

## Testing the Limits of Tolerance: Blacks and the Social Order in Columbia, Pennsylvania, 1800-1851

Willis L. Shirk, Jr.  
*Columbia, Pennsylvania*

The enforcement of the federal Fugitive Slave Act in 1851 brought into sharp focus the deep racial divisions that had evolved in Columbia, Pennsylvania over the preceding three decades. The new law required U.S. marshals in the northern states to fully cooperate in the arrest and extradition to the South of all alleged fugitive slaves. This act was significant because it, in effect, eliminated the small measure of security blacks had attained in the northern states. Passage of the act made it legal for southern bounty hunters to arrest any African-American who could not prove his or her status as a free person. Northern towns such as Columbia that had large black communities and were located near the South were the first to feel the impact. In the filiopietistic county histories written in the nineteenth century, the early Quaker settlers of Columbia, especially William Wright, were frequently lauded for their role in creating the network of safe houses known as the underground railroad.<sup>1</sup> Closer examination of contemporary records reveals, however, the deep racial and class divisions which were occasioned by rapid economic growth in Columbia between 1820 and 1850.

Despite its relatively small size, Columbia by 1820 contained a high percentage of free blacks living in close proximity with whites, as well as an emergent black middle class similar to that which Gary Nash has described for Philadelphia during the same period.<sup>2</sup> This racial and ethnic diversity, as well as the high population density of the town, caused deep social divisions similar to those responsible for violence in such seaport cities as Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Baltimore during the antebellum period.<sup>3</sup> While outbreaks of racial violence in Columbia in 1834 and 1851 were certainly unique products of actions taken by particular individuals locally, they also illustrated broader patterns of racial violence in the urban North during the antebellum period.

Though Columbia's black population was relatively small during most of the eighteenth century, by 1820 the rate of black immigration to the town greatly exceeded the general rate of population growth. Negro slaves accompanied the first Quaker settlers to Wright's Ferry, the future site of Columbia, in 1726.<sup>4</sup> When Samuel Wright laid out lots for Columbia in 1788, an influx of German and Scots-

Irish settlers had already begun to overwhelm this provincial English Quaker settlement on the Susquehanna. By 1801, there were about forty dwellings in Columbia and the population included ten free blacks and no slaves.<sup>5</sup> By 1820, out of a total population of 1092, Columbia's black population had soared to 288 free blacks and 64 slaves.<sup>6</sup> The availability of work and the town's strong abolitionist ties made it attractive to free blacks, most of whom immigrated from Maryland and upper Virginia. In less than twenty years the African Americans comprised 32% of Columbia's total population.

These recent arrivals were welcomed as valuable laborers in the expanding lumber yards along the Susquehanna River. In 1819, the Wrights provided land for a party of 56 slaves freed by Captain Izard Bacon of Henrico County, Virginia. These freedmen were settled in the northeastern part of the borough that became known as Tow Hill.<sup>7</sup> Two years later, an even larger influx of a hundred manumitted slaves, formerly owned by Sally Bell of Hanover County, Virginia, pulled into the yard of the old Lamb Tavern on Locust Street where they were quartered until additional log and frame dwellings could be erected for them in the rapidly burgeoning Tow Hill.<sup>8</sup>

Courtesy of the Columbia Historic Preservation Society.



March 3, 1930 view of the same block of North Front St. in which Stephen Smith's office was located.

Columbia's expanding black population attracted the notice of fugitive slaves as well as professional slave catchers. R. C. Smedley, writing in 1882, suggested that several spectacular kidnapping attempts, some of which involved the shooting of fugitive slaves, prompted the local English Quakers to organize the Columbia Abolition Society in 1818.<sup>9</sup> Despite the obvious dangers, some African Americans were able to carve out a niche for themselves in a town where economic opportunities abounded. Stephen Smith, an indentured mulatto servant originally owned by local lumber merchant Col. Thomas Boude, was able to purchase his freedom with a loan from Robert Barber in January, 1816.<sup>10</sup> He subsequently entered into the lumber business and later invested heavily in Columbia real estate, much to the chagrin of many poor white working men in the town.

By the second quarter of the nineteenth century in Columbia, a multi-tiered black society was emerging which mirrored the kind of class differentiation Gary Nash has described for Philadelphia during the same period.<sup>11</sup> By 1833, shrewd investment in real estate had ballooned Stephen Smith's overall wealth to an astounding \$6,500.<sup>12</sup> William Worner states that Smith was at one time the largest stockholder in the Columbia Bank.<sup>13</sup> Other African Americans also benefited from Columbia's economic boom. In addition to Smith, 36 other black property owners in Columbia owned real estate which, added together, had a total value of \$8,460.<sup>14</sup> According to the federal census of 1830, Columbia's population had risen to 2046, of which 430 persons, or 21%, were designated as Negro.<sup>15</sup>

Despite Columbia's modest size, its rapid economic growth, its highly diverse and densely co-mingled population created conditions favorable to the development of the kind of urban racial and ethnic instability which swept through many eastern cities in 1834. As early as 1819, Columbia sent a delegation to the Philadelphia "American Convention for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and Improving the Condition of the African Race."<sup>16</sup> In just over a decade, however, it became obvious that, even among white abolitionists in Columbia, there was no consensus on how to deal with increasing racial tensions. In August 1830, many of the original founders of the Columbia Abolition Society, including William Wright, organized themselves into the Columbia Auxiliary Colonization Society. Its mission was to resettle freed slaves in Liberia.<sup>17</sup> Though the original Columbia Abolition Society probably exhibited a strong colonization bias from the beginning, by the 1830s it appears that local blacks had grown increasingly dissatisfied with such policies. In a public meeting held on August 5, 1831, prominent blacks living in the borough, including Stephen Smith, denounced the new colonization society as an

Courtesy of the Columbia Historic Preservation Society.



House that formerly stood at 155 South Fourth Street that was originally occupied by freed slaves. Photographed in April of 1923 just before it was demolished.

instrument of southern policy and resolved to oppose all attempts at colonization in Liberia.<sup>18</sup>

Despite the opposition of the black community, the *Columbia Spy* of January 12, 1833 published an address by the president of the Columbia Colonization Society vigorously defending the colonization scheme.<sup>19</sup> When the *Columbia Spy* later described in vivid detail a series of urban race riots which had swept through several northern cities in the spring and summer of 1834, the Columbia colonization scheme gained new momentum.<sup>20</sup> The first outbreak of racial violence in Columbia was reported in the August 23, 1834 issue of the *Columbia Spy*:

On Saturday, Sunday, and Monday evenings last, the first outbreaks of a riotous disposition were exhibited and the windows of several of the colored people were broken, partly on account of their own imprudence and partly through the prevalent spirit of jealousy and animosity which pervades the county respecting that class of the population.<sup>21</sup>

These incidents were closely followed by an even more violent attack directed toward the inhabitants of Tow Hill the following Tuesday night.<sup>22</sup> Even the editor

of the *Spy* seemed to think that blacks had in some measure brought on the violent attacks by their "imprudence," that is, their presumption that they should enjoy the same opportunities and privileges as their white neighbors.

The existence of 37 black property owners in a town where a large number of whites lived in poverty was particularly galling to those whites who fancied blacks as preternaturally inferior. Clearly, many lower class and ambitious middle class whites deeply resented the upwardly mobile blacks in their midst. In the resolution of a meeting of white working men held in Columbia on August 23, 1834, fears of racial amalgamation and the loss of jobs to blacks were cited as the causes of unrest.<sup>23</sup> A committee was established to determine the size of the black population and ascertain whether black property owners would be willing to sell their holdings.<sup>24</sup> In apparent deference to the committee's wishes, Stephen Smith placed an ad in the September 13, 1834 issue of the *Columbia Spy* offering to sell his entire inventory of lumber as well as all his real estate.<sup>25</sup> In light of the considerable size of his holdings, there is some question as to whether he believed anyone locally could actually make him a serious offer. It is perhaps more likely that he was using the ad to defuse a highly volatile situation.

In spite of Smith's efforts, peace did not prevail. An article in the *Columbia Spy* on October 4, 1834 reported a second wave of riots aimed at the homes of Columbia's black middle class. The root of the disturbance, which included the destruction of Stephen Smith's office on Front Street, was an unsubstantiated rumor of marriage between a black man and a white woman.<sup>26</sup> The frequency with which racial amalgamation was raised by apologists of the rioters in contemporary newspaper articles testifies to the outrage such fears aroused in some segments of the community.

Following this incident, eight young white men were arrested on charges of riot, though all were ultimately found "not guilty" of the charges.<sup>27</sup> Thomas P. Slaughter recently observed that this was the first time in 130 years of court proceedings in Lancaster County that defendants charged with riot against property owners were completely exonerated of the charges, suggesting that protection of property under law was somewhat less secure for blacks than for whites.<sup>28</sup> Interestingly, two thirds of the white rioters were laborers and mechanics not employed full time, while the remaining third appear to have been recently-arrived, socially-ambitious middle class men.<sup>29</sup> Perhaps because of their own lack of financial security these individuals were more prone than other Columbia residents to feel themselves in competition with the town's black property owners.

Courtesy of the Columbia Historic Preservation Society.



Courtesy of the Columbia Historic Preservation Society.



*Two views of one of the original cabins built on Tow Hill by freed slaves circa 1820. The building was demolished shortly after this photograph was taken in 1942.*

Though ostensibly Stephen Smith's properties were all for sale, he continued to engage in real estate speculation in Columbia. Some local whites grew incensed when Smith "bid up" the price of Columbia real estate at auctions, and in February 1835, he received an anonymous letter threatening his person.<sup>30</sup> In response, William Wright and several other prominent white businessmen had the letter published in the *Spy*, along with a warning that they considered any attack on Smith an attack upon their own financial interests in Smith's business.<sup>31</sup> This consolidation of public support for Stephen Smith by a white upper class element in the community apparently quelled, for the moment, the threat of overt action by disgruntled whites. Nonetheless, Columbia's white population remained divided on issues of race. One extreme threatened violence against an upper class black man, while the other went so far as to help Stephen Smith and William Whipper hide fugitive slaves in the false ends of rail cars which Smith ran between Columbia and Philadelphia.<sup>32</sup> The racial unrest of 1834 took its toll on Columbia's black community. While the number of black property owners in Columbia remained stable at about 37 throughout this period, black population growth may have declined slightly.<sup>33</sup> According to the Census of 1840, Columbia had 455 blacks living in the borough, representing just 17% of a total population numbering 2719.<sup>34</sup> In view of the tendency of the census to undercount by as much as 25%, it is unclear whether such an apparent decrease is statistically significant, but it would not be surprising to find that, in the wake of the riots, some blacks felt less secure in Columbia and therefore might be inclined to seek opportunities elsewhere. In 1836 Stephen Smith was moved to write a letter to John Strohm of Harrisburg, reminding him of the recent lawless events in Columbia. Smith implored Strohm to exercise his influence to persuade the state legislature to resist the blandishments of southern politicians and ensure equal protection of the rights of all people in the state regardless of their race.<sup>35</sup>

As the national abolitionist movement became increasingly divided over the question of gradual versus immediate abolition, Columbians struggled to resolve racial questions on a local scale. Perhaps seeking direction, the Columbia Abolition Society, for the first time since 1819, sent a delegation to a meeting of the American Convention for the Abolition of Slavery which met in New York in August 1837.<sup>36</sup> At the meeting, sentiments of some white abolitionists, such as those in Columbia who favored the colonization of freed slaves, angered blacks who dreamed of citizenship in the nation of their birth. Once splintered into factions, the American Convention was never able to regain its former unity and was, in fact, dissolved the following year. Columbia Abolitionists returned from the convention with little direction on how to cope with the town's growing racial unrest.

The federal census of 1850 provides a far more comprehensive picture of the demography of antebellum Columbia than is available for any previous year. Of a total population of 4140, there were 873 people or 21% of the population who could claim African descent.<sup>37</sup> The percentage of black residents matched the 1830 level while the number of black property owners had increased to 61, indicating steady growth of a black middle class. Of the black males enumerated, 84% were described as unskilled day laborers; another 3.5% were employed as waiters, porters, housekeepers and gardeners; leaving over 12% engaged in such professional occupations as conductors, clerks and hotel hosts. In addition, two shopkeepers, two lumber merchants, a teacher and a clergyman were reported as part of Columbia's black work force. More than half of the African-Americans had been born in the upper slave states and another third were born in Pennsylvania.<sup>38</sup> The number of free slaves, coupled with the proximity of Columbia to the slave states, made local blacks particularly vulnerable to the operations of professional slave catchers.

Ethnic and racial diversity contributed to the urban character of an otherwise small community. Of the 873 individuals in Columbia who could claim African descent, fully 549, or 67% were described as mulatto. The census also shows that 11.2% of the white population was born outside the United States with 61.8% coming from Germany and 35.8% coming from Ireland.<sup>39</sup> Further, the total population of Columbia had nearly doubled in the past decade and social tensions were aggravated by a relatively high population density. At that time, the town only extended five blocks back from the river and heavy traffic was centered on the canal basin, railroad depots, lumber yards, anthracite iron furnaces, rolling mills, and machine shops along the shore.<sup>40</sup>

During the 1840s, Columbia remained an important entrepot for fugitive slaves fleeing Maryland and Virginia. The success of the underground railroad during these years is evidenced by the scarcity of contemporary newspaper accounts of successful captures of fugitives, despite the permanent residence of professional slave catchers in Columbia. In a letter to William Still, William Whipper recalls that "... in the three years from 1847 to 1850, I passed hundreds to the land of freedom, while others, induced by high wages, and the feeling they were safe in Columbia, worked in the lumber and coal yards of this place."<sup>41</sup> Whipper, a black man who managed Smith's lumber operations during these years, always encouraged the fugitives to go on to Canada, but other local merchants persuaded many to remain, secure in the conviction they would be safe in Columbia. This comfortable



Courtesy of the Columbia Historic Preservation Society.



Second Columbia Town Hall that stood from 1832 to 1873. It was here that William Baker was taken after his arrest on January 28, 1851. It also was the site where abolitionist C. M. Burleigh was prevented from giving a lecture by an unruly white mob on February 8, 1951. Photograph was taken between 1869 and 1873.

sense of security experienced by many local blacks was shattered with the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. Suddenly, local newspapers were filled with dramatic accounts of both successful and unsuccessful slave captures. These incidents fueled old racial animosities which had been seething just beneath the surface since 1834. Again, racial unrest erupted in Columbia.

Since few records survive of the *Columbia Spy* for the year 1851, the following accounts are derived largely from articles which appear in Lancaster newspapers. The January 28, 1851 issue of the *Lancaster Intelligencer* printed a letter from a

Columbia correspondent reporting a “great excitement” arising from the arrest of William Baker, alleged to be Stephen Bennet, a slave who had escaped from the Baltimore County plantation of C. B. Gallup.<sup>42</sup> What is particularly interesting about this incident is that it occasioned a series of letters to the *Intelligencer* over the succeeding months by this articulate Columbia correspondent who attacked both abolitionists and the local authorities for allegedly prosecuting white, but not black, rioters.

According to the account provided by the *Intelligencer* correspondent, known only by his pseudonym “Tattler”:

The fugitive slave was brought to the office of esquire Brooks; but as soon as he saw the young man alluded to above he “bolted,” but was soon overtaken and properly secured in the Squire’s office. A large concourse of people soon filled the street in front of the office, and in thirty minutes “Tow Hill” came down en masse, some of whom threatened a rescue. The women exhibited a more intractable spirit than the men. . . . When removing Bennet from the office to the car which was to take him to Phila., the most intense feeling prevailed. The “higher law” men, got upon Col. Herr’s piazza to look down; but the democracy stood on the ground, recognizing no higher law than the Constitution of the United States of America. A fierce shout was given as a signal for rescue; but the leader, a desperate negro by the name of Cole, who swore he would shoot the police officers as he would squirrels, was felled to the earth just in time to save his life, for if he had advanced two paces further, a dozen bullets would have riddled him.<sup>43</sup>

The account goes on to allege that this same Cole, a twenty-six-year old laborer born in Pennsylvania, shot and wounded Bennet’s captor during the arrest.<sup>44</sup>

There is some question as to the validity of the latter charge. In the February 11, 1851 issue of the *Intelligencer*, the editor of the *Columbia Spy* asserted that there “is not a particle of truth” to Tattler’s charge that Cole shot a police officer, or even discharged a pistol at anyone during the affair.<sup>45</sup> Obviously, there was a fractious debate in progress between the editor of the *Spy* and the correspondent for the *Intelligencer* over the incident, but arguments on only one side of the issue have survived. After quoting the *Spy*’s denial, Tattler wrote: “I repeat again that this yellow, copper-headed negro *did* shoot a white man, and injured him to the extent given in your discourteous extract. . . .”<sup>46</sup> By describing Cole as a “copper headed negro,” Tattler probably hoped to capitalize on white fears of miscegenation by reminding Lancastrians of the high proportion of mulattos in Columbia’s population. He expressed disgust that local citizens had succeeded in raising \$700 to purchase the fugitive’s freedom when some houses in Columbia could be bought for

as little as \$500. Finally, he proceeded to detail the living conditions of 200 white persons in Columbia who were ill clad and ill fed and emphasized the plight of white women who subsisted on 12¢ a day making shirts. He argued that the \$700 foolishly squandered on the freedom of a single slave could house, feed, and clothe hundreds of "our own people."<sup>47</sup> The *Saturday Express*, another Lancaster newspaper, offered some confirmation of these figures by reporting that there were in Columbia at that time, "upwards of fifty white families in destitute circumstances."<sup>48</sup> Tattler went on to remind his readers that only a few years before one Benjamin Peart had been murdered by the very former slave whom he had helped to free.

In the February 18 issue of the *Intelligencer*, Tattler provides a brief account of the cancellation of a lecture by Philadelphia abolitionist C. M. Burleigh who had been scheduled to speak in the Columbia town hall. "Our citizens assembled en masse and made every preparation to tar and feather the lecturer and ride him on a rail."<sup>49</sup> This event illustrates the deep divisions of opinion over race in Columbia in 1851. Obviously one faction of the population had invited this radical Philadelphia abolitionist to speak in the Columbia Town Hall, yet he was not permitted to speak by another faction of the community who found his presence distasteful. In the February 25 issue, Tattler provides evidence that local authorities were anxious to restore order to the town after this unsavory affair:

Several of our citizens have been arrested as violators of the peace . . . . It becomes my painful duty to let you know that they are bound over to court in the sum of three hundred dollars as *rioters*! The suit has been instituted by our Chief Burgess, at the instance of a few men who are determined to prosecute "poor white trash" to the extatic [sic] gratification of all "TowHill."<sup>50</sup>

Tattler goes so far as to admit that the rioters might be found guilty under the law, but by the sense of this community, they were no rioters. . . . Their crime consists in opposing the delivery of sentiments which have for their object the dissolution of our great family of States. They would not allow a white negro to insult the modesty of our mothers and our sisters by preaching his odious doctrine of amalgamation of races and colour.<sup>51</sup>

The balance of this article consists of a diatribe against those individuals responsible for prosecuting the "rioters." In describing Mr. Burleigh as a "white negro" and citing his doctrine as a threat to the virtue of white womanhood, Tattler was again using a defense of feminine virtue to inflame white male readers. The *Saturday Express* of February 22 described the incident in somewhat less inflammatory language while still suggesting that Mr. Burleigh should have been arrested for

Courtesy of the Columbia Historic Preservation Society.



Late nineteenth century view of Front Street above Locust Street that gives a flavor of the urban character of Columbia. None of these buildings survive.

advocating a treasonable disregard for the Constitution in opposing enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Act.<sup>52</sup> As in the weeks following the violence of 1834, defenders of a lawless white mob played upon the latent fears of miscegenation held by many whites in the community. Clearly, Tattler saw the threat of southern secession as a consequence of unreasonable demands made by northern abolitionist agitators such as C. M. Burleigh.

Tattler's letters continued to appear regularly over the succeeding weeks and he reported on March 4 that two more fugitive slaves were arrested in Columbia and returned to Philadelphia without incident.<sup>53</sup> An article appearing in the *Lancaster Examiner and Herald* on March 12 detailed another slave arrest in Columbia where the fugitives were a man and his pregnant wife who had a nine or ten-year old son said to have been born in Pennsylvania.<sup>54</sup> Clearly, these fugitives were not recent arrivals in Columbia. By March 19, 1851, a fugitive mother and her son were arrested in Columbia and removed to Philadelphia without incident, suggesting that open resistance to the enforcement of the law had greatly diminished.<sup>55</sup>

The last of Tattler's incendiary correspondence appeared in the April 8, 1851 issue of the *Intelligencer*, where he promised to relate the results of the trials of the Columbia "rioters" in the next issue.<sup>56</sup> The Quarter Sessions Docket reveals that eight defendants were charged in Columbia with assembling on the evening of February 8 in a "riotous & tumultuous manner, disturbing the peace of our Borough and made attempts to injure the persons and property of some of the citizens."<sup>57</sup> The named defendants were Joseth Hogendobler, David Wilson, James Browen, John Yeanish, John Swaney, John McAnall, Joseph Emes, and Jacob Stein. The charges were ignored and the county paid the costs. Tattler's correspondence first appeared in print with the arrest of William Baker in January and ceased abruptly just before the Columbia defendants were acquitted of riot charges. A case could be made that the anonymous Tattler was a southern agitator who came to Columbia to stir up anti-abolitionist sentiment in the months prior to active enforcement of the new Fugitive Slave Law. Evidence that some contemporaries thought this might be the case is suggested in one letter where Tattler acknowledges that local authorities had offered a reward for the disclosure of his identity.<sup>58</sup>

It is apparent that deep divisions of opinion over racial issues continued to plague Columbia seventeen years after the riots of 1834. In 1851 the percentage of the black population in Columbia had again climbed to 21% while the size of the black property-owning middle class had nearly doubled since 1834. Twenty-six-year old William Baker, born Stephen Bennet, was neither a poor man nor a newcomer to Columbia. The 1850 Census records show that he owned property valued at \$500 in that year.<sup>59</sup> For a period after arrests began under the new Fugitive Slave Law, the citizens of Tow Hill assembled in large numbers to register their indignation when fugitive slaves were arrested. Enforcement of the law ultimately prevailed, however, and neither white abolitionists or blacks were arrested in 1851 for interfering with the capture of fugitive slaves in Columbia. Nonetheless, the black community was a force to be reckoned with. Not only were they able to raise \$700 in just a few days to purchase Baker's freedom, but they also took out an ad in the *Spy* thanking those white Columbians who had rendered financial support.<sup>60</sup> In this way, leaders in the black community were able to acknowledge ties to influential segments of the white middle and upper class in Columbia while at the same time deflecting attention from their own financial resources.

There is tremendous irony in the fact that, after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, a black property owner could himself be legally seized as prop-

erty and returned to his former station as a slave. This was, in fact, the plight of William Baker, whose arrest in 1851 became a cause of celebration for many working class white men in Columbia who were jealous of the growing black middle class and fearful of increased racial mixing. Swelled by a rapid influx of German and Irish immigrants, Columbia's working class was representative of the two ethnic groups which played a central role in the racial violence of the nation's larger eastern cities. Grown bold from the enforcement of the new law, young toughs drove an abolitionist speaker from the town on the evening of February 8, accusing him of preaching racial amalgamation, aggravating Southerners toward secession, and creating an unfair job competition which they believed condemned many white Columbians to poverty. Poor working class white families found an articulate and impassioned advocate in Tattler, who used the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Act as an occasion to ignite the fear and anger many of them felt toward the black community.

The roots of the racial unrest in Columbia in 1851 lay in the deep social divisions that had emerged over the past three decades. William Wright, a founder of the "underground railroad," was dead and Columbia's abolitionist movement had splintered. No longer a Quaker enclave, Columbia's idealism of an earlier generation was eroded by the harsh realities of a multi-racial and multi-ethnic urban society. Further, the racial violence that occurred in Columbia during the opening months of 1851 provides a social context for the more famous Christiana Riot that took place in September of the same year, when fugitive slaves violently resisted enforcement of the new Fugitive Slave Law. While antebellum Columbia may have been a land of economic opportunity for blacks fleeing bondage in the South, enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law in the Spring of 1851 revealed seething tensions of race and class, attributable largely to the improving economic fortunes of the community's black citizens.

## Notes

1. The most important recent work dealing with antebellum race relations in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania is Thomas P. Slaughter's *Bloody Dawn, The Christiana Riot and Racial Violence in the Antebellum North* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). Older works have tended to rely heavily on the massive, but undocumented, work of Samuel Ellis and Franklin Evans, *History of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Everts & Peck, 1883). An important source of information about the 1851 Fugitive Slave Law is Stanley Campbell's *The Slave Catchers: Enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law, 1850-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1970). Other important background can be gleaned from the work of James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York, 1988) and Winthrop Jordan, *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro: 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968).
2. Gary B. Nash, *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), p. 213.
3. *Ibid.*, 273-274. *Lancaster Journal*, July 18, 1834, August 19, 1834, December 20, 1834.
4. Society of Colonial Dames of America, *Susanna Wright, 1697-1784* (Lancaster: Privately printed, 1906), p. 15.
5. *Population Schedules for the Second Census of the United States* (1800) for Hempfield Township, National Archives Microfilm Publication (NAMP) on deposit with Lancaster County Historical Society (LCHS).
6. *Fourth Federal Household Census* (1820) for Columbia Borough, NAMP Microcopy 33, Roll 106 on deposit with LCHS.
7. Ellis and Evans, *Lancaster County*, p. 74.
8. R. C. Smedley, *History of the Underground Railroad in Chester and the Neighboring Counties of Pennsylvania* (Lancaster: Office of the Journal, 1883) 28. Also see Ellis & Evans, p. 74.
9. Smedley, *Underground Railroad*, p. 26.
10. William Frederic Wörner, "The Columbia Race Riots," *Papers Read Before the Lancaster County Historical Society*, 26, (1922): 176-177.
11. Nash, *Forging Freedom*, p. 213.
12. Leroy T. Hopkins, "Black Eldorado on the Susquehanna: The Emergence of Black Columbia (1726-1861)," *Journal of the Lancaster County Historical Society*, 89 (1985): 119.
13. Wörner, "Columbia Race Riots," p. 177.
14. Hopkins, "Black Eldorado," p. 119.
15. *Fifth Federal Household Census* (1830) for Columbia Borough, NAMP Microcopy 19, Roll 153, p. 304, on deposit with LCHS.
16. *Minutes for the American Convention for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and Improving the Condition of the African Race* (Philadelphia, 1819), pp. 11-14.
17. William Frederic Wörner, "The Lancaster County Colonization Society," *Papers Read Before the Lancaster County Historical Society*, 26 (1922): 108.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
19. *Columbia Spy*, July 12, 1833, 2.
20. "Riots in Philadelphia, Second Night," and "Philadelphia Riots, Third Night," *Columbia Spy*, August 19, 1834, 2.
21. *Columbia Spy*, August 23, 1834, 2.
22. Slaughter, *Bloody Dawn*, pp. 164-181. See also: Wörner, "Race Riots," pp. 175-187; Hopkins, "Black Eldorado," pp. 120-122.
23. *Columbia Spy*, August 30, 1834, 2.
24. *Columbia Spy*, September 6, 1834, 3.
25. "Notice," *Columbia Spy*, September 13, 1834, 3.
26. "Occurance at Night," *Columbia Spy*, October 4, 1834, 2.
27. Commonwealth vs. John Lightener and others for attack on James Smith and Commonwealth vs. John Lightener and others for attack on James Richards, *Lancaster County Quarter Sessions Docket Book*, November, 1834.
28. Slaughter, *Bloody Dawn*, p. 179.
29. Carl Oblinger, "New Freedoms, Old Miseries:

The Emergence and Disruption of Black Communities in Southeastern Pennsylvania, 1780-1860," (Ph.D. Diss., Lehigh University, 1988), p. 21.

30. "Advertisement," *Columbia Spy*, March 7, 1835, 3.

31. "Enquiry being made . . .," *Columbia Spy*, March 28, 1835, 3.

32. Smedley, *Underground Railroad*, p. 46.

33. Tax Lists for Columbia Borough, microfilm on deposit at LCHS.

34. *Sixth Federal Household Census* (1840) for Columbia Borough, NAMP Microcopy T-5, Roll 156, pp. 176-191 on file LCHS.

35. Letter from Stephen Smith to John Strohm, January 15, 1836, Ms. in John Strohm Papers on deposit at Pennsylvania State Archives, Ms. Group 121, Box 1, No. 265.

36. Robert Duane Sayre, "The Evolution of Early American Abolitionism: The American Convention for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and Improving the Condition of the African Race" (Ph.D. Diss., Ohio State University, 1987), p. 311.

37. *Seventh Federal Household Census* (1850) for Columbia Borough, NAMP Microcopy 432, Roll 787, pp. 202-251 on deposit LCHS.

38. *ibid.*, 202-251.

39. *Ibid.*

40. Map of Columbia in 1850, photocopy labeled L-29 on deposit LCHS.

41. William Still, *The Underground Railroad* (Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1872), p. 736.

42. "Great Excitement in Columbia," *Lancaster Intelligencer*, January 28, 1851, 2. *Lancaster Satur-*

*day Express* February 1, 1851, 2.

43. *Lancaster Intelligencer*, January 28, 1851, 2.

44. *Ibid.*, 2.

45. "Letter From Columbia," *Lancaster Intelligencer*, February 11, 1851, 2.

46. *Ibid.*, 2.

47. *Ibid.*, 2.

48. *Lancaster Saturday Express*, February 22, 1851, 2.

49. *Lancaster Intelligencer*, February 18, 1851, 2.

50. *Lancaster Intelligencer*, February 25, 1851, 2.

51. *Ibid.*, 2.

52. "Mob Law in Columbia," *Lancaster Saturday Express*, February 22, 1851, 2.

53. *Lancaster Intelligencer*, March 4, 1851, 2.

54. "Fugitive Slave Case," *Lancaster Examiner and Herald*, March 12, 1851, 2.

55. "Surrender of Fugitive Slaves," *Lancaster Examiner and Herald*, March 19, 1851, 2.

56. "Letter From Columbia," *Lancaster Intelligencer*, April 8, 1851, 2.

57. "Commonwealth vs. Joseph Hogendobler, et. al.," *Lancaster County Docket Book* Vol. 17 (1851-1853), 28. See also Complaint sworn out by Amos Green, Chief Burgess of Columbia Borough against the defendants on February 12, 1851, Ms. on deposit with LCHS.

58. *Lancaster Intelligencer*, March 11, 1851, 2.

59. *Seventh Household Census* (1850), microfilm on deposit with LCHS.

60. "The Late Slave Case," *Lancaster Saturday Express*, February 8, 1851, 2.