did the wants of the farm family. Farm families began to demand an increasingly higher standard of living.

In a speech before the Franklin County Agricultural Society, George T. Davis, a Greenfield resident, asserted that "the farmer wants, not merely food, but he wants something to pay his debts, to educate his family, to surround himself, if not with the shows and pomp of life, yet with the allurements and solaces that civilization offers." The spinning and weaving formerly performed by women, particularly the unmarried daughters, disappeared.

The farmer's growing dependence on a cash income and the higher standard of living led him to strive to increase agricultural production and to seek added income through non-agricultural employment. But increased agricultural production demanded increased capital investment. Such things as cast iron plows, horses, mowing machines, and horse-rakes increased production, but they required more capital. The farmer's new wants, together with the farmer's daughter's desire for such amenities as new clothes and pianos led farm women to leave the farm and take up employment in growing factory towns as either factory workers, school teachers, or domestic servants. Many turned to the manufacture of shoes, straw hats, bonnets, and brooms. This
they did at home on a commission basis for merchants.\textsuperscript{113}

For example, in Deerfield in 1845, 187 women were employed as makers of 27,333 palm leaf hats.\textsuperscript{114}

Early (pre-1850) commercial farming in the Connecticut River Valley had been based on staples sold to townspeople such as rye, oats, wheat, corn, beef, pork, and wool. As woolen factories gobbled up the fine fleeces of the newly introduced Merino and Saxony sheep, sheep raising became profitable; and hay production rose to fatten beef cattle which were being driven to Boston.\textsuperscript{115}

But soon the railroad and the opening of the West altered the new direction of the early period of commercial agriculture. Western wool, beef, pork, and wheat arrived at prices so low as to discourage local production.\textsuperscript{116} Cattle raised on New England pastures worth $30 per acre in 1862 and corn grown at 75 cents a bushel could not compete with cattle raised on prairies costing only $1.25 per acre and corn produced for only 10 cents a bushel.\textsuperscript{117}

Western competition forced New England farmers to specialize in the kind of crops which made nearness to the market a necessity or an advantage.\textsuperscript{118} The result was an increase in the production of dairy products, market garden produce, fruit products, and hay.\textsuperscript{119} Orchard products increased rapidly from $26,295 in 1840 to $249,423 in 1900.\textsuperscript{120} Especially rapid was the rise in dairy production which became a major source of farm income by 1895.\textsuperscript{121} As the
Mid-West became a major dairy production area, cheese production dropped. With the perfection of the refrigerator care, butter production after reaching a peak of 1,729,470 lbs in 1885 dropped to 824,140 lbs in 1900. On the other hand, fluid milk production continued to increase, reaching 10,123,152 gallons in 1900, since its perishability even under refrigeration made local production a necessity.

The Connecticut River Valley was particularly suited, by reason of climate and soil, to tobacco and onion production. In 1850, Franklin County produced 14,590 lbs of tobacco. In 1860, this jumped to 880,561 lbs, and in 1870, to 2,473,265 lbs. With the changes in cigar styles from light colored wrappers to the darker Havana leaf, tobacco production decreased to a low of 915,296 lbs in 1890. By this time, farmers began introducing the darker Havana leaf in place of the light Connecticut leaf tobacco. As a result, production rebounded to 2,000,690 lbs by 1900. Another speciality crop was onions. In 1875, onion production totalled 16,365 bushels. In 1885, production was still only 38,912 bushels. But by 1895, partly as a result of the immigration of Polish peasants willing to perform the intensive hand labor required of onion cultivation, onion production jumped to 191,330 bushels.

As farming became increasingly a commercial venture, the farmers became more dependent upon a cash income from
the sale of his crops. But this income now fluctuated with the uncertainties and vicissitudes of an increasingly national and world market. If prices were high, the farmer lived quite well. If prices fell, the result could be disaster. When the panic of 1873 combined with a shift of demand from the light Connecticut tobacco leaf to the dark Havana leaf, the number of foreclosures and forced sales of farm property was unprecedented in the history of the local area.126

Thus, the shift from subsistence to commercial agriculture proved a mixed blessing. In the words of John Useem:

The old ways had provided assurance of the necessities of life, the new promised greater national comfort but threatened the loss of all savings and property. The self-sufficient farm family possessed a high degree of economic security at a low level of living. The commercial farm family possessed a higher level of living at a lower degree of security.127

One of the most important and least foreseen outcomes of commercial farming was foreign immigration. The growth of onion and tobacco farming created a heavy demand for agricultural labor.128 In the days of subsistence farmers, farm laborers had been few in number -- generally relatives or neighbors of the farm owner. Farm laborers were not considered employees, but members of the household. Thus, in sociological terms, the relationship of farmer and farm laborer was both "particularistic" (defined in terms of
personal relationship rather than occupational function) and "functionally diffuse" (the mutual obligations of farmer and farm laborer were vaguely defined, and usually went far beyond the specific economic relationship of performing precisely defined services for specified wages).  

With the shift to commercial farming, the farmer came to see the farm laborer not as a member of his household, but as a cost factor in his business enterprise. In the words of the Bureau of Labor Statistic Report (1870-71), "the price of labor [was] of as much importance to the farmer as it [was] to the manufacturer." To get cheap labor, farmers resorted increasingly to immigrants. The 1872 Report noted that there had been "an almost entire change within the last 25 years" in the nationality of farm laborers, and that "few natives could be hired to work upon a farm."

There were several factors involved in the replacement of native born laborers by immigrants. Native Americans, as noted earlier, preferred self-employment over working for another. In so far as entrance into farming was easy, they temporarily worked as agricultural laborers in order to gain the cash and often the experience necessary for success as a farm owner. But as farming became a commercial operation involving increasingly large capital expenditures, the farm laborer role ceased to provide either the necessary capital or the relevant experience. Americans
thus came to view jobs as a farm laborer for what they were—low in status, low in pay, and fit only for uneducated immigrants.

As the farmer came to consider the farm laborer as a cost factor, the relationship between them became purely economic. Since immigrants would usually work for cheaper wages, the farmers started hiring (and exploiting) them. Since farm profits depended on the cost of farm labor wages, it behooved the farmer to keep wages low and hire only on a seasonal or daily basis. Consequently, the farm laborer became a seasonal and often migrant worker. In Massachusetts and Franklin County, the agricultural season lasted from April to November.\(^{134}\) In 1872, wages with board averaged $25.78 a month in Franklin County; without board, it averaged $41.42 a month.\(^ {135}\) For an 8 month season, a man without board would earn approximately $331. For a farm laborer, this sum would pretty much represent his yearly earnings, since there was little employment available, during the winter. What jobs existed were mainly brief and occasional chores as cutting and teaming wood, preparing wood for fuel, cutting and storing ice, and similar odd jobs.\(^ {136}\) In comparison, a grinder in the cutlery who worked a full 300 day year at $1.75 per day would earn $525 a year. Consequently, it was very understandable that "active intelligent persons of American parentage" refused to become farm laborers; and that farm laborers more and more came to
to be persons whose "educational condition is below mediocrity." 137

The development of commercial agriculture dealt a devastating blow to the hill towns of the Connecticut Valley. Hill town land was marginal and could never approach the yields of the much more fertile lowlands. 138 When a farm merely had to provide subsistence, high yields per acre were not important. But in commercial agriculture, high yields per acre became a necessity. Low-yield land meant a low cash income and relative poverty. When the farmers of the hill towns compared their meagre standard of living with that of lowland farmers and factory workers, they became intensely dissatisfied and emigrated en masse. In words which echoed this spirit of discontent, the Rev. Moses Miller, Congregational minister in the hill town of Heath, stated, "We would sell our farms if we could and take our final departure from this bleak eminence." 139

Immigration

The building of the railroad, the tending and harvesting of crops, and the operating of machinences in the factories all required manpower. Yet manpower was in short supply. For reasons already enumerated, there was not enough local native American labor able or willing to do these jobs, so farmers and businessmen sought out foreign immigrants. At the same time, numerous changes in Europe were
driving multitudes to America in search of jobs, thus filling Greenfield's needs for labor. These immigrants not only fostered Greenfield's economic development, but also changed the homogeneous Yankee Protestant Village into an ethnically heterogeneous and religiously pluralistic factory town.

The first immigrants into Greenfield were the English cutlers from Sheffield, followed in the late 1840's and 1850's by the German cutlers from Solingen in the Ruhr District. The famines of the 1840's affected Europe as well as Ireland, causing numerous farmers to emigrate. Famine in agriculture caused depression in industry since peasants and the landlords dependent on their rents could no longer purchase the industrial goods. This depression greatly affected the English and German cutlery industry because cutlery was not an indispensible item of consumption but a "consumer durable," the demand for which was relatively elastic. With employment and relatively high wages beckoning in the United States, it was natural for English and German cutlers to emigrate.

Also among the first migrants to Greenfield and Franklin County were the Irish. In Ireland, the agricultural revolution created immense problems for both the Anglo-Irish landowning class and the Irish peasants. Increasing Irish population and English exploitation made the position
of the Irish peasant tenants increasingly precarious. The country lived in a state approaching chronic famine, and, in the words of a classic study of immigration, "the famine years were simply the years in which the chronic symptoms became acute." The fall in the price of grain after 1820 virtually ruined the Irish peasantry and made it difficult for landlords to collect rents. This decline in rent income in turn convinced the landlords that it would be more profitable to evict the tenants and turn the land into pasture. But eviction was dangerous for the evicted had no place to go, and often turned to crime in order to keep body and soul together. The worsening economic conditions in Ireland induced numerous cotters to seek employment as agricultural laborers in England. Then as enclosures also created larger farms in England and as industrial employment opportunities opened up, many Irish took up permanent settlement as industrial workers and migrant agricultural laborers. By 1841, a total of 419,256 persons of Irish birth were permanently living in England and Scotland. The influx of Irish immigrants and the dislocations of the industrial revolution caused English poor rates to skyrocket. Blaming "Irish paupers" for increasing poor rates, English rate-payers pressured Parliament into enacting the Irish Poor Law of 1838. This subjected Irish landowners to high taxes and aroused their desire to stimulate emigration,
particularly since the Poor Law provided for assisted emigration. Moreover, the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 destroyed Ireland's protected position in the English market and greatly stimulated evictions. Finally, the potato rot which lasted from 1845 to 1849 gave the landlords the opportunity to evict the famine stricken cotters and to reorganize Irish agriculture. "Those evicted had but one desire--to escape Ireland and English rule as quickly as possible. In the minds of the people the famine ingrained a dread of the hopeless future and a desire to get away at all costs."  

The Irish peasants fleeing the famine usually arrived destitute and immediate employment was a necessity. But the seaports of Canada, Boston, and New York were primarily commercial trading centers rather than manufacturing cities. The trading center economy consisted primarily of shop-keepers and craftsmen, and the destitute Irish peasants lacked both the capital and skills to become either. There was some demand for stevedores on the docks, porters in the stores and warehouses, and laborers on the construction sites. But these jobs were of short duration and relatively few in comparison with the need. Employment remained a pressing problem.  

In and around towns like Greenfield, railroad construction, accompanied by an emerging industrial and
commercial agricultural economy created employment. As the cutlery industry expanded, Irish workers eagerly took on the relatively high paying but dangerous job of grinder. As Turners Falls developed its paper, cutlery and cotton textile industries, the Irish flocked into these factories; and as Franklin County farmers started growing tobacco, fruit, and garden vegetables for commercial sale, the Irish became the farm laborers who planted, tended, and harvested these crops.

The early immigrants who came to Greenfield and Franklin County were followed by streams of fellow countrymen, some seeking jobs and others seeking to join relatives. Numerous other ethnic groups followed, the most important of whom were the French Canadians who started arriving in the late 1870's to work in the factories, and in the 1890's the Poles, who worked as agricultural laborers.

Among other causes, these later migrations, whether from Italy, Quebec, Scandinavia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Poland, or Russia, had one thing in common: a surging European population, caused in part by a decline in infant and child mortality. Population growth threatened the peasant's traditional economic and social status. In a pre-modern European society, characterized by land scarcity, small holdings, transition from a subsistence to a market economy, and a lack of non-agricultural employment, a
growing population threatened to reduce the status of many peasants and their sons from peasant to landless agricultural laborer. To escape, many peasants came to America, often with the initial idea of earning enough money in America to return and improve his status by buying enough land to support himself and his sons. Thus Thomas and Znaniecki noted of the Polish immigrant:

... the emigrant who goes to America means to return a different man, to obtain -- by earning much and spending little -- the economic foundation on which to build a new and superior career. If he is a landless peasant, ... or will be landless because his parents have not enough land to give some to each child, he wants to save for a farm. If his farm is too small to live on without hiring himself as a laborer, he intends to buy a larger one so as to be completely his own master. If he is a hardworking journeyman, he dreams about establishing a prosperous business of his own.

Needing work on arrival, many of the newer immigrants, like their predecessors, flocked into Greenfield.

Immigration not only increased the Greenfield area's population, but also transformed its ethnic and religious composition. By 1905, the Greenfield-Montague-Deerfield area had a combined population of 18,283. Of these, 5,511 were immigrants, and 9,909 (almost 50%) had a foreign-born father. Only 7,668 (Approx. 42%) had two native-born grandfathers. The social implications of this transformation go far in illuminating historical generalizations about religion, mobility, and ethnicity in America.
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CHAPTER IV
THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION, 1840-1910

In Greenfield, the Industrial Revolution created many opportunities and problems. Pre-industrial Greenfield experienced a fairly even distribution of wealth. In 1798 the wealthiest 10% of the assessed property holders owned only 30% of the property. With industrialization total wealth greatly increased, but a much larger proportion went to the upper strata. By 1859 the wealthiest 10% of the property owners owned 52% of the property. Clearly, the benefits went primarily to an industrial-entrepreneurial elite, and secondarily to a middle class of professionals, businessmen, commercial farmers, and skilled craftsmen. The semi-skilled factory and the unskilled laborers (whether factory or farm) profited little if at all. Thus while the output of goods and services vastly increased, the benefits for large segments of the Greenfield population declined.

Industrialization and Social Change in Greenfield:
A New Propertied Class

The Industrial Revolution brought into existence a new social status group composed of property owning industrialists, merchants, commercial farmers, professionals, and certain skilled craftsmen. While differing in their
economic levels, they possessed in common a certain characteristic life style, set of values, set of needs, and ideology which differentiated them from both property owning subsistence farmers and the newly created working classes.

Like the subsistence farmers, these propertied classes owned income producing property. For both groups, "social status rested largely upon the amount and condition of property that one owned" and "income was derived from profits made from working with one's property." But while the pre-industrial farmer produced just enough to maintain his family's traditional standard of living, the new middle class businessman strove for an ever improving standard of living. This necessitated increased wealth which in turn required increased production and profits. But achieving wealth and profits in a competitive environment demanded certain traits. Among these were economic rationality (the making of economic decisions on the basis of purely economic criteria), asceticism, and impulse control.

Economic rationality followed from the demand for profits. The businessman who made decisions on criteria other than "how will this affect profits" soon lost out to his competitors. As a result of the profit motive, employers organized production to manufacture a maximum amount of goods at lowest possible cost; reduced costs by either substituting machines for workers or replacing
expensive labor by cheap labor; and stimulated sales by creating demand for products through innovative sales and merchandising techniques. In each of these areas, increased profits demanded that traditional modes of operation be compared with alternatives, and judged accordingly. The design for profits led businessmen to mechanize production, introduce immigrant and child labor, standardize products, create new products, devise new demand-creating techniques, foster both technological and organizational change, and make risky capital investments. But what started out as an economic necessity soon became an economic and moral virtue. Thus an editorial in the local newspaper moralized that the businessman should "act as best he can for the good of his business, and demand the protection of the law in his rights" — rights which included paying wages at any rate "they see fit to pay."  

Besides economic rationality, success required asceticism and impulse control. For the sake of future profits, the businessman had to avoid use of capital for non-investment purposes. Instead of spending money on houses, carriages, luxury goods, leisure activities, liquor, or children, success demanded that the businessman limit consumption and invest all possible profits back into the business or at least save for future contingencies. Only
when business success was achieved could the businessman and his family indulge in conspicuous consumption. Instead of spending time with family, friends or leisure activities, success necessitated long hours of hard work at the office or shop. Economically dependent upon the sale of his products or services, the aspiring businessman needed to cultivate clients and customers. He had to give these people the impression of being able and willing to meet needs, whether such needs were a product of certain specifications, delivery by a certain date, or provision of required services. To convey this impression, the businessman had to conform to client and customer images of a proper businessman or professional. Thus the ideal businessman or professional had to appear competent, knowledgeable, sober industrious, reliable, diligent, dependable, and polite. He also had to appear personally concerned with his customer's or client's problem and welfare, and to believe in the worth of his product. Living up to these impressions often required considerable role playing and impulse repressing modes of behavior. Contrary to a sociological cliche about the "inner directed," self-reliant entrepreneur, the Greenfield entrepreneur was quite "other-directed."

The Industrial Revolution directly fostered impulse control by changing the child from an economic asset to an economic burden. In the new middle class as opposed to
the old subsistence farm family, the child did not work until late adolescence. In addition, nineteenth-century middle class families had no real means of controlling family size other than through sexual abstinence. Available birth control techniques were uncomfortable or ineffective. Also Church, State, and medical profession condemned every artificial practice to limit the size of families. With children an economic liability and abstinence the only acceptable form of birth control, sexual relations became a source of anxiety and strain. The economic consequences of possible pregnancy made sexual pleasure a possible threat to economic success. Thus hand in hand with an increased valuation of economic success went increased devaluation of sexuality.

Newspaper advertisements for patent medicines reflected this emerging Victorianism. In the early years of the nineteenth century, the Greenfield papers carried few medicine ads; but those they did carry were quite frank. In 1828, Hunt and Sparhawk advertised Potter's Vegetable Catholicon as a specific cure for syphilis. Subsequent patent medicine ads claimed to cure menstrual disorders, and piles. But later ads, especially after the 1850's, toned down these exact terms in favor of such euphemisms as "female complaints." An editorial comment in 1892 (the Centennial of the paper) on the moral level of its
earlier editions illustrated this growth of prudery in Greenfield:

Nothing is more certainly reflected from the files of a paper covering a century's time than the improvement or refinement in common morals. The Gazette was begun and passed its early years under auspices of highly respected men and its constituents were most intelligent and dignified people of purely New England communities; but a study of its pages, as of any paper commonly read in that time, reveals the continual presence of miscellany of an offensive order, gross and vulgar, which no paper would print now, or could print in safety to its circulation. If it shall not be argued that men behave better then a century ago, it is certain that a higher sense of decency...is one product of a hundred civilizing years.\textsuperscript{11}

The rise of an entrepreneurial class of businessmen also stimulated secularization. As noted earlier Puritanism saw the striving after wealth as a source of moral evil and an indication of misplaced values rather than as a virtue. Franklin County Congregational ministers, perceiving the growing "corruption" of their congregations, lamented:

There is far too much mammon worship in the church. The disciples of Christ too often apparently seek wealth for its own sake. They do not seem to live for Christ. They do not seem to seek wealth that they may honor him with it, in using it to promote the prosperity and advancement of his kingdom. They rather seek to make a vain show, to pander to the lusts of selfish hearts, to foster pride, and to compare themselves among themselves, and yet they have in a public manner consecrated themselves to Christ. But they seem not to have dedicated their property to him. They are exhorted to 'lay up a treasure in heaven' but they seem to be laying it up on the earth.\textsuperscript{12}
In a subsequent report, the same ministers complained that Christian parents inculcated into their children "the idea that the acquirement of riches is 'the chief end of man.'"13 The ministers concluded that "a worldly spirit" would "prevail in the church" so long as "so much is said in the family about the desirability of money" and "the rich are spoken of as happy, and are respected merely on account of their wealth."14

Along with riches in their private lives, these "worldly" Christians wanted entertainers and status symbols in their pulpits. The Reverend Amariah Chandler bitterly lammented:

In nothing is the public taste more changed, as I think for the worse, than respecting the qualifications of ministers . . . They want a man whose mind is a voltaic battery; who can electrify an audience, arrest the multitude, fill up a house of worship; and thus help pay off his salary; a man whom they can show off to proud advantage in comparison with their neighbors, as farmers whom their horses and big bullocks at a county fair, a man who can excel in the pulpit not only, but on a platform; one who can 'court a grin' as readily as 'woo a soul' and 'bring down the house' as the phrase is . . . 15

Thus the growth of a secularized middle class greatly changed the role of the Church. No longer did the Church exercise leadership or make serious moral demands on its members. Instead, it sought to entertain its parishioners, and cater to their social status needs. The middle classes remained church members; but one senses that they did so, not because they believed in the Church's Theology, but
because the Church catered to their needs for status, respectability, social stability, and friendship.

The Lower Classes and Emerging Social Problems

Besides the propertied classes, the Industrial Revolution brought into existence a new class of factory operatives, unskilled laborers, and migrant farm workers. With this latter class came a host of social problems with which the town was ill-prepared to cope.

In pre-industrial Greenfield, farmers formed the bulk of the population. The farm family was an economic enterprise in which each member had definite tasks and functions. Work took place within the family setting so that it "was a wholly natural extension of family life and merged imperceptibly with all of its other activities." In addition, farming embraced a wide variety of roles. The farmer planted crops, chopped wood, erected fences, repaired plows, built corn cribs, made furniture, carted surplus farm products to market and bought supplies and West India goods in exchange, helped a neighbor build his barn, distilled corn whiskey, drove cattle to market, sheared sheep, milked cows, and administered the business aspects of the farm. The farmer could alternate these tasks and perform them pretty much when he chose. While farming required hard work and provided the farm family with little more than subsistence, it, nevertheless, had
its compensations.

Even for the merchant, artisan, or professional, work mingled with family social life. The merchant's store, the artisan's shop, and the professional's office were either in the home or physically adjacent to it. The socialization of children often took place in the work setting with the child functioning as his father's clerk, errand boy, or apprentice. Work merged with social life, for socializing and chatting with customers or clients who were also one's friends was both a necessary and pleasurable aspect of business. As his own boss, the village merchant, artisan, or professional could control the pace and timing of his work. Also the work itself was varied, interesting, and conferred either status or pride of craftsmanship.

The Industrial Revolution made work a problem. Work became divorced from the family setting, and from the social life of the individual. Even if one's friends were fellow workers, the socializing that went with friendship took place during off-work hours. In addition, work changed from a way of life embracing many roles to a single job role.

Whether railroad laborer or factory worker, the worker increasingly performed a single repetitive specialized task at a time and pace imposed on him by the employer with often
considerable risk to life and health. To work under such conditions involved a considerable amount of emotional strain and boredom. Consequently, once off the job, the worker needed to unwind, to release his energies to dissipate his pent-up frustrations and hostilities. With his working life distinct from his non-working life, the worker now faced a problem, particularly if he had no family, of what to do with his free time.

But other things besides the work role imposed anxieties and frustrations upon the worker. As a result of illness, accident, fire, lay off, the firm going out of business, the worker faced the ever threatening possibility of losing his job with its consequent loss of savings and possible destitution.

Among the cutlery grinders and polishers, conditions were such that workers "breathed in an immense cloud of dust" thus creating ideal conditions for the contracting of tuberculosis, emphysema, silicosis, and other lung diseases.\(^{17}\) The cutlery grinders and the railroad workers suffered often from accidents; and the \textit{Gazette \& Courier} carried numerous accounts of grinders injured or killed by bursting stones, and railroad workers injured or killed while using explosives or coupling cars.\(^{18}\)

During the second half of the nineteenth century, fires destroyed many buildings and businesses. At various times,
flames consumed portions of the Russell cutlery, the Wells Bros. building, the Keith Paper Mill, and the Warner Manufacturing Company. On five separate occasions, fires burned down whole blocks of the business district. Under the burnt embers were many lost jobs.

Finally, many workers lost jobs when employers went out of business. In 1869, Civil War contract cancellations caused the Greenfield Manufacturing Company, a firm which made woolens and dated back to 1832, to go bankrupt. In 1883, the Depression and the competition of metal bench tool producers forced the Greenfield Tool Company into bankruptcy. Ultimately in 1903, the Cutler, Lyons & Field Shoe Manufacturing concern went out of business. In each instance, anywhere from 80 to well over 100 workers lost their jobs.

The worker had other causes of discontent and frustration. One was overcrowded housing. Industrialization caused a growth in population and created a tremendous demand for housing. So great was the need for shelter that the Gazette & Courier stated that "if fifty dwellings could be built at once, they would immediately find occupants." Rent gouging and overcrowding were the inevitable result. As a consequence of an inadequate transportation system, the railroad and cutlery workers had to live within walking distance of their jobs. Consequently, the working class became segregated into a "ghetto" south
of the village, away from the stores and middle class.

Inadequate sewerage aggravated the problem of overcrowding. In 1874, half of the privies and drains of the town ran into an open sewer. Not only was the sewerage foul smelling, but it also produced "sickness" in adults and "several fatal cases [of diphtheria] among children."^{27}

Thus the worker, often a new arrival in the community, found his environment full of anxiety, tension, and frustration. He found work in a factory or on a railroad boring, stressful, and tension producing. He found the prospects of losing his job, often as a result of factors totally beyond his control, threatening. When off the job, on evenings and Sundays, he, especially if unmarried, had little to do. Home, in an overcrowded tenement near a noisy railroad and an open sewer, was not inviting. Under these conditions, it was not surprising that some drowned their tensions in alcohol or acted them out in various forms of disorderly behavior.

Drunkenness was fairly common. Reporting a case of "a well-dressed Irish woman" wandering down Main Street in "a state of shameful intoxication," the paper sourly stated, "There are cases to be found like this every day."^{28} It was again reported that the inhabitants of the south part of the village "[laid] in a stock of liquor, with subsequent "disturbances of the peace and fighting" on Sunday."^{29}
License laws designed to regulate the number of places selling liquor, helped little. Occasional attempts at prohibition stimulated bootlegging. 30

The tensions and frustrations that led to drunkenness also led to disorderly behavior. The pages of the Gazette & Courier were filled with such accounts as: "Pay day for the railroad employees in Deerfield and vicinity came last week and several bucks got in their muscle. Three were brought before Justice Thompson", 31 "A party of tough enders were creating a disturbance in the street near the common . . . "; 32 and "One of our mechanics, who is a peaceable man, has been attacked several times by 'Tough Enders' when returning from work." 33

Another concern was welfare. In the pre-industrial community, welfare was no problem. In a subsistence farming economy in which the family was the economic unit of production, individual families took care of those unable to work such as the aged, the sick, or the crippled. If, as in rare cases, the infirm had no relatives, then the town contracted with a family to care for the "poor" at a certain stipulated sum. If the poor were non-residents, they were either sent back to the town of residency or removed to the State Alms House at Monson. 34

In the industrial setting, welfare became a problem. With newcomers migrating into the community and old families
leaving, many "unemployable" individuals who formerly were cared for by their families no longer had families. Work hazards like sickness, accidents, fires, bankruptcies, and business slumps often produced unemployed breadwinners and welfare-needing families. The able-bodied unemployed generally went elsewhere if they could not find jobs in town. But as these people went from town to town in search of work, they often exhausted whatever funds they had and became temporarily dependent on the community for welfare. Thus towns not only had to provide support for an ever increasing number of "unemployables," but also for larger numbers of able-bodied and unemployed transients or "tramps."

Since Greenfield was a railroad junction point, it received more than its share of "tramps." In the depression year of 1875, Greenfield "lodged over 500 tramps" in a single month. In the view of the town officials, "quite a number of these persons have claimed assistance from the town almost as a right; and their claims are sometimes pushed with a wonderful degree of impudence and pertinacity." Not only did these "tramps" have the gall to claim welfare as a right due them, but they were also beggars and thieves. In the words of the Gazette & Courier:

They beg from house to house, and when they find an opportunity steal anything they can put their hands upon. Not only thieving, but graver crimes are committed by these rascals. Not a day passes that our exchanges are not filled with revolting recitals of unprovoked murders and fiendish outrages perpetrated by the lawless rascals
who are swarming through our midst. They invade unbidden our households, and are becoming bolder and bolder in their demands. It has got to such a condition of things that our people are in a perpetual state of terror. Life and property are not safe; and there comes an urgent cry from all sides for protection. It is true that we have laws that punish those who are convicted of thefts and other crimes, but they do not meet present demand at all. When one tramp is arrested for a breach of law, one hundred go unpunished. They care not for the law. A sentence of three months in the House of Correction has no terrors for them. It means in their minds, comfortable quarters and plenty to eat and wear. No doubt many commit misdemeanors for the very purpose of thus getting food and shelter.

Accepting the idea that most or all welfare recipients were either chiselers or thieves, Greenfield officials believed that the way to solve the welfare problem was to crack down on the recipients. "Tramps" were lodged at the jail and fed crackers for breakfast. "Unemployables" were housed at the Town Farm. According to Selectman, there were many able-bodied persons who would "rather loaf about the streets, and live on charity than work for a living." These individuals should be made to work and "contribute to the support of their families." Unfortunately, many of these same people had "families of small children who [were] not to blame for their condition, and whom it [did] not seem right to let suffer." The Town Farm enabled the town to teach the children a trade, force their cheating parents to work, house "unemployable" welfare recipients, and cut welfare costs. (The town hoped to defray
welfare costs by the sale of farm produce.) To impel welfare recipients at the Town Farm to become self-supporting, accommodations were deliberately uninviting. A Report of the State Board of Lunacy had noted that the rooms needed whitewashing, the walls had holes, and both were infested with vermin.

The Loss of Social Control

The anti-social behavior and "irresponsibility" of the lower classes which the railroad and factory brought into being appalled Greenfield's middle class. Largely, if not completely, ignorant of their role in causing these social problems, the middle classes blamed either the moral wickedness of the social deviants or the corrupting influence of liquor and the grog shop. Since Irish immigrants contributed in large measure to the problems of drunkenness, violence, gambling, and pauperism, many Greenfield residents saw the Irish as the cause. The reporting policy of the Gazette & Courier enhanced this tendency to blame the Irish. The paper in its accounts of crime, identified criminals as Irish or as members of an immigrant group, but not as native-born Americans. On the one hand, the news contained such items as; "There was a terrible riot among the Irish laborers on the Illinois Central Railroad at Lasalle, Illinois . . ." "An Irish girl named Ann Cahil died at West Cunningham . . . from an attempt to produce an
 abortion"; "Last Monday evening, a young Irishman named Sweeny was arrested, at Warren, on a charge of rape . . . ."; and "A serious and bloody attack was made upon a party of Republicans by a gang of inflamed Buchanan Irishmen after a late political gathering . . . ." On the other hand, native-born Americans were just simply identified as individuals and not as members of a group. Such biased reporting had two major effects. It stereotyped the Irish as immoral and violent foreigners especially prone to drunkenness, brutality, sexual immorality, and crime; and it led readers to view crime committed by native-born Americans as merely a personal abberation affecting only the individual concerned.

The Irish, stereotyped as deviant, were also feared because they were Catholic. In arguing for stricter naturalization laws, the **Gazette & Courier** cringed at the prospects of elections:

> . . . controlled by the foreign vote -- of men who vote not from the proper understanding of the case, but from the dictation of bishops and priests who, it is well known, do not acknowledge allegiance to our government, and in secret, are doing what they can to subvert it.46

The distress posed by drunkenness, violence, pauperism, and Irish Catholic immigration was real enough to members of Greenfield's middle class. But beneath these surface fears lay a deeper fear which aggravated this discomfort -- a fear of losing the social control formerly exercised over
both the youth and the lower classes of the town. The feeling that the Irish did not accept the traditional values and mores of the community and the realization that the established mechanisms of social control did not include the Irish made them seem especially threatening to the middle class.

Pre-industrial Greenfield possessed strong social controls, based upon group pressure and commonly shared values. But the effectiveness of these social controls depended upon certain conditions. These included: 1) a community wide interaction and institutional network which made all or almost all economically independent persons members of the group or institution and consequently subject to the pressure of the group; 2) an ideology accepted as normative by all so that any deviance from norms would provoke unified group reaction and pressure; 3) the absence of both competing groups and deviant ideologies so that deviant individuals could find neither ideological justification nor group reinforcement; and 4) a strong family system in which children were constantly subject to parental supervision, and made to conform to parental and community norms. In pre-industrial Greenfield, these conditions existed. The community was small enough so that a social interaction and institution network could embrace all or nearly all, members of the community. The community was so
isolated that members had to seek friends from within; and thus were subject to community control. The integration of work with family life and social life subjected children to the social control of their parents, and subjected the parents to the social control of persons who were not only clients, employers, and customers, but also friends, relatives, and neighbors. Finally, the community was not only religiously and ethically homogenous; but also had community wide institutions such as the church, the school, and the town meeting to inculcate a common ideology and a set of common values.

In industrial Greenfield, the social controls of this earlier era no longer effectively served to control social behavior. The long-term residents of the community did not know the foreign immigrants or the migrating hill farmers; and, consequently, had little personal impact on their behavior. Likewise, traditional community institutions had little influence over these newcomers. Unlike earlier arrivals, they were segregated occupationally in the lower classes, and residentially in the cheap tenements of "Tough End" and the railroad.

Other factors like the stresses of cultural assimilation and the demands of the factory system also helped weaken traditional social controls. The migration of parents from a foreign culture reversed the traditional parental role in which children learned appropriate socio-cultural norms and behavior from parents.
Since children more easily assimilated American culture than their parents, parents often resorted to their children for knowledge about American mores. This reversal of learning roles often carried the seeds of generational conflict. When the "old world" standards of the parent conflicted with the Americanized standards of school and peers, the child often rebelled against his parent in favor of the peer group. But the peer group, needing excitement and "something to do," often, under the pressure of slum conditions and inadequate recreational facilities, promoted juvenile delinquency. Margaret Mead made a classic analysis of this phenomenon in her essay "We are All Third Generation."  

The factory system also weakened parental authority. The removal of father from farm to factory also removed the child from parental supervision. With the child no longer having an economic function in the family, he had much more free time, which was spent in the company of his peers. To some observers who perceived this phenomenon, the inevitable consequence was anti-social behavior. In the words of the Gazette & Courier "the beginnings of a crooked career date back to early life and owe their start to a lack of home government, allowing . . . [boys] to run the street too freely and commit petty misdemeanors" with the result that "they drift into attitudes of antagonism"
to family, school, and authority. Annoyed by the behavior of certain youth who played "noisy" games during the warm summer evenings, one irate letter writer to the newspaper complained that "boys, allowed to go out at night and left to the bent of their 'natural depravity' ... will be sure to learn impure thoughts and words, and acquire a taste for disorderly behavior. Thus for adolescents, even more than for adults, the factory created division between work time and leisure time and fostered problems for the community.

Under the new social circumstance created by industrialization, community leaders felt a need to institute new means of social control. The following Gazette & Courier editorial in support of a free public library illustrated this mentality:

The general mind works actively and pants for action if an idle moment arrives. It will be doing something. If nothing good offers, something not good will -- 'For Satan finds some wicked thing for idle hands (or minds) to do! Hence in villages like this, where there are many mechanics, mechanics' boys, and others who have more or less leisure in the evenings, it is important that some provision be made to enable them to employ their leisure hours in some useful way. Nobody who is acquainted with things in this village doubts that Satan has set his traps pretty thick about her to catch the young and unwary -- to employ their 'idle hands'; and if somebody better than he does not contrive some way to spring his traps without game, he will be likely to do much mischief ... One of the best modes of doing this is to furnish the mind with something useful to do. Books are necessary implements in this matter. Many a young man, with an active restless mind, would gladly employ his energies on some useful book if he
could get it, rather than put himself into the filthy rum sinks and smoke holes which serve as a resort for so many to kill time and rob their pockets. It is not likely that all would prefer mental to sensual pleasures; some would — many would. For their sake we ought to have a good library, calculated to instruct and entertain them.50

Implicit in this editorial was an awareness that many of the town's social problems stemmed from the free time created by the factory-induced division between work and leisure. Leisure, especially among youth, could be either an opportunity for self-improvement or a temptation to self-destruction. Whatever choice taken depended on the following: the values and self-restraints that the youth possessed; and the existence or non-existence of institutions which would either occupy leisure time or subject it to community influence.

Thus Greenfield's alarm over the loss of social control embodied a fundamental optimism. The town could solve its social problems if it did the following: create an new value consensus; inculcate these values into its children; and devise institutions which would provide for constructive use of leisure time.

The Ways of Restoring Social Control

Given the above perspective, three things were needed to re-establish social control: 1) the creation of a new ideological consensus which is commonly called the "ideology
of mobility" and which a newly secularized and religiously pluralistic society could accept; 2) the effective inculcation of internal psychological restraints to replace the diminishing external restraints of group pressure; and 3) the creation of new means by which individuals could be made subject to group and community pressure.

The ideology of mobility, like any other ideology, an integrated set of emotionally held beliefs and myths that account for social reality, has definite social functions. By accounting for, or explaining reality, ideology enables individuals to define personal and group experiences, and to decide how to react in order to meet group needs. Out of a continuous and patterned constellation of needs arises interests, and the pursuit of interests leads to ideologies which give meaning, reinforcement, and justification to these interests, one of which is the preservation of the prevailing social structure.

The ideology of mobility, as it arose in the early industrial society of the United States in the first half of the nineteenth century, may be defined as a set of values which taught people to believe that they earned their place in the social structure through individual effort, character, and ability. The new middle class of property-owning businessmen, manufacturers, merchants, and commercial farmers created by the Industrial Revolution exploited and expanded this
ideology in order to protect and increase their wealth. The ideology accomplished two things for them. First, it acted as a new source of value consensus that expressed the new society, a society that was changing economically and socially, a society that was becoming increasingly pluralistic and secularized. Secondly, it helped the community as a whole to convince poor, aspiring, hard-working people that they could easily fulfill all their aspirations for a better life. It was not difficult for this to be accomplished. For the ideology of mobility was simply a universalization of the new middle classes' experiences in a changing and expanding economy.

What were these experiences? The Industrial Revolution caused fundamental changes in the economic-occupational structure causing economic wealth and high status occupations to be available to an ever-increasing minority. Those who conducted their businesses on "business principles" (economic rationality) and practiced such ascetic-virtues as industry, perseverance, frugality sobriety, initiative, honesty, and reliability succeeded in the competitive business world. Those unable to understand the factors making for business success, or unwilling to practice the required economic virtues failed. Thus it became easy for successful businessmen to see their success as the result of superior ability and virtue, and the failure of others as the result
of a lack of these attributes especially virtue. In the words of Irwin Wylie, the drama of economic salvation came to parallel (and also to replace) the drama of spiritual salvation. Like God the employer provided success for those who willed success and practiced the appropriate virtues. Like God, the employer provided failure for those who willed it and engaged in such vices as laziness, sloppiness, intemperance, lateness, disloyalty, or dishonesty.

Greenfield accepted the new ideology of mobility. According to the Gazette and Courier, top positions in society were easily accessible to virtuous boys:

Wanted: A Boy with Ten Points. 1) Honest 2) Pure 3) Intelligent 4) Active 5) Industrious 6) Obedient 7) Steady 8) Obliging 9) Polite 10) Neat. One thousand first rate places are open to one thousand boys who come up to the standard . . . The places are ready in every kind of occupation. Many of them are already filled by boys who lack some of the most important points, but they will soon be vacant . . . Some situations will soon be vacant because the boys have been poisoned by reading bad books such as they would not dare to show their fathers, and would be ashamed to have their mothers see. The impure thoughts suggested by these books will lead to vicious acts; the boys will be ruined, and their places must be filled. Who will be ready for one of these vacancies? Distinguished lawyers, useful ministers, skillful physicians, successful merchants must all soon leave their places for somebody else to fill. One by one they are removed by death. Mind your ten points boys; they will prepare you to step into vacancies in the front rank. Every man . . . is looking for you, if you have the ten points do not fear that you will be overlooked. A young person having these qualities will shine as plainly as a star at night.
Elsewhere, the paper claimed "that nearly all rich men in this country were once poor" and that "nearly every personal fortune . . . is either the product of its owner's toil and skill, or the representative of his father's toil and skill." Starting without capital, these successful capitalists "went boldly and resolutely to work; they toiled, and thought, and planned, and kept toiling, and thinking, and planning, patiently, until at last they . . . succeeded." The news often related laudatory articles about Greenfield or Franklin County natives who made or were making good elsewhere. Obituary articles depicted the deceased self-made man worthy of the highest praise. An obituary dedicated to Emil Weissbrod, a local manufacturer of women's pocket books, began with the statement that he "furnished in his life, with its early struggle, and its full measure of success, one of those fine instances of self-help, of honest industry, of the making of the most of one's advantages, however meager, and of the employment of success for the good of others . . ." The article then went on to describe how he emigrated as a 12-year old boy from Coburg, Germany and landed in America "without friends, without money, and without employment." Nevertheless, having "already learned the lesson of self-reliance" and possessing "every virtue that counts for business success," he diligently pursued success and "denied his own tastes through years of
application . . ."56 When success came, he devoted much effort to civic and religious pursuits.

Not content with using editorials, articles, and obituaries to convey the ideology of mobility, the Gazette & Courier also employed fiction. In the 1850's the paper printed front page fictional stories to entertain and instruct. Many of these stories stressed the Horatio Alger Myth. For example, the June 13, 1859 issue contained a story entitled, "Was It All Luck"? which narrated how Mark Anderson's politeness, eagerness to learn, and hard work enabled him to obtain a clerk's job, and eventually work his way up into partnership with the firm. Although the writer mentioned lucky breaks and chance acquaintances which helped Anderson in his upward striving, he concluded that "I think you will agree with me in saying my friend Mark Anderson does not owe his prosperity -- no not even his first step upward -- to what you, gentlemen, are pleased to call luck."57

Other opinion forming groups such as the Protestant clergy and schools espoused the ideology of mobility. In a Sunday sermon, George Grennell's minister was heard to say: "the acquisition of wealth and honors [is] commendable, if pursued honestly and by just means . . ."58 So pervasive was the ideology of mobility that a Thanksgiving Day sermon by the Reverend N. N. Glazier argued that the Golden Rule
was perfectly compatible with success-striving in business. Implicitly accepting this striving in business as the more important value, the Reverend Glazier contended that "the man of generous soul will have his full portion of earthly goods," and that the Golden Rule "is consistent with true success in business life." The fact that a Baptist minister expounded these ideas to a Baptist congregation composed overwhelmingly of farmers and factory workers, indicated a community wide acceptance of the ideology of mobility.

The second mode for restoring social control -- that is, social order -- was the inculcation of self-control, that is, the internalization of desired values. The proponents of the ideology of mobility" laid a great stress on the value of self-control. Much of the behavior demanded of the successful individual required the internal stimulus of conscience and super-ego. People could not be externally compelled to practice perseverance, frugality and other such economic virtues. Only "properly" socialized individuals would practice them. Thus the ideology helped foster an increased stress on self-control. Contributing to the latter was the impact of community pressure. As social life became more impersonal and social relationships more segmented, it became necessary that conscience or super-ego replace group pressure as a governing force in personal behavior.

This was especially true when increasingly impersonal social
relations were combined with the socio-economic stresses caused by immigration and industrialization.

The new stress on self-control led the Greenfielders like other Americans of their age to value and regard education very highly. The imperatives of the ideology of mobility and the need for social control led to the notion that proper socialization or character training would serve both the community and the individual. The belief that education could teach "good character" (create an ascetic and self-controlled personality) made those desirous of it to stress the need for compulsory education. If the early educational experiences of the child determined whether or not he acquired "good character," then proper education assumed a momentous importance. In the words of the School Committee, "Lack of good education or an education that is pernicious may lastingly damage a person . . . especially in respect to . . . character." Given this high valuation of "proper childhood education," the non-attendance of children became increasingly perceived as a serious problem. This was especially so in the context of socio-economic changes, which brought immigrant families into the town and left children with both increased leisure time, and lessened parental supervision. In school, children could be given proper education, and properly socialized into the prevailing norms and standards of the community.
Thus the industrialization of Greenfield helped increase the old New England respect for education. In a basically agricultural community, before the changes brought by immigration and industrialization, the Greenfield School Committee seemed complacent over the fact that almost 30% of the school age population did not attend school. By 1860, the School Committee called non-attendance "the most serious evil connected with schools"; and by 1866, it saw non-attendant children as "preparing themselves to fill the ranks of paupers and criminals."

The doctrine of self-control led to a strong emphasis on Temperance. A historical sociologist has noted that when "self-mastery, industry, and moral consistency are prized virtues," then "drinking is a profound threat because it may engulf the drinker in demands which he cannot control," (i.e., may cause actions leading to either personal failure or social deviance). In the words of one writer to the newspaper, liquor led to "idleness, wastefulness, poverty, vice, suicide, murder, and all other crimes . . ." Thus a person striving after success would likely see alcohol as an evil. Drink diverted resources from either savings or investments to present pleasures. Drink lessened one's inhibitions and restraints so that injury to reputation or socially deviant acts could result. Likewise, the success striver saw abstinence as good.
Abstinence meant money saved, and good character confirmed, thus increasing self-esteem.

Abstinence or Temperance besides being a personal virtue was also a public badge of virtue. By his public practice of Temperance, the abstainer affirmed to others his potential and worthiness for success. Here was an individual who could make it even if he was poor. Likewise, the drinker conceded his moral weakness and his potential for failure.

Temperance became a public badge of "class" and "status group" membership. The Abstainer projected the image of a worldly ascetic from the prestigious middle class. The Drinker conveyed an image of membership in one of the following low status groups: the degenerates in life whom drink led to ruin, or the lazy, improvident, and intemperate workers and farm laborers who failed to achieve success or the immigrant Irish and Germans who held the low status employee positions in the community.

By becoming a badge of "class status group" membership, the Temperance movement had important social consequences. By identifying drink with failure and low status, Temperance provided middle class abstainers with a simplified explanation of whatever was wrong in either the community or society at large. In the words of John F. Moors, Unitarian minister:
Learn of pauperism, and destitution, of ragged and neglected children, of disorderly and unhappy homes, of ruined prospects, of broken and crushed hearts, and you are almost sure, if you look for the cause, that you would find intemperance at the bottom. 70

The fact that much of the disorder in Greenfield stemmed from people who got drunk and started brawling reinforced the tendency to see liquor as the root of all evil. Newspaper accounts of strife stressed the role of liquor as a cause. For example, a report of a bar-room brawl in a Greenfield hotel, played up the fact the participants were "mad with liquor." 71

The evil image of liquor led many desirous of more social control to seek to ban the liquor traffic. This ban was strongly resisted by liquor dealers 72 and drinkers, most of whom were immigrant workers and farm laborers. A long, continuing and bitter dispute over instituting a permanent local prohibition resulted. 73 In fact, so bitter was the dispute that the issue of prohibition either overshadowed or swallowed up all other social conflicts in the community. In contrast, every class or ethnic-religious conflict, while present, never reached either the intensity or the sustained impact of prohibition.

The final way in which the distressed social order of Greenfield could be cured and social order restored was the creation of new institutions which could subject
individuals to group and community pressures. A new form of group pressure working for social order arose in the 1860's and 1870's: the voluntary organization, a social group which served psychological and social functions. As one historian noted, "the more individuals are driven into isolated, specialized roles, and particularized identities, the more dependent they become on others, in both practical and spiritual ways, for the sense of competence and completeness that has been lost."74 As society became more impersonal Americans established structured voluntary organizations not unlike those founded for special purposes during the Jacksonian period. In these structured organizations, one could find friendship, seek persons with like interests, engage in congenial social-recreational activities, and gain a sense of social identity; one could achieve personal goals, while enjoying satisfying interpersonal relationships. By 1875, Greenfielders had established a large number of social-activity organization, including the Greenfield Farmers Club, Deutscher Order Harugari, Odd Fellows, Young People's Social Union, the Greenfield Light Infantry, the Greenfield Musical Society, the Greenfield Lyceum, the Greenfield Dramatic Club, the Sons of Temperance, the Grand Arm of the Republic, and Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Turnverin, and three separate Masonic lodges -- not to speak of numerous new church organizations which could
hardly have been imagined in the 1830's.

It is a well-known fact that post-Civil War churches took on social functions. This was reflected in the large number of new subsidiary church organizations and activities. The local newspaper carried accounts of Methodist Christmas festivals, Baptist excursions to Mt. Nonotuck, Congregational outings and fish fries, Episcopal fairs, and Catholic picnics. Many of these were fund-raising affairs. A report of a Catholic Church picnic mentioned that the proceeds were to be used in paying off the debt of the church. These trends reflected religious secularization. In an age dominated by the ideology of mobility churches had to meet non-religious social and personal needs in order to retain their membership. Hence the increasing tendency of church organizations to take on social functions, and church fund raising to combine with social activities, recreation, and entertainment.

By 1900, the organizational list also included: a women's bowling club, a young men's social club, the Wednesday Club, the Cercle Jacques Cartier, the Sons of Veterans, the Father Mathew Temperance Society, the St. Joseph's Temperance Society, the Knights of Columbus, the Greenfield Club, the German-American Social Club, the DAR, the Red Men, the Daughters of Pochontas, Knights of Pythias, Knights Templar, the Sons of Hermon, the Order of the
Eastern Star, the Foresters, and Knights of Malta. Several of these organizations had more than one local chapter, like the Masons, Odd Fellows, and Knights Templar. In addition there were several Whist clubs, and several labor unions, which functioned more as lodges and social clubs than as unions. Many of the railroad unions functioned as fraternal organizations, with locals being referred to as lodges. Thus the D.S. Simmons Lodge was really the local organization of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the E.A. Smith Lodge, the local organization of the Order of Railroad Conductors. These and similar organizations sponsored social activities such as dances, concerts, and developed lady auxiliaries.  

Greenfield's social organizations promoted ethnic-religious segregation, by enabling individuals to confine their primary face-to-face relationships to members of the same ethnic group, or religion. In Greenfield, except for a few elite clubs like the Greenfield Club (a men's club which embraced the business-professional upper class) and the Union lodges, most social organizations cut across class lines. But, "structural segregation" along ethnic and religious lines was common. All of the immigrant ethnic groups formed their own separate organizations.

The Germans not only had such social organizations as the Turnverein and the Deutscher Order Harugari, but also
their own German Lutheran and German Methodist churches. These German organizations fostered an intense identification with the "Fatherland." When the Prussians defeated France in the Franco-Prussian War, "a procession of between 200 and 300 was formed at Turn Hall and with banners... they marched through the streets..." 78

The Irish had such organizations as the Emmet Club (a pro-Irish Nationalist organization), the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and the Father Mathew Temperance Society. In the 1870's Holy Trinity Church was essentially an Irish church. When the Catholic Church held a procession and picnic, the marching organizations included the Fenian Brotherhood and the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and the picnic festivities featured Irish step dancing and the playing of Irish and American airs. 79

Subsequent immigrant ethnic groups also formed their own social organizations. The French Canadian immigrants in Greenfield-Turners Falls formed the Cercle Jacques Cartier and had their own parish church in Turners Falls. The Polish immigrants, coming in the first two decades of the Twentieth Century, had their Polish American Citizen's Club and their own parish, Sacred Heart Catholic Church.

Besides fostering ethnic-religious segregation Greenfield's organizations re-created some measure of social control through group pressure on aspiring individuals. These
organizations enabled the upper middle class, whose members constituted a sizable proportion of the members and a larger proportion of the group leaders,\textsuperscript{80} to socialize group members into middle class values and attitudes.\textsuperscript{81}

**A New Social Equilibrium**

The development of the ideology of mobility, the emergence of an increasingly self-controlled population, and the proliferation of voluntary organizations helped to restore a measure of social control and optimism in the 1880's. This helped lessen social tensions, and helped produce a changing attitude toward both Catholics and immigrants. Awareness of the social control that the Catholic Church exerted over the lower classes led the middle classes to become more tolerant of the Catholic Church and more accepting of individual Catholics striving for middle class status. When the Catholic Church held a fair in 1874, most of the Protestant merchants in the community donated gifts.\textsuperscript{82} When the Catholic pastor, the Reverend Mark Purcell, died in 1900, "very many townspeople of Protestant affiliations" attended the funeral.\textsuperscript{83} Likewise, hostility toward immigrants declined. Stereotypes persisted, but they were no longer completely unfavorable. People saw the Poles as avaricious, dirty, tight-fisted, prone to drunkenness, and quarrelsome. Nevertheless, they only assaulted
"those of their own nationality," never molested "any person outside their own people," and were industrious, frugal, ambitious, honest, and generally law-abiding. If condescending, these stereotypes at least lacked the hostility earlier directed at the Irish.

The initial loss of social control and the new forms of social control exerted a major influence on social life and social mobility in Greenfield. The new social equilibrium achieved by the new means of social control clearly affected the occupations, status, and social behavior of groups and individuals in the community in numerous and significant ways.
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For example, the May 4, 1895 issue of the Gazette & Courier had an article on "Franklin Boys in Chicago" which illustrated the contribution of Marshall Field and other individuals to Chicago's economic life. The May 22, 1882 issue mentioned the election of Silas Bullard, a Greenfield native and "self-made man" as mayor of Menasha, Wisconsin. Other articles from time to time discussed the exploits of such other Greenfield natives or residents as William Washburn (Governor of Massachusetts and U. S. Senator), Charles Devins (Civil War General, Attorney General under Rutherford Hayes, and Massachusetts State Supreme Court Justice), and Charles Stone (Civil War General in the Egyptian Army).
55 Emil Weissbrod, a local pocket book manufacturer, was born in April 1843, the son of a landscape gardener, in Cöburg, Germany. Emigrating to America at age 12 in 1865, he found a job as a boy apprentice in a pocket book shop. In 1870, he was offered a job with a pocket book concern in Montague. Starting out subsequently on his own, he built Emil Weissbrod & Sons Co. into a sizable local manufacturing concern. He was Deacon of the Second Congregational Church; Vice President of Franklin County Hospital Association; and former President of the Greenfield Recorder.

56 Greenfield Recorder, October 11, 1905, p.2.
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58 Diary of George Grennell, Jr., Entry for January 13, 1867. In Grennell Papers, PVMA, Deerfield Heritage Library.


60 In the latter half of the Nineteenth Century, the Protestant churches of Greenfield began to stratify along class lines. Thus the Unitarian and Episcopal churches became largely "elite" and middle class churches while the Baptist and First Congregational consisted overwhelmingly of farmers and workers. This phenomena will be discussed in Chapter V.

61 This statement does not imply that social control through the inculcation of super-ego restraints did not exist in pre-industrial Greenfield. As noted in Chapter I, such forms of social control exists in all societies. It just means that in the pre-industrial setting, socialization is directed to achieving conformity to traditionally accepted modes of behavior. In the industrial setting, socialization is directed to developing certain attitudes and traits of character. These distinctions are similar to David Reisman's distinction between the "Tradition-directed" and the "inner directed" character except that, contra Reisman, both types were also considerably "other directed." See David Reisman, The Lonely Crowd Yale Paperback (New Have: Yale University Press, 1969) Chapter I.
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Joseph Gusfield notes that Temperance propagandists continually played upon the theme of the middle class drinker whose drinking causes him to lose his job, savings, credit, and the love of his family with consequent economic and social failure as inevitable results. Gusfield, p. 34.

A large proportion of the German and many of the Irish immigrants worked in the cutlery. As noted in Chapter III, employee status represented an inferior status to an American workman. The low status of cutlery workers was reflected in a tendency of American cutlery workers to list themselves on their marriage applications as "mechanics."
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Except for the druggists who sold alcohol containing beverages in the form of "medicine," most of the liquor dealers were English, Irish, or German immigrants.

A letter from George Grennell, Jr. to William Grennell noted, "We have a large strife on the question of a prohibitory or license liquor law. You may not understand it; but it creates a most intense excitement reaching all classes and places." Letter from George Grennell Jr. to William Grennell, dated October 24, 1867. Grennell Papers, PYMA, Deerfield Heritage Library.
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CHAPTER V
SOCIAL MOBILITY IN GREENFIELD, 1850-1910

In a period of social turmoil and change the "elite" and middle classes of Greenfield tried to restore a measure of social control and social stability by providing a new ideology which gave meaning to the experience of a new propertied class. This ideology of mobility, essentially an early version of Social Darwinism, asserted that the Industrial Revolution created unprecedented opportunities for achieving both social mobility and wealth. The new possibilities for wealth and status produced an intense competition. In this race, the prizes allegedly went to persons of ability and good character. Those deficient in either, especially character, suffered the penalties of failure and poverty. In theory, the American social stratification system constituted a meritocracy under which character, ability and effort determined a person's social position.

The middle classes accepted this ideology, for it justified their status and raised their self-esteem. But what about the lower classes? Did they accept an ideology that implied their poverty was deserved? These questions are important for several reasons. If the lower classes accepted the ideology of mobility's claim of a just social structure, then failure stemmed from personal inadequacy rather than from an unjust society. Resentment over one's status would
lead to guilt and lowered self-esteem rather than rebellion against the status quo.¹

Other, larger social effects would also follow. The lower classes would eschew political radicalism in favor of political conservatism and apathy. In an environment supposedly devoid of class conflict and class consciousness, politics would focus on status conflict issues and personalities. Major political parties would cut across social class lines and differ little in their political-economic views. If the lower classes rejected the ideology of mobility as inconsistent with their own life experiences, then one would expect to see a high degree of class consciousness and class conflict. Political parties would cleave sharply along social class lines and diverge radically on economic issues.

The extent to which the ideology of mobility appealed to the lower classes is difficult to determine. Dead men cannot be interviewed, and workers left no written records for historians. But in spite of these limitations, one can make some well-grounded inferences by comparing the claims of the ideology of mobility with the mobility experiences of actual people. After all, "people test the validity of ideologies concretely in everyday life."² If an empirical study of social mobility in the past indicated relatively high or low degrees of mobility, then one can infer that people in the past perceived this and responded accordingly.
According to the ideology of mobility, all should strive for success. But what constituted "success"? Nineteenth century advocates of the ideology of mobility saw success as moving from a lower social class to a higher one -- from working class factory worker to middle class businessman or from middle class clerk to bank president. But class mobility involved two separate, but interrelated factors: occupation and property.

Twentieth century sociologists and nineteenth century ideology of mobility proponents saw occupation as the major indicator of social class. Seymour Lipset and Hans L. Zetterberg noted:

> From Plato to the present, occupation has been the most common indicator of stratification. Observers of social life -- from novelists to pollsters -- have found that occupational class is one of the major factors which differentiates people's beliefs, values, norms, customs, and occasionally some of their emotional expression.³

Charles Westoff, et al., noted that modern sociologists tend "to employ the term social mobility and occupational mobility interchangeably."⁴ So did the proponents of the ideology of mobility. Thus, the newspaper exhorted the boys of the town to develop such virtues as honesty, purity, industry, politeness, and reliability so that they may achieve "first rate places ... in every kind of occupation."⁵ The obituaries of prominent citizens always stressed their low occupational beginnings, showing an
implicit awareness that occupational mobility indicated social mobility.

But occupational mobility was not the only criterion of success. In an age that valued the accumulation of wealth and the pleasures that money would buy, the possession of wealth or the ownership of property also conveyed status. In the pre-industrial economy, property ownership constituted the major determinant of social class. In pre-industrial Greenfield, property ownership meant both economic independence and full-fledged adulthood, and conferred a social status far higher than that of the property-less worker. But even with industrialization, property ownership conveyed status. Like the pre-industrial farmer, the new middle class owned property; and its property was the major visible characteristic which distinguished it from the lower class.

The concept of "social stratification" involves the idea of differentiated ranks or classes. But class or rank depends not only on objective factors such as occupation and property ownership, which sociologists and historians can observe, record, and measure with some ease, but also subjective factors such as status and prestige which are more difficult to assess. Status, according to Max Weber, involves "specific, positive or negative, social estimations of honor." Weber implied that occupations involving administrative control over others, ownership of productive
property, or specialized skills in short supply possessed a relatively high degree of social honor. Likewise, property ownership also conferred honor. But social honor or prestige reflects other things besides economic class factors. Social status groups exhibit specific life styles which differentiate one from another. Status groups can be defined not only by economic class, but also by such factors as religion, ethnicity, consumption patterns, and educational level. Status groups differ in their prestige so that the persons within them are evaluated not only on the basis of such personal qualities as role competence, personal behavior, and personality traits, but also on the basis of status group membership.  

The sociologist can measure prestige and status by asking respondents how they evaluate the prestige of various occupations, social groups, and persons. The historian, dependent upon records, must determine the structure of past social stratification systems by extrapolating the findings of modern sociology back into the past, corroborating his assumptions with indirect evidence. 

Given these problems, what can we say about the social hierarchy of Greenfield in the latter half of the nineteenth century? We can begin by stating a few basic postulates. As Weber noted, non-manual occupations, which demand administrative control of property or people, or require
specialized knowledge possess higher status than manual occupations. Within the manual ranks, skilled occupations (machinist, carpenter, mason, painter) outrank the semi-skilled factory operatives who in turn outrank the unskilled laborers and migrant farm workers. Besides the status gradations arising out of skill differentials and property ownership, strong status distinctions emerged out of income differences. In the nineteenth century, these two status hierarchies of occupation and income coincided because of the direct connections which existed between the kind of work performed and the workers' income, as shown in the following table:
TABLE 1^a

AVERAGE ANNUAL WAGE IN FRANKLIN COUNTY, 1876

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Classification</th>
<th>Days Worked</th>
<th>Mean Annual Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual Workers^b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>298.04</td>
<td>868.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>141.57</td>
<td>237.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>550.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>506.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinists</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>630.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>472.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperers</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>512.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlers (undesignated)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>442.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Operatives (undesignated-male)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>393.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinders</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>378.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Laborers</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>341.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Laborers</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>276.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


^b Includes agents, bank officials, bartenders, bookkeepers, buyers, cashiers, town officials, clergymen, clerks, dentists, engineers, express officials, insurance agents, journalists, lawyers, nurses, overseers, railroad officials, salesmen, stenographers, teachers, and telegraph operators.
As noted on the last page, there is a close correlation between occupation and social class. Consequently, occupational mobility coincided with social mobility.

* * * * * * *

The following attempt to measure social mobility in nineteenth century Greenfield will focus on the dimensions of occupational mobility and property mobility. By comparing the mobility experiences of various social groups in Greenfield, it should be possible to show how mobility affected the social life, ideological beliefs, and political behavior of the community.
Methodology of the Study

The ideology of mobility embraced two basic concepts. First, any person, no matter how humble his origins, could climb to the top if he had the requisite ability and character. Second, "success" consisted of improving one's position, either relative to one's parents or to the beginnings of one's own career. Many eulogies on the success theme began with either "He began work as a common laborer and ..." or "Coming from a poor and humble family, he ...." Consequently, both these aspects, termed by sociologists "career mobility" and "intergenerational mobility," should be studied.

Any research should seek to open up new areas of knowledge and avoid the weaknesses of previous research. One weakness of previous historical studies of social mobility in the United States has been their narrowness -- telling only of mobility within a limited time span or within particular social classes. To gain a wider and more meaningful view of social mobility, one must study mobility throughout the whole stratification system over a longer period of time. Since previous research indicates that religion, ethnicity, and family life affect mobility, it would be extremely useful to have source materials which would enable the historian to select individuals from all social strata and permit investigation of religion, ethnicity, and
family life. For this purpose historians have rarely used a wonderfully relevant and complete form of documentation, namely, marriage records. These will form the chief basis of this study of Greenfield -- which fortunately has an almost complete run of detailed records from 1850 to the present.

Marriage records, as opposed to a random selection of names from a census, permit the study of several aspects of mobility. Besides the names of bride and groom, the marriage records list their occupations, place of birth, residence, parents' names, and the name of the clergyman or official performing the ceremony. In combination with census records (up to 1880) and Town Directories (after 1877), it becomes possible to study the influences of both religion (determined from the religion of the person performing the ceremony) and ethnicity (determined from the birthplace of person or parents) on mobility. The study of the mobility experiences of married couples sheds some light on family life. Finally, use of marriage records helps solve a problem inherent in any mobility study, namely, accurate identification of individual names. In using successive census schedules and then town directories, the historian will find some names easy to trace and others very difficult. When there are several John Jones's, it is easier to identify a married couple like John and Elizabeth Jones than to
identify a single individual named John Jones.

In order to exploit these records, four separate cohorts of names were selected. They consisted of all Greenfield male inhabitants married in the years 1850-1857, 1880-1886, 1910-1912, and 1940-1941. These years were selected because they permit the study of mobility trends over a long period of time, and provide a sample numerically large enough for statistically significant testing.

After listing all married couples in each cohort, the writer traced these people through successive census schedules, town directories, and tax assessment records to determine the following: whether the couple still resided in Greenfield, size of family, occupation of family members, property owned (whether real or personal), and names and relationships of people living with the family.

After compiling and tabulating the above information, the writer analyzed that data pertaining to both the 1850-1857 and the 1880-1886 cohorts in order to assess the geographic mobility (the extent to which persons left the community), the intergenerational mobility, the career mobility, and the property mobility (the extent to which persons acquired property) of each cohort. A summary of the characteristics of the cohort as a whole and, especially of the various social classes and status groups within each cohort concludes each analysis.
The analysis of these two cohorts made it quite evident that many aspects of Greenfield's social life and behavior reflected the town's mobility characteristics. Consequently, this study then proceeded to examine the relationships between Greenfield's mobility patterns, and the dominant values, ideas, and social patterns of the community.

The 1850-1857 Marrieds

Any analysis of the married couples in Greenfield must begin with the fact that only 5% of the males were born in the Greenfield area. By contrast, 38% were immigrants born in Ireland, German, or England. The vast majority of the remainder were rural migrants born in western Massachusetts, southern Vermont, or southern New Hampshire. Whether immigrants or rural migrants, all came to Greenfield while young adults, spent a few months or years in the community, got married (either to a Greenfield girl or one from their former place of residence), and finally either settled down for a while or moved on elsewhere. Overall, the marrieds of Greenfield were quite mobile geographically. Of the 1850-1857 married males, only 31% were living in Greenfield in 1850, and only 46% remained until 1860. In fact, so transient was this cohort, that only 17% were listed on both the 1850 and 1860 censuses, and 33% were listed on neither.
Thernstrom and Knights showed that there was a neat and simple economic pattern in emigration from Boston in the late nineteenth century. Those at the top, like well-to-do proprietors, stayed; the less well-to-do were more likely to leave; and the poor, unskilled laborers were the most likely to leave. In Greenfield, however, emigration was relatively heavy among all social classes, as the following table shows:

**TABLE 2**

**GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY AMONG 1850-1857 MARRIEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Class</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1850 &amp; 1860</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietors</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlers</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample (N=244)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nevertheless, an economic determinant similar to that of Boston was clearly evident, if not so neat. Thus proprietors were the most likely to remain in the community, but even they often moved from Greenfield as businesses failed or greater opportunities elsewhere beckoned. In a recent study of small businesses in Poughkeepsie, Mable Newcomer noted that only 12% of the small businesses lasted twenty years or more, and that 55% lasted less than five years. The January 2, 1860 issue of the Gazette & Courier, printed a copy of an 1839 business directory which listed 48 firms. Of these, only 16% were still in business at the end of 1859. Of the 11 non-craft proprietors in the 1850-1857 Married cohort, only two were in business in 1870.

The most mobile group was the "mechanics." During the 1850's, a total of 49% came to Greenfield, married, worked, and left, without being recorded in either census. The "mechanics" consisted of two groups. The American "mechanics" were rural craftsmen who made and repaired tools, household utensils, and farm implements. The immigrant "mechanics" were generally craftsmen in the cutlery industry. The Americans migrated to Greenfield as factory-produced tools, implements, and utensils undermined their livelihood in the farming communities from which they came. Once in Greenfield, they sought to protect their traditional status by starting their own business, or entering another craft whose status was not threatened by the industrial revolution.
(such as carpentry, blacksmithing, or harness-saddle making). As rural, self-employed craftsmen, the American "mechanics" felt a deep aversion to employee status. Only one of them subsequently worked any extended time in the cutlery. The immigrants were skilled craftsmen in various phases of the cutlery industry. Induced to migrate by economic depression at home and economic opportunities in the American cutlery industry, they came to Greenfield specifically to work in the Russell cutlery. As these immigrants became culturally assimilated and as the cutlery industry became mechanized, they left Greenfield for more lucrative employment elsewhere. Consequently, geographic mobility was extremely high in both groups.

The Yankees did not like to refer to themselves as cutlers, so that those who did list themselves as cutlers were almost all European immigrants. One would expect that, unlike the mechanics, who included native-born Yankees, the cutlers would not have the linguistic or capital resources to move. Yet, even these foreign-born workers were often on the move. While some cutlers left Greenfield to work in the Lamson & Goodnow Cutlery in near-by Buckland, most avoided the larger cutlery companies. In the 1860's and 1870's, the major American cutlery concerns were located in Greenfield, Buckland, Northampton, and Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts; Meriden, Connecticut; Chicago, Illinois; and
Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania. Many cutlers went back and forth between Greenfield-Turners Falls and Buckland, but only one Greenfield cutler was found working in any of the more distant cutlery companies: Ludwig Stark. A cutler from Germany, Stark got married in Greenfield in February 1857. In 1860, he was living in Cheapside with his wife, child, and his wife's brother and sister. In 1870, he turned up in Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, working in the cutlery there and owning $800 worth of real estate. By 1880, Stark had returned to Turners Falls to work for Russell. Apparently, the migrating cutlers either went into business for themselves or went to work in tool and farm implement making concerns where their cutlery craft skills could command a high wage.

The unskilled, contrary to the findings of Thernstrom and Knights, were less mobile than either the skilled or semi-skilled workers. Most of the unskilled were Irish immigrants with a sprinkling of German immigrants and rural migrants. In Greenfield, unskilled workers could find employment as agricultural laborers, railroad workers, or as teamsters, porters, and grinders in the cutlery. With a varied demand for unskilled work present, many of the unskilled, particularly the Irish and Germans, preferred the relative security of Greenfield to the insecurity of migrating elsewhere.
The skilled craftsmen, as distinct from the "mechanics" showed a mobility pattern almost identical to the cohort as a whole. A minority (19%) of the skilled craftsmen were immigrants. The vast majority of the skilled craftsmen were migrants from rural areas seeking better opportunities. These craftsmen came to Greenfield, worked a few years, and, if they were able to establish themselves in a competitive environment, stayed. Otherwise, they left for other communities or, in a few exceptional cases, went out West. Thus Edward E. Pratt, a watchmaker, born in Montague, migrated to Springfield, Missouri, and, after establishing himself out there, briefly returned to marry a local Greenfield girl.

Farmers, as expected, were a relatively persistent group; but even they had a high degree of mobility. Most farmers who married in Greenfield came from Massachusetts and Vermont hill towns. Often they migrated with the hope of eventually buying a farm suitable for commercial agriculture or of earning enough money to make their own or their parents' farm commercially profitable. Thus, these farmers came to Greenfield with the expectation of working a few years as agricultural laborers. Those who acquired a farm generally stayed unless the vicissitudes of nature or the market place forced them off the land. Those unsuccessful in acquiring a farm generally went elsewhere -- sometimes out West. Thus four of the "farmers" married in
Greenfield were residents of Wisconsin and Michigan. Two of them, J. Ballard Cross and James P. Howard, resided in Lake, Wisconsin; and, it was possible that others subsequently joined them.

Finally, the professionals tended to be both very mobile and extremely stable. Those who established themselves remained in the community permanently. But a town the size of Greenfield could support only so many lawyers, clergymen, doctors, dentists, and pharmacists. For the rest, there was no alternative but to move on; this they did.

In discussing geographic mobility in Greenfield, two things must be added. First, having been born, reared, and married in Greenfield or Cheapside did not guarantee permanent residence there. Only 60 percent of the males in this category persisted until 1860, and these were mostly farmers or sons of farmers. Second, the census records reveal a sizable amount of "return mobility," i.e., people leaving the community and later returning. About 10% of the marrieds left Greenfield and later returned. (And this is not counting the cutlers who migrated from Greenfield to Buckland and back.) Most of the returnees were either cutlers or farmers who migrated during the Civil War, and, after the Panic of 1873, came back to either cutlery or farm. Another group (about 2% of the marrieds) consisted of widows and children, who returned after death of the husband. For example, William Pierce,
a tin worker, and his wife Ellen left Greenfield for Iowa after their marriage in 1856. By 1870, his widow and three children (all born in Iowa) had returned to Greenfield where her family lived.

One may safely conclude that geographic mobility was extremely high among all social classes. Various classes differed in their mobility rates according to the amount of economic opportunity available for each particular class. Migration rates were highest among those with the fewest opportunities and vice versa. Likewise, return rates were higher for those groups whose economic opportunities in Greenfield (as revealed in letters from friends and relatives) exceeded those available elsewhere.

As noted earlier, social mobility has two sides: intergenerational (son's occupation in comparison with his father's) and career (occupation at beginning of working career as opposed to occupation at a later date). As the following table indicates, two trends characterized the intergenerational mobility pattern of the 1850-1857 marrieds: 1) social class inheritance (son's occupation follows father's social class status) and 2) a strong tendency for farmer's sons to follow non-farm occupations.
The above table is incomplete in that it traces the intergenerational mobility of only a small portion of the 1850-1857 marrieds. This reflects the incompleteness of the data. While the marriage records listed the groom's occupations and the names of his parents, they did not list the parents' occupation. Consequently, it became necessary to determine parental occupations from census data. This excluded the parents of immigrants. It also excluded parents who either died before 1850 or migrated. Consequently, only a small proportion of parents could be traced. Nevertheless, it seems likely that complete data would merely reinforce these tentative conclusions. The great majority
of the cutlers and a large proportion of the "mechanics" were immigrants who followed the craft of their fathers. Many of the migrants from rural areas and immigrants from Ireland were sons of farmers or farm laborers. In each case, they merely strengthen the two chief trends already observed, i.e., social class inheritance and the flight from farming.

Career mobility patterns, as the following tables indicate, showed a tendency for workers to remain at the occupational level at which they entered the labor force. Occupational mobility, either upward or downward, was the exception, not the rule.

TABLE 4
CAREER OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, DATE OF MARRIAGE TO 1870

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Origin</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Non-Manual</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Un-Skilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5
CAREER OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, DATE OF MARRIAGE TO 1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Origin</th>
<th>Non-Manual</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Un-Skilled</th>
<th>Retired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the dominant trend toward occupational stability, some occupational mobility did occur. Eight of the 39 manual worker marrieds who remained until 1880 achieved non-manual status, and two became farmers.

Farming in the late nineteenth century still retained a high degree of prestige. Individuals ranging from unskilled laborers to well-to-do merchants all strove to become farmers. To achieve success in business, and then buy a farm and become a gentlemen farmer was considered a mark of high status. Thus Henry Handforth, an immigrant from England, started out in the ice business and, after achieving some financial success, became a farmer, leaving the ice business to his son.
Nevertheless, farming, even commercial farming, was rarely a lucrative occupation. Many farmers left their plows, and those who did so invariably entered manual occupations, usually as agricultural laborers.

If farmers were often downwardly mobile, skilled craftsmen suffered little downward mobility. Contrary to W. Lloyd Warner and other theorists,15 very few skilled craftsmen suffered "status degradation." Only a small number of craftsmen ended up as factory workers or unskilled laborers. Even the American-born mechanics, whose skills were being undermined by the Industrial Revolution, suffered little downward mobility. Often, if these mechanics remained in the community, they either went into non-manual occupations like Alanson W. Ward who became a retail grocer, or into other skilled occupations like Edward Howland who became a carpenter-joiner. Only two American mechanics were subsequently listed on census records as cutlery workers or laborers. Apparently, rather than suffer the "status-loss" these American born "mechanics" would continually migrate from place to place in the hope of establishing themselves as an independent self-employed craftsman. Thus, Giles M. Kelly, married in 1852, established himself as a blacksmith in Greenfield by 1870. But before this date, he had migrated from Massachusetts to Vermont back to Massachusetts, and then
to Pennsylvania and finally back to Greenfield.

While the 1850-1857 marrieds showed limited occupational mobility during their working career, they did exhibit a very high degree of property mobility. Of the 57 married manual workers who lived in Greenfield until 1870, 73.7% acquired property with 58% possessing at least $1,000 worth of personal and/or real property. As the following tables indicate, all sections of the working class succeeded in obtaining property.

**TABLE 6**

**PROPERTY MOBILITY OF UNSKILLED BY OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Value of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7

**PROPERTY MOBILITY OF CUTLERS**<sup>a</sup> **BY OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Less than 300</th>
<th>300-999</th>
<th>1000-1999</th>
<th>2000 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Includes "mechanics" listed in census as cutlery workers.
### TABLE 8

**PROPERTY MOBILITY OF SKILLED WORKERS**<sup>a</sup> **BY SOCIAL MOBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Less than 300-999</th>
<th>1000-1999</th>
<th>2000 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> includes "mechanics" except those listed as cutlery workers in either the 1860 or 1870 census.
Thus, 91% of the unskilled laborers, 56% of the cutlers, and 100% of the skilled workers obtained property. Nor was this high degree of property mobility dependent upon social mobility. While the socially mobile invariably succeeded in subsequently acquiring property, most of the property mobility occurred among persons who were occupationally stable. Thus 77.5% of those acquiring $1,000 worth of property and 67% of those acquiring $2,000 remained manual workers.

The 1880-1886 Marrieds

The males married in 1880-1886 showed mobility patterns that were largely similar to those of the 1850-1857 marrieds. In 1880-1886 as in the earlier group, a minority (23%) of the men married in Greenfield were born in the Greenfield area. Again a large, though decreased percentage (24%), were immigrants. As before, most of the marrieds were rural migrants born in western Massachusetts, southern Vermont, or southern New Hampshire. Like the 1850-1857 marrieds, these people, whether immigrants or rural migrants, came to Greenfield as young adults, spent a few months or years in the community, got married (either to a Greenfield girl or one from whence they came), and then either settled down for a while or moved on elsewhere. Like the preceding cohort, the 1880-1886 group of marrieds was quite mobile. Only 44 percent remained until 1901.
As the following table shows, migration was heavy among all social classes (despite variations):

### TABLE 9

GEOGRAPHICAL MOBILITY AMONG 1880-1886 MARRIEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Class</th>
<th>Percentage listed in Directories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals &amp; Prop.</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Sales</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Trades(^a)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics &amp; Machinists</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Engineers &amp; Firemen</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlers</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Employees</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^c)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hustlers/Teamsters</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (N=286)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^a\) Masons, Carpenters, Plumbers, Painters, Moulders and Bricklayers.

\(^b\) Printers, Bakers, Millers, Blacksmiths, Tailors, etc.

\(^c\) Factory Operatives, Butchers, Drivers, Brickmakers, Bartenders, etc.
The preceding table understates the true amount of persistence in 1891. Despite this bias, it is clear that social classes varied widely in their geographical mobility patterns.

In contrast to the 1850-1857 marrieds, the mechanics-machinists showed the highest rate of persistence as a group. The emergence of Greenfield as a center of the tap and die and machine tool industry created a continual demand for machinists. With wages relatively high and employment opportunities good, these workers tended to stay rather than go elsewhere.

The next group most likely to remain were the non-manual workers, especially the proprietors and professionals. Ownership of a business was obviously a factor in keeping a person within the community; but, as with the previous cohort, ownership of a business did not guarantee success. Only 47% of the 1880-1886 marrieds, who achieved ownership of a business still owned their businesses in 1910. In contrast, 53% failed, or abandoned their business ventures with 28% leaving Greenfield, and 25% finding employment in some other occupation.

The most mobile groups were such miscellaneous skilled workers as printers, bakers, millers, blacksmiths, tailors, and related workers. Like the earlier "mechanics," their status and livelihood were being threatened by either the mechanization of their craft skills or the increasing
tendency of people to buy factory produced ready-to-use goods. For people like blacksmiths, urbanization and the growth of public transportation (particularly the trolley) greatly reduced public reliance on the horse as a means of transportation. Finally, for some groups such as the printers, job opportunities were relatively limited in Greenfield.

Next to the Miscellaneous Skilled Workers, the most mobile were the hostlers/teamsters. The tendency for the street railway to make factory deliveries reduced the demand for teamsters and hostlers. Consequently, many of these people, no longer needed, left for other jobs elsewhere.

The other groups had pretty much the same persistent rates as did the cohort as a whole. Farmers, contrary to expectations, were slightly more mobile than the group as a whole. Like the farmers in the preceding cohort, most farmers married in Greenfield, came from Massachusetts and Vermont hill towns. In some cases, they migrated with the hope of eventually buying a farm suitable for commercial agriculture. In others, they left the farm with the hope of gaining more lucrative employment in the city. Since Greenfield was a railroad junction point, many passing through stayed on for a few months or years to work. Apparently, persons migrating from the farm to the big city
did so in stages. Rather than going directly from hill town farm to Boston or New York, they migrated to the smaller railroad junction towns like Greenfield, attempted to establish themselves there, and, failing that, left for the larger cities. The direct flight from farm to big city is a legend of urban history.

While being born in Greenfield did not guarantee permanent residence in the community, those born there had higher persistence rates than those born elsewhere. Thus 61.5% of the Greenfield born males remained until 1901 as opposed to 44% for the entire sample.

As the following table indicates, two older trends characterized the intergenerational mobility pattern of the 1880-1886 marrieds: 1) social class inheritance (son's occupation follows father's social status), and 2) a strong tendency for farmers' sons to follow non-farming occupations, and for cutlers' sons to follow other lines of employment. But now a third trend was apparent: 3) a large increase in the number and proportion of sons in those manufacturing and service industries that reflected the expansion of Greenfield's economy, namely, clerical and sales personnel, building trades workers, machinists, and various semi-skilled (factory operatives, brickmakers, bartenders, butchers, drivers, etc.) workers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Son's Occupation</th>
<th>Prof &amp; Prop</th>
<th>Cler &amp; Sales</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Mech &amp; Mach</th>
<th>Bldg</th>
<th>Other Skill</th>
<th>Cutters</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>Other Semi</th>
<th>Un-Skilled</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cler &amp; Sales</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech &amp; Mach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Trades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Skilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a inherited parent's occupation.
This third trend simply reflects the rapid economic changes in Greenfield during the late nineteenth century. Agrarian occupations were declining while manufacturing and service occupations were increasing.

While workers often followed careers different than their father's, they tended to remain at the occupational level at which they entered the labor force, as the following tables show.

### TABLE 11

CAREER OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, DATE OF MARRIAGE TO 1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Origin</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cler &amp; Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While occupational mobility was the exception, some mobility did occur. Seven of the 57 manual workers who remained until 1910 achieved non-manual status, and two became farmers. While this was a lower proportion than the 1850-1857 group, it did include some spectacular examples of mobility such as Frank O. Wells, a mechanic who became President of Wells Brothers -- a major tap and die manufacturing concern; A. J. Smart, a machinist who found the A. J. Smart Manufacturing Company; and Frank Lawler, a cutlery worker who became a prominent attorney and theater owner.

As in the 1850-1857 marrieds, farmers tended to be downwardly mobile. Skilled craftsmen underwent little
downward mobility. Even those skilled workers whose skills were being undermined by economic and technological change suffered little downward mobility. Instead, they either left the community or accepted equivalent status positions in industry. Thus Charles Bigelow, a baker, became a car inspector for the Boston and Maine Railroad. In other cases, skilled craftsmen simply accepted supervising positions in the industry that displaced them. Thus Charles F. Allen, a shoemaker, became foreman of the Cutler, Lyons & Field shoe factory. When this concern went out of business, he became a mason.

If, like the 1850-1857 cohort, the 1880-1886 group showed limited occupational mobility, they, like their predecessors, experienced a high degree of property mobility. Of the 77 male married manual workers who remained in Greenfield until 1901, 57.1 percent acquired property with 45.5 percent possessing at least $1,000 worth of property. Except for the unskilled workers (when only 37.5 percent acquired property), the majority of the semi-skilled workers (62.8%) and the skilled workers (63.7%) acquired property.

In addition to class differences in the acquisition of property, there were also definite ethnic differences. Thus of the manual workers, 71 percent of the Irish, 75 percent of the Germans, but surprisingly only 51 percent of the American-born acquired property (a figure which drops to 44 percent if those occupationally mobile into the
farming or non-manual classes are omitted). This runs counter to the cliché of American social history that native-born had advantages in all aspects of social mobility.

Social Corollaries of Greenfield's Mobility Patterns

In order to understand how manual workers managed to amass so much property in spite of their limited social mobility, one must delve into the prevailing patterns of family life and values. In comparison with the twentieth century, the males in both the 1850-1857 and the 1880-1886 groups married at relatively late ages. For the 1850-1857 group, the average age at first marriage ranged from 24 for "mechanics," to 29 for professionals. After marriage, children soon arrived. In an age where birth control techniques were either inadequate and stigmatized as "immoral," families were large. In Greenfield, inspection of census records revealed four different patterns of family life. In all social classes, the nuclear family prevailed. In all, children remained in the parents' household until time of marriage. In none did the wife work.

In middle class families, live-in servants (mostly immigrants) were common. Education for the children was stressed with the sons going into the professions, clerical or sales occupations, or the father's business. Daughters either remained at home or worked as teachers.
Farm families had few servants unless extremely wealthy. Nevertheless, many of these families had agricultural laborers who boarded with the family. In comparison with middle-class families, there was less stress on education since the sons worked on, and expected to take over the farm.

Unlike the middle classes, the skilled workers did without servants. Children usually completed school, and then went to work to help supplement the family income. Daughters either remained at home or worked at clerical or professional jobs. In some cases, the family took in boarders.

The semi-skilled and unskilled workers placed little value on education. When teen-agers, children went to work, usually in semi-skilled or unskilled occupations, to supplement the family income. Often, the family took in boarders.

What emerges from a social study of Greenfield is a picture of families and individuals under stress. Economic anxieties pressed strongly upon almost all fathers. If middle class, he had to support his family in a fairly comfortable life style and insure his sons the education or business opportunities necessary to maintain middle class status. If working class, he had to provide an adequate subsistence for his family, and creat some "nest egg" as an insurance against future economic adversity.
In the industrial age, the family was not an economic asset but a burden. To carry this burden, a man had to enter marriage relatively established -- either having a good steady job or accumulated savings. Therefore, the average man had to postpone marriage until his mid or late twenties. After marriage, the arrival of children began to create economic anxieties. These anxieties in turn generated sources of conflict within the marriage.

One source of tension was sexual. Without any effective or socially sanctioned means of birth control, sexual relations could result in pregnancy with consequent new financial burdens and worries. With marriage relations clouded by economic anxiety, wives undoubtedly pressured their husbands to make the family economic situation more secure by creating some sort of cushion against possible adversity. For a poor family, few things equaled home or property ownership as a bulwark of financial security.

Home ownership permitted the considerable portion of the family budget hitherto devoted to rent to be diverted to other expenses or saved. A house and property represented a source of income through rental to boarders or tenants. Finally, the home constituted an asset which could be sold or mortgaged in any emergency. No other investment rivalled home or property ownership as a risk-free source of economic security. While the family breadwinner could invest his
family's savings in either a business or the education needed to acquire a skilled or non-manual position, few were willing to do so. It was risky and anxiety producing to invest hard-earned savings in ventures which only offered a possibility and not a certainty of advancement and profit, especially if one had a wife and children to support. Consequently, a manual worker found it safer to eschew any attempt at occupational mobility and to strive for property ownership instead.

To achieve the goal of home or property ownership on near subsistence level wages, it became necessary to depress the family's standard of living to a poverty level, and to increase family income by forcing his children into the labor force and renting rooms to boarders. But these measures in turn generated new tensions and anxieties. By forcing his family to live on a spartan budget, the husband experienced feelings of inadequacy regarding his competence as a breadwinner. In coping with these feelings, a husband could react in one of three ways: 1) he could carry his inadequacy feelings and emotional energies into the marriage relationship so that he abdicated his role of head of the household to his wife, and lived an intensive private life with minimal socializing; 2) he could aggressively assert his dominance within the family by keeping the wife dependent (forbidding her to work) and dominating the children (by either forcing them into his own occupation or sending
them out into the labor force); or 3) he could seek in
social or religious activities the sense of status and
competence which eluded him in his work role.

In Families Against the City, Richard Sennett saw
middle class and working-class fathers as responding in
different ways to their lack of economic success. The
middle-class fathers of Union Park coped with their social
immobility and consequent sense of inadequacy as bread-
winner by withdrawing from the outside world, focusing
their emotional energies on an intense family life, ab-
dicating their role as head of the family to their ag-
gressive and domineering wives, and living a life of
moderation and self-denial. Sennett contrasts these with
the working-class fathers described in Thernstrom's
study of Newburyport. The latter coped with poverty
by dominating their families, even to the extent of
forcing their children to work to help supplement the
family income.

Sennett's contrast between middle-class and working-
class family life provides a valuable insight, even if
oversimplifying the difference. Fathers in both middle-
class and working-class families had to cope with similar
feelings of inadequacy as a breadwinner in a competitive
environment. But passivity and aggression were merely two
opposite poles of response. Why would middle-class fathers
act passive and working-class fathers aggressive? The answer possibly lies in two variables which affected the two groups differently. The first was the attitude of the father toward his unfavorable occupational situation -- whether he saw his unfavorable occupational status as permanent or merely temporary; and whether he saw it as his inevitable fate in life or as the result of his own faults and failings? The second was the impact of personal "reference groups" upon self evaluation of occupational status -- whether such "reference groups" reinforced or lessened a sense of self-esteem.

The middle-class fathers of Sennett's Union Park apparently wanted to view their occupational immobility as temporary. Also, they used the upper classes of Chicago as a frame of reference for judging their status. In contrast, the Irish laborers of Newburyport seemingly saw their lowly status as permanent, and used their fellow-Irishmen rather than the Yankee Protestant middle class as the "reference group" for judging their own individual status.

Those who saw their status as temporary would likely avoid social relationships which would either tie them down or be difficult to break. Those who perceived their status as permanent (like the Irish) would try to make the best of their situation, and form social relationships which would
provide the satisfying personal life and the sense of self-esteem which the job failed to supply. Likewise, persons considering themselves "failures" (like the Union Parkers) in terms of the reference group to which they aspired could only feel a sense of inadequacy when it came to participating in social activities with this group. In this situation, it was easier to withdraw from social life into the privacy of one's own family. In contrast, those whose reference group consisted largely of members of one's own class or status group were not threatened by social activities. Here, socializing did not constantly provide reminders of one's inadequacies; but instead conferred gratifications and esteem.

Finally, the impact of occupational success, or a feeling that one has succeeded, upon family life and social activities should be considered. Success in "getting ahead," however defined, obviously increased self-esteem and self-confidence. One consequence was an increased involvement in social activities. Clearly, persons who channelled a considerable amount of energy and emotion into achieving success would, after achieving it, seek other outlets. One such outlet was participation in social activities.

These considerations help explain the family patterns and social activities of various social groups in nineteenth century Greenfield. Three different patterns of family social
group activity prevailed. First, certain groups like the Yankee cutlery workers lived a family centered existence, and avoided participation in community activities. Second, other groups like the Irish or Germans had their own structurally segregated organizations in which members confined their social group activities to the exclusion of participation in community wide groups. Third, the middle classes and those seeking middle class status participated fairly widely in the major civic, social, fraternal, and religious organizations of the community, contributing most of the members and the great majority of the leaders.

For each group, the pattern of social activities reflected group evaluation of its own occupational status, vis-a-vis certain "reference groups." Such groups as the Yankee cutlers compared themselves with the Yankee farmers and businessmen. Considering themselves failures, they avoided participation in community activities and social organizations. Groups, like the Irish and Germans, felt inferior as a result of their outgroup status and low social class to the Yankee middle class, but not to other members of their own groups. Consequently, these groups formed structurally segregated groups. Finally, the middle class and those aspiring to it, considered themselves "successful" and thus had no anxieties about participating in the status organizations of the community. These factors
resulted in both a large number of social organizations and a tendency for each organization increasingly to stratify along class lines. Thus, on the one hand, non-manual workers tended to form the bulk of the membership of the Masonic lodges, the Lyceum, the Episcopal, Second Congregational, and Unitarian churches. On the other hand, manual workers and poorer farmers formed the bulk of the membership of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Deutscher Order Harguagi, the Circle Jacques Cartier, the Baptist, and First Congregational churches.

Besides the above organizations, there were organizations which cut across class lines. The Knights of Columbus' founding charter members ranged from a hotel proprietor, a real estate broker, a lawyer, and a roofing contractor, down through clerks, moulders, meat cutters, and laborers. The Methodist Church officers included prominent merchants such as J. M. Munson (a local manufacturer of baby carriage trimmings) and J. H. Lamb (proprietor of a music store) along with clerks, skilled workers, and a cutler, farmer, and laborer. Likewise, the Catholic Temperance organizations and the political party town committees also cut across class lines. But even though, objectively, these organizations transcended class boundaries; psychologically they did not. While these, and even the more obviously middle-class organizations, had manual workers as members, most
of these persons were either property owners or aspiring members of the middle class. Thus two effects of property mobility were a feeling of having "succeeded" and a consciousness of being a member of the middle class, regardless of one's occupation. In terms of the ideology of mobility, the success of the working class in acquiring property "proved" to the workers the "truth" of the ideology. And thus, it seems wrong for historians to underestimate the social importance of property mobility.

Having by and large succeeded in acquiring property, the working classes accepted the ideology of mobility. From this acceptance, followed the corollary that the American socio-economic structure was essentially just and beneficial. If one was dissatisfied with one's lot in life, then the best solution consisted of practicing the appropriate economic virtues in the expectation that one's efforts would eventually be rewarded. If economic success depended upon ability, virtue, and effort, then neither politics nor trade unionism possessed much relevance. Consequently, the growth of trade unionism languished. Except for the railroad unions, unions did not arise in Greenfield until 1900, and even the, involved only the building trades. There were sporadic strikes from time to time, like the strike of the cutlery grinders in January 1885, but these were invariably spontaneous responses to management
instituted changes in working conditions or wage rates. Not until the 1930's did strikes lead to a permanent industrial trade union.

Another corollary was a political and social conservatism. Both the middle classes and the working classes owned property, and property ownership gave both classes a vested interest to defend. One threat to this vested interest was taxation, for this burden fell upon property, not income. While the benefits derived from taxation (schools, sewer systems, water supply, street lighting, police and fire protection, trash collection, etc.) were real, they were also very remote. Seldom did these benefits have a direct and express impact upon the person paying the taxes. Property tax bills always had an immediate and personal impact. Consequently, property owners, whether middle class or working class, tended toward a low tax ideology and laissez-faire attitudes concerning government. After all, more governmental activities meant higher costs and, consequently, higher taxes. With money tied up in savings back accounts and life insurance policies, Greenfield's working class, like the creditor business class, favored "sound money" and opposed inflation. In the 1896 election, the Republican and Conservative Gazette & Courier sought to use the workers' economic attitudes in order to defeat Bryan and Free Silver:
What are the workingmen to gain by the free coinage of silver . . . ? . . . In answer . . ., wage earners have nothing to gain because they are not a debtor class. They owe practically nothing, nobody trusts them. They are not borrowers. More than any other class in the community they pay cash for what they get. They are retail purchasers and pay every day, week or at most every month. But to the extent that they have any savings in the form of insurance policies or savings bank accounts, they are creditors and will be losers by any depreciation of the standard money . . . What would they gain by a sudden rise in the price of commodities? Clearly nothing, . . . They will lose in the value of their savings; they will lose in the purchasing power of their wages, and most of all they will lose by the enforced idleness accompanying the business disturbance and bankruptcy which a radical depreciation of our money standard would create. 

In the elections of 1896, workers demonstrated their loyalty to the ideology. In 1892, Greenfield produced a typically narrow Republican majority of 625 to 559. In 1896, Greenfield voted as follows: Republicans - 952, Democrats - 262, Gold Democrats - 104. Since the factory towns of Turners Falls, Buckland, and Shelburne Falls showed similar voting shifts, it was evident that the Republican's overwhelming majority came from previously Democratic immigrant-ethnic working class voters. Since the 1896 election was the one late nineteenth century election in which the major parties diverged on major economic issues, it was evident that the ethnic working class Democrats shared the economic conservatism of the Yankee Republican middle class.
Another political corollary of Greenfield's acceptance of ideology of mobility was apathy. To people striving for success through savings and hard work who accepted the status quo, politics seemed irrelevant. Since both parties shared the same fundamental orientations, politics became merely a matter of personalities and tradition. To such people, politics mattered little because, regardless of who won, policies generally remained the same, and, except for the tax rate, equally irrelevant to most people's personal concerns. Consequently, few voters bothered to attend town meetings or vote in town elections. Even town meetings which considered issues of direct interest to the working class failed to dent voter apathy. Thus a town meeting called to consider, among other things, the issues of a 20-cent-an-hour minimum wage and a 9-hour day for town employees (issues of direct importance to all because of the competitive impact upon the private sector), attracted only 14% of the registered voters.23

With no fundamental difference between the parties over economic issues, political parties cut across class lines rather than between them. Thus the Democratic town committees in 1895 consisted of the President of the Franklin County National Bank, the cashier of the same bank, a physician, a lawyer, a retired businessman, three merchants,
a slating-roofing contractor, two farmers, a cutler, a moulder, a telegraph repairer, and a hostler. The Republican town committee in 1895 consisted of businessmen, but even the Republicans selected a shoemaker, a messenger, a baker, a butcher, and two foremen, among others, as delegates to the County Convention. While the Republican leadership comprised a greater proportion of the town elite than did the Democrats, the chief difference between the party leaderships lay in their ethnic composition. The republicans were overwhelmingly Yankee; the Democrats included a large number of Irish and Germans as well as Yankees.

With the parties in basic agreement on economic issues, party conflicts focused on either personalities or on status conflict issues. While the lower classes did not consider the business "elite" to be economic exploiters, they sometimes viewed them as cultural oppressors. As noted in the previous chapter, the socio-economic changes of the nineteenth century led the middle classes and the lower classes to radically divergent views on the issue of liquor. For the lower classes, the "cup of good cheer" facilitated social intercourse, drowned out personal problems, and alleviated the boredom and tensions created by the job. For the middle classes, "demon rum" threatened self-control, led to economic and
moral ruin, and created the social problems which beset the community. To many segments of the middle class, prohibition seemed the logical answer. To the lower classes, prohibition attacked their life styles and threatened deeply rooted psychological needs. Thus prohibition always generated an intense and bitter "status group" dispute between middle class and lower class. Writing to his son, George Grennell, Jr., a Greenfield lawyer, remarked:

We have a large strife on the question of prohibitory or license liquor law. You may not understand it; but it creates a most intense excitement reaching all classes and places.  

This continuing dispute over prohibition had interesting social effects. Being a moral ideal, prohibition theoretically embraced all who willingly accepted its message, and aggressively proselytized for converts to its cause. Since prohibition constituted a fairly significant element in the life style of the middle class, its proselytizing and universal message helped make the middle-class elite an "open status group" (a group whose ideological convictions lead it to recruit new members) instead of a "closed status group" (a group which seeks to monopolize status and prestige through exclusion and creation of social distance). For any group with ideological convictions, success in converting non-group members to the "truth" bolstered group self-esteem. Thus a willingness to admit newly converted members to the status group became a pre-requisite for the
success in spreading its message. Consequently, members of immigrant groups or Catholics who espoused prohibition found it possible to advance into the middle class and be socially accepted. Seeing that conformity to middle-class norms of Temperance brought social acceptance, many socially and occupationally ambitious Catholics started espousing prohibition. In fact, so popular did prohibition become among the socially mobile Catholics that of the five major Catholic social organizations in 1900, two were Temperance Societies. Even the Ancient Order of Hibernians practiced abstinence. Referring to the State Chaplain's circular against "beer socials," the officers of the Greenfield chapter stated that "the practices condemned by the circular would never be allowed here." The implications of this conformity and of the concepts "open status group" and "closed status group" will be discussed in a later chapter.

In addition, prohibition helped create an image of the political parties as competing status groups. The Democratic party, in consequence of its lower-class constituency, tended to be "soft" on liquor. This limited its ability to gain middle-class votes. Likewise, the identification of prominent Republicans with prohibition reduced the Republican's normal appeal to the working class and immigrant groups. One consequence was a strong tendency toward block, straight-ticket voting. In the 1888 election, with races for President, Governor, Governor's
Councilor, Congressman, State Senator, and State Representative, every Republican received between 521 and 534 votes and every Democrat between 471 and 483 votes.

Finally, prohibition paradoxically reinforced the working class and immigrant groups' basic conservatism. By identifying prohibition with the cause of reform, the prohibition reformers discredited the idea of reform by equating it with unwarranted influence in one's personal life.

Conclusion

Since many of Greenfield's social characteristics reflected its mobility patterns, it would be useful to summarize the main findings. Migration of marrieds from Greenfield in both cohorts was extremely heavy and economically selective. Nevertheless, geographic mobility did not follow the neat and simple progression described by Thernstrom and Knights, that is, the wealthier skilled and non-manual workers stayed, and the poor and unskilled left. Various social classes differed in their persistence rates according to the economic opportunities available which of course varied over long periods of time.

Social class inheritance and the flight from farming constituted the two chief trends concerning intergenerational mobility. Occupational mobility, either upward or downward,
was the exception, not the rule. Nevertheless, some occupational mobility did occur. Contrary to W. Lloyd Warner and other theorists, very few skilled craftsmen or American-born "mechanics" suffered permanent "status degradation" to the level of factory worker or unskilled laborer.

Despite the limited amount of occupational mobility, both cohorts experienced a very high degree of property mobility. Often this property mobility represented a characteristic response to economic anxiety since few things rivalled home or property ownership as a risk-free investment and source of economic security.

The success or lack of it in achieving occupational mobility or acquiring property deeply affected people's sense of self-esteem. This in turn affected the social activity patterns of various groups. For example, the middle class, whose self-esteem was bolstered by the feeling of success, participated widely in community activities. In contrast, the Yankee cutlers, who saw themselves as relative "failures" avoided social activities and lived an intense family centered existence.

From both the property mobility of a sizable majority in each cohort, and the social mobility of a not insignificant minority, several corollaries followed. The acquisition of property and occupational mobility produced a feeling of having "succeeded" and a consciousness of being
a member of the middle class. In terms of the ideology of mobility, success proved the "truth" of the ideology. From this conviction of truth followed a view of the American socio-economic structure as essentially just and beneficial. This view led to political conservatism, political apathy, an indifference to unionism, political parties which cut across class lines, and a tendency for political conflicts to focus on status issues and personalities. To the people of Greenfield, there seemed to be sufficient mobility to justify the epithet "land of opportunity" and a strong conservatism in economic and political matters. Not until property and mobility seemed threatened by the Great Depression would the attitudes of Greenfielders change.
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CHAPTER VI
TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES, 1900-1970

The Greenfield area at the end of the nineteenth century was a bustling place.

The local economy, based on the railroad, commercial farming, and various industries, boomed and diversified. The population grew as rural migrants and immigrants (mostly Polish, French Canadian, and Irish) flocked to jobs as teamsters, migrant farm laborers, or factory workers.

Distinct social classes existed, characterized not only by income differences, but also by lifestyle contrasts involving ethnic distinctions, religious affiliation, family relations, and consumption patterns. The "elite" and middle class consisted mostly of Yankees who usually belonged to the Episcopal, Unitarian, or Second Congregational churches. These families sent their boys to school until adulthood, kept the girls either at home or in school until they married or secured a professional job, hired "live-in" domestic servants, participated widely in community organizations, and liked to display their success by their large well-built houses, elaborate furniture, and fine clothing. In contrast, the working classes consisted mostly of immigrants or their children, and included a sizable proportion of Catholics. These families sent their children out into the labor force as soon as possible, often
had boarders, participated mostly in either church or ethnic organizations, and sought a measure of success and security through the acquisition of home ownership. To explain social reality and to justify the status quo, the elite and middle classes preached the ideology of mobility to the working class. The great extent of working class property ownership combined with some degree of occupational mobility led the lower classes to accept the ideology with its moral imperatives of hard work, saving, frugality, deferred gratification, and sexual repression. A school system with compulsory education and a network of social organizations served to inculcate the ideology of mobility, meet personal needs, and preserve social order. Finally, the railroad, telegraph, telephone, newspaper, and magazine reduced, but did not eliminate, the isolation of the community. This combination of partial dependence on and partial isolation from the outside world insulated the town from many outside cultural trends, and yet rendered it susceptible to the impact of various economic forces.

The twentieth century changed much that was characteristic of Greenfield in 1900. New technological innovations and economic forces replaced growth with stagnation, totally ended the town's isolation from the outside world, radically changed the life styles and consumption patterns of all social classes, and modified and reinforced the ideology and institutions which emerged in the nineteenth century.
The Implications of Mass Production

The output of goods had greatly increased in the nineteenth century as a result of the Industrial Revolution. Nevertheless, two major bottlenecks to large-scale mass production remained. One was an inadequate supply of power; the other was the lack of machine tools for the manufacture of precision standardized parts.

With the invention of the alternating current motor, high-voltage transformer, and the steam turbine electric generator, it became possible, by the late 1890's, to substitute electricity for other sources of power. Electric power revolutionized factory production and the American economy. In the words of William Miller,

Electricity freed the factory from the river valley and the coal field. Factories could now be set up near raw materials, markets, or ports. Inside the plant, electricity made the 'straight line' system of production all the more efficient, and smoothed out conveyor belt and assembly line procedure. It also put a premium upon plant specialization, upon standardization of jobs and products, and hence upon scientific management. It made possible such a simplification of operations that unskilled and illiterate workers could be employed . . .

In 1899, 5% of private factory power came from electricity. By 1919, the figure rose to 55%; by 1925, it climbed to 73%. By freeing the factory from the river bed, electric power undermined Greenfield's attractiveness as an industrial site. This portended a future difficulty in bringing in new industry since" . . . in the long run goods . . . tend to be produced where technical conditions
are favorable and unit costs of manufacture are low."

Between 1880 and 1920, the machine tool industry experienced a rapid growth. A critical breakthrough consisted in the development of high speed carbon steel. This steel made possible a harder and more heat resistant cutting edge which permitted high speed precision cutting of metals. This in turn fostered the rapid and large scale manufacture of precision standardized parts.

The development of electric power and precision machine tools made mass production possible and necessary. The use of more and more machine tools and machinery resulted in additional capital expenditures, which necessitated large scale production to cover the overhead. But large-scale production in turn demanded large scale selling. As more firms engaged in mass production, competition for available markets increased, usually in the form of price cutting. In order to protect profits, firms sought to achieve stable prices at levels which assured at least "normal" profits. One way of achieving price stability was "price-fixing" -- in which, firms would get together and set a common price for similar type products. Unfortunately, this was easier agreed to than done. No sooner did businessmen set up "fixed-price" agreements than such agreements broke down. In the cutlery industry, the major firms made numerous price-fixing agreements which in turn were violated by all involved. Such attempts at collusion invariably broke down because it
was always in the self-interest of one or a few of the firms involved to violate the agreement if the others kept it. By so doing, the "cheater" could undersell his competitors and grab the bulk of the market.

Since price-fixing in a competitive industry failed to achieve price stability, it became necessary for business to create "monopolies" within an industry. Under monopoly or oligopoly conditions, the dominant firm or firms could set prices, and either threaten or force the others to go along. To achieve monopolies, entrepreneurs organized numerous trusts, mergers, and holding companies. In the creation of these new forms of corporate control, banks and bankers played a key role. Only banks and other financial institutions possessed the large amount of capital necessary for corporate control. Thus the formation of mergers, and holding companies inevitably involved some degree of banker control with bankers often holding high corporate office. The origin of the Greenfield Tap & Die Corporation illustrated the above tendencies toward monopoly on a local level.

As noted earlier, the tap & die industry was an oligarchic industry composed of numerous small firms and two large ones -- the Wiley & Russell Manufacturing Company and the Wells Brothers Company, which in 1912 were the two largest tap & die concerns in the world.
In April, 1912, Frederick H. Payne, a Boston banker, formed the Greenfield Tap & Die Corporation as a holding company to purchase the majority stock of both the Wiley & Russell Company and the Wells Bros. Company. To insure coordination among the various firms in the tap & die and machine tool industries, the promoters named an interlocking board of directors which consisted of bankers and officials of major tap & die and machine tool firms in Massachusetts. Finally, when "coordination" did not work or when profit possibilities beckoned, Greenfield Tap & Die proceeded to gobble up other companies in the field, acquiring control of seven competing companies within ten years of its founding.

While firms on both the national and local level sought to acquire power to control prices, they also strove to create a stable demand for the products sold at these controlled prices. This led to "brand-name" advertising on a massive scale. As David Potter has pointed out, in an economy of scarcity advertising is not needed, since total demand usually equals or exceeds the total supply produced. But in a mass production economy, advertising became necessary:

It is when potential supply outstrips demand -- . . . that advertising begins to fulfill a really essential economic function. In this situation, the producer knows that the limitation upon his operations and upon his growth no longer lies, as it lay historically, in his productive capacity, for he can always produce as much as the market will absorb; the limitation has shifted to the market, and it is selling capacity
which limits his growth. Moreover, every other producer of the same kind of article is also in a position to expand output indefinitely, and this means that the advertiser must distinguish his product, if not on essential grounds, then on trivial ones, and that he must drive home this distinction by employing a brand name and by keeping this name always before the public.11

Thus, in 1880, before electric power and precision machine tools revolutionized the mass production of consumer goods, firms did little brand name advertising. While in 1880 Gazette & Courier devoted 53% of its column space to advertising, the great bulk of the ads plugged local merchants. The very few brand name ads were for patent medicines like Lydia Pinkham's Vegetable Compound. By 1900, brand name advertising had increased with such items as Chase & Sanborn coffee, Ivory soap, Glenwood ranges, and Remington typewriters. After 1900, brand name advertising mushroomed. By 1919, the Gazette & Courier carried ads for Presto-Lite batteries, GE fans, Kelly-Springfield tires, Overland automobiles, Camel-cigarettes, Kellogg's corn flakes, Corona portable typewriters, Socony gasoline, Mazola corn oil, and numerous other products.

As time went on, brand name advertising became increasingly oriented toward creating a demand where none previously existed. Since there was no physical need for many of the new goods produced, advertising had to portray the product as meeting some psychic need such as superior social status, social acceptability, sexual attractiveness, personal comfort, or a feeling of well-being.
The technology of mass production and the development of brand name advertising made a mass consumption society a possibility. But other pre-requisites were also necessary. People needed the leisure time to enjoy the goods they bought, and the purchasing power to buy them.

World War I gave people the leisure time necessary for mass consumption. In 1912 Congress made 8-hour days mandatory for those companies engaged on government contracts. Originally, this law affected few employers. World War I defense contracts subjected most employers to its provisions so that the 8-hour day with a 4-hour Saturday, and time and one half for overtime became standard.12

World War I and the post-war conversion fostered a large amount of capital investment in new plant and machinery. This proved a boom to the tap & die and machine tool industries. In 1920 new investments in plant and equipment exceeded that of any year prior to World War II.13 In Greenfield, this investment caused an intense boom, which was reflected in record high levels of employment, wages, and value of output.14

This high level of capital investment permitted American industry to modernize its plant and machinery, and increased its ability to mass produce goods. The combination of high level capital investment, mass production methods, modern engineering management techniques, electric power, and new mechanical devices for handling and transporting materials
greatly increased production capacity and substantially lowered per capita unit costs for goods produced. This permitted employers to increase profits and to lower prices or raise wages. Generally, employers tended to lower prices. Decreased prices combined with stable incomes and installment buying greatly increased the purchasing power of large numbers of people. This increased purchasing power helped pave the way for the prosperity of the "Roaring '20's."

Paradoxically, the economic trends which fostered prosperity in the nation in the 1920's fostered economic stagnation in Greenfield. As plant and machinery became modernized, the demand for capital goods (including machine tools) declined. Consequently, the machine tool-tap & die industry and Greenfield's economy suffered. From a high of 3,024 in 1920, employment in the town's measured establishments dropped to 1,281 in 1922; and total wages sank from $4,054,730 in 1920 to $1,428,846 in 1922.15

The tap & die industry never fully recovered from the slump until World War II. From 1922 to 1940, Greenfield Tap & Die paid no dividends on common stock.16 It was not until the late 1920's when the growth of the automobile and electrical appliance industries and their adoption of yearly model changes intensified demand for taps & dies and machine tools, that a measure of health returned to the industry.
The Impact of the Automobile

As the purchasing power of consumers grew, the demand for durable consumer goods like houses, automobiles, electrical appliances, radios, and furniture rapidly increased. Consumer demand for these items tended to be unstable because they could be purchased at the discretion of the buyer. Seeking stability of demand, manufacturers turned increasingly to advertising, to style changes to create psychological obsolescence, and to large scale consumer credit and installment buying.

These goods not only affected sales and merchandising techniques, but they also -- particularly the automobile, radio, and electrical appliance -- revolutionized the economy of the nation and the life styles and values of its people.

The automobile transformed the nation's economy and exerted a far-reaching impact. By 1929, the auto industry accounted for 12.7% of all manufacturing output. It consumed 15% of all steel production, and gave a tremendous boost to the gasoline, oil, rubber, plate glass, nickel, and lead industries.

With the coming of the auto, people no longer had to live within walking distance of work, streetcar, or railroad. Consequently, with the auto came suburbia, suburban sprawl, and the housing project. The auto permitted a realtor to buy an extensive tract of land in an outlying area; induce the town authorities to lay out roads and install water mains...
and sewers; employ architects and building contractors who would design and build look-a-like houses; and sell the finished houses to families for a small down payment and a mortgage payable in monthly installments. Greenfield in the 1920's saw the erection of three such developments, the largest being a 53-house tract known as Madison Circle. 19

Besides fostering a housing boom, the auto created a whole host of related enterprises. These included gas stations, auto repair shops, trucking firms, hot dog stands, restaurants, motels, and cabin camps. In 1919, before the auto fully revolutionized Greenfield's economy, there existed 26 auto supply and repair shops, 13 trucking firms, and 7 restaurants. By 1929, there appeared 15 auto dealers, 49 auto supply and repair firms, 23 trucking outfits, 36 gas stations, and 19 restaurants. 20

By creating a demand for good roads, the auto fostered extensive road construction. After 1921, state, local, and federal (through matching grants) governments poured at least $1 Billion annually into paved highway construction. 21

Paved highways soon connected Greenfield with both neighboring and far away towns. The mobility which the auto provided revolutionized life and leisure. The car made possible the Sunday family drive and the weekend trip. As people became mobile, tourism became a major industry.

In many ways, the auto had a beneficial impact upon Greenfield. It gave mobility and recreation to many of its
inhabitants; it created new industries and proved a boon to the machine tool-tap & die industries. But it also had undesirable effects as well. Already by 1910, the Greenfield newspapers carried gruesome accounts of auto accidents and attendant fatalities and injuries. More important, the car and truck ruined the trolley industry and greatly weakened the railroad.

The auto adversely affected the railroad in general, and Greenfield in particular, in three ways. First, the truck and the bus took away much of the railroads former business, particularly among passenger and short haul traffic. As business declined, so did employment. Second, the auto destroyed the town's position as a transportation center, an advantage which, in the nineteenth century, had helped attract industry to Greenfield. Firms needed to obtain raw materials and ship finished goods as quickly and cheaply as possible, and railroads met this need. As a railroad junction point with extensive freight facilities, Greenfield had attracted many businesses in the nineteenth century. With the coming of the truck, a factory no longer had to be near a railroad to ship bulk or heavy goods inexpensively, and Greenfield lost its transportation advantage over other locales. Third, while the auto brought many customers from neighboring towns to shop in Greenfield, it also made it easy for Greenfield area inhabitants to shop elsewhere. Thus the car subjected many Greenfield retail
businesses to the competition of like firms in Northampton, Springfield, and other towns.

Losing the advantages of available water power and superior railroad facilities, Greenfield found it difficult after World War I to attract new industry. The only major industrial concern to establish itself in Greenfield after 1919 was the Threadwell Tool Company, later known as the Threadwell Tap & Die Corporation. This firm originated in 1925 out of a merger of the American Tap & Die Company of Greenfield and the Williamsburg Manufacturing Company of Williamsburg, Massachusetts. The new concern manufactured taps, dies, screw plates, hack saw frames, and mechanic's tools. 22 Threadwell came to Greenfield for two basic reasons: a labor supply of machine tool-tap & die workers existed, and plant facilities were available.

While the auto had the most revolutionary impact of all consumer durable goods upon American life, other products also had a profound effect. Electricity, which facilitated mass assembly line production of the auto, also made possible mechanization of the home. The electrical appliance industry prospered in the 1920's as refrigerators, washing machines, toasters, vacuum cleaners, and mixers invaded the home. Mechanization of kitchen chores and housework gave housewives an unprecedented amount of leisure. With free time on their hands, many wives went out into the job market or became active in community social activities.
Thus, in the 1920's many women's organizations came into being. These included the Greenfield Garden Club, the 1296 Club (Ladies' auxiliary of the Elks), the Daughters of Isabella (Ladies' auxiliary to the Knights of Columbus), and the Heeladee Council, Daughters of Pocahontas.  

The Impact of Mass Media

The 8-hour day, the mechanization of the home, and prosperity made use of leisure time a problem. In response, numerous social and recreational organizations arose. Among these were organized sports (such as semi-pro and amateur baseball leagues), theatrical groups, and, most important, job-originated social and recreational organizations. Thus the newspapers of the post-World War I era contained references to such organizations as the GTD Rod and Gun Club, the GTD Engineering Club (which had 400 members and its own baseball team), and the Goodell-Pratt Brotherhood (which put on vaudeville and minstrel shows). The Boston & Maine Railroad workers fielded both a baseball team (B & M Giants) and a football team (B & M Warriors). The various tap & die concerns formed baseball teams which competed in an Industrial Baseball League. In addition, there were numerous bowling leagues. These included an 8-team GTD Girl's Bowling League, a 4-team Industrial League with teams representing each of GTD's subsidiary concerns, and a 6-team GTD Office Bowling League with teams from the Production,
Order, Payroll, Stockroom, Sales, and Service departments. 

The problem of leisure time helped make the radio and the movies (and later television) a profitable success. These mass media provided the entertainment for leisure time which the public craved, and which other activities did not entirely provide.

While radio derived its revenue from advertisers, called sponsors, and movies from paying movie-goers, both media sold a leisure time product which was costly to produce. In both industries, the economic facts of life created a diligent search for the largest possible audience. In the movies, the ever-rising salaries paid to writers, directors, and stars caused film production costs to skyrocket. In radio, and later television, the commercial sponsors were able to force networks, by threatening withdrawal, to cancel programs with poor ratings.

Since revenue depended on either high ratings or large numbers of paying customers, radio programs and movies focused on those themes which would have the greatest popular appeal. Since people wanted to escape from pressures of domestic problems, financial worries, and boring jobs, the media portrayed an imaginary world far removed from everyday life. As Russell Nye phrased it,

What the movies did, and what the public wanted them to do was to show life as an exciting sophisticated adventure [and] . . . to create for the millions . . . a happy, sophisticated, make believe world that was better to live in than the one they had.
Likewise, radio created a world of illusion. "Radio provided sound, the listener filled out the rest in his mind." Thus recorded taxi-horn and street cries became a city street. A wind machine and the recorded sound of chirping birds became a forest.

In portraying this make-believe world of fantasy, the media popularized the personalities, life styles, and material goods they portrayed. In the words of Russell Nye, "... life became a mirror of the movies" in which "people copied what they saw upon the screen . . ." Since movies created constantly changing fads in manners, fashions, and hairdos, it seemed logical that they also affected the nation's values as well. The movies glorified consumption, pleasure, and leisure thus helping give rise to the leisure seeking, pleasure seeking, materialistic consumer society of modern America.

Social historians of the "Roaring Twenties" era have talked about the "Sexual Revolution" during which the prudish and rigid standards of Victorian sexual morality broke down in favor of more relaxed standards. While several factors contributed to this (the impact of Freud, the development of relatively safe and efficient means of contraception, the growing economic independence of women, economic prosperity, the automobile, and World War I), it seemed evident that the mass media by popularizing new standards and causing people to identify with actors and actresses who
exhibited these new standards played a dominant role in generating the so-called "Sexual Revolution."

In Greenfield, movie ads gave evidence that the "Sexual Revolution" had reached small town New England, even if, by the standard of the 1960's and 1970's, they seemed quite innocent. The Lawler Theater, owned by two prominent members of the Knights of Columbus, saw fit to put sexual innuendos in their ads as a means of attracting customers. Thus an ad for the movie "Flaming Youth" showed a man hugging and kissing star Colleen Moore with the captions entitled "Should a Girl confess her Loves"? and "You are too easy to hug."29 A subsequent ad for the same movie stated, "Does Marriage shatter Romance? . . . Patricia Fentriss, the naive flapper heroine . . . along with many others of the jazz-mad, luxury living set believes that it does. That is, she refuses to marry the man she loves, telling him that matrimony would destroy their happiness."30 Needless to say, prior to the "Roaring Twenties," no Greenfield paper tolerated ads with sexual connotations.

'By distributing and broadcasting their films and programs on a nationwide basis, the film companies and the radio networks broke down the cultural isolation of local communities and "homogenized" American culture. As William Leuchtenburg noted, "Within a decade the radio and the movie nationalized American culture, portraying the same
performers and the same stereotypes in every section of the country. In nationalizing and homogenizing American culture, the mass media changed people's frame of reference from a "community consciousness" to a "national consciousness." Both movies and the radio made their "stars" come across as real people. Movies allowed people to see their screen idols. Radio gave the illusion of face-to-face communication. Though an audience might number millions, each individual listened separately either alone or at home with his family so that the speaker seemed to be talking to the listener personally. By such media exposure, media celebrities became psychologically significant individuals to members of their audience. Thus people responded emotionally to media celebrities in the same way they responded to members of their family or close friends. In being exposed to media celebrities, people became attuned to the life styles, events, and issues which these personalities experienced or with which they were identified. Constant exposure to national events, issues, and personalities made people see these as more important than local ones. In fact, because of intense media exposure, people often knew more about the national scene than they did about the local one. Before national media, people's consciousness focused on the local community -- its personalities, issues, problems, controversies, and officials. In his study of George Grennell (d. 1877) of Greenfield, David Russo illustrated this
local community orientation in noting:

In no area did Grennell's "rootedness" in his local community more clearly display itself than in his sporadic comments on national and international affairs. He did not often write about such matters and when he did, it was in an awkward, forced manner, not at all characterized by perceptiveness or even accuracy, at times. He simply did not have the awareness or the perspective for a mature understanding of these events. And he realized as much.32

With national media, people's interests focused on events at the national level. Thus in the 1920's, the front page of the Greenfield newspapers began to stress national and international news or items of a spectacular nature (like accidents or natural disasters). Thus, for example, the January 14, 1924 issue of the Greenfield Daily Recorder had two banner headlines: "Dawes Opens Reparations Inquiry at Paris" and "Bandits Take $60,000 in Rum from N. J. Warehouse." Of the six other major articles on the front page, none dealt with local events. Even the sports page devoted two columns to an article entitled "Notre Dame to Face Good Stiff Schedule."33 This trend accelerated to the point that, by the late 1940's, even the deaths of important local figures were often relegated to minor articles on the inside pages. Thus, for example, the March 23, 1948 issue of the paper put the following articles in major captions on the front page: "Find Bodies of Two Fishermen (Edgartown, Mass.)", and "Oil Space Heater Fire Kills Three Girls and Mother (Greenwich, Conn.)".34 While giving front page coverage to unknown persons who met
tragic deaths, the paper gave one half column each on an inside page to two prominent Greenfield residents who died. These persons were W. Beltram du Mont (President of the du Mont Corporation, former Director of GTI), former Chairman of the Board of Directors of Threadwell Tap & Die) and George U. Hatch (Vice-President of the Millers Falls Company, former Chairman of the Red Cross and Community Chest drives, and former President of the Kiwanis). In earlier times, these deaths would have gotten front page coverage. As an additional indication of popular interest in national events, the paper contained the syndicated columns of Drew Pearson and John Crosby, and also two columns of editorials on national and international issues.

Because of the exposure given by the national news media, the local community and its institutions lost much of their significance. The media made people conscious of being part of a national economy, aware of being only a small part of a national whole, and oriented to the nation instead of the community. In the light of this new awareness, local issues, events, and institutions paled into insignificance. But, paradoxically, this new consciousness increased the importance of one local institution -- the public school. The mass media made people aware that a complex economy, and especially its most prestigious and lucrative occupations, demanded more of its workers than "good character" (an ascetic self-controlled personality)
and a rudimentary knowledge of the 3 R's. Schools had to provide an increasing amount of knowledge to prepare their pupils to fill their future economic roles. With occupational status progressively seen as a function of educational achievement, the school naturally assumed increased importance.

The demand that the schools inculcate more and more knowledge radically affected education. Dissemination of information demanded that teachers change from mere enforcers of classroom discipline to trained professionals. Consequently, Greenfield's teachers gradually became professionalized. While, in 1929, only one of Greenfield's elementary school teachers possessed a college degree; by 1961, all had a degree. Assimilation of knowledge demanded a lengthened education. In 1900, only a small minority of Greenfield's pupils entered high school; and of these, only 48% graduated. By 1929, virtually all pupils entered high school although only 55.3% graduated. By 1960, 98% of entering high school students graduated. As schooling became longer and more clearly related to future occupational status, it also became psychologically more significant to both students and their parents. For the parents school became the means by their children could achieve the success denied themselves. For the students, the school became a total environment in which most significant life experiences of later childhood and adolescence took place.
At school, the students made friends, formed peer groups, formed relationships with the opposite sex, and gained knowledge of the world. Through educational competition with peers, the students either gained the self-confidence necessary for occupational success or suffered a sense of failure which scarred future possibilities of achievement. In short, the high school began to undermine the socializing function of family and religion.

By becoming a focal point of significant life experiences and a symbol of aspiration, the schools assumed an important psychological function in people's lives. Greenfielders began to identify with the school, and school events, especially athletics, achieved community-wide as opposed to merely school-wide significance. In the nineteenth century, the Greenfield newspapers either ignored high school events or reported them only in passing. In the twentieth century, as a consequence of this identification process, the newspaper gave extensive coverage to high school events. Thus, for example, the November 24, 1948 issue of the paper devoted nearly one whole page to discussing the upcoming Greenfield High School-Turners Falls High School football game. This development reflects, of course, the rise, nation-wide, of organized spectator sports during the twentieth century. But this development could not have extended to the high schools until the latter had become the vehicle for almost all community-wide
activities and aspirations.

The Implications of Economic Dependence

The interrelated phenomena of mass consumption, the automobile, the electrical appliance, and mass media revolutionized Greenfield's social and economic life. Like other Americans, Greenfielders readily accepted the comforts, conveniences, and pleasures which these innovations provided. Nevertheless, these changes had a disquieting aspect. They revealed the dependence of the community upon, and its vulnerability to, forces and events totally beyond its control. Before the new orientation created in large part by the mass media, most people, except for those directly involved in economic activities transcending the limits of the community, could easily maintain the illusion that the community controlled its own destiny. The mass media dispelled this comforting misconception.

In the late 1920's, one implication of such economic dependence, the loss of one's monopoly of the local market, assumed a threatening aspect. In April, 1928, the A & P opened a chain food store in Greenfield. In the summer of 1929, Sears & Roebuck, Montgomery Ward, Liggett Drug Stores, First National Stores, Thom McAn Shoes, and Kresge's also opened stores. If housewives were delighted at the chain's cheaper prices and greater variety of goods, the town's merchants feared for their future. In part, this fear
stemmed from the knowledge that the chains could both undersell and out-advertise their local rivals. But some of the fear also stemmed from the realization that the chain stores, unlike local merchants, were independent of local social controls and largely unaware of local needs. In an editorial on the chain stores, the Greenfield Daily Recorder expressed this understanding:

It is a debatable question, however, if the old system of the individual merchant, investing his profits in the community where he did his business, and bearing his share of the cost of local government not to mention his contributions to community welfare projects, were not a better thing for community life than these modern merchandizing systems which take a great deal from the towns and cities where they locate and give a minimum of return.  

Considerably more threatening than the chain stores was the depression. The depression hit Greenfield extremely hard. In 1929, employment totalled 1,704, and wages added up to $2,219,351. In 1932, employment shrank to 963, and wages declined to $975,559. As jobs diminished, welfare rolls mushroomed. In 1929, the town supported or relieved 228 non-institutionalized poor persons. By 1933, the figure climbed to 2017. In large part, these figures reflect the devastating impact of the depression upon the machine tool-tap & die industry.

The depression brought about many changes in Greenfield. Among other things, it weakened the Republican Party, stimulated the growth of industrial unionism, and made the community economically dependent upon Federal government expenditures.
Pre-depression Greenfield was a strongly Republican community. Despite the large Catholic population in the town, and community opposition to Prohibition (in 1928, a referendum proposal to amend the 18th Amendment carried Greenfield by a vote of 2,844 to 2,653), Herbert Hoover easily defeated Al Smith of a vote of 4,334 to 2,471.

Greenfield's Republicanism reflected several factors. The most important of these was the extensive property mobility, discussed in Chapter V, which fostered acceptance of the ideology of mobility and the socio-economic status quo. Since the Republicans were the party most identified with the status quo, they profited the most from such popular acceptance. Another factor was the skill with which the Republicans played upon the ethnic nationalism of the immigrant groups, especially the large Polish population. Thus in an address to the Polish American Citizens Club, a Dr. Smolezynski of Chicopee touched his audiences's emotions by describing in detail how Herbert Hoover relieved starving Poland in the aftermath of World War I. As a result, the Polish American Citizens Club unanimously endorsed the Republicans. Finally, the Republican position in favor of higher tariffs convinced many workers that Republican rule would protect their jobs and wages from the competition of European labor and products.41

The depression weakened the social bases of the community's Republicanism, and, consequently, eroded its
strength. As a result, the Democratic Party became a viable political force, able to contest strongly and sometimes carry the town in local, state, and national elections.

By threatening the worker's status and property, the depression undermined the conservatism of the working class, stimulated the growth of class conflict, and destroyed the prevailing apathy toward unionism that long characterized Greenfield's industrial workers.

Except among the railroad and building trades' workers, unions did not exist in pre-depression Greenfield. There had been occasional strikes from time to time; but these, characteristically, were usually spontaneous reactions to a management instituted change in wage rates or working conditions. Such strikes were invariably short-lived and usually unsuccessful.

Industrial unionism began in Greenfield in 1930 when 50 men in the polishing room of Greenfield Tap & Die Plant No. 1 walked out in protest over a management decision to substitute a piece-work wage system for the prevailing basic weekly-wage system. With the other employees supporting the strikers, the management capitulated, retaining the weekly wage system and even granting a five cent an hour increase.

The success of the strike convinced employees that they ought to create a permanent union. Consequently, the workers formed the Industrial Association of Small Tool Workers (IJSTW).
In January 1934, the GTD management recognized this local independent union as the collective bargaining agent. The C.I.O. made repeated, but unsuccessful, attempts to convince the IASTW to join the CIO-affiliated United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America (UE). In August, 1940, 300 employees of Greenfield Tap & Die Plant No. 1 formed UE Local No. 274 which then petitioned the National Labor Relations Board for a jurisdictional consent election which the UE won. On November 1, 1940, Local 274 signed a contract with Greenfield Tap & Die which provided for a 5-day work week, 8-hour work day, time-and-a-half pay for overtime, and 4 paid holidays.

After its success at Greenfield Tap & Die the UE gradually succeeded in organizing other machine tool-tap & die concerns although complete unionization of this industry did not occur until the Millers Falls Company workers joined the UE in 1965.

A major factor hampering and delaying the unionization of area industry after World War II was the dispute between the UE and the Independent United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers (IUE). In 1949, the CIO expelled the UE on grounds of Communist domination. Subsequently, the CIO organized the IUE as a rival to raid UE locals. Despite the accusations of Red influence, the workers, a large proportion of whom were Catholic, remained loyal to the UE. Two reasons the workers supported the UE were that the local
adopted a popular posture of militancy and obtained reasonably good contracts. Even more important, the local union leaders strongly supported the UE, willingly took loyalty oaths, and had no visible Red ties, leading workers to feel that the Communist issue was a "Red herring." As the UE became a local power, the union toned down its militancy and sought civic respectability by sponsoring the Greenfield Minor League baseball teams, and by contributing heavily to such charities as the Jimmy Fund, the United Fund, and the Red Cross.

Finally, the depression led to a growing economic dependency upon the Federal government. Except during World War I, pre-depression Greenfield had little direct contact with Federal agencies or programs. With the depression, a whole host of Federal agencies like the FERA, WPA, and PWA came into Greenfield. Soon, these agencies came to play a major role in the local economy as a result of the funds they expended and the jobs they created. This dependence on Federal largesse increased as World War II neared. In 1940, Federal contracts for defense production began pouring money into Greenfield. As a result of such contracts, Greenfield Tap & Die's business increased 63% over 1939, and the company paid a common stock dividend for the first time since 1921.

World War II and the post-War decades saw the culmination of the trends which revolutionized Greenfield in the
early decades of the Twentieth Century.

World War II and the Cold War made the Federal government the major source of employment in the country both directly through the Federal bureaucracy and indirectly through defense contracts. While Cold War era Greenfield had relatively few federal employees, part of its prosperity depended on subcontracts from sectors of the economy whose own prosperity resulted from federal expenditures. Thus GTD sold 60% of its taps & dies to the automobile industry, 30% to the electrical appliance and equipment industry, and 10% to the aircraft industry -- all industries highly dependent on government contracts.51

The high volume of Federal spending and the general prosperity such outlays engendered greatly boosted corporate profits and give large corporations sizable amounts of cash to invest. This surplus capital fostered the growth of giant conglomerates as big businesses began investing unused profits in buying up smaller firms. As a consequence of this trend, major firms in Greenfield lost their independence. In 1958, the United Drill and Tool Corporation acquired GTD to form the United-Greenfield Corporation. In 1968, TRW, Inc. swallowed up United-Greenfield. So vast was TRW in proportion to Greenfield Tap & Die that constituted only 1% of the TRW organization.52 Earlier, in 1966, Bendix bought Threadwell tap & Die and made it the Bendix Cutting Tool Division. During the next half-dozen
years, Greenfield's economy participated in the nation-wide rush into conglomerates.

Despite a brief period of prosperity during World War II, the slump in railroad employment continued and intensified between 1943 and 1970. Prior to 1943, railroad trains were powered by steam locomotives. Steam required a bulky supply of coal and water which necessitated numerous refueling stops, and demanded complex equipment which needed frequent repairs. This resulted in the creation of such facilities as the East Deerfield freight yards. After 1943 the Boston & Maine replaced steam locomotives with diesels. Using simpler and more efficient oil-burning combustion engines, diesels demanded fewer repairs and refueling stops. When a $200,000 fire destroyed the car repair shops in East Deerfield on July 13, 1950, the railroad decided to abandon East Deerfield.\(^\text{53}\)

Declining traffic also contributed to the slump in employment. Because of high overhead expenses (high costs of buying and maintaining equipment, high taxes, the legal necessity of maintaining unprofitable lines, and union "featherbedding"), the railroad could not compete with either bus fares or truck rates. Moreover, the railroad lacked the mobility and convenience of the car and truck. When Interstate 91 neared completion in 1966 the doom of passenger service was sealed. On November 2, 1966, the Boston & Maine petitioned for the end of passenger service
between Greenfield and Springfield. So miniscule had passenger service become that Greenfield selectmen reported no opposition to the proposal.54

With the television boom of the early 1950's, Greenfield saw the culmination of the "media revolution." Television combined the immediacy (or illusion) of face-to-face communication of radio with the sight and sound of the movies. As in radio and movies, people could not only identify with television celebrities, but could also witness far away events "live" as they happened. Events hundreds or thousands of miles away could become psychologically significant. Before mass media (radio and especially television), the important events in people's lives took place in the local community. Thus during the Civil War, the event that created panic in Greenfield was not news of Confederate military victory, but a rumor that the Irish lower class in Greenfield might riot in protest against the draft.55 After television, the emotional impact of an event bore little relation to geographic proximity. Thus, in 1966, the newspaper could editorialize on a vast variety of local subjects with a tone of emotional detachment. Yet the death in Vietnam of an Army Captain from the area could precipitate a very emotional editorial, entitled "Never in Vain," in support of the war.56

Besides severing the connection between psychological importance and geographic proximity, television also tended
to monopolize leisure time. Television took the profit out of movies and radio. The three theaters in town shrank to two -- both struggling to survive with the help of concessions and movies aimed at young adult audiences. As the high-priced stars and popular shows moved from radio to television, radio stations shifted to local news coverage, music, interview and talk shows, and occasional sports broadcasts. Organized local sports and local theater vanished. The semi-pro baseball league and the numerous amateur baseball leagues, which arose in the 1920's, disappeared. Likewise, the theatrical organizations. In addition, fraternal organizations suffered a decline in membership. 57

With the culmination of the "media revolution" and the mass-consumption society, the community lost its emotional significance and became merely one small part of a large mass society. This change not only affected the town as a whole, but also, as will subsequently be shown, deeply altered the local status hierarchy of the community.
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CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL MOBILITY IN GREENFIELD, 1910-1970

Social mobility in nineteenth-century Greenfield occurred in a booming economy based upon the railroad, industry, and commercial agriculture. The town's economic growth created a host of manual and white collar jobs. Townspeople and rural migrants, inspired by the ideal and prospect of success, flocked into the non-manual jobs which they considered more remunerative and higher in status. Jobs that were lower in pay and in status found ready takers among other rural Yankees and foreign immigrants: cutler, teamster, factory worker, and migrant farm laborer. Within these two general occupational groups, important differences of social class arose. Income levels, consumption patterns, ethnicity, and religious affiliation determined class membership.

During the second half of the nineteenth century the "elite" and middle classes were largely Yankee. The emerging working class consisted mostly of immigrants, most of them Catholics. To explain social reality, to justify the status quo, and to control the working-class population, the ruling class formulated an ideology of mobility which they inculcated through the media and the school system. To meet the personal needs of themselves and their workers and to exercise social control, they established a network of "voluntary" social organizations.
This social and economic system was short-lived. By the 1920's the emerging mass production-mass consumption economy, powered by electricity and carried by cars and trucks, undermined the railroad and supplanted water power—these two traditional but narrow bases of the town's prosperity. The new mass production-mass consumption created a whole range of new professional, clerical, sales, and administrative opportunities in Greenfield. These opportunities, when combined with other developments, had revolutionary social consequences.

Thus the growing number of newer high status positions suddenly intensified the existing social mobility of the lower class—precisely at the moment when they were sufficiently acculturated to exploit the economic transformation of their home town. The ethnic and religious homogeneity of the largely Yankee middle class had been gradually breaking down. This process accelerated after 1910, bringing many immigrants, their children, and many Catholics into the middle class and even into "elite" occupational roles. The process went on even faster after the official cessation of immigration in 1924. Meanwhile, the continued arrival of rural Yankee migrants and their acceptance of lower-class positions helped change the meaning of the term "lower class."

Religious and ethnic differences had finally begun to cut across, rather than to follow, socio-economic class lines.
Of this transformed society, one might ask the following questions: Did the patterns of social mobility in twentieth century Greenfield differ from those of the nineteenth century? How did religious affiliation affect social mobility? Was there a "Protestant Ethic" which fostered upward social mobility and a "Catholic Ethic" which hindered it? And, finally, how did the old Yankee establishment react to aspiring newcomers, largely Catholic, of recent immigrant parentage? These issues in turn will be considered separately.

The following consideration of mobility in the twentieth century will follow the procedure used for the earlier period, that is, the analysis of the two cohorts of names--consisting of all Greenfield male residents married in the years 1910-1912 and 1940-1941. After listing all married couples in each cohort, I traced these individuals through town directories (at 10 year intervals) and the tax assessment lists to determine the following: whether the couple still resided in Greenfield; the occupation of family members; real property owned; and street address. After compiling and tabulating the data, each cohort was analyzed to determine the geographic mobility (the number of persons who left the community), the intergenerational mobility (occupations of sons relative to their fathers), the career mobility (changes in occupational status over a period of time), and the property mobility (the value of real property acquired) patterns of each cohort. A summary of the noteworthy characteristics of the cohort as a
whole, and, especially, of the various social classes and status groups within each cohort conclude each analysis. The analysis of the cohorts will be followed by a discussion of the relationship between religion and social mobility, the old establishment response to new elite members of immigrant parentage, and long term mobility trends.

The 1910-1912 Marrieds

The members of the 1910-1912 cohort, like those in the two preceding cohorts, were largely newcomers and transients. Only 10.9% of the males and 12% of the females were born in Greenfield. By contrast, 21.5% were immigrants, mostly Polish or French Canadian. The majority were rural and small-town migrants from western Massachusetts, southern Vermont, and southern New Hampshire. Whether rural migrants or immigrants, all came to Greenfield while young adults, spent a few months or years in the community, got married (usually to someone they met in Greenfield), and finally either settled down or moved on elsewhere. The majority did move on elsewhere, for only 46.1% of the cohort still resided in Greenfield in 1920. In the above characteristics, the 1910-12 cohort closely resembled its predecessors.

As in nineteenth-century Boston, and twentieth-century Norristown, Pennsylvania, migration was economically selective with the well-to-do likely to stay, the less well-to-do more likely to leave, and the poor, unskilled laborers most likely
to leave. Nevertheless, in twentieth-century Greenfield, as in the earlier part of its history, migration was heavy within each occupational class, as the following table shows:
### TABLE 13

**GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY AMONG 1910-1912 MARRIEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number listed in Directories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Manual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor-Managerial</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professionals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level White Collarb</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Trades</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinists</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Eng., Fire., Ins.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Skilledc</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Skilled Workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Brake, Yard &amp; Sig.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linemen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Workers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Semi-Skilledd</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks &amp; Barbers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unskilled</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Draftsmen & Bookkeepers*

*b* Clerks, stenographers, telephone operators, telegraph operators

*c* Wood workers, inspectors, tailors, bakers, upholsterers, pringers, jewelers, blacksmith, boilermakers and millwrights

*d* Car cleaners, train callers, packers, motormen, meat cutters, freight handlers, stationary firemen, carpet layers, & drivers
Teamsters, laborers, gardners, hostlers, waiters, railroad section hands, butlers, and janitors.
As expected, proprietors were much more likely to stay until 1920 than the other groups. Since the town boomed between 1910 and 1920 as a result of both the growth of the machine tool industry and the stimulus of war-time and post-war conversion prosperity, the merchants generally prospered, and so, had little incentive to leave. After 1920, when Greenfield's economy entered a slump, a number of merchants left as businesses failed or greater opportunities elsewhere beckoned. Thus only 12.5% of the marrieds in business in 1910 were still in the same business in 1940. In this low rate of long-term business survival, Greenfield strongly resembled Poughkeepsie, New York, where only 12% of the small businesses lasted 20 years or more.  

The groups with the highest overall rates of persistence were the electricians, the skilled railroad workers (enginees, firemen, & inspectors), and the miscellaneous skilled workers. With both factory and home becoming electrified, demand for people who could install and repair electrical wiring and equipment mushroomed. With a steady business assured, electricians tended to stay. The persistence of the skilled railroad workers was surprising, given the nature of railroad work. But, perhaps, because railroad men were continually on the move, it made little sense continually to uproot one's family. With the extensive freight yard and repair facilities at East Deerfield, many car inspectors and repairmen worked there permanently. While engineers and firemen were
necessarily on the move, Greenfield's position as a junction point made it more likely that their runs would be back and forth runs with Greenfield as one of the termini. Hence, the relatively high persistence rate of skilled railroad workers. The miscellaneous skilled workers included numerous inspectors. With an increasing demand for precision products and quality control, the need for inspectors continually rose. Thus inspectors, given the demand for them, tended to stay.

The most mobile groups were professionals, farmers, building trades workers, mechanics, unskilled workers, and cooks & barbers. For all groups, the high mobility rates represented the combined pull of greater opportunities elsewhere and push of limited opportunities in Greenfield. Greenfield needed professionals, of course; but a town of its size could support only so many. The rest simply had to go elsewhere. The end of population growth lessened the demand for new building, and this decline in construction led unemployed and underemployed building trades' workers to migrate. The substitution of the auto for the horse and the railroad abolished the jobs of many unskilled teamsters, laborers, hostlers, and railroad section hands, causing their migration. Finally, the growing use of safety razors and declining resort to barbers for shaves reduced demand for their services thus making barbers & cooks the most mobile of all groups.
The groups not otherwise mentioned has about the same persistence rates as did the cohort as a whole. The exception was the machinists who had higher persistence rates for 1920 and 1929, but not for 1940. This phenomena probably reflected the Depression which hit the machine tool-tap & die industry extremely hard, and caused an exceptionally high amount of unemployment.

While being born in Greenfield did not guarantee permanent residence in the community, those born there had higher persistence rates than those born elsewhere. Thus 64.1% of the Greenfield-born males remained until 1920 as opposed to 48.9% of the entire cohort. Another factor contributing to persistence was having a wife who was born in Greenfield. 62.8% of the males who had wives born in the town stayed until 1920. In short, the decision to remain reflected family ties as well as job factors.

* * * * *

As the following table indicates, four trends characterized the intergenerational mobility pattern of the 1910-1920 marrieds: (1) social class inheritance (son's occupation follows father's occupational status); (2) a strong tendency for farmers' sons to follow non-farming occupations; (3) a relative increase in the proportion of sons as white collar workers, machinists, and skilled workers; and (4) a relative decrease in the proportion of sons as factory workers and unskilled.
### TABLE 14

Intergenerational Occupational Mobility Among 1910-1912 Marrieds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Sons</th>
<th>Prof § Prop</th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Skilled Worker</th>
<th>Semi-Skill Worker</th>
<th>Unskill Worker</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof § Prop</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in the above table, occupational inheritance was strong. 40% (50 out of 125) of the sons belonged to the same occupational class (non-manual, farm, skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled) as their father, and this does not include sons of proprietors-managers who occupied a manual or white collar job in the family-owned business with the expectation of learning the business from the "ground up" in anticipation of eventually taking over. Nevertheless, there were some examples of Horatio Alger style mobility in which sons of unskilled or semi-skilled workers occupied professional or proprietary roles. Thus Ralph W. Shepard, the son of a janitor, owned a fairly prosperous funeral home business, and Charles Slocomb,
the son of an hostler, became the assistant postmaster and later selectman.

The other trends noted simply reflected the rapid changes affecting both Greenfield's and the nation's economy around the turn of the century. Agrarian, unskilled, and semi-skilled occupations were declining while manufacturing, skilled, and non-manual occupations were increasing.

* * * * * * *

Whether or not they followed careers different from their fathers', most workers tended to remain at the occupational level at which they entered the labor force, as the following tables show:

TABLE 15
CAREER OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, DATE OF MARRIAGE TO 1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Origin</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop ¹</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-Skilled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16
Career Occupational Mobility, Date of Marriage to 1929

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Origin</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop a</td>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a includes Semi-professionals

### TABLE 17
Career Occupational Mobility, Date of Marriage to 1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Origin</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop a</td>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a includes Semi-Professional

b RET - Retired
While a large proportion of the 1910-1920 marrieds were occupationally immobile (50% of those who stayed until 1929, and 41% of those who stayed until 1940), much mobility did occur. 23.6% of the 106 manual workers who remained until 1929 achieved non-manual status. The mobile included a few spectacular examples such as George W. Cary, a machinist who became superintendent of the Goodell Manufacturing Company and Chairman of the Greenfield and Montague Transportation Authority, and Horatio S. DuMont, an inspector who became assistant manager of Rogers, Lunt & Bowlen and president of the Greenfield Country Club.

As in earlier cohorts, white collar workers were much more likely than manual workers to achieve proprietary or managerial status (46.7% of the white collar as opposed to 18.9% in 1929). For those manual workers who achieved high-level non-manual jobs, much mobility was in situ (within related occupations). Thus Elwin L. Streeter, an electrician, became proprietor of an electrical contracting firm; and Albert Merriam, a mason, became a mason contractor. Until the Great Depression, there was little downward mobility except among building trades workers, machinists, and miscellaneous skilled workers. In all these areas, employment opportunities declined as a result of the post-War slump in the machine tool industry, the cessation of population growth (and demand for new construction), and the replacement
of the horse by the auto. Yet even during the Depression, when the above trends were intensified, only about 25% of the skilled workers sank into semi-skilled or unskilled jobs. In most cases, skilled workers whose jobs were being undermined by economic or technological change either left the community or accepted equivalent status positions.

If, like earlier cohorts, the 1910-1920 marrie ds showed limited occupational mobility, they, like their predecessors, experienced a high degree of property mobility. Of the 110 married manual workers who lived in Greenfield until 1929, 86.4% acquired property with 60% acquiring at least $1500 worth of property. As the following tables indicate, a majority in all sections of the working class succeeded in obtaining property.

TABLE 18
Property Mobility of Unskilled by Occupational Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Value of Property</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Up to $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500-$1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1500-$2499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2500-$4999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over $5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Farmers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19

Property Mobility of Semi-Skilled by Occupational Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Value of Property</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>up to $500</th>
<th>$500-$1499</th>
<th>$1500-$2499</th>
<th>$2500-$4999</th>
<th>$5000</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 20

Property Mobility of Skilled Workers by Occupational Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Value of Property</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>up to $500</th>
<th>$500-$1499</th>
<th>$1500-$2499</th>
<th>$2500-$4999</th>
<th>$5000</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Prop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus 46.7% of the unskilled, 53.6% of the semi-skilled, and 65.7% of the skilled workers obtained at least $1500
worth of property. This property mobility did not depend upon social mobility. While the socially mobile invariably succeeded in subsequently acquiring property, most of the property mobile were occupationally immobile. Thus 53.9% of those remaining manual workers acquired at least $1500 worth of property.

In many ways, the patterns of mobility that prevailed among the 1850-1857 and 1880-1886 cohorts also existed among the 1910-1912 marrieds. All groups showed high levels of geographic mobility. In all groups, intergenerational occupational inheritance predominated, except among sons of farmers. Among all cohorts, a large though fluctuating proportion of marrieds remained within the occupational class in which they began work. Nevertheless, an ever increasing proportion of manual workers or their sons achieved non-manual status as the white collar and managerial sectors of the economy grew. Finally, all three groups showed a high degree of property mobility.

Among all three cohorts, the high degree of property mobility and the observed incidence of social mobility fostered a feeling of having "succeeded" and a consciousness of middle class status which made the community accept the "ideology of mobility" and its implications of political and economic conservatism. Only with the Depression was faith in the "ideology of mobility" shaken and commitment to the status quo weakened.
The 1940-1941 Marrieds

The origins of the males married in 1940-1941 differed from the earlier cohorts in several ways. First, a much larger proportion of the men married in Greenfield were born in Greenfield (37% of the 1940-1941 cohort as opposed to 10.9% of the 1910-1912 cohort and 23% of the 1880-1886 cohort). Second, as a consequence of immigration restriction, only a miniscule proportion were foreign born, and most of these came from Canada. Third, while, as in earlier cohorts, most of the marrieds were migrants from small towns and rural areas in western Massachusetts, southern Vermont, and southern New Hampshire, many came from other areas as well. Seven came from New York City and six from Boston, indicating that small town-big city migration was not a one way street. Finally, this cohort, despite the intervening migrations occasioned by World War II, had a higher persistence rate after the first ten years than any of the earlier cohorts. Thus, despite the claims of certain social science popularizers, large scale geographic mobility has not been an ever-accelerating phenomenon which has reached its peak in the post-World War II era.  

As in earlier cohorts, migration was economically selective, but class differences in migration were relatively small—much smaller than in earlier cohorts. Nevertheless, despite the higher persistence level, migration still remained
heavy among all classes, and varied greatly among different groups within each occupational class, as the following table shows:

**TABLE 21**

Geographical Mobility Among 1940-1941 Marieds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop-Managerial a</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professional b</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level Manager c</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>70 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level White Collar</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Trades</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65 %</td>
<td>55 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinists</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics-Repairmen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Skilled d</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled Workers</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Operators</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck &amp; Bus Drivers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinders</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Workers e</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Semi-Skilled f</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Employees g</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers H</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled i</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a radio announcers, draftsmen, professional athletes
b foremen, chief stewards, produce managers in stores, etc.
collectors, clerks, salesmen, cashiers, typists, telegraph operators, telephone operators, train dispatchers, bookkeepers, insurance agents

printers, steam engineers, photoengravers, compositors, upholsterers, electrotypers, linotype operators, multigraph operators, millwrights, railroad engineers and firemen

buffers, rod makers, threaders, core makers, polishers, gage makers, tool hardeners, mounters, straighteners, stampers, metal workers, shop workers, assemblers, lathe operators, & miscellaneous tap & die-machine tool workers

timekeepers, paper workers, meat cutters, box makers, miscellaneous construction workers

all railroad employees except conductors, engineers, and firemen

bartenders, cooks, barbers, & guards

laborers, unemployed, railroad section hands, janitors, & greenskeepers
As expected, proprietor-managers were more likely than most other groups to remain in the community. One factor keeping managers in the town was a growing stability or job tenure. This tenure reflected the growth of large business bureaucracies which employed an ever increasing proportion of the managerial work force. Thus while only 12.5% of the 1910-1912 cohort manager-proprietors occupied an identical or like position 30 years later, 41.2% of their 1940-1941 counterparts did so.

The groups with the largest overall rates of persistence were low level management personnel, electricians, inspectors, truck drivers, miscellaneous semi-skilled, and building trades workers. The persistence of these groups reflected two factors: the prosperity of the town's industries as a result of defense contracts and general nationwide prosperity, and the building boom of the late 1940's and 1950's. The Depression and World War II virtually ended all housing construction, thus creating a need for new housing. With the return of peace and prosperity, a building boom began which intensified as owners of older dwellings decided to buy first Cape Cod and later modern ranch style homes.

The persistence of the low level managers (mostly foremen) reflected a new factor--an increasing tendency to promote on the basis of seniority. As seniority became a factor in advancement, those promoted became reluctant to move since seniority was non-transferable.
The most mobile groups were service workers, railroad employees, mechanics and repairmen, and miscellaneous factory workers. For all groups, the high migration rates reflected limited opportunities in Greenfield and greater opportunities elsewhere. With the closing of the freight yard facilities in East Deerfield, many of the few remaining railroad employees moved to other areas, thus accounting for their high rate of mobility.

The other groups differed little from the cohort as a whole in their mobility characteristics. The exception was the unskilled workers. While more likely to leave by 1950, they were more likely to be present in Greenfield in 1970. This characteristic reflected the success of the 1940-1941 cohorts' unskilled in achieving social and property mobility.

Unlike earlier cohorts, males born in Greenfield, and couples with wives born in Greenfield were little more likely than the others to stay in Greenfield. Thus while 56.8% of the whole cohort remained until 1950, 65.1% of the males born in Greenfield and 58.6% of the males with wives born in Greenfield persisted. This reflected the declining impact of family ties on mobility patterns.

As the following table indicates, four trends characterized the intergenerational mobility patterns of the 1940-1941
marrieds: 1) a strong tendency toward social class inheritance -- which did not, however, mean a decrease of social class mobility; 2) a decrease in the proportion of sons as unskilled and semi-skilled workers; 3) an increase in the proportion of sons as skilled and non-manual workers; and 4) a dramatic increase in the proportion of sons as professionals.

### TABLE 22.5

**INTERGENERATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AMONG 1940-1941 MARRIEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Sons</th>
<th>High Level Non-Manual</th>
<th>Low Level Non-Manual</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Skill Worker</th>
<th>Semi-Skill Worker</th>
<th>Unskill Worker</th>
<th>To.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Level Non-Manual&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level Non-Manual&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> includes Professional, Semi-professional and Proprietor-Managerial

<sup>b</sup> includes Low Level Management & Low Level White Collar
As noted in the above table, occupational inheritance predominated. 39.4% of the sons belonged to the same occupational class (non-manual, farm, skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled) as their fathers, and this does not include sons of proprietors who occupied a manual level job in the family owned business with the expectation of learning the business from the "ground up." Nevertheless, there were a few examples of Horatio Alger style mobility in which sons of manual workers achieved proprietary or professional roles. Thus, for example, Acilio Sandri, son of a railroad employee, became owner of a wholesale gas & oil distributorship and proprietor of a real estate development and rental concern.

The other trends noted reflected the changes in both Greenfield's and the nation's economy as the country stood on the brink of World War II. Unskilled and semi-skilled occupations were declining while skilled, white collar, and especially professional occupations were increasing.

* * * * * * *

Whether or not they followed the careers of their fathers, most workers tended to remain at the occupational level at which they entered the labor force, as the following tables show:
### Table 23

**Career Occupational mobility, date of marriage to 1950**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Prof &amp; Prop</th>
<th>Low Manage</th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Skill Work</th>
<th>Semi-Skill</th>
<th>Un-Skill</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop &amp; Prop 32 <em>a</em> Prop</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar 7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled 7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 24

CAREER OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, DATE OF MARRIAGE TO 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Origin</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop Prop</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes Semi-professionals

* Ret. -- Retired
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Origin</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof &amp; Propa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof &amp; Propa</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-Skilled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a includes Semi-professionals
b Ret -- Retired

While a large proportion of the 1940-1941 marrieds were occupationally immobile (50% of those who stayed until 1960 and 43.1% of those who stayed until 1970), much mobility did occur. 26% of the 112 manual workers who remained until 1960 achieved non-manual status. Likewise, 40% of the 30 white collar workers who stayed achieved proprietary or managerial
status.

As in the earlier cohorts, white collar workers were much more likely than manual workers to achieve proprietary or managerial positions. Unlike earlier cohorts, mobility from manual worker to proprietor usually involved a shift to a completely different occupation. Thus David Sedgwick, a plumber's helper, became president of an appliance company, and Henry White, a barber, became president of Ryan & Casey (liquor dealers). There was little downward mobility except among machinists and low level white collar workers. For machinists, most downward mobility meant a shift into the category of miscellaneous factory workers and thus probably represented a shift of jobs within the factory setting rather than a demotion.

For low level white collar workers, the movement from white collar to largely semi-skilled railroad and factory jobs represented a new phenomena -- the blurring of class lines separating white collar from blue collar workers. As Gavin MacKenzie noted, "Traditionally, the most permanent and meaningful line of demarcation in the American class structure has been that separating manual from non-manual workers."6

This separation reflected the fact that white collar occupations traditionally possessed both higher status and greater salaries. White collar jobs had high status for two reasons: 1) they demanded and developed skills which
were useful and necessary for success in managerial positions, and 2) they required a degree of education which most people lacked. Since education was both an intrinsic source of status, and a commodity in short supply, any occupation demanding education would, following Max Weber, accordingly possess a high degree of social honor or status. Because the education required for white collar jobs was in short supply, these jobs paid greater salaries. Because even skilled blue collar jobs required little formal schooling, more people could take these jobs along with a lower income and a lower status.

In the 1920's and 1930's, two new factors emerged which began to break down this traditional demarcation. They were the rising educational level of the general population, and the increasing number of women, including married women, in the work force. The rising educational level of the population, as an ever rising number and proportion of people completed high school, and the growing number of working women greatly increased the number of persons who met the educational requirements for white collar jobs. These factors served to depress the relative income of white collar workers vis-a-vis other occupational classes. Even more important, the growth of trade unionism succeeded in raising the wages of blue collar workers vis-a-vis other groups. As a result, the wages of many blue collar craft
and factory jobs began to exceed the salaries of many white collar workers. Consequently, an anomalous situation arose. White collar jobs still carried greater status and prestige, but they often offered less money than many manual jobs. By the 1950's -- "before Sputnik" -- teachers and college professors joked wryly about being "paid in prestige." Since status was not an edible commodity, many white collar workers began opting for higher paying blue collar jobs.

If, like earlier cohorts, the 1940-1941 marrieds showed limited occupational mobility, they, like their predecessors, experienced a high degree of property mobility. Of the 120 married manual workers who remained in Greenfield until 1960, 74.2% acquired property with 65% acquiring at least $3,000 worth of real property. As the following tables indicate, a majority in all sections of the working class succeeded in obtaining property.
TABLE 26
PROPERTY MOBILITY OF UNSKILLED BY OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Value of Real Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>up to $2000-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level Non-Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level Non-Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Professional, Semi-professional and Proprietor-Managerial

b Low Level Management and Low Level White Collar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Value of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None up to $2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level Non-Manual&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level Non-Manual&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Professional, Semi-professional and Proprietor-Managerial

<sup>b</sup> Low Level Management and Low Level White Collar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Value of Property</th>
<th>Up to $2000</th>
<th>$2000-$2999</th>
<th>$3000-$3999</th>
<th>$4000-$5999</th>
<th>$6000-$7999</th>
<th>$8000-$9999</th>
<th>$10000</th>
<th>$10000 To.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level Non-Manual&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level Non-Manual&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Professional, Semi-professional, & Proprietor-Managerial

<sup>b</sup> Low Level Management & Low Level White Collar
Thus 85.7% of the unskilled, 63.3% of the semi-skilled, and 81.2% of the skilled workers obtained at least $2,000 worth of property. Property mobility did not depend on social mobility. While the socially mobile invariable succeeded in subsequently obtaining property, most of the property mobile were occupationally immobile. Thus 66.3% of those remaining manual workers acquired at least $2,000 worth of property.

***

In many ways, the 1940-1941 cohort showed the same mobility patterns as the earlier cohorts. As the next table indicates, all showed the following: a high level of geographic mobility; a strong tendency, except among sons of farmers, for sons to inherit their fathers' occupational class; a tendency for persons to remain in the class in which they began; and a high degree of property mobility.
TABLE 29
MOBILITY RATES AMONG THE FOUR COHORTS OF MARRIEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persistence Rate</th>
<th>1940-1941</th>
<th>1910-1912</th>
<th>1880-1886</th>
<th>1850-1857</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Sons of Manual Workers and Farmers in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Manual Jobs</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop-Manager Jobs</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Immobility Rate$^a$</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Manual Workers achieving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual Jobs</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Ownership</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Over 30-year period.

Surprisingly, the 1940-1941 cohort tended to be more persistent and socially mobile than expected. After 1920, Greenfield's population began to level off, and its economy started to stagnate. If one were to make the common assumption that people move to seek economic opportunity, then these trends should have created higher rates of
geographic mobility, higher proportions of persons experiencing both intergenerational and career occupational immobility, and lower rates of upward social mobility, especially into proprietor-managerial positions. Yet these phenomena did not occur. Apparently, mobility patterns in Greenfield, while obviously influenced by local demographic-economic trends, reflected more the trends in the national economy as a whole. As the composition of the labor force changed in conformity with national economic trends, the rate of social mobility, especially of intergenerational mobility, increased.

**Mobility, Religion, and the Establishment**

Social mobility does not take place in a vacuum or solely according to economic interests. Mobility patterns affect, and are affected by, other social phenomena. Thus a gradual change in the ethnic and religious composition of the social class structure altered both social mobility and the general social environment.

Prior to industrialization, Greenfield was a typical homogeneous Yankee Protestant farming community. Even as late as 1845, there were only four Catholic families in the town. But with the economic growth engendered by railroad and factory, a whole host of manual and white collar jobs gradually opened up. Townspeople and rural migrants, inspired by the ideal and prospect of success,
flocked into the more remunerative and high status non-manual jobs. Other rural migrants and successive waves of Irish, German, French Canadian, and Polish immigrants had to take the low paid and low status jobs of factory worker, cutler, teamster, and migrant farm laborer. Why some rural native-born migrants to Greenfield took the less desirable jobs is not clear, though probably age, educational level, and prior class status played a part. But for the foreign immigrants, it was quite clear that their ethnic and religious affiliation were prime ingredients in the kind of jobs they sought and got. Consequently, religiously and ethnically differentiated social classes emerged. A Yankee Protestant "elite" and middle class formed the upper classes while the working class consisted mostly of immigrants and their children, most of whom were Catholic.

The new twentieth century mass production-mass consumption economy created an ever-growing number of non-manual, skilled, and semi-skilled jobs. The expanded opportunities of this century made it possible for a few immigrants and many of their children (including a large number of Catholics) to move fairly rapidly up into middle class and even "elite" positions. By the 1930's and 1940's the middle and upper classes -- overwhelmingly Yankee Protestant in the nineteenth century -- were gradually
becoming ethnically and religiously heterogeneous. The makeup of the lower classes also changed, for with the cessation of immigration and the continued rural migration into low status positions, the lower class was no longer synonymous with Irish, Catholic, or immigrant. In short, religious and ethnic differences began to cut across rather than along class lines.

The above change is particularly important because it focused on two central and controversial issues relating to social mobility -- namely, the relationship between religion and social mobility, and the "openness" of the establishment to newcomers.

To understand the relationship between religion and social mobility, one must delve into a sociological controversy over social causation -- a controversy based on the issue of whether creative ideas and values on the one hand or new economic relationships on the other hand are the major cause of social change.

In contrast to Marxists and other economic determinists who saw ideas and values as the necessary corollary of the prevailing mode of economic relationships, the sociologist Max Weber saw economic conduct as inseparable from the ideas with which men pursued their economic interest, and these ideas were not merely a product of economic factors. 9

In discussing Capitalism, Weber argued that the essence of
Capitalism was not avarice, which existed in all societies, but economic rationality (the idea that economic judgments should be made purely on the basis of profit without regard to other standards). Only Capitalist societies produced men characterized by the following: 1) the idea that work was a duty and an end in itself, and not merely a means of acquiring wealth; 2) a commitment to economic rationality; and 3) a distaste for personal indulgence. See Capitalism as an unnatural phenomena opposed to such human inclinations as the desire to enjoy gratifications and the wish to work as little as possible, Weber sought to determine the causes responsible for its emergence. He found its origins in Protestantism, and more especially in Calvinist and Puritan teachings, which, he thought, contained the seeds of a radically different approach to economic life. Weber argued that the Calvinist doctrine of Predestination created within the believer a deep anxiety concerning his salvation. For his own peace of mind, the Calvinist needed to believe that he was a member of God's Elect; but the believer could be confident of his election only if he could convince himself that his good deeds represented the fruits of a pious outlook on life in which all actions conformed to what he believed was God's Will. Out of this reasoned piety grew both an emphasis on a rational approach to life (including economic life) and a distaste for personal indulgence. See
Weber's thesis of a distinctive "Protestant Ethic" contains numerous implications for the historical study of social mobility. If Protestants and Catholics were put in an economically competitive environment, then Protestants, who judged economic activity by rational criteria and viewed work as an end in itself, would enjoy greater success than Catholics, who judged economic activity by traditional values and viewed work as solely a necessary means of earning an income. Extrapolating still further from Weber's general thesis, one would expect Protestants to have higher rates of upward social mobility. This upward tendency would be especially pronounced in higher level professional and managerial positions which strongly stressed rational planning and intellectual autonomy. Finally, Protestants, following the logic of Weber, would be more likely to achieve property mobility. The accumulation of property or liquid capital demanded saving which in turn required an ascetic self-denial when it comes to spending money. This self-sacrificing behavior would be more characteristic of Protestants than Catholics.

To test the implications of Weber's Thesis, the writer tabulated the social and property mobility patterns of each cohort on the basis of religion and ethnicity. After tabulation, the writer analyzed each cohort to determine what effects religion and ethnicity had on various patterns.
As the following tables indicate, religion had little effect on mobility patterns, once class and ethnicity were held constant. The findings do not disprove the Weber Thesis, but they do suggest its limitations.

**TABLE 30**

PROPERTY MOBILITY OF MANUAL WORKERS BY SOCIAL MOBILITY AND RELIGION FOR THE 1880-1886 COHORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Value of Property (Real and Personal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C(^a)  P(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual Farmers</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Manual(^c)</td>
<td>6 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immobile Man.(^d)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward Man.(^e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) C -- Catholic

\(^b\) P -- Protestant

\(^c\) Upwardly mobile during occupational career but remaining within the manual ranks.

\(^d\) Occupationally Immobile.

\(^e\) Downwardly mobile during occupational career.
### Table 31

Property Mobility of Manual Workers by Social Mobility and Religion for the 1910-1912 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Real Property</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Cath</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immi Cath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Prot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Cath</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immi Cath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Prot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-$1,499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Cath</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immi Cath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Prot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500-$2,499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Cath</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immi Cath</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Prot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500-$4,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Cath</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immi Cath</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Prot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Cath</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immi Cath</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Prot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **Amer Cath** -- American-born Catholics
- **Immi Cath** -- Immigrant Catholics
- **Amer Prot** -- American-born Protestants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Real Property</th>
<th>Class of Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $2000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000-$2999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3000-$3999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4000-$5999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $6000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other -- Persons married by neither a Catholic priest nor Protestant minister.
Unexpectedly, immigrants (who in the 1910-1912 cohort were mostly Catholic) were much more likely to achieve property mobility than native-born Americans regardless of religion.\textsuperscript{13} This result confirms similar findings by Duncan and Lieberson in twentieth century Chicago, and Stephen Thernstrom in nineteenth century Newburyport.\textsuperscript{14}

The high rate of property mobility among immigrants reflected their greater insecurity. First of all, the immigrant, as both a foreigner and a generally low level worker, felt a relatively high degree of insecurity. Consequently, the immigrant sensed a special need to make his family's economic status more secure by creating some sort of cushion against possible adversity. For a poor family, few things equaled home or property ownership as a bulwark of financial security. Home ownership permitted the considerable portion of the family budget hitherto devoted to rent to be devoted to other expenses or saved. A house and property represented a source of income through rental to boarders or tenants. Finally, the home constituted an asset which could be sold or mortgaged in any emergency. No other investment rivalled home or property ownership as a risk-free source of economic security. Little wonder that many immigrants became home owners. Second, as Gerald Rosenblum noted, many immigrants came with the initial intention of earning and saving money to buy land in their native village
in the old country. After having saved some money, these immigrants decided for various reasons to remain in America. Seeing real estate as a safe investment, many used their savings to buy property.

Surprisingly, neither religion nor immigrant origin had much effect on social mobility. Contrary to implications derived by some sociologists from the Weber Thesis, religious differences either vanished when controls for social class and ethnicity were introduced, as in the 1880-1886 and 1910-1912 cohorts, or indicated that Catholics, as in the 1940-1941 cohort, had a slightly higher rate of both property and upward social mobility. But, even in the 1940-1941 cohort, observed differences between Catholics and Protestants were not statistically significant.

While religion and ethnicity had little effect on social mobility, prior social class did play a crucial role in determining a person's chances in achieving high level professional or proprietary-managerial positions. In the nineteenth century, Protestants rose more frequently than Catholics to high level non-manual positions because Protestants comprised the overwhelming bulk of the higher social classes (white collar and well-to-do farmer). A disproportionate share of the high level non-manual workers had been recruited from these higher groups. In the twentieth century, however, religious differences in upward occupational
mobility declined as substantial numbers of Catholics achieved white collar status.

From the lack of any significant influence of religion on social and property mobility, one may venture two conclusions: 1) Contrary to implications derived by some sociologists from the Weber Thesis, there was no evidence, especially in the twentieth century, for Protestant-Catholic differentials based on the existence of a "Protestant Ethic;" and 2) the similarity of Catholic and Protestant mobility patterns indicated that both groups responded to a common "Mobility Ethic," and that, despite religious prejudice, the class system was open.

Nevertheless, certain issues still remain. If there was a "Mobility Ethic" to which Catholics and Protestants both subscribed, where did this value system originate? It obviously did not originate within Puritanism. Puritanism in early Greenfield saw little merit in either possessing wealth or striving after it. In the mid-nineteenth century, Franklin County's Congregational ministers complained bitterly that the "disciples of Christ too often apparently seek wealth for its own sake." Thus the "Mobility Ethic" derived not from Puritanism or Calvinism, but from the secularization of society, and the triumph of an industrial capitalism which placed economic goals above all. As Kurt Samuelsson stated,
But it was not the worship of God that led to the worship of Mammon. It was rather that it was felt necessary to demonstrate that devotion to wealth was not necessarily an impediment to true piety -- and the need to assert this was all the greater because so many of the Puritan fathers had so intensely feared the harmfulness of riches. Religion had to revise its ideas, partly perhaps so as not to stand in the way of the economic transformation, but chiefly in order to keep up with the evolution that had been in rapid progress for some time, away from the world of small scale agriculture and petit bourgeois craft industry towards a society marked by large scale industry. 

The most then, that a Weberian could assert about the mobility ethic and its "worship of Mammon" was that the primeval Puritanism of the colonial period had permitted the development of the ethic so as not to stand in the way of economic transformation. Norms concerning property were secularized in the ethic -- a process which Weber brilliantly suggested in his famous remarks on Benjamin Franklin. The wave of egalitarianism that followed the American Revolution completed the general outlines of the mobility ethic. So the early nineteenth century ministers of Greenfield were, perhaps, complaining a 100 years too late.

Finally, it is true that at first foreign immigrants and Catholics had to take the lower status jobs, but within an extraordinarily brief period, they "made it." Thus the insignificant effect, in the long run, of religion and ethnicity upon social mobility gave some hint that the class structure was open to minority groups, and that the
Greenfield establishment was an "open" aristocracy rather than a "closed" caste. The finding of a relatively "open" aristocracy in Greenfield did not necessarily preclude the existence of a tightly knit economic oligarchy.

It is precisely the issue of whether the elite was "open" or "closed" to minority groups that the sociologist E. Digby Baltzell has considered in historical detail for the nation as a whole. Baltzell noted that economic and social elites often degenerated into castes. Caste he defined as an upper class which protects its privilege and prestige, but neither contributes leadership nor assimilates new elite members of differing religious, ethnic, or racial groups. In his discussion of the national elite, Baltzell saw this group after the 1880's as becoming more and more of a caste whose caste consciousness led to such innovations as the country club, summer resort, genealogical society, and the exclusive suburb.

In Greenfield, the economic structure and the relatively small population of the community, in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, fostered the creation of a tightly-knit economic oligarchy which dominated the town's economic, political, and civic life. This oligarchy consisted of individuals who ran Greenfield through an interlocking directorate over the town's major institutions and organizations. Four representative leaders during the post-Civil War century were (in overlapping chronological order):
Eben A. Hall (1839-1900) -- Owner and Publisher of the Gazette & Courier (1876-1900); member of the Parish Committee of All Souls Unitarian Church; member of the Executive Committee of the Franklin County Public Hospital; Director of the Greenfield and Turners Falls Street Railway; Director of the Franklin County National Bank; Trustee of the Greenfield Savings Institution; Charter Member and Founder of the Edwin E. Day Post of the GAR; and member of the Governor's Council (1883-1884).

J. W. Stephens (1850-1926) -- President of the First National Bank of Franklin County (1895-1921); Trustee of the Franklin Savings Institution, and member of its Board of Investment; Organizer and Director of the Greenfield Electric Light and Power Company; President of the Greenfield Electric Light and Power Company (1905-1924); member and sometimes chairman of the Town Finance Committee; Chairman of the School Committee; Charter member and first President of the Greenfield Club; Chairman of the Building Committee of All Souls Unitarian Church.

John E. Donovan (1867-1953) -- Vice President and Director of the First National Bank and Trust Company (1913-1953); Treasurer of Goodell-Pratt Company; Chairman of the Board of Directors at Lunt Silversmiths; Director of the Franklin Savings Institution; President of the Greenfield Storage Company; member of the Town Finance Committee (1932-1938) and Chairman for three of those years; member of the Greenfield Club; member of Holy Trinity Catholic Church.

John W. Haigis (1881-1960) -- Editor and Publisher of the Greenfield Daily Recorder (1920-1928); County Chairman of the Red Cross; President of the Franklin County Public Hospital; President of the Franklin County Agricultural Society; President of the Franklin County Trust Company; Founder of Radio Station WHAI in 1937; member of the Board of Directors of the Greenfield Tap & Die Corporation. Haigis was also State Representative (1909, 1911-1912), State Senator (1915-1916; 1923-1926); State Treasurer (1929-1931); Republican nominee for Governor in 1936; and Permanent Chairman of the State GOP Convention in 1938. Congregationalist by religion.
It is clear that these men were extraordinarily active in social and business activities of all kinds. A complete series of biographies -- a prosopographical analysis -- of the entire elite up to and including those born before 1920 would also make clear the fact that the local elite did have a few of the closed caste tendencies which Baltzell saw in the national elite. The above short list is typically dominated by white Yankees of non-Evangelical Protestant persuasion -- Unitarians, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, and a few Methodists and Baptists. The incursions of outsiders were led by Irish Catholics like the above Mr. Donovan during the 1920's, followed by members of other ethnic groups in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's.

Some prominent Catholics detected a slight tendency toward caste and began speaking up at the beginning of this process of "opening up." In an address to the Knights of Columbus in 1920, Father P. J. Meehan, the Catholic pastor, accused the banks of discriminating against Catholics when it came to picking directors or trustees. He concluded by urging that Catholics get together, and "exert as a unit the power which is theirs."21 These charges of discrimination caused the local elite to react sharply. In a comment on Fr. Meehan's charges, the editor of the Gazette & Courier, a newspaper whose opinions reflected those of the local establishment stated,
The inference in Rev. Mr. Meehan's remarks, as quoted above, that Catholics are not receiving justice in Greenfield came as a distinct surprise to the Protestant population of the town. There has long been the feeling that Catholics, not only in Greenfield, but in general, were getting more than their share of public recognition.

The editor then went on to list all of the town offices that were occupied by Catholics, from one of the selectmen down to the police force. The editor then concluded his refutation of charges of elite discrimination against Catholics by stating that "women of the Catholic faith have been very generally recognized" in the women's social and welfare organizations.

Mr. Meehan may have had something of a case with regard to the control of banks, but there was, as our tables have amply shown, little empirical evidence to support his contention that the doors of opportunity and the ladders of esteem were cordoned off by native American Protestants. Perhaps his complaints emanated from some deep sense of psychological unease which tables cannot measure. Doubtless, Fr. Meehan's source of distress was the knowledge that, despite the acceptance of Catholics into many business and political positions, there was still a widespread prejudice and condescension toward Catholics within the Greenfield elite.

This elite ambivalence toward Catholics becomes clear when one inquires into whether the elite clubs accepted
Catholics as members. As E. Digby Baltzell noted, "the club has become . . . one of the most important agencies for assimilating men of talent and their families into an upper class way of life . . ."\textsuperscript{23}

Despite the feeling that Catholics were "pushy," obituary articles of prominent Catholics who died during and after the 1920's indicated that Catholics belonged to Greenfield's prominent social clubs, including the elite Greenfield Club.\textsuperscript{24} Thus, for example, Thomas L. Lawler, owner of a theater chain and a charter member of the Knights of Columbus, was both a member of the Greenfield Club and an exalted ruler of the Greenfield Lodge of Elks.\textsuperscript{25}

Judging from both the presence of Catholics in elite roles and organizations, and the opinions expressed by both the Catholic pastor and newspaper editor, it seemed that Greenfield's establishment showed both "openness" and caste tendencies. Widespread anti-Catholic prejudice obviously existed within Greenfield's elite, but these negative attitudes did not prevent acceptance of individual Catholics as elite members.

Consequently, Catholics and the Catholic community occupied a somewhat insecure status. Aware of prejudice, many Catholics, especially those aspiring to upward mobility, tended to be anxious about their status. This insecurity led to a characteristic response -- overconformity to community norms.\textsuperscript{26}
This overconformity led to such behavior as the creation of two separate Catholic Temperance organizations in the 1890's. It also led the middle class and aspiring middle class Catholics, mostly Irish, to put pressure on the newer immigrant Catholics, mostly Polish, to conform to community accepted norms of propriety. Fearful that the drunkenness and occasional disorder that followed Polish weddings on Saturdays might unfairly and unfavorably stereotype all Catholics, the Catholic pastor refused to perform such weddings on Saturday and decreed that such weddings must be performed during the week "when the necessity of getting back to work tends to sobriety." 27

The sensitivity of the Catholic pastor and Catholic middle class to the disorderly behavior which sometimes followed Polish weddings was understandable, given the tendency of the papers, especially the Greenfield Recorder, to play up such disorders. For example, in an account of a stabbing at a Polish wedding in which one Ignace Chohosky knifed one Joseph Potowi after a wordy quarrel, the Greenfield Recorder not only put the story on the front page, but also captioned it with the following banner headline: "One Polander in Hospital, One in Jail, Two Married." 28

In comparison with the national elite described by Baltzell, Greenfield's establishment was more "open." Two major reasons explained the greater openness of the local
elite. First, the elite of Greenfield was small enough for each member to know most every other elite member, as well as many of the persons aspiring to elite status. Hence, the process of evaluating aspirants for acceptance or rejection usually involved personal knowledge so that these persons were judged as individuals and not as members of a status group. Second, the Greenfield establishment had ideological commitments to "openness" -- namely, the ideology of mobility and Temperance. Commitment to these ideologies not only met personal needs for self-esteem and intelligible explanations of social reality, but also had vital social control functions. To exert maximum social control on aspirants to middle class status, the elite had to prove to such aspirants that conformity to middle class norms would bring acceptance and rewards. The universal commitment to the ideology of mobility tended to put a damper on discrimination.

In addition, the establishment wanted to believe that their ideology represented a social perception and value framework that was shared by all members of the community. Thus the elite often favorably publicized evidence of immigrant conformity to ideology of mobility norms. Commenting on the sale of a Deerfield farm to one Joseph Noska, the Gazette & Courier editorialized:
Sales like this are becoming an old story in the Connecticut valley for the Poles are everywhere supplanting the native Yankee stock, and in some towns... the sturdy Poles own nearly every desirable farm to be had... And they farm intelligibly, too, and make a good profit on their investments, while the majority are not only getting a living, but are becoming well-to-do, and in time they make excellent citizens. The Pole does not grumble about hard work, low prices, long hours, or at any of the other requisites for successful farming in New England... The Pole has a veritable genius for hard work, and it never occurs to him to try and sidestep that curse or blessing... Many people affect to despise the characteristics of our new neighbors with their tongue-twisting names, but as a matter of fact they have a host of admirable traits which everlastingly practiced and developed lead to a success which many of our native-born citizens never succeed in attaining despite all the fingerposts and aids with which this century abounds.29

Thus ideological commitment and the need to see their values as universally accepted led the elite to favorably evaluate immigrants and minority group members who conformed to the ideology of mobility. Such evaluations fostered acceptance and weakened prejudice, thus combating tendencies toward caste exclusion.

**Two Other Significant Social Trends**

The rise of minority group members into middle class occupations was not the only social change to challenge the local elite's traditional status and sense of social importance. The "media revolution," discussed in the preceding chapter not only changed the orientation of the community from local to national events and issues; but also changed
the self-perception of the local elite.

As Seymour Lipset and Reinhard Bendix pointed out, the upper class or small cities "is largely composed of people who are middle class" from the perspective of a large city.\(^{30}\) As standards of social evaluation became influenced by nation-wide media, the social status of Greenfield's elite declined as its members became evaluated by national standards. This decline in status produced feelings of defensiveness and hostility. As Joseph Gusfield noted, groups that have "internalized traditional values" and have "made these the core of [their] claim to status and respectability" react to any challenge to these values by both reasserting traditional ideals and condemning modern norms.\(^{31}\) Thus Greenfield's local elite responded to the challenges posed by social change by strongly defending the ideology of mobility which had justified their traditional status and bolstered their self-esteem. In an editorial comment on the 1928 election, the Gazette & Courier saw the nominations of Herbert Hoover and Al Smith as "proof to the world that the original American idea of personal liberty and equality of opportunity is still . . . ascendent . . ." and a refutation of skeptics' claims that the "great underlying principles of American civilization have been lost sight of, and that the measure of success of the individual is in proportion to the advantages open to him through prestige of family connections and money power."\(^{32}\)
In addition, members of the local elite began to feel a hostility toward the outside institutions which they felt to be undermining the elite's traditional social position and economic status, especially big business and the Federal government. Thus in an editorial on chain stores, the Greenfield Daily Recorder strongly criticized chains as "modern merchandizing systems which take a great deal from the towns and cities where they locate and give a minimum in return." Even more hostility existed toward the Federal government and its "briefcase toting bureaucrats." In an editorial, the paper lamented:

After watching both federal and state governments in the fields of utility operation, housing, transportation, and the like, thoughtful Americans are developing a horror of such steps. Bureaucracy's heavy hand almost constantly snarls up the situation so badly that efficiency vanishes in favor of the pork barrel. Advancement ceases to be a result of training and professional growth; it becomes dependent upon seniority and political know-how . . . [or] because they knew a congressman or because superior knowledge of English and history gave them a higher point score in an examination.

In the above mentioned views, Greenfield's elite exhibited the same set of attitudes that Joseph Gusfield saw in the middle class Temperance advocates after the repeal of Prohibition -- namely, estrangement from prevailing values and a desire to return to the dominant values of the past. Implicit in these attitudes was a strong yearning for the past -- a past where the local elite's ideology and socioeconomic status were unquestioned.
In addition to a decline in the social status of the local elite, the twentieth century saw a definite rise in the status of women -- a rise marked by a growing entry of women, both married and single, into the labor force. In the nineteenth century, few women worked, and those who did were usually teachers or domestic servants.

The dearth of working wives reflected more than mere male chauvinism. The lack of any effective or socially sanctioned means of birth control made the quick arrival of children a characteristic of most marriages. In addition to the care of children, women also had to perform the standard chores of housework (cooking, sewing, cleaning, etc.) without the benefit of either pre-packaged foods or electrical appliances. Since both child care and housework were demanding and time-consuming functions, most women, even if the families were financially hard pressed, found it necessary to devote full-time to these roles, and, if unable to hire domestic servants, keep their teen-age and unmarried daughters at home to cope with the housework. Even more important, the married males, especially if they occupied blue collar jobs, saw working wives as a threat to their own status as breadwinner. With male authority in the family to a large extent dependent on his breadwinning role, a working wife represented a threat to male self-esteem. Hence, wives were either forbidden to work, or prudently decided not to work.
In the early 1900's, the opportunities for unmarried women expanded rapidly. Instead of staying in school or at home until marriage, or working as a teacher or domestic, women began to get jobs as low level white collar and factory workers. In the 1910-1912 cohort, 57.3% of the women worked at the time of their marriage. Of these, as the following table shows, about 18% were factory workers and 24% were non-manual workers.

**TABLE 33**

**WIVES' OCCUPATION AT MARRIAGE BY HUSBAND'S OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husbands' Occupation</th>
<th>Wives' Occupation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Prof.</td>
<td>Skill Collar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop-Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled RR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Semi-sk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Semi-skilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks &amp; Barbers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes Semi-Professionals
As shown in the preceding table, women were generally restricted to certain occupations. Men completely dominated managerial, proprietary, and most skilled blue collar occupations. Of the women who worked prior to marriage, 51.7% were unskilled workers (i.e., maids, domestics, laundresses, and waitresses). Despite the exclusion of women from certain occupations, most marriages involved people of equal or near-equal occupational class status. Non-manual males married largely professional or white collar women; semi-skilled men married factory workers or unskilled women; and unskilled men married unskilled women. Only skilled workers to any great extent married women of all occupations. Thus the legends of the wealthy executive marrying his maid, or the rich heiress marrying the butler corresponded little with social reality.

If class endogamy generally prevailed, religious and ethnic group endogamy predominated even more. Only 2.7% of the 1910-1912 cohort marriages involved marriages of Catholics with Protestants. And as the following table shows, ethnic intermarriage occurred very infrequently.
TABLE 34
WIVES' NATIONALITY AT BIRTH BY HUSBANDS' NATIONALITY AT BIRTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husbands' Nationality</th>
<th>Wives' Nationality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Immigrant</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>264</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even in marriages of native-born Americans with foreign-born, endogamy generally prevailed. Most of such marriages were either marriages of Americans and English-speaking Canadians, or marriages of immigrants with the American-born children of members of the same ethnic group. In these patterns, the 1910-1912 cohort conformed closely to its predecessors. But thirty years later important changes began to take place.

Concerning class intermarriage, the patterns of the 1940-1941 cohort resembled those of the 1910-1912 cohort. Yet persons in this cohort, which contained few foreign-born, showed a greater inclination to marry people of other ethnic groups and religions. Thus 9% of the marriages were inter-religious marriages of Catholics with Protestants.
In the 1940-1941 cohort, wives were more likely to work before marriage (76.7% of this group were employed when married as opposed to 57.3% of the 1910-1912 marrieds). Also, as the following table shows, most of the 1940-1941 wives were white collar workers with only 12% working as domestics.

### TABLE 35

**WIVES' OCCUPATION AT MARRIAGE BY HUSBANDS' OCCUPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husbands' Occupations</th>
<th>Wives Occupations</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Skill Work</th>
<th>Factory Worker</th>
<th>Serv</th>
<th>Dom</th>
<th>Other/ None</th>
<th>To.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Manual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionala</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop-Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a includes Semi-professional
b Service workers
c Domestic workers
The large number of white collar women reflected the increasing white collar composition of the total labor force. The decline in the proportion of domestic servants reflected the change in housework caused by electrical appliances and pre-packed foods. With these innovations, and with smaller families (a result of both weakened moral inhibitions and technological innovations regarding birth control), housework and child care no longer constituted a full-time job. With domestic help no longer needed as before, the proportion of domestic servants declined.

Finally, the 1940-1941 cohort, as opposed to all other cohorts, showed a sizable proportion of working wives (15.6%). In contrast, only 1.4% of the 1910-1912 cohort wives worked after marriage.

There were four reasons for the large increase of working wives. First, there was the "household revolution" caused by the electrical appliance and canned food on the one hand, and smaller families on the other. This gave many women leisure time which some spent in social and civic activities, and others on a job. Second, there was World War II. With millions of men in military service for nearly four years, a tremendous labor shortage existed. To maintain production, women had to enter the labor force. In so doing, the role of the working wife was socially legitimized. Third, there was the "media revolution." By advertising a whole host of conveniences and goods, the media
created a mass demand for the products advertised. With his family wanting these goods, the male breadwinner faced the dilemma of either forcing his family to do without, or of letting the wife work. Consequently, many wives went to work, ostensibly on a temporary basis, to earn the needed extra money. But as the family became used to a higher standard of living, many wives remained at work permanently.

Fourth, after World War II, the increasing demand for college educated personnel made it clear that getting ahead meant getting a college degree. As college education for the children became a common expectation, many wives went to work to help put their children through college.

**Conclusion**

The married cohorts of the twentieth century like those of the nineteenth century showed high levels of mobility. All cohorts exhibited high levels of geographic mobility. In all cohorts, social class inheritance and career occupational immobility characterized many of the marrieds. Nevertheless, all cohorts showed numerous examples of social mobility on both the intergenerational and career occupational levels. In all cohorts, a sizable majority of manual workers, both skilled and unskilled, achieved property ownership. While religion had little impact on mobility, immigrants were more likely to acquire property than native born Americans.
This extensive mobility validated many of the claims of the ideology of mobility, fostering a basic social conservatism which only the combined impact of mass media and depression were able to modify. Also fostering conservatism was the rise of some immigrants and many of their descendents to middle class and even "elite" status. Another help was the willingness, even if reluctant, of Greenfield's establishment to assimilate socially mobile Catholics and ethnic group members.

In addition to the other mobility trends, the twentieth century saw the emergency of the working wife, freed from the drudgery of housework to experience the drudgery of a job.

In general, the social history of Greenfield clearly demonstrated that the attempts of some historians to characterize the Land of Opportunity as "legend," are without foundation.
CHAPTER VII

Footnotes


3 Like the tables on intergenerational mobility among the 1850-1857 and 1880-1886 marrieds, this table is incomplete in that it traces only a portion of the 1910-1912 marrieds. Since marriage records listed names, but not occupations of parents, parents' occupations had to be gathered from town directories. Since few towns had such directories, data was necessarily incomplete. Nevertheless, it seems probable that complete data would tend to reinforce the conclusions drawn.

4 See Vance Packard, A Nation of Strangers (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972). In this book, Packard sees widespread geographic mobility as essentially a post-World War II phenomena. According to Packard, such mobility has broadened people's horizons; but it has also created lonely and pathological individuals who neither know nor care about their neighbors and their community, and who are prone to crime, alcoholism, marital infidelity, divorce, mental illness, and psychosomatic ailments. For a critical review of Packard, see Herbert J. Gans, "Vance Packard Misperceives the Way Most American Movers Live," Psychology Today, VI (September, 1972), 20-28.

5 See Footnote to Table 14. (See Footnote No. 3).


12 Greenfield marriage records listed the place of birth of both bride and groom, and the name of the person officiating at the marriage. The ethnic background was determined from the place of birth; the religion from that of the officiating priest or minister.

13 When the property mobility rates of immigrants and native-born American manual workers were compared statistically by X square, the results were as follows: \( X^2 = 10.945 \) df-1 P.001 - 10.827 -- indicating a less than 0.1% probability that the statistically discovered differences reflect chance.


16 When the social mobility rates of Catholics and Protestants were compared statistically by X square, the results were as follows: \( X^2 = 5.244 \) df-3 P.20 = 4.624 P.10 = 6.251. Such results while indicating greater Catholic mobility do not definitively rule out chance.
Thus the Rev. Titus Strong's Common Reader made the following comments about wealth seekers and status strivers:

'How much is wealth thought of and desired by the generality of mankind; but how little does it avail its possessor; . . . How often do care, ambition, and envy arise in proportion to the abundance of wealth which men possess? What a share has it often proved? How many on their dying beds may truly say, 'This wealth has killed me! . . . my riches, instead of advancing my happiness, have only served to debase my mind, and to increase my misery.' Our blessed Saviour informs us, that a man's life does not consist in the abundance of things he possesseth . . .


Baltzell, p. 19.

The Greenfield Club, founded in 1892, was a men's club whose membership was restricted to the economic and social elite of the town. Acceptance into this club meant social acceptance into the elite.


Joseph Roucek notes that upwardly mobile persons are especially vulnerable to social controls, and much more likely to conform or "overconform" to accepted norms. Joseph Roucek et al, Social Control, (2nd ed.: Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1956), pp. 236-237.


35 Gusfield, p. 144.
CHAPTER VIII

REFLECTIONS ON THE HISTORICITY OF SOCIAL MOBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES

This study of Greenfield confirms many of the findings of previous mobility studies, particularly those of Stephen Thernstrom in Newburyport, Massachusetts.¹

Like Thernstrom's Newburyport, pre-industrial Greenfield was a tightly-knit community, a rigidly controlled society. In both communities, this tightly-knit social structure broke down under the combined impact of such oft-cited but rarely described "macro" factors as immigration, population increase, and the market economy. Like Newburyport, Greenfield created a new value consensus in the form of the ideology of mobility to help restore some measure of social control. Like Newburyport, Greenfield also placed an increased stress upon compulsory public education, and experienced a proliferation of voluntary associations. Similarly, both towns saw many of their residents leave, and both witnessed a large influx of immigrants and rural migrants. In both communities, most people remained in the occupational class in which they began; but a few achieved a degree of social mobility, and a considerable proportion acquired property ("property mobility"). Workers in Newburyport and Greenfield accepted the ideology of mobility and became a stabilizing and conservative force in the community.
The study of Greenfield substantiates some of the findings in Clyde Griffin's study of Poughkeepsie, New York. In Poughkeepsie and Greenfield, geographic mobility was highest in those occupations affected by dilution of skills with diminishing opportunities for employment. In neither of these two communities was there much evidence that skilled workers suffered "status degradation." In both places, most factory workers were either immigrants or sons of immigrants for when "factory employment was an improvement in status and . . . in security . . .".3

The social history of Greenfield also confirms some (but not all) findings in Richard Sennett's study of families in the Union Park section of Chicago.4

In both cities different social classes exhibited varying patterns of family life and social group activity. But unlike the middle class of Union Park, that of Greenfield had a radically different associational life. The intense family-centered life which Sennett observed in Union Park did not exist in Greenfield except among the American-born cutlery workers. Thus class differences in social activity patterns in Greenfield conformed more to the general sociological findings summarized in Leonard Reissman. Reissman noted that most studies showed "a higher degree of [middle class] participation and involvement in the community," and that this class tended "to dominate the organizational activity, the intellectual life, and
the leadership of the community."\(^5\)

The Greenfield study supports a finding in Stuart Blumin's study of Philadelphia -- namely, the tendency for industrialization to cause increasing economic inequality.\(^6\) In Philadelphia, inequality grew steadily, so that by 1860, the wealthiest 10\% of Blumin's sample owned 89\% of the wealth. In pre-industrial Greenfield (c. 1798), the richest 10\% of the taxpayers owned 30\% of the property; and in industrial Greenfield (c. 1859), they controlled 52\% of the property. The smaller town's inequality was less, but still quite significant.

The Greenfield study confirms Mabel Newcomer's conclusion that small businesses have an extremely high mortality rate.\(^7\) Contrary to a contemporary myth which views giant conglomerates and chain stores as pushing small businessmen against the wall, small enterprises were just as risky and hazardous an investment in nineteenth-century Greenfield as in twentieth-century Poughkeepsie.

Finally, the history of social mobility in Greenfield supports two of Natalie Rogoff's major findings concerning intergenerational mobility in Indianapolis in 1910 and 1940.\(^8\) Rogoff found that sons were more likely to enter the occupations of their fathers regardless of whether "the occupation was economically or socially rewarding . . ."\(^9\) In comparing the 1940 group with the 1910 group, Rogoff concluded that "no great change has taken place in recent times in the
extent to which men may move from the occupational origins represented by their fathers' positions. Rogoff's conclusions accurately characterized social mobility in nineteenth and twentieth century Greenfield.

The Blocked Mobility Thesis

In its corroboration of earlier research and in its other findings this study of the social history of Greenfield sheds a revealing light on the question of the "openness" of the American social structure to the aspiring poor during the past century and a quarter.

In the past, many sociologists and social theorists have argued that opportunities for upward social mobility by the poor have declined. Supporters of this theory, known as the "Blocked Mobility Theory," have depended upon certain questionable arguments. Thus in 1952, J. O. Hertzler rather typically asserted:

The occupational ladder, with its chance to work up through various levels of skill to supervisory, managerial, and executive posts, does not operate that way to any great extent any more. The very nature of the industrial process, with its production line of semi-skilled human machine parts, ties the worker to a given craft level. He may move horizontally from plant to plant, but he is not fitted in the process to move through the acquisition of higher skills and management experience to a foremanship and above. Furthermore, the supervisory and technical jobs require formal and expensive training due to their highly specialized nature. Incumbents rarely can be recruited from working class personnel. "Following" and serving a machine and punching a time clock do not prepare them for such tasks.
Hertzler (among others) noted that the "Size, complexity, and cost of the modern equipped shop make the process of launching out as an individual entrepreneur . . . more difficult than several generations ago," especially in a large corporate economy. The professions, he added, have become increasingly inaccessible to lower class persons owing to "the high cost and prolonged training and apprenticeship necessary to meet the high standards of admission . . ."\textsuperscript{13}

In contrast, other sociologists have called the "Blocked Mobility Theory" into question.\textsuperscript{14} These scholars cited both the lack of empirical evidence in support of the "Blocked Mobility Thesis" and the structural changes in the economy over the past century which caused the proportion of high status jobs to increase and those of low status jobs to decrease.

As the following table indicates, the "openess" of Greenfield's socio-economic structure has increased over the past century and a quarter.
TABLE 35
MOBILITY RATES AMONG THE FOUR COHORTS OF MARRIEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>1850-1857</th>
<th>1880-1886</th>
<th>1910-1912</th>
<th>1940-1941</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Sons of Manual Workers and Farmers in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual Jobs</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof-Prop Jobs a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Immobility Rate b</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Manual Workers Achieving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manual Jobs</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Professional-Proprietary-Managerial Jobs
b Over 30 year period

Thus the rising levels of both intergenerational and career occupational mobility into non-manual and high level professional-proprietary-managerial occupations together with a declining level of occupational immobility shows an increasing "openness" in the socio-economic structure.

Surely then, the "Blocked Mobility Thesis" is a most dubious one, especially since the extensive evidence from Greenfield corroborates the findings of Stephen Thernstrom and Natalie Rogoff.
In view of these results, it becomes evident that the thesis was based upon certain misconceptions. Thus Hertzler and other proponents succumbed to the Romantic tendency to compare the present with the "good old days," forgetting that the "good old days" were not so good at the time. In addition, they misconstrued the nature of factory work, assuming that such work did not confer skills that either led up the factory ladder or were useful outside the factory. For Greenfield, such assumptions proved invalid. Many factory workers and machinists in all cohorts won promotions to foremen and above. Furthermore, in the twentieth century, some machinists and factory workers developed on the job knowledge and skills which were useful in their future positions as appliance repair shop and service station owners. And, despite the rising costs of starting a business, there was no evidence that such costs deterred workers from becoming entrepreneurs.

Finally, the Blocked Mobility theorists misinterpreted the increasingly stringent educational requirements for entry into the professions. Educational requirements for the professions were always high relatively, so that additional requirements did not raise new obstacles but merely preserved existing barriers. The educational prerequisites for entrance into the professions always greatly exceeded the average educational level of the workers. Thus in mid-nineteenth century Greenfield, most professionals were either
college graduates or had served a post-high school apprenticeship at a time when most workers were either illiterate or had only a few grades of schooling. The educational gap between professional and factory worker was even wider at that time than it is now when most professionals have graduate degrees and most workers have high school educations. Consequently, working class mobility into the professions was extremely rare in all the Greenfield cohorts.

Religion and Mobility

One generation of Greenfielders, the marrieds of 1940-1941, exhibited a pattern of mobility that was surprisingly at variance with the findings of many neo-Weberian sociologists. These studies, in exploiting the implications of the Weber Thesis, found Protestants to be more upwardly mobile and less downwardly mobile in comparison with Catholics. Only one earlier study, Jerry G. Bode's sociological survey of religious affiliation and social mobility in Nebraska in the mid 1960's found Catholics to be more upwardly mobile than Protestants. The upward mobility of Catholic Greenfielders (1940-1941 cohort), in property ownership and occupational status, confirms the findings for Nebraska.

How can one account for the curious non-Weberian upward mobility of these Catholics? How could this finding diverge so dramatically from the general findings of the
For one thing, previous studies contained several flaws and omissions. For example, in his research on mobility in Boston, Stephen Thernstrom, because of his reliance on town directories, could not identify specific individuals in various cohorts by religious affiliation. He had to assume that a particular ethnic group would profess a particular religious belief. Thus, from the fact that native-born Americans, British, and Germans (overwhelmingly Protestant) were more mobile than Irish and Italians (overwhelmingly Catholic), he inferred that Protestants were more mobile than Catholics. Such an inference is suspect since neither membership in a given ethnic group nor possession of a given name guarantee a specific religious affiliation. The study of marriage records in Greenfield show that most American-born Catholics had typically Anglo-sounding names while several persons with Polish, French Canadian, and Italian names were married in Protestant churches. In most cases, the typically English-sounding names of Greenfield Catholics represent names that were originally anglicized when that person's ancestors arrived in this country.

The flaws in Thernstrom's tentative historical analysis of the relationship between religious affiliation and social mobility are relatively innocent compared with those of the empirical sociologists. Gerhard Lenski, for example, in his study of religion and mobility in Detroit in the late 1950's
introduced an unconscious bias of more serious proportions, namely, that of special big-city conditions. Seeking a pure relationship between religion and mobility, Lenski and others applied certain controls such as place of birth, ethnicity, place of residence, number of generations in America and so on. But these controls failed to compensate for two very significant but distorting factors. The first is the fact that different social groups in big cities characteristically exhibit a high degree of "structural segregation." The second is that the big city is impersonal; and as we have noted above, the more personal "primary" face-to-face relationships of small town Greenfield served to discourage the use of stereotypes to limit individual upward mobility.

This unconscious bias becomes especially clear if one makes a distinction between "structural assimilation" and "structural segregation." The phase "structural assimilation" has been used to indicate the large scale entrance of immigrants or minority group members into the cliques, clubs, and other primary groups of the society at large. "Structural segregation" is the opposite of "structural assimilation;" and is used to indicate the tendency of immigrants and minority groups to form primary groups (as a result of both choice and discriminatory exclusion) distinct from those of the society at large. Now, ethnic
groups in larger metropolitan areas typically experienced a much greater degree of structural segregation than did smaller communities such as Greenfield. This greater degree of structural segregation had a profound effect on patterns of mobility. Even Lenski, himself, noted that a high degree of communal involvement (Lenski's term for structural segregation) was consistently and significantly linked with low rates of social mobility among both Catholics and Protestants. 19

The depressing effect of ethnic segregation upon rates of social mobility resulted from the effect of such segregation, in the words of one historian, in hampering "the flow of knowledge and experience." This impeded diversification of interests and occupations, fostered group occupational uniformity, and hindered the upward mobility of the group and its members. Ethnic segregation could have only negative effects because migrants to America from pre-industrial, mostly peasant, societies almost invariably entered the least skilled jobs. 20

It is clear that comparisons between the upward mobility of Catholics and Protestants living in big cities, with their built-in ethnic segregation and their impersonality, are necessarily biased. Under such big-city conditions, individual Catholics found it more difficult to climb the ladder of mobility than they did in Greenfield.
Notes on the Study of Mobility

Except for Thernstrom's study of Newburyport, all mobility studies have merely measured some type of mobility without showing the consequences of mobility rates upon the social system of the community. By focusing on the measurement of mobility, as distinct from the consequences, such studies have accumulated facts, but given us little understanding of the impact of mobility on the social system.

By contrast this study of Greenfield began with certain premises (see Chapter I) concerning the importance and impact of social mobility. One premise assumed that the level of social mobility in any given society is intimately related to both the needs of the economy and the ideological self-interest of the ruling class.

In confronting industrialization in the 1840's, it was in the self-interest of that class to devise an ideology and a system of social control capable of defending its place in the social structure; and, as we have seen, the elite of Greenfield succeeded, perhaps all too well. They made a perfect adjustment to the revolutionary change from an agricultural to an industrial economy, from a hierarchy of statuses based on the soil to a hierarchy of occupations based on the new factory system.

The industrial Revolution clearly forced the aspiring
Greenfielders, led by the middle class, to repudiate the older, less acquisitive, agrarian ideology. The stricture of the Franklin County Congregational ministers in 1856 (quoted in Chapter IV) against the new worship of mammon fell on ears that were attuned to the new age of "Dodge and Bragg," to the rapid accumulation of wealth, to the industrialized version of the land of opportunity. The new ideology, devised in large part by the middle classes of the Jacksonian Era, legitimized acquisitive desires, rationalized the new social realities, and provided a new value consensus. Above all, the new ideology provided a means of social control, for Greenfielders in all classes had internalized it values.

This new ideology, known as the ideology of mobility, reflected the social perception that industrialization caused fundamental changes in the socio-economic structure. These changes permitted economic wealth and high status positions to become available to an ever-increasing minority. Persons who conducted their businesses on "business principles" (economic rationality) and practiced such virtues as industry, frugality, and sobriety succeeded. These people unable to understand the factors making for business success or unwilling to practice the required economic virtues failed. It thus became easy for successful businessmen to view their success simply as the result of superior ability and virtue, and to see the failure of others stem from a lack
of these attributes. Thus, arose, in the early nineteenth century, a new ideology, the ideology of mobility, which taught people to believe that they earned their place in the social structure through individual effort, character, and merit. The new middle class of property-owning businessmen adopted these beliefs because they were a set of values which would justify the new system of stratification.

Did everyday reality support the teaching of the new ideology that social position resulted from merit and effort? Apparently it did -- at least as Greenfielders perceived reality. It was evident that both the middle and working classes of Greenfield perceived the ideology as "true," i.e., they believed that ability and hard work brought rewards. From this perception followed numerous social consequences. The ability to acquire property and achieve occupational mobility produced a feeling of having "succeeded" and a consciousness of being a member of the middle class. In terms of the ideology of mobility, "success" proved the "truth" of the ideology. From this conviction of truth followed a view of the American socio-economic structure, in Greenfield and elsewhere, as essentially just and beneficial. This opinion led to political conservatism, political apathy, an indifference to unionism, political parties which cut across class lines, and a tendency for political conflicts to focus on status issues and personalities. Their perception of the truth was largely justified.
But such pragmatic, conservative, and anti-ideological consequences for public issues also had implications for what sociologists call "social control."

Proponents of a particular system of stratification seek naturally to preserve it by some system of social control. A change in the economy will strongly affect the prevailing modes of social control. To describe the dominant forms of social control is to describe much of the community's value system and behavior.

In pre-industrial Greenfield (c. 1800) a community of economically independent farmers, social control depended largely upon group pressure and commonly shared values. In this kind of community, overt expressions of aggression threatened the unity upon which the force of group pressure depended. The greatest moral emphasis focused upon the repression of aggression and hostility with the avoidance of any behavior (e.g. quarreling, slander, fraud, non-fulfillment of obligations, and adultery) which threatened to cause dissension among community members. Where actions were not perceived as causing aggressive behavior, a greater permissiveness reigned. Since the monotony and restrictions of village life created a need for outlets, people exhibited a de facto toleration of drunkenness and pre-marital sex.

In a subsistence farming community which lacked an ideology of "Dodge and Bragg," one of economic greed, and in which accumulation of wealth was difficult and hard to imagine,
the obsession for riches did not exist. Virtues that indeed could make for some wealth such as diligence, industry, and frugality were valued, but mainly because they were necessary for survival, and not the mere consequence of religious belief.

The citizens of eighteenth-century agricultural Greenfield had a rough economic equality. As noted above (Chapter IV), wealth was fairly evenly distributed: the wealthiest 10% of the population in 1798 owned only 30% of the real and personal property. Gradations were thus less dependent on sheer material wealth than they became after the 1840's: in 1859, the wealthiest 10% of the population owned 52% of the real and personal property. Because of the lesser influence of sheer wealth in the older Greenfield, gradations tended to lean more strongly on elements of status, such as age, occupational skills, or level of education. After 1840, however, when Greenfield became an industrial community, the traditional means of social control, partly based on gradations of status, broke down as a result of economic expansion, immigration, and population growth. These in turn forced the emergence of more distinctly economic classes, and helped diminish the very personal and intimate relationships of pre-industrial Greenfield.

Economic growth caused by the Industrial Revolution created opportunities for personal wealth. Such possibilities
led to the secularization of the middle class, which saw traditional agrarian and religious values as incompatible with the desire for economic success. The new factories and railroads also created a new lower class of factory workers and unskilled laborers. The new system, whether factory or railroad, removed the work of lower class individuals from the context of his family and social life. Usually these jobs consisted of single, boring and repetitive tasks performed at a time and pace imposed by the employer with often considerable risk to life and health. In fires, lay-offs, illnesses, accidents, or bankruptcies, the worker faced continual threats to steady employment. The stress of work and the poverty created by low wages and unemployment created many social problems such as extensive drunkenness, disorderly behavior, welfare, and crime.

Since the middle class saw these social problems as basic threats to its wealth and status, this group felt an intense need to institute new modes of social control. In the religiously heterogeneous and economically expanding environment of industrialized Greenfield, only a secularized ideology which both defended the newly emerging stratification system and gave poor people the feeling that they, too, could share in the bonanza could obviously have any hope for universal acceptance. In this context, the decline of Puritanism and the full-fledged acceptance of the ideology of mobility becomes intelligible.
As the social environment became more impersonal, people could no longer be made to behave as they "ought" by the force of community pressure. If people were to behave "appropriately" (act as self-supporting, law abiding, and self-disciplined individuals of "good character"), then the community needed to inculcate the appropriate values and behavior patterns, i.e., create a community of self-controlled and self-disciplined individuals. To be sure, the society of pre-industrial Greenfield had inculcated values fostering certain preferred modes of behavior, including self-control and self-discipline. But after the 1840's the values were those of a new ideology, an ideology that the elite consciously exploited to encourage loyalty to the system. The community pressure of neighbors no longer sufficed.

Moreover, the new factory system and the new market system that went with it encouraged such virtues and useful by-products as honesty, dependability, sexual morality, and the repression of all impulses toward deviant behavior.

Since the Greenfield community strongly valued economically rational behavior and the achievement of wealth and status, the townspeople stigmatized drunkenness and distrusted sexuality. Drunkenness threatened to lead the drinker to personal failure or social deviance. Hence the importance of the Temperance Movement in Greenfield. Expressions of sexual impulses (in an era lacking effective
and morally sanctioned means of contraception) threatened to produce a pregnancy which would be extremely costly to one's economic status or aspirations. This was one reason for the emergence of a new prudery.

Another consequence of the new value consensus and emphasis on self-control was an increased stress on education. Since the elite of Greenfield considered education an effective means of inculcating ideas and values, they insisted on compulsory school attendance and a curriculum devoted to the development of "good character."

Greenfield's commitment to the new ideology of mobility had consequences besides those already noted in connection with personal behavior. The new ideology also had fundamental implications for the operation of the class system and mobility within it.

Thus, in Greenfield, the elite discovered that its commitment to the ideology of mobility required a subsequent commitment to an "open" elite. The ideology of mobility taught that a person's place in the social structure depended upon his competence and character. For this belief to be an effective means of social control, people had to be rewarded on the basis of competence and character. This necessity put a damper on overt discrimination and forced the establishment to accept, even if grudgingly, upwardly mobile members of minority groups.
Certainly, the group behavior of individuals often reflects the human need for status and self-esteem. These needs help explain the absence of working wives and the intense desire to accumulate property in Greenfield. Working wives threatened a husband's self-esteem; property ownership conferred status. In this context, much of the family behavior observed in Greenfield becomes understandable. The prestige needs also help explain why different social classes had varying patterns of social activity. Thus the middle classes of Greenfield participated fairly widely in the major civic, social, fraternal, and religious organizations of the community. For persons in these classes, such activities provided enjoyment, status, and esteem. But the Yankee cutlers, who considered themselves "failures" in terms of their middle-class aspirations, avoided these organizations, since participation in these groups only increased their feeling of inadequacy and sense of status inferiority.

Other aspects of Greenfield's behavior reflected entrepreneurial and corporate needs for profit. In the early phases of industrialization, businessmen wanted sober, industrious, self-disciplined, and docile workers. To create such a labor force, businessmen used the ideology of mobility, the school system, and the local media to inculcate the desired values and behavior into its future workers. But as a mass production - mass consumption economy emerged,
a less ascetic orientation became desirable. As distribution replaced production as the main limit on profit, it became necessary to use mass advertising to create a consumption oriented society seeking pleasure, gratification, and products. In this process, the mass media (radio, movies, and television) played a central role. By glorifying consumption, pleasure, and leisure, the mass media changed the nation's cultural values, and paved the way for the "sexual revolution" of the "Roaring Twenties" in which the structures of Victorian prudery began to break down. Besides changing norms, the media also reoriented people's frame of reference from a "community consciousness" to a "national consciousness." As a result of media exposure, media celebrities, and the issues, events, and life styles with which they were identified, became emotionally significant to their audience. Through such psychological importance and constant exposure, national personalities, issues, and events soon overshadowed local ones in both familiarity and significance. Thus a new national orientation replaced the former local orientation of people in the community in the 1920's.

A Central Theme

A central theme in this social history of Greenfield has been the meaning and impact of social mobility. In Greenfield
and elsewhere, the idea of America as a "Land of Opportunity," in which merit and industry find their rightful reward and where men "from a humble origin and from small beginnings rise . . . in the world . . . to the most elevated positions," was a central cultural theme in nineteenth-century America. Editorials, news stories, speeches, books, obituary articles, sermons, and popular fiction all disseminated and inculcated this set of interrelated beliefs.

The importance of this theme and of its popular dissemination lay, as Stephen Thernstrom noted, in its social consequences:

These ideas constituted an "ideology," a set of ideas which served to "direct activity toward the maintenance of the existing order." The traditional Federalist image of society was unable to provide a satisfactory orientation to the new age. The function of the ideology of mobility was to supply the citizens of nineteenth century America with a scheme for comprehending and accommodating themselves to a new social and economic order. According to this doctrine, a distinctively open social system had appeared in the United States. The defining characteristic of this open society was its perfect competitiveness, which guaranteed a complete correspondence between social status and merit. The wealthy and privileged could occupy their superior position only so long as their performance warranted it; the talented but low-born were certain to rise quickly to stations befitting their true worth. 22

Thernstrom argued the revisionist thesis that nineteenth century America was no golden land of opportunity for the common man. Opportunities for advancement were neither boundless nor equal. Yet the main reason the ideology of mobility
. . . held sway in the latter half of the nineteenth century was that [it] bore a certain resemblance to social reality. Even at the very bottom of the class ladder there were abundant opportunities for modest self-advancement, and the workmen who failed to climb at least one notch upwards rarely remained in the community for very long. The desperate economic grievances and the rigid social barriers which fed the class-based parties and the ideological politics of the Old World were missing from the Newburyport scene. 23

Thernstrom's description of mobility in Newburyport equally characterized mobility in Greenfield.

For one who compares the actual mobility of individuals with the grandiose claims of the ideology of mobility, truth fell short of ideological claims. Few of the marrieds in Greenfield rose from working class origins or occupations to high-level non-manual professional, proprietary, or managerial positions. And even though most accumulated property, few accumulated anything approaching riches. The mobility described in Greenfield was not the large scale mobility of men from "humble origins and small beginnings" to elevated positions. It was, however, mobility of a kind deeply significant to the rural migrants, immigrants, and workers' sons living in Greenfield. After all, these people, oriented to the local scene in the absence of modern media, judged the validity of the ideology of mobility not by comparing themselves with the heroes of Horatio Alger but by comparison of themselves with the other people in Greenfield. In this context, hard work and frugality did bring "success" -- the tangible rewards
of property ownership, security, and status in the local community. For these people, America was a "land of opportunity" and their own perceived "success" proved it.
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Footnotes
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16 It might be noted that when Bode tested for statistical significance, he concluded that the differences between Catholic and Protestant mobility in his sample were about the same as the ones between the Catholics and Protestants in the 1940-1941 cohort in Greenfield -- namely, P >.20 <.10.
18 While there was very little religious intermarriage in Greenfield prior to the 1920's (only 2.7% of the 1910-1912 cohort marriages were marriages of a Catholic with a Protestant), there is some evidence that some Catholic marriages represented marriages of Catholics with people who converted to Catholicism before marriage at the behest of their respective mate. Unfortunately, the number of these marriages could not be ascertained. The other phenomena, marriages of persons with obviously Polish, French Canadian, or Italian names in Protestant churches was not uncommon. In some cases, these persons were remarrying after a prior divorce. In other cases, such marriages reflected a personal decision to affiliate with a church more in tune with one's life style, personal needs, or theological beliefs.
The concepts of "structural segregation" and "structural assimilation" are derived from Milton Gordon. See Milton Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 68-71. While Lenski, unlike other sociologists, was aware that structural segregation affected mobility rates, he failed to appreciate its full importance. Consequently, he failed to introduce controls sufficient enough to compensate for this factor. For Lenski's finding on the effects of structural segregation on social mobility, see Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor, Anchor Books (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1963), p. 123.

Gerald Rosenblum, "Modernization, Immigration, and the American Labor Movement" (Ph. D. Dissertation, Princeton University, 1968), p. 391. Ethnic segregation also helped intensify the group stereotyping prevalent in the impersonal environment of the big city. When one compares the relative "openness" of Greenfield's elite with the openness of the national elite as described by E. Digby Baltzell, one finds the Greenfield elite was more open. The elite's personal knowledge of aspiring members of minority groups discouraged discrimination on the basis of group stereotypes. See E. Digby Baltzell, The Protestant Establishment, Vintage Books (New York: Random House, 1966).
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A NOTE ON SOURCES

Most of the primary sources used in this study are located in the Deerfield Heritage Library, the Greenfield Public Library, the Greenfield Town Hall, the Greenfield Historical Society, the Franklin County Courthouse Building, and the Springfield Public Library.

The Deerfield Heritage Library contains the valuable records of the Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association which include a vast amount of manuscript material and a large number of the contemporary published primary sources. The Heritage Library also has copies of the Greenfield newspapers from 1792 until 1929. The Greenfield Public Library has a complete microfilm copy record of the Greenfield newspapers from 1792 until the present. The Library also has a complete set of the Town Directories and the Annual Reports of the Town Officers. The Greenfield Town Hall forms the repository for the town's birth, death, marriage, and tax assessment records as well as the records of the Selectmen and other town officials. The Franklin County Courthouse Building houses the probate and property records for Franklin County as well as the records of the County Commissioners. The Greenfield Historical Society contains several published contemporary primary sources and also miscellaneous manuscript records. The Springfield Public Library has copies of the Massachusetts State
documents listed in the bibliography.

No scholarly history of Greenfield exists. There is a four volume history of Greenfield (Francis M. Thompson, *History of Greenfield*, 2 vol.; Lucy C. Kellogg, *History of Greenfield, 1900-1929*; and Charles S. Severance, *History of Greenfield, 1930-1953*); but these works are simply detailed chronologies devoid of any interpretation. Nevertheless, the Thompson volumes and David Willard's *History of Greenfield* (1838) are valuable because they include very extensive excerpts from primary source material not always available elsewhere, as well as many complete contemporary documents and speeches.

The secondary sources listed below constitute a selected rather than a complete bibliography. The works listed represent sources which I felt were especially useful in providing essential background information or a theoretical framework for analyzing and interpreting primary source data.
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