

THE NEW YORK CITY NEGRO AND OCCUPATIONAL EVICTION 1860-1910 ¹

It is the basic contention of this paper that intensification of Negro occupational eviction from 1860-1910 imposed another limitation on the Negro in addition to "job ceiling". The term job ceiling, logically, connotes a prescribed set of trades or occupations, restricted exclusively to a group with ascribed social and economic status, and offers almost no upgrading. Negro eviction from the trades adds another restriction to his already low status, since the Negro was now not only limited in his opportunity to rise in the occupational scale – "job ceiling" – but jobs formerly relegated to him as low-grade Negro jobs were taken away from him – "eviction" – when whites entered into competition for them. This happened when (a) immigrants arrived who did not think such jobs normally beneath their dignity and (b) when native-born whites suffered unemployment.

To develop this thesis, we have divided the paper into three parts: (1) the basis for the "so-called" Negro job ceiling during the period 1820-1860, (2) the basis for the eviction theory, or the displacement of the Negro from "black jobs" 1860-1910, and (3) the basis for an analytical conclusion.

In New York City, Negro manumission dates back to 1644,² which permitted the formation of a Free Negro Group. This group and its offspring did play an important role, but only on the intimate fringe of the city's active life. The group plied the trades they had learned under the institution of slavery, consisting, mainly, of barbering, catering, baking, and the occupations of restaurateurs, coachmen, laborers, etc.³ Thus a link is established between a given set of

¹ I am under obligation to Prof. Maurice R. Davie for his critical reading of and editorial advice on this paper.

² O'Callaghan, E. B., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of New York*, (Albany, 1853-1857), Vol. I., p. 343.

³ Johnson, C. S., *Black Workers and the City*, in: *The Survey*, March 1, 1925, p. 641; *African Repository*, Vol. 29, pp. 323-324.

occupations and the notion of a Negro job ceiling. Here, too, the types of social and economic organization created during the period of Negro servitude,¹ until 1827,² persisted long after his legal liberation and was responsible for reinforcing the limitation placed on Negro occupations. Later, because of the Negro's ascribed socio-economic status, the immigrant was able to displace the Negro in the very trades originally limited to him.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEGRO JOB CEILING 1820-1860

There is some evidence that a Negro job ceiling originated in New York about 1820; prior to this date a very large proportion, "if not a majority of the artisans of the city were colored."³ The long succession of Anglo-French Wars keeping the volume of foreign immigration relatively low until after 1815 is a factor in the Negro's holding his place as an artisan until about 1820.⁴ After 1820, there was a steady decline in the number of black artisans, and by 1837, ten years after legal liberation, only 350 out of some 10,500 Negroes in the city were engaged in skilled trades.⁵ That the Negro during this period was restricted to certain occupations and his status became institutionalized is verified by such writers as Mr. C. C. Andrews,⁶ a white teacher at the African Free School in New York City. He states that during the 1820's and early 1830's Negroes were either refused entry into certain trades or, when they managed to get some training, they found the better shops closed to them. Artificial restriction of occupational entry forced the Negro to turn to the sea for employment as steward, cook, sailor, etc. "Those who (could not) procure trades, and (did not) like to go to sea became waiters, coachmen, barbers, servants..."⁷ That Mr. Andrews was not alone in his observations is verified by numerous articles appearing in the weekly newspaper, *The Colored American*,⁸ published in New York during the years 1835-1841.

Mr. Dyson⁹ summarizes the Negro labor situation as it existed from the time of liberation until about 1840:

¹ De Mond, A. L., *Certain Aspects of the Economic Development of the American Negro 1865-1900* (Catholic University of America Press, 1945), p. 13.

² Northrup, A. J., *Slavery in New York* (University of the State of New York, Albany, New York, 1900), pp. 298-299.

³ Spero, S. and Harris, A., *The Black Worker* (New York, 1931), p. 15.

⁴ Handlin, O., *Newcomers* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959), p. 6.

⁵ Spero and Harris, *op. cit.*

⁶ Andrews, C. C., *The History of the African Free School* (New York, 1830), p. 32.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

⁸ *The Colored American* (published between 1835-1841), *passim*.

⁹ Dyson, A., *Gerrit Smith's Efforts in Behalf of the Negroes in New York*, in: *Journal of Negro History*, Vol. 3., p. 355.

“Most Northern men still objected to granting Negroes economic equality. When the supply of labor exceeded the demand, the free Negroes, unable to compete [job ceiling] with these foreigners, were driven not only from the respectable positions, but also from the menial pursuits. Measures to restrict to whites employment in higher pursuits were proposed and where there were not actually made laws, public opinion, to that effect accomplished the same result...”

The decade of the 1840's found the Negro's job ceiling fairly restricted to occupations heavy on the muscle, light on the brain and rather irksome and dirty. Usually included in these occupations were longshoremen, hod carriers, white-washers, coachmen, bootblacks, etc. The *New Moral World*,¹ an Owenite newspaper, published in the middle 1840's, ascribed a virtual monopoly to the Negro in the above mentioned occupations. The Negro female found her lot as circumscribed as her male counterpart. She was restricted to such occupations as domestic maids, cooks, scullions, laundresses and seamstresses, etc.² Not only was her economic horizon circumscribed but the influx of Irish women coming to New York in the 1840's intensified eviction of Negro women from domestic service³ and other occupations as rough washers, house cleaners, coarse sewers or in any other rude work they could find to do.⁴ During this same decade, a continuous invasion by whites into occupations formerly linked with the Negro had begun, making the concept of “Negro jobs” rather fluid. German and Irish immigrants were accepting such posts as porters, dockhands, waiters, barbers, cooks, etc.⁵

The intensification of the Negro's occupational plight was noted in special reports outside of New York during the 1850's in such sources as the *Maryland Colonization Journal*.⁶ Wide discrimination against the Negro in New York restricted his occupational entry in trades usually reserved for him in the South, but he was being preempted in these very occupations by other races in New York. More conclusive is the 1850⁷ census report covering some seventy-five selected occupations; this report revealed that some 3,337 Negroes were

¹ *The New Moral World*, June 29, 1844.

² Spero and Harris, p. 13; Abbott, E., *Women in Industry* (New York, 1926), passim.

³ Abbott, op. cit., p. 137.

⁴ Abbott, E., *Historical Aspects of the Immigration Problem* (Chicago, 1926), pp. 325-326.

⁵ Harmon, J. H., Lindsay, A. L. and Woodson, C. G., *The Negro as a Businessman* (Washington, D. C., 1929), p. 4.

⁶ *Maryland Colonization Journal* (1850, Vol. 3), p. 103.

⁷ *Compendium of the Census of 1850* (Washington, D. C.), pp. 80-81.

employed and that over 81% of them were confined to six occupations. Even in these six occupations the Negro was losing ground to the whites.

Occupational statistics of passengers arriving in the United States from foreign countries for the years 1820-1860,¹ show that aside from laborers and servants, these immigrants did not follow any of the "Negro" occupations at home. However, even though the bulk of these immigrants listed occupations other than "Negro" trades, they lacked the resources or skills to enter the handicrafts. Thus they were forced to take any job open to them; they did take on such jobs as porters, sweepers, etc. and their wives and children went into service, or began to take in sewing or laundry.²

Mr. Charles Wesley³ reviews the status of Negro occupational status from the middle 1840's until the Civil War, as follows:

"The anti-slavery movement would destroy slavery but it neglected the more practical task of creating an economic future for the free Negro population in industry. Many Negroes were physically free, and yet, they were enslaved and placed in degraded economic positions by the apathy of their friends and hostile attitude of their fellow workers. Racial toleration in industrial occupations was rare. In the majority of places where Negroes and whites worked together there was a sullen suspicion which soon gave opportunity to the whites to force the Negroes out of their employment either by means of economic pressure or by legislation. The conditions of Negro free labor which were brought about by the Civil War did not end economic strife between the races. They served only to intensify the competition [eviction] and to increase the struggle between white labor and black labor in the United States."

THE IMMIGRANT AND NEGRO EVICTION

Although the authorities may differ as to the degree of occupational eviction the Negro suffered during the period 1820-1860, there is agreement as to the existence of a Negro job ceiling. Advent of the Civil War saw a marked rise in Negro eviction by the immigrant in such occupations as those of porters, tobacco stemmers, waiters,

¹ Preliminary Report of the 8th Census, 1860 (Washington, D. C., 1862), pp. 80-81.

² Ernest. R., *Immigrant Life in New York City* (New York, 1939), p. 19; Jerome, H., *Migration and Business Cycles* (New York, 1926), p. 40.

³ Quoted by Franklin, C. L., *The Negro Labor Unionist of New York* (New York, 1936), p. 21.

barbers, cooks,¹ etc. Invasion of Negro occupations by whites was most pronounced during periods of depression when jobs were scarce and the white man's higher socio-economic status in society had to be maintained at Negro expense. A specific example of eviction appeared in the "World",² a New York newspaper. Negroes who had been employed in tobacco factories for many years as stemmers and other occupations shunned by whites were forced out of employment in Lorillard factories. A white delegation threatened management with a strike unless these Negroes were released and no more Negroes were to be employed at the plant. The "Tribune",³ another New York newspaper, reported the same type of attitude in the muscle trades. Irish workers informed management that they must dismiss all Negroes employed as longshoremen, dockhands, etc., otherwise they would tie up the port. Also, the Irish and Germans were deeply entrenched in the common labor field in construction. By 1865 a "shanty population of about 20,000 [Germans and Irish] on the upper west side of Manhattan was firmly established",⁴ the bulk of them being laborers employed by contractors in grading, sewerage of streets and in the removal of rock, or in the excavating for public purposes. Other occupations formerly monopolized by the Negro were not exempt from invasion. Henry Ward Beecher,⁵ Minister at Plymouth Church in Brooklyn, stated in his sermon in 1862 that Negro barbers and waiters were being driven from these occupations as fast as white replacements could be found. In 1863, the year of the draft riots, the Committee of Merchants for the Relief of the Colored People Suffering from the Late Riots in the City of New York,⁶ pleaded in vain to have various positions restored to the Negroes – positions from which the Negro had been evicted by whites.

Dr. W. E. B. Dubois⁷ summarizes the decade of the 1860's as follows:

"Before the Civil War the Negro was certainly as efficient a workman as the raw immigrant from Ireland and Germany. But whereas the Irishman found economic opportunity wide and clearly growing wider, the Negro found public opinion determined to keep him in his place."

¹ African Repository, Vol. 27, p. 110; Vol. 21, p. 140.

² The World, August 2, 1862.

³ The Tribune, November 25, 1862 and January 24, 1863.

⁴ Hourwitch, I. A., Immigration and Labor (New York, 1912), p. 231.

⁵ The Tribune, December 1, 1862.

⁶ Committee of Merchants for the Relief of Colored People Suffering from the Late Riots in the City of New York, Report of the Committee of Merchants for the Relief of Colored People Suffering from the Late Riots in the City of New York (New York, 1863), p. 10.

⁷ Dubois, W. E. B., in The New York Times, November 17, 1901.

The decade of the 1870's revealed further intensification of Negro occupational eviction in several ways. The Irish an ethnic group frequently classified on the same social level as the Negro, continued to get priority in employment. To quote Berthoff,

“The name Ireland has become a hissing and a by-word among the nations of the earth, that of Irishman a synonym for the lowest caste in the social scale – a badge of servitude as marked as was, for so many years, a black skin.”¹

Although the Irish had been assigned a “badge of servitude” akin to that of the Negro, other ethnic groups must have shared this badge since forty-two percent of New York City's population was foreign born in 1870.² Regardless of social status of any white ethnic group, where the white man dominated the labor situation he pushed his black brother into jobs for which he did not care to compete. Whites were given preference because “the newcomer from Europe had to be provided for”³ and the bulk of the newcomers were white with little occupational experience. Thus the foreigner was successful in evicting the Negro from both menial employment and in the trades in which the Negro had acquired a rudimentary foundation during slavery. This point is illustrated in the 1870 Census for New York⁴ where such Negro occupations as mariners showed at least fifty percent as foreigners; ninety percent of the laborers were foreigners, seventyfour percent of the launderers, and eighty percent of the shoemakers, etc.

In line with the contention that the white foreigner must be provided for in preference to the native Negro, a new type of eviction became manifest. We refer to this type of occupational eviction as indirect or oblique displacement. An example is that of the clothing industry after the Civil War. During and immediately after the Civil War the production processes in the clothing industry changed to that of mass production, or deskilling of operations. During the ante-bellum period the clothing industry was mainly in the hands of Americans, English and Scotch.⁵ The post-bellum period, with increased emphasis on mass production brought lower occupational status to the clothing industry and a shift in ethnic composition of its workers – Irish and Germans.⁶

¹ Berthoff, R. T., *Immigrant in Industrial America* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 190.

² Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census: *Immigrants and Their Children*, 1920 (Washington, D. C., 1927), Census Monograph 7, p. 26.

³ American Academy of Political and Social Science: *The Negro's Progress in Fifty Years* (Philadelphia, 1913), pp. 34-35.

⁴ Census of 1870, *Statistics of Population*, Vol. I (Washington, D. C., 1872), p. 793.

⁵ Davie, M. R., *World Immigration* (New York, 1936), p. 242.

⁶ *Ibid.*

The latter's importance in the trade is, partially, exemplified by their percentage of the work force in the industry – sixty-six and two-thirds percent.¹ Ordinarily the lowering of social status of clothing occupations would have permitted Negro entry, but availability of whites plus white domination of the labor situation meant that the Negro could be kept out.

Continued immigration into the United States during the 1880's, albeit a geographic shift in source from northern and western Europe to eastern and southern Europe saw the Jews and Italians² taking the places of the Irish and Germans in the needle trades. The Negro continued to remain an outsider³ despite his greater familiarity with the language and culture of the United States.

That this is not an isolated instance during the 1880's and the decades to come is illustrated in such occupations as longshore work, barbering, shoeshining, catering, asphalt paving, etc. In the field of longshoring the Italian immigrant gained his foothold during the middle 1880's,⁴ and in time became second in numbers to the Irish. The Italian found other occupations as shoeshining⁵ and street paving⁶ open, and he gradually began to infiltrate these trades at the expense of the Negro.

That the Negro, again, was aware of his displacement is shown by his resort to strikebreaking,⁷ used as a means of regaining a foothold on the waterfront. However, in each case, once the strike was settled, the Negro found himself an outsider.

The increased degree of Negro occupational eviction during the period from 1865 till 1890 can best be seen in perspective.

“Fifty years ago [1865], the waiter in New York... was usually a man of color, as was the barber, the coachman, the caterer, or the gardener. True enough, he had little opportunity to rise above such menial occupation [job ceiling], but with the growth of the humanitarian, if rather apologetic, attitude toward the Negro engendered by the great conflict which had brought about verbal

¹ Statistics of Population, Ninth Census of the United States, Vol. I. (Washington, D. C., 1872), p. 793.

² Hourwittch, I. A., *Immigration and Labor*, op. cit., p. 25; Davie, op. cit.

³ Spero and Harris, op. cit., p. 177.

⁴ Barnes, C. B., *The Longshoremen* (New York, 1915), p. 8.

⁵ Foerster, R. F., *Italian Emigration in Our Times* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), p. 334.

⁶ Baker, R. S., *The Negro's Struggle for Survival in the North*, in: *American Magazine*, Vol. 65., (1907-1908), p. 479.

⁷ Frazier, E. F., *A Negro Industrial Group*, in: *Howard Review*, June, 1924, p. 198; Barnes, op. cit., p. 9.

abolition of slavery...., it is possible that the Negro's status in New York... would have been rapidly and permanently improved, industrially as well as in civic recognition, had not the current immigration, which had been retarded for a decade or two during the Civil War and the preceding agitation, started with renewed force on the cessation of conflict.... the European immigrant soon outstripped his Negro rival for the employment and the respect of the American... [The white European] looked and still looks upon the Negro with the contemptuous eye of an easy victor over a hopelessly outnumbered weak and incompetent foe..."¹

The "new" immigration took on a clear preponderance after June 30, 1896 when its total rose to fifty-seven percent² and since that date held a clear majority over immigration from northern and western Europe. Thus from the 1890's until 1910 the bulk of the immigrants settling in New York City either intensified Negro displacement or relegated the Negro to less lucrative posts within the trade or denied him supervisory work, or led to his receiving lower wages for the same type of work. During the period from 1890 to 1910, at no time did the percentage of total foreign white stock in New York fall below seventy-six percent.³

Many of the newer immigrants, arriving in New York after the middle 1890's through 1910, as the Italian peasant, "so unskilled that he can be put only to pick and shovel in another country..."⁴ or like the Greeks whose proportion of unskilled rose from sixty-six percent in 1900 to ninety-one percent in 1907,⁵ readily displaced the unskilled Negro. The Italians were not only infiltrating such industries as longshoring, but also shoeshining, asphalt work – paving and construction –, and many other trades formerly dominated by the Negro. An example of Negro eviction in the paving industry is attributed to the change in hiring practices of such companies as the Cecelia Asphalt Paving Company.⁶ This company had the contract to pave the square around Cooper Union and they "began to fill the places of the Afro-American

¹ American Academy of Political and Social Science; *The Negro's Progress in Fifty Years* (Philadelphia, 1913), p. 34.

² Jerome, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

³ *Immigrants and Their Children*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

⁴ Foerster, R. F., *A Statistical Survey of Italian Emigration*, in: *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 3, (1908-1909), pp. 79-81.

⁵ Fairchild, H. P., *Greek Immigration to the United States* (New Haven, 1921), p. 117.

⁶ *The New York Age*, July 12, 1906.

pavers and rammersmen with Irish and Germans..." Later to be followed by Italians. Other ethnic groups like the Slavs took over the heavy work in many a brick-making plant along the Hudson River;¹ formerly, this work was executed by southern Negroes who came north at certain seasons of the year. The Greeks, like the Italians, gradually evicted the Negro from such occupations as shoeshining, catering, etc. Young Germans and Frenchmen joined the ranks of Italians and Greeks in displacing the Negro as dining room servants.² Italians along with Germans in New York City, and indeed in every city of considerable size along the lines of the New York Central Railroad, were fast monopolizing the barber trade.³ Other ethnic groups, English and Irish, replaced the Negro as coachmen and stable hands, trades ranking next to caterers in social status.⁴ Other trades, as whitewashing, a Negro monopoly, were swallowed up by white house painters, decorators and paperhangers.

Only when immigrants no longer had the economic need to ply a trade did they permit the Negro to be hired. To wit: the majority of Negroes entering the needle trades around 1900 were women and they gained access in the old waist industry.⁵ Work in this industry was of the lowest skill and employers turned to colored girls only because immigrant labor shunned these jobs. Miss Ovington⁶ made a study of the occupations held by Negroes in New York needle trades and found that as of 1906, there were no Negro cutters, or operators, but only finishers, cleaners, etc. The occupations assigned to Negroes were the lowest in the occupational scale. The same situation was true of the laundry industry, where the majority of the laundry workers were women.⁷ The better jobs, both economically and socially, such as drivers, markers, and sorters went to white men; the unskilled work as wringers, pullers, assistant washers, etc., was invariably allotted to Negroes.⁸

Finally, we come to the instance where the Negro does, or is fully qualified to do, the same type of work but his annual earnings are

¹ Roberts, P., *The New Immigration* (New York, 1920), p. 58.

² Speed, J. G., *The Negro in New York*, in: *Harper's Weekly*, Dec. 22, 1900, p. 1250.

³ Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

⁴ *The National Urban League; Negro Membership in American Labor Unions* (New York, 1930).

⁵ Spero and Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 337.

⁶ Ovington, M. W., *The Negro in the Trade Unions of New York*, in: *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May 1906, p. 91.

⁷ Spero and Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

⁸ *Ibid.*

below those of whites. A survey made in 1907-1908 of Negro craftsmen in New York City by Miss Tucker¹ revealed that the Negro mechanic could get some work, but rarely steady work. After trying to obtain steady work at his trade, the Negro craftsman² gave up and turned to a menial position at wages less than his ability should command. In this instance, the irregularity of employment, coincident with lower income forces the Negro into menial positions and offers an oblique form of displacement by white immigrants.

Still another type of practice, serious in its effect, is differentiation of earnings between white and Negro in the same trades, as in catering, longshoring,³ etc. Where the Negro is high in proportion to the total group – 200 colored waiters out of every thousand in the trade – the Negroes do not compete against the 800 white waiters, rather they are given second place in work assignment. This means that the Negro as a rule does not serve in the most fashionable hotels or restaurants. Since the waiter's income depends mainly on gratuities, restriction in employment means that total Negro income will be lower. This results despite the Negro's waiting on as many persons as, or even more than his white counterpart, putting in the same number or more hours on the job. There is the possibility of more hours worked, permitting the Negro to equalize his income with that of the white man, but his hourly wage will be less.

Longshoring has a peculiar quirk – the shape up⁴ – attached to it and should not be placed in the same general category as those trades mentioned above. In addition to the shape-up, most longshoremen are assigned to docks, which assignment helps them to get work. The Negro, unlike the Italians and Irish, has not been assigned to specific docks in New York. Thus he starts out with two strikes against him because he has no specific dock assigned to him, forcing him to wander from dock to dock in the hope that he will find some work. Moreover, since hiring depends upon the foreman, usually of Irish or Italian ethnic origin, the Negro is excluded from being given preference in hiring. This means that the Negro docker's income must be lower than that of his fellow worker.

In 1907, Mr. Samuel Scrothon described Negro occupational eviction by the immigrant as follows:

¹ Tucker, H., *Negro Craftsmen in New York*, in: *Southern Workman*, Vol. 37, 1908, p. 48.

² Tucker, H. *Negro Craftsmen in New York*, in: *Southern Workman*, Vol. 36, 1907, p. 545.

³ Ovington, M. W., *Half a Man* (New York, 1911), p. 93.

⁴ Larowe, C. P., *Shape-up and Hiring Hall* (University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1955), pp. 49, et. seq.

"...Negro waiters and hotel employees were giving way before the inroads of whites. Throughout the entire North and West most of the best hotels and restaurants replaced their Negro waiters with whites... The Italian, Sicilian and Greek foreign to America's language and institutions occupy what was confessedly the Negro's forty years ago (1860). They [Greeks and Italians] have bootblack stands, newsstands, barbering, waiters..., janitors and catering businesses..."¹

The 1910 Census for New York fortifies Scrothon's position statistically, since over two-thirds (70.1%) of all Negro workers were limited to domestic or personal service. The majority of the remainder were concentrated in manufacturing and mechanical industries (porters and general utility men),² with a few Negroes scattered in trade, professional services and transportation and communication. "It is quite evident that the occupations of Negro workers [are] not far removed from the traditional Negro jobs – akin to the work he did as a slave."³

In summation, the period from 1860 to 1910 revealed that the Negro's occupational status had regressed despite the critical labor supply during the period under discussion; despite the increased use in both old and new industries of semi-skilled and unskilled jobs, the Negro made almost no progress. Simultaneously, the Germans, English, Irish, Swedes and Greeks were making severe inroads upon the traditional occupations as domestics, caterers, bootblacks, butlers and coachmen. Thus there appeared a racial stratification of American labor that was rapidly relegating the Negro to a most insignificant status in most occupational groupings other than agriculture and domestic service.⁴

ANALYTICAL CONCLUSION

The Negro's social subordination leads to restricted social mobility, and, in turn, the latter restricts the Negro to his own racial group, a separate group within the larger society. Thus the Negro finds himself an outsider looking in on the larger white society.

Inherently linked with the factor of racial subjugation is the white

¹ Scrothon, S., *The Colored American*, 1907.

² Ovington, M. W., *The Negro Home in New York*, in: *Charities*, October 7, 1905.

³ Franklin, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁴ National Urban League, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

man's constant association of the Negro with a particular mode of living (socio-economic discrimination), a mode of living permitting only those social and economic standards thought commensurate with his "outsider status". Furthermore, this "helot status" affects his economic and social status and economic mobility since the lack of mobility restricts his standard of living, ultimately, offering the white man and immigrant a rationalization for a continued acceptance of the Negro's hereditary inferior status.

Precisely how this takes place may be examined through the Negro's economic status, economic security and occupational status. Economic status, one of the main bulwarks in our materialistic society, is a basic determinant in establishing or circumscribing the potential position of an individual or group on the economic ladder. Economic status includes economic chances and economic standard of living. Together, they are responsible for the particular status ascribed to the individual as a member of a given ethnic group and to the group at large. Thus public acceptance of racial subordination, also accepted by employers and unions, *via* formal and informal controls, affects the Negro's economic status. This is accomplished by artificially manipulating the Negro's economic mobility, permitting the maintenance and reinforcement of the Negro's "outsider status". Concretely, the Negro's economic mobility is affected by restricting his occupational and job mobility by continued eviction from both mechanical and menial jobs by the immigrant.

Since economic status depends upon wages, and wages are recompense for skill, there is an interdependency between the level of economic status one holds and economic mobility, especially so where the Negro is suffering from a low occupational status. Thus the Negro is forced to accept any job he can get when available. Jobs assigned to the Negro pay the least in dollars, restrict the Negro's job mobility to a limited horizontal sphere of employment. Usually, the Negro is unable to entrench himself on this horizontal level because of eviction, – "the white man has to be provided for" – which reveals the additional imposition on the Negro in addition to his job ceiling.

The lack of occupational mobility is further articulated when we examine the quality of Negro economic security and standard of living. If the Negro is so insecure in retaining employment, it follows that his economic security is most precarious, if it can be called "security" at all. Economic security consists of job security. This is important to remember, for security of continuous employment considered alone fails to disclose the effect of earning power which is directly related to occupational status. The higher the occupational

rank, the higher the earning power and the greater is the economic security. A high occupational rank, likewise, affords greater job mobility. Obviously, the specialization of a high rank presupposes some knowledge of preceding operations in the production cycle. Such a qualified person is able to do varied activities in the trade. Thus the supervisory position of a foreman presupposes a certain familiarity with all the operations under his direction. Should a business depression or a reorganization take place, such a man would be able to qualify for a variety of jobs within his field.

Focussing our attention, directly, on the eviction theory, we note that it strengthens the case for continued socio-economic discrimination, a factor influencing the degree of racial subjugation and the circle of discrimination. There was no increase in racial prejudice during the years of European immigration;¹ yet, the immigrant, himself despised by the dominant white group was able to usurp the jobs held by the Negro. The assigned status of outsider to the Negro made his mode of life incompatible with the white man's standards; all white groups, regardless of class status, had to hold a higher socio-economic status than the Negro. Such occurrences are most pronounced in times of economic stress, when even the lowest status jobs are made available to the white man. Hence the implication of a prescribed mode of life carries with it its own standards. To maintain these artificial standards various restrictions are imposed upon the Negro, affecting his economic and social life. In combination, these artificial standards permit continued Negro subjugation. The above is most acceptable to the immigrant since it promotes his own economic and social status in the greater society.

To sum up, we find that the Negro's economic mobility was limited, mainly by public and employer prejudice, during the period from 1860 to 1900. This type of socio-economic discrimination made possible preference for immigrants in employment and their ultimate rise on the occupational ladder, despite their lack of knowledge of the language and culture of our society. The continued depression of the Negro *via* occupational eviction permitted the formation of a continued vicious circle from which the Negro found it rather difficult to extricate himself. He had to wait until World War I, the critical shortage of labor, the curtailment of immigration during this period and the change in our immigration policy following World War I before some occupational security was offered to him.

¹ Based on personal correspondence with Oscar Handlin, letter dated January 18, 1960.