



RHODE ISLAND
HISTORY

VOL. 23, NO. 3

JULY, 1964

PUBLISHED BY THE RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
52 POWER STREET, PROVIDENCE 6, RHODE ISLAND

GEORGE C. DAVIS, *president*

NATHANIEL M. VOSE, JR., *treasurer*

FRANK L. HINGCKLEY, JR., *secretary*

CLIFFORD P. MONAHAN, *director*

CLARKSON A. COLLINS, 3RD, *librarian*

*The Rhode Island Historical Society assumes no responsibility
for the statements or the opinions of contributors.*

ISSUED QUARTERLY AT PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

(Second-class postage paid at Providence, Rhode Island)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
RHODE ISLAND COTTON MANUFACTURING	65
by Peter J. Coleman	
THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF A CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST	81
by Charles R. Crowe	
JOHN SMITH, THE MILLER, OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND	
SOME OF HIS DESCENDANTS	90
by Charles William Farnham	
[continued from April, 1964, v. 23, no. 2, page 60]	
NEW MEMBERS	Back Cover

COVER

KEYSTONE FROM JOHN BROWN HOUSE

The following quotation is from *Publications of The Rhode Island Historical Society*, New Series, v. 6, no. 3, October 1898, p. 162:

There is in the cabinet a figurhead of decidedly pleasing aspect. It is made of different materials and has the appearance of having once served as the key to an arch. It came from the John Brown (now the Professor Gammell) house that was built by the former in 1786. According to a statement made by Professor Gammell, this head was removed from its old locality about 1853, when he and Mrs. Gammell took possession of that estate.

In 1898, when this note was made, the editor could not know that sixty-six years later John Brown House would be the headquarters of the Historical Society. The keystone head came back to the place of its origin in 1942 when the Society moved to 52 Power Street.

It was doubtless this year of 1853, "when he and Mrs. Gammell took possession of that estate," that the three-story ell was added to the main block of John Brown House. It may well be that in order to connect the second floor of the main house with the second floor of the newly-built ell, a Palladian window on the landing of the stairs was removed in order to make a passage from the front to the rear of the house. This Palladian window, overlooking the gardens at the north of the mansion, might well have had the keystone with the carved head.

Could it be possible that this is a sculptured portrait of John Brown, the builder of the house? There are those who believe in this theory.

FUND DRIVE GOAL, NEW LIBRARY CLOSE AT HAND

TO ALL MEMBERS AND FRIENDS:

Progress with history is in the making. We are taking some giant steps forward . . . and gaining momentum and enthusiasm as we move ahead.

Ours is a most difficult role, for we are charged with preserving in a most accurate manner that which has come before us. And while doing this we must also project our Society and its historical treasures into the daily life of our community.

The Historical Society is on the threshold of new-found vigor and vitality — made possible through your generosity and continued interest.

Fund drive results near goal

Our Development Fund is more than two thirds of the way to its goal of \$150,000. The present receipts are at \$108,000. And most important, we have a \$5,000 incentive gift waiting for us when we reach the \$145,000 mark — made possible through the generosity of one of our donors.

New library a reality by this fall

The architects have completed plans for the restoration of our new library at the corner of Power and Hope streets. This accomplishment will be a most gratifying tribute to your efforts, and will be *the* focal point in the state in terms of a reference library for historical research and reading enjoyment.

Once the preparatory work has been completed, we shall move our volumes from John Brown House to their new home as quickly as possible. Hopefully, the new library will be fully operational by the first of October of this year.

Refurbishing of John Brown House

Work on John Brown House will begin as soon as our library has been relocated. A committee is presently being formed for this important task. John Brown House will then be a fine museum and display center that will reflect the pride of our Society's membership and friends.

Your generosity and splendid support is deeply appreciated. For without you the Society could not be the monument to our Rhode Island history that it is fast becoming.

Yes, we are making magnificent progress with our history.

Cordially,

GEORGE C. DAVIS, *president*

IMPORTANT NOTICE

The first floor of John Brown House will remain open during the summer. Beginning July first the library will be closed until further notice in preparation for moving to 121 Hope Street.

Please note the Open Hours at John Brown House, effective July first, as printed below:

OPEN HOURS at JOHN BROWN HOUSE

Tuesday through Friday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Saturday and Sunday afternoons 2 to 4 p.m.

Closed Mondays

OPEN OTHER HOURS BY APPOINTMENT

Closed on Jan. 1, Feb. 22, Easter Sunday,
May 30, July 4, Aug. 14, Labor Day, Oct. 12,
Nov. 11, Thanksgiving and Christmas.

RHODE ISLAND HISTORY

VOL. 23

JULY, 1964

NO. 3

RHODE ISLAND COTTON MANUFACTURING

A Study in Economic Conservatism

by PETER J. COLEMAN

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin

THE HISTORY OF RHODE ISLAND presents a paradox. Down through the years the colony and state have always manifested an intriguing blend of conservatism and radicalism. As one might expect, the innovators seem to have had the greater influence. Their efforts have ranged over many fields; their names form the warp and woof of the Narragansett Bay story. They include Roger Williams and ideas fundamental to the growth of individual liberty; Thomas Wilson Dorr and the struggle to democratize Rhode Island government; Francis Wayland and the transformation of higher education; Brown and Ives and the development of the fabulous East India trade; Samuel Slater and the rise of cotton manufacturing; and Jabez Gorham and the establishment of the silver industry.

The thread of conservatism in Rhode Island history is less well known. Yet the colony which was the first to declare itself independent of Great Britain was also the last to embody the liberal principles of the Revolution in its system of government; Rhode Island lagged behind other New England states in the creation of a system of free public education; throughout most of the nineteenth century it had a higher incidence of child labor than any other Northern state; it resisted extending political equality to foreign-born citizens until 1886; and, despite the efforts of reformers dating back to Dorrist days, as late as 1905, Lincoln Steffens could write about Rhode Island as a "State for Sale."

The paradox of receptiveness to some kinds of change but not to others even existed within the textile industry, the field of economic activity in which Rhode Islanders prided themselves on their leader-

ship. Conservatism appeared early and was nowhere more apparent than in the slowness with which cotton manufacturers adopted power weaving. In effect, a technological lag of more than a decade occurred between the invention of the power loom and its widespread utilization by Rhode Island cotton manufacturers. The explanation for this delay lies in a combination of entrepreneurial conservatism and economic circumstances.

For almost a generation after 1790, American millowners struggled with the cumbersome hand-weaving system, but even after 1808, when the Jeffersonian Embargo and the war with Great Britain gave them a virtual monopoly of the growing domestic market for cotton textiles, their efforts to increase production were hamstrung by their ignorance of the technology of power weaving. Despite the incentive of high profits, they could not expand spinning capacity beyond the ability of hand weavers to turn yarn into cloth.

To be sure, Great Britain guarded her industrial secrets by prohibiting the emigration of skilled workers and the export of machinery, but in the long run these restrictions merely delayed rather than prevented American manufacturers acquiring power looms. Nevertheless, when the technological breakthrough occurred — in 1815 in Waltham, Massachusetts, and in 1815 and 1816 in South Kingstown and North Providence, Rhode Island — economic conditions discouraged the installation of the expensive new equipment and, in the case of Rhode Island, a growing conservatism reinforced the reluctance to mechanize production.¹

To a certain extent, industrialists had good reason to proceed cautiously. The flood of British cotton goods after the War of 1812 caused severe hardship throughout the American textile industry. Those Rhode Island firms which did not fail outright stayed in business only by practicing rigid economy and by drawing on the large profits they had accumulated during the war.² Even the Tariff of 1816, by which Congress intended to protect the fledgling American industry against British competition, gave Rhode Island mills less support than anticipated. This was particularly true of the producers of gingham, the local specialty. Some manufacturers saved themselves from the competition of foreign calicoes only by shifting to the production of fine quality goods, the duties on which were high enough to give them a price advantage over English mills.

But depression and competition only partially explain the slowness with which Rhode Island producers converted to power weaving. The continued reliance on child labor, the failure to reorganize production along the large-scale, fully integrated lines adopted by the Lowells and Lawrences in Massachusetts, and, particularly, the refusal of Samuel Slater to finance William Gilmore's efforts to reproduce the Scotch-style power loom reflected a growing conservatism in Rhode Island industrial circles.³ In part, this cautiousness represented a weakening of the daring sense of risk taking which had characterized the entrepreneurial spirit in privateering and slaving ventures in the eighteenth century, the opening of the Far Eastern and Latin American trades after the Revolution, and, indeed, the establishment of cotton manufacturing itself.

What had happened to the Rhode Island entrepreneurial spirit? The answer lies in geography, in business trends, and, perhaps above all, in the resilience and flexibility of industrial leadership. With the exception of the Fall River area of Tiverton, southeastern Rhode Island had developed virtually no textile interests. The shortage of water power ruled out significant industrial development.⁴ Anyway, the British occupation during the Revolution had broken Newport's spirit, and though maritime trade seemed to revive after 1783, the port hardly grew at all until the opening decade of the nineteenth century. Even this recovery proved temporary, for the Embargo of 1808 and the War of 1812 first paralyzed Newport's commerce, then destroyed the town's will to survive as a major southern New England center. During the critical fifteen years after the Treaty of Ghent, Newport contributed little capital or energy to the transformation of the Rhode Island textile industry. In truth, Newport stood apart from the rest of the state, an anachronism drawing little from and contributing still less to Rhode Island's economic development.⁵

For quite different reasons, Bristol also lived apart from the rest of the state. It too lacked the water power to industrialize. But unlike Newport, Bristol suffered from an excess rather than a shortage of entrepreneurial resilience. Through George DeWolf, that maverick in a brilliant family of merchant-adventurers, Bristol met the challenge to its maritime interests after 1815 by plunging into various "black-birding" and piratical enterprises. A few prudent investors such as

James DeWolf excepted,⁶ Bristol diverted its resources to these nefarious activities and thus played no part in shaping Rhode Island's industrial pattern.

This placed the responsibility for innovation in the textile industry squarely on the shoulders of businessmen in the northern and western segments of the state. On the whole, they moved cautiously. Although the third largest cotton mill in New England, the Coventry Company, converted to power weaving in 1817,⁷ the majority of manufacturers accepted the new technology so slowly that a decade later only a third of Rhode Island's 110 cotton mills had installed power looms.⁸ Of the remainder, about half had integrated production but still used hand looms; the other half spun yarn and twist for outright sale or, frequently, to be put out to hand weavers. Even in 1832, sixteen years after Gilmore had developed his power loom, at least a tenth of the mills did no weaving whatsoever. By that time Massachusetts had replaced Rhode Island as the leading American cotton manufacturing state.⁹

Rhode Island's declining importance was directly attributable to technological lags. Four factors were primarily responsible. The most important was a sheer lack of nerve. In sharp contrast to their behavior during the critical five years preceding the Embargo of 1808, when the cotton industry expanded rapidly through a massive shift of capital from maritime to industrial uses, after 1815 Rhode Islanders no longer set the pace. Instead of shifting with the times as Boston entrepreneurs were doing, or even anticipating and making trends, they moved belatedly and only after they could no longer resist change.

A shortage of venture capital partially inhibited innovation. In the straitened conditions of the postwar world, small operators experienced difficulty in raising funds to purchase power looms at seventy dollars apiece. But the leading industrialists, such as the Slaters and the Browns, had ample resources. In reality, Rhode Island suffered not so much from a dearth of risk capital as from unwillingness to venture it.

Vested interests also slowed the rate of technological change. Some millowners resisted altering the established way of conducting their operations. The relative newcomers especially, many of whom were farmers, mechanics, and millwrights, were satisfied to have mastered the techniques of spinning and to have learned how to organize hand

weaving. They had no stomach for complicating their enterprises by introducing power weaving. They refused to invest in new looms, to learn the new technology, to retrain their workers, and to adjust their marketing arrangements to new products. Thinking of this kind was particularly characteristic of those who relied heavily on child labor. Power weaving, they were quick to appreciate, would require a much higher proportion of adults in their labor force and would increase their wage costs. Slater himself had chosen not to venture into woolen manufacturing on precisely these grounds, and many other cotton manufacturers preferred to keep down their capital investment and labor costs by operating only the relatively simple spinning machinery which could be tended by children under the watchful eyes of a few overseers.

Finally, the Rhode Island cotton industry had a major investment in the putting-out system of hand weaving. More than a decade in the making, it had developed in response to clearly felt needs. By 1817 it was working tolerably efficiently and, despite some deficiencies, it satisfied most manufacturers. This was particularly true for the production of plaid and checked goods which, it transpired, could not be woven on the crude power looms initially available.

From the outset of their cotton manufacturing experiment in 1790, Almy and Brown shrewdly recognized that the success of their pioneer Pawtucket venture depended as much upon their ability to market their yarn as on their capacity to spin it. As Moses Brown observed to Slater, "Thee must shut down thy gates or thee will spin all my farms into cotton yarn."¹⁰ Fortunately for the partners, and this was one of the great assets of the pioneer merchant-industrialists, they had the commercial connections, knowledge, experience, and organization to grapple effectively with marketing problems. They began by selling their yarn to local hand weavers, then gradually expanded their sales area until it extended from Portland in the north to Baltimore in the south and Albany in the west. As a temporary inducement to retailers to stock yarn, Almy and Brown sold on consignment, allowing their agents a commission varying from 2½ to 5 per cent on sales. From 1790 to 1800 the consignment system moved sufficient yarn to enable the partners to increase production fairly steadily and gave them a reasonable return on their investment.¹¹

This method of marketing yarn produced problems as well as profits. The consignment system soon became permanent, mainly because retailers and wholesalers refused to invest their own capital in the trade by purchasing yarn outright. In effect, they forced manufacturers to assume all the risks. Too, as more and more mills went into operation, agents used their competitive advantage to demand liberalized terms in the form of higher commissions, extended credit, and larger discounts for prompt remittance. And increasingly, mill-owners had to accept payment in kind rather than in cash. Although they bartered such goods for raw materials, used them to pay their mill hands, or disposed of them in their capacity as merchants, the consignment system grew more and more burdensome.¹²

Manufacturers secured some relief after 1804 when commission merchants in the major commercial centers began to serve as middlemen between the producer and the smaller wholesaler and the local retailer. This drastically reduced the number of agents with whom the millowner had direct relations, reduced his marketing overhead, and freed him to devote additional time and energy to production problems.¹³

Cotton spinners had no sooner begun to derive tangible benefits from this more efficient system of disposing of their yarn than the textile market underwent another major change. Consumer demand, especially in the rapidly growing western areas extending from upstate New York and Pennsylvania into Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee, shifted from yarn to finished cloth. This forced a radical reorganization on millowners and for the first time in the history of the American textile industry involved them directly and on a large scale in the manufacture of cloth. Although some producers continued to market yarn in the same way as before or brought hand weavers into the mill, the majority turned to the putting-out system as the most satisfactory way of meeting the new demand.¹⁴

At first, millowners organized production themselves and dealt directly with individual weavers either at the mill or at stores in the major population centers. Factories in the Pawtuxet and southern Blackstone valleys had direct access to a large number of weavers. By contemporary American standards, this crescent-shaped region extending from Scituate and Warwick through Cranston and Provi-

dence into North Providence, Cumberland, and Smithfield was densely inhabited, had a population that was increasing fairly rapidly, and enjoyed the advantage of an efficient, well-organized system of transportation. The remoter mills to the south and west, by contrast, had difficulty in reaching sufficient weavers to maintain the flow of production. Many overseers shared the trials and tribulations suffered by Rowland Hazard, the pioneer woolen manufacturer of Peace Dale in South Kingstown, who rode the length and breadth of Washington County leaving webs of yarn at various homes to be woven into cloth. Sometimes he had to call as many as a dozen times before he could collect the finished product from delinquent weavers.¹⁵

As they gained experience with the putting-out system, manufacturers gradually learned to keep careful records of each web and piece of cloth and of the work of each weaver. But they never themselves solved a number of difficulties. Since most cottage weavers were part-time workers who depended only partially upon the loom for their livelihoods, they completed their tasks at their own convenience. Moreover, cloth varied in quality from weaver to weaver. Exasperating though these problems were, most manufacturers met them cheerfully enough, especially after 1808, when the shortage of British goods and the increase in Western demand led to soaring profits.

The financial crisis of 1814 and particularly the postwar depression forced a radical reorganization of the putting-out system. In a period when millowners were struggling to avoid bankruptcy, they grasped at any method of raising efficiency and reducing costs. Though the most venturesome met the challenge by constructing large-scale, fully integrated factories and by adopting power weaving, the majority merely improved their old way of doing things. On the cloth manufacturing side of their operations, they drastically reduced hand weaving rates and, more important, abandoned the system of dealing directly with weavers. Instead, they employed commission merchants to perform this function for them, thereby relieving themselves of the burdens of finding weavers, delivering yarn, picking up cloth, inspecting finished work for quantity and quality, and maintaining separate records of their dealings with each of the hundreds of workers they employed.¹⁶ Although the manufacturer paid commissions ranging from 10 to 13 per cent of the value of yarn handled, and although the weaving contractor assumed none of the risks and invested none of

the capital, the new system represented a major advance over the old method and more than compensated the millowner by raising efficiency and reducing over-all operating costs.¹⁷

Indeed, the system worked so well that some of the more conservative manufacturers developed such a vested interest in hand weaving that they clung to the antiquated methods of production long after power weaving had proved its superiority. Samuel Slater did not install power looms until 1823, eight years after Gilmore had introduced the Scotch-style power loom, and he did not completely abandon hand weaving until 1827. But Slater was not an eccentric vainly trying to swim against the current. He operated profitably throughout the 1820s, mainly because the reputation of his gingham in such markets as Philadelphia enabled him to dispose of all the cloth he could produce at premium prices. He was even able to pay his hand weavers more than the current rate.¹⁸ Nor was Slater an isolated example of the technological lag in the Rhode Island cotton industry. Many manufacturers, including some of the other more prominent ones, also relied heavily on the putting-out system and they too delayed the installation of power looms until they could no longer compete effectively with the fully mechanized mills.

In the 1820s, the North Stonington area of eastern Connecticut constituted a major hand-weaving center for Rhode Island spinning mills and well illustrates the way that the putting-out system worked.¹⁹ Between the spring of 1821 and the summer of 1828, a local commission merchant by the name of Russell Wheeler acted as agent for eleven manufacturers, most of them from Pawtucket in North Providence. His records, though incomplete, show that he had a substantial business. The surviving invoice books record that in this seven-year period he handled almost 5,000 webs totaling nearly 114,000 pounds of cotton yarn and that he arranged for the weaving of nearly 494,000 yards of cloth. It is probable, though not certain, that these figures covered only a portion of his production.

The Richmond Manufacturing Company of Scituate supplied by far the largest proportion of this yarn, almost 40,000 pounds or nearly 30 per cent of the total. Barney Merry and Company of Pawtucket delivered not quite 22,000 pounds of yarn to Wheeler, Timothy Greene and Sons shipped more than 11,700 pounds to him, and the

Providence Manufacturing Company forwarded another 10,700 pounds from its Crompton Mills in Warwick. Andrew Hutchinson, Thomas Lefavour and Sons, Samuel and Daniel Greene and Company, the Smithfield Manufacturing Company, Benjamin Cozzens, Jr., A. Kennedy, and Stephen Jenks and Sons supplied smaller amounts ranging from less than 700 pounds to more than 7,700 pounds.²⁰

TABLE I
THE NORTH STONINGTON, CONNECTICUT
HAND-WEAVING INDUSTRY, 1821-1828

Firm	Time Span	Webs	Weight	Yards
Thomas Lefavour & Sons	1821-1822	333	7,710	32,752 ^(a)
Timothy Greene & Sons	1821-1824	522	11,717	51,891
Stephen Jenks & Sons	1822-1823	30	691	3,075
Smithfield Cotton Manufacturing Co.	1822-1823	261	6,299	26,984
Samuel & Daniel Greene & Co.	1822-1824	308	6,267	28,601 ^(b)
Benjamin Cozzens, Jr.	1822-1824	93	1,983	8,840
Providence Manufacturing Co.	1823-1824	445	10,709	39,643 ^(c)
Andrew Hutchinson	1824	202	5,145	21,747
Barney Merry & Co.	1824-1826	994	21,860	102,370
Richmond Manufacturing Co.	1826-1828	1,695	39,966	171,091 ^(d)
A. Kennedy	?	70	1,524	7,016
Totals		4,953	113,871	493,920

^(a) 8 webs weighing a total of 177½ pounds were delivered to C. Williams and were not returned as finished cloth; 3 other webs weighing a total of 69½ pounds were not woven into cloth either but were included in a settlement of accounts on September 10, 1822; ^(b) 2 webs were supplied by the manufacturer to be used as filling; ^(c) 47 webs were not woven into cloth; and ^(d) 11 webs, including two that were destroyed by fire, were not woven into cloth.

In his invoice book, Wheeler kept a detailed record of his transactions with each spinning mill. He recorded the arrival of each shipment of yarn, the weight and number of webs of yarn in each load, the weight and number of yards of finished cloth he returned, and the amount due him for his services.

He kept comparable records of his dealings with each hand weaver. Column by column, his weaving book carried the weaver's name; the date the yarn was put out to be woven; the inventory number, fineness, and weight of each web; the type of cloth to be woven; the date the cloth was returned; its weight and yardage; the price paid per

yard; and the total sum paid to the weaver.

Wheeler distributed the yarn to weavers scattered over an area extending as far east as Hopkinton and Charlestown in Rhode Island and as far west as Groton in Connecticut. However, the principal concentration of weavers was in the immediate neighborhood of his store. According to the 1820 census, North Stonington had 307 cotton looms and produced 210,000 yards of cloth annually; Stonington, including the port area, had another 263 looms and produced 234,500 yards of cloth each year. The weaving book shows that between June, 1822, and September, 1823, Wheeler employed 216 weavers to convert 332 webs of yarn into cloth. Some of the workers (or their families) wove more than one web. Thus the names of forty-one weavers appeared twice on the weaving book; fourteen names appeared three times; ten names appeared four times; three names appeared five times; and one name appeared six times. Somewhat more than half (56 per cent) of the weavers were women and girls.²¹

Depending upon the fineness of the yarn (usually from Number 12 to Number 19, but sometimes ranging up to Number 50) and the weight of the web (generally about 23 pounds), a web produced from 75 to 120 yards of cloth. The average was 101 yards. Out of the 4,953 webs Wheeler received from the spinning mills, 2,000 were to be woven into plaid, 1,480 into ginghams, 775 into stripes, 597 into checks, and 97 into shirting.

TABLE 2
THE NORTH STONINGTON, CONNECTICUT
HAND-WEAVING INDUSTRY, 1821-1828

Firm	Webs Supplied For						Total
	Checks	Ging- ham	Plaid	Shirt- ing	Stripes	Other	
Thomas Lefavour & Sons	x	292	x	x	41	x	333
Timothy Greene & Sons	117	332	x	14	58	1	522
S. Jenks & Sons	x	22	1	2	4	1	30
Smithfield Cotton Manufacturing Co.	4	235	x	10	12	x	261
Samuel & Daniel Greene & Co.	51	236	x	x	19	2	308
Benjamin Cozzens, Jr.	12	81	x	x	x	x	93
Providence Manufacturing Co.	31	156	134	71	53	x	445
Andrew Hutchinson	15	7	133	x	47	x	202
Barney Merry & Co.	367	84	319	x	224	x	994
Richmond Manufacturing Co.	x	35	1,351	x	309	x	1,695
A. Kennedy	x	x	62	x	8	x	70
Totals	597	1,480	2,000	97	775	4	4,953

Although hand weavers had received during the War of 1812 as much as 13 cents a yard and a premium of 1 cent a yard for each color,²² by the early 1820s rates had fallen sharply and ranged from 3 cents to 7 cents a yard.²³ Thus Adam Stales, an old man, spent a month in the early summer of 1821 weaving a 24-pound web of Number 14 yarn into 106 yards of gingham for \$4.77, or at the rate of 4½ cents a yard. The rate dropped to 4 cents in 1824, then to 3 cents during the depression the following year. Weavers received a little more in the spring of 1826, but they rarely earned more than 3¼ cents a yard.

Wheeler paid his weavers in either cash or goods. In July, 1822, for example, Amy Hiscock took payment in a harness from Wheeler's store, and in October, 1825, Oliver Hewith wove a Barney Merry web into 109 yards of cloth and had the option of receiving \$2.45 in cash or \$3.00 in store goods. The commission merchant penalized his weavers for various deficiencies. In July, 1825, he deducted half a cent per yard from the agreed price because Nancy Champlin had kept a web for ten months, and he threatened Matilda Burdick of Charlestown, Rhode Island, with a similar penalty if she failed to return the finished cloth within seven weeks. Weavers who produced narrow or "thin and poor" cloth received from 2 cents to 4 cents instead of the prevailing rate of 3 cents to 5 cents a yard, a very stiff penalty indeed.

Actually, although a weaver occasionally delivered the cloth he had woven in less than a month, it was more typical for a web to be outstanding for about three months. In the same sample of 332 webs obtained from Stephen Jenks and Sons, Benjamin Cozzens, Jr., and the Smithfield Cotton Manufacturing Company cited previously, 41 webs were returned to Wheeler as cloth in less than 45 days; 95, in less than 75 days; 63, in less than 105 days; 43, in less than 135 days; and 28, in less than 165 days. The balance, 64 webs, took from 166 days to 511 days to be woven into cloth. If the normal delays in shipments between the mill and merchant are added, as well as the delays in getting the webs out to the weavers and finished cloth to the market, it can be seen that it was extremely difficult for a manufacturer to supply a rush order except from goods on hand or to shift his production from one type of fabric to another. At best, he had either to

warehouse a large inventory of many different types of cloths or to gear his production to what he guessed the market would be four to ten months into the future. To some extent, this inhibited experimentation and innovation and forced manufacturers to concentrate on staple goods.

TABLE 3
HAND-WEAVING RATES IN MASSACHUSETTS
AND CONNECTICUT, 1812-1827

Year	Samuel Slater & Co. Massachusetts			Troy Company Massachusetts			Russell Wheeler Connecticut			
	Shirting #12 ¢	Gingham #16 ¢	Stripes #12 ¢	Shirting #12 ¢	Gingham #16 ¢	Stripes #12 ¢	Shirting #15 ¢	Gingham #16 ¢	Stripes #14 ¢	Checks #14 ¢
1813		11	7							
1814		11		7	10	7				
1816		11				4				
1818		8		4 $\frac{1}{3}$	6					
1820		7 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	3 $\frac{1}{2}$				
1822	5	6 $\frac{1}{4}$	5				4 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	3	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1823		6 $\frac{1}{4}$		3 $\frac{1}{2}$		3 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 $\frac{1}{2}$		3	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1824		3 $\frac{1}{8}$					3 ^(a)	4 ^(b)	3	4
1825		3	2				3 ^(a)	3 ^(b)	2 ^(c)	2 $\frac{2}{3}$ ^(d)
1826		3	2						2 ^(c)	3 ^(d)
1827		2	2 $\frac{1}{4}$							

Compiled from Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 307, and the business records cited in note 19 above. The variants noted in the table are: (a) plaid #15; (b) gingham #15; (c) stripes #40; and (d) checks #46. Wheeler paid a premium ranging up to a cent per yard if the yarn was supplied in the skein rather than warped.

Wheeler received substantial commissions for his services. In 1822, Benjamin Cozzens, Jr., paid 10 cents a yard for cloth which Wheeler had obtained for as little as 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a yard. Thomas Lefavour was less generous, but even he paid Wheeler from 5 cents to 9 cents a yard at a time when weavers were receiving a mere 3 cents to 5 cents a yard for their labor. Moreover, this differential tended to widen rather than narrow when weaving rates plummeted after the spring of 1824, and the weavers rather than the merchant bore the brunt of the price decline which followed the depression of 1825 and the expansion of production from mechanized mills.

According to Henry Bradshaw Fearon, a London surgeon who

visited Providence in 1817, the condition and status of hand weavers may not have been as unpleasant as these piece rates imply. He reported that Providence agents of Pawtucket spinning mills treated hand weavers with respectful consideration and that, in sharp contrast to the manner of starving weavers in Manchester, the Providence women carried themselves with a sturdy but not impudent air of independence.²⁴ Nevertheless, conditions and earnings did deteriorate over the next decade and the gradual abandonment of the putting-out system forced some hand weavers into the mills and encouraged the migration of many New Englanders to the West.

In the long run, of course, Rhode Island cotton manufacturers could neither halt nor resist the march of technological innovation. Initially, millowners paid the operatives who tended power looms \$2.50 a week. This seemed a very large sum at a time when many hand weavers earned as little as \$5.00 a month. The manufacturer had also to add on the cost of installing and maintaining the machinery, heating and lighting the mill, and paying the wages of overseers. Eventually, however, as millowners gained experience with power weaving, they put their workers on piece rates of a cent a yard.²⁵ No matter how much the commission merchant cut his rates, he could not compete with the power loom and still make money. By 1832 a mechanized mill could spin, weave, finish, and profitably market a yard of cloth for about the same price which had formerly been paid just to get it woven by hand.²⁶ Such competition brought an end to the putting-out system. Though some spinning mills stayed in business, they either supplied warps to weaving mills or specialized in such products as candle wicks and wadding, which did not involve weaving. In the meantime, hand weavers and the putting-out system had played important roles in the process by which Rhode Island made the transition from a maritime to an industrial economy.

NOTES

¹Compare Nathan Appleton, *Introduction of the Power Loom, and Origin of Lowell* (Boston, 1858), 9; Samuel Batchelder, *The Introduction and Early Progress of the Cotton Manufacture in the United States* (Boston, 1863), 63-68, 70-71; William R. Bagnall, *The Textile Industries of the United States* (Cambridge, 1893), 222-225, 546-549; *Transactions of the Rhode Island Society for the Encouragement of Domestic Industry, 1864*, 62-74.

²All but a handful of the 169 mills in the Providence area failed after the war. They included the Crompton Mills in Warwick, an enterprise operated by the Providence Manufacturing Company since 1807. James DeWolf had to close his Arkwright Cotton Mills in Coventry between 1816 and 1818, but he had made

profits ranging from 20 to 30 per cent a year during the war. See Louis McLane, *Report on the Manufactures of the United States* (22 Congress, 1 session, House Executive Document no. 308, vol. 1, serial 222, Washington, 1832), 934, 941; Oliver Payson Fuller, *The History of Warwick* (Providence, 1875), 174; Bagnall, *Textile Industries*, 451-457.

³Accounts vary. One says that Daniel Lyman hired Gilmore to build a loom only after Almy and Brown had refused to finance experimentation. A second account blamed Slater's son John who, it reported, turned Gilmore away with the argument that economic conditions did not justify trying to develop power weaving. Compare, Samuel Webber, *Manual of Power for Machines, Shafts, and Belts, with the History of Cotton Manufacture in the United States* (New York, 1879), 70; Edward Field, ed., *State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the end of the Century: A History* (3 vols., Boston, 1902), 3:348; Batchelder, *Cotton Manufacture*, 70; George S. White, *Memoir of Samuel Slater* (Philadelphia, 1836), 389. Paradoxically, however, Slater took a leading part in the introduction of steam power into the Rhode Island cotton industry, and he made an early attempt to adopt the corporate style of organization in the iron industry.

⁴For example, construction of the Enterprise Manufactory at Portsmouth began in 1814 as a wartime speculation. The owners planned to install 600 spindles, but they soon found that they had so grossly overestimated the water power that they could not operate more than 240 spindles. See McLane's *Report*, 1:965.

⁵Benjamin Hazard had a small share in his son-in-law's mill on the Woonasquattuck River in North Providence and a few other Newporters invested in the Fall River cotton industry. However, as compared to what Providence entrepreneurs had done, the amount ventured was small. Newport did not become directly involved in cotton manufacturing until 1832 when Edward W. Lawton and others constructed a large steam mill capable of operating 4,256 spindles and 100 power looms. See McLane's *Report*, 1:966; Frederick M. Peck and Henry H. Earl, *Fall River and its Industries* (New York, 1877), 11.

⁶In 1810 James DeWolf formed a joint stock partnership to build and operate the Arkwright Cotton Mills in Coventry. The mill had 2,000 spindles and produced 1,000 yards of cloth a day. DeWolf became sole owner of the \$60,000 enterprise in 1820. See McLane's *Report*, 1:941.

⁷*Transactions of the Rhode Island Society for the Encouragement of Domestic Industry*, 1864, 68-69; Bagnall, *Textile Industries*, 411. The Fall River Manufactory also installed power looms in 1817. See Henry M. Fenner, comp., *History of Fall River, Massachusetts* (Fall River, 1911), 57.

⁸Field, *Rhode Island*, 3:353. For example, Jonathan Tiffany and John K. Pitman spun yarn at their mill in Crompton in the town of Warwick until 1827. But when they abandoned the system of putting the yarn out to be woven on hand looms they did not introduce power weaving. Instead they converted to the manufacture of wadding. Rowse Babcock and John Knowles of Hopkinton apparently continued the putting-out system of hand weaving even after 1829. See, Fuller, *History of Warwick*, 174; S. S. Griswold, *An Historical Sketch of Hopkinton, 1857-1876* (Hope Valley, 1877), 57.

⁹McLane's *Report*, 1:970-975; *Address of the Friends of Domestic Industry* (Baltimore, 1831), 112; Timothy Pitkin, *A Statistical View of the Commerce of United States of America* (New Haven, 1835), 526.

¹⁰Quoted in Frances Little, *Early American Textiles* (New York, 1831), 117.

¹¹Caroline F. Ware, *The Early New England Cotton Manufacture: A Study in Industrial Beginnings* (Cambridge, 1931), 32-33, 35-37; Victor S. Clark, *History of Manufactures of the United States* (3 vols., New York, 1929), 1:356-357, 365-366.

¹²Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 161-167.

¹³*Ibid.*, 41-43, 167-169, 170, 172.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 50, 52. However, the evidence on this point is inconclusive. Some writers infer that the putting-out system operated throughout the period from 1789-1817. This is confirmed by Almy and Brown invoice books in The Rhode Island Historical Society. Records for the period from 1791 to 1803 show that Almy and Brown put work out to pickers, carders, twistors, weavers, dyers, and cutters. For example, Benjamin and Silas Shephard contracted in 1803 to weave bed ticking. They received a third of the value of the yarn in payment and one cent a yard for wastage. The Shephards delivered more than 9,000 yards of cloth under this contract. Ware in *ibid.*, pp. 28-29, says that Almy and Brown tried the putting-out system for weaving in 1801 but thought it unsatisfactory. According to John K. Pitman [quoted in Massena Goodrich, *Historical Sketch of the Town of Pawtucket* (Pawtucket, 1876), 63] in November, 1809, there were more than 1,000 hand looms in operation in Rhode Island, most of them in homes rather than in factories. The Tillinghast mill, built at East Greenwich during the War of 1812, was one of the cotton factories which relied heavily upon these hand weavers. See D. H. Greene, *History of the Town of East Greenwich* (Providence, 1877), 61.

By 1809, Almy and Brown had brought a hundred hand weavers into the mill. The partners believed that properly supervised factory weavers could produce many times as much cloth as cottage weavers. Clark, in *History of Manufactures*, 1:432, says that bringing weavers into the mill increased production threefold; but Ware in *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 51, says that production increased tenfold. See also, Thomas Steere, *History of the Town of Smithfield* (Providence, 1881), 92; and Edith Abbott, *Women in Industry: A Study in American Economic History* (New York, 1919), 37, 45-47, 93.

¹⁵Thomas Robinson Hazard, *The Jonny-Cake Papers of "Shepherd Tom"* (Boston, 1915), 327-328. See also, Thomas R. Hazard, *Miscellaneous Essays and Letters* (Philadelphia, 1883), 156; and Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 50-51. Many of Slater's hand weavers lived twenty or more miles from the mill. See *ibid.*, 53.

¹⁶Between 1816 and 1820 Slater dealt with 560 people, mostly individual weavers. See *ibid.*, 74. Almy and Brown first used a merchant weaver in 1808. *Ibid.*, 28-29.

The auction system, a variant first tried in 1816 by the Waltham Company, did not become important until the end of the next decade. Compare *ibid.*, 172-176 with Clark, *History of Manufactures*, 1:358-359.

¹⁷Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 73-77.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 74-75.

¹⁹The discussion of the putting-out system which follows is based on two manuscript volumes (an invoice book and a weaving book) located in the office of the North Stonington town clerk. The volumes are unpagged.

²⁰Barney Merry, Timothy Green, Thomas Lefavour, A. Kennedy, and the brothers Samuel and Daniel Greene were directors of the New England Pacific Bank in North Providence. The Smithfield Manufacturing Company was organ-

ized in Central Falls in 1805 by Benjamin S. Walcott and Rufus and Elisha Waterman. They operated the mill until 1822, an unusually long period of continuous ownership, but the enterprise failed in 1823 and they ceased supplying Russell Wheeler with yarn. The Providence Manufacturing Company, by contrast, experienced many changes of ownership between the time it was organized in 1807 and 1823. Benjamin Cozzens, Seth Wheaton, and Edward Carrington formed a ten-year partnership early in 1823. Wheaton sold his interest in 1826. The Richmond Manufacturing Company was also owned in Providence. Organized as a joint stock partnership in 1814, the company spent \$40,000 to build and install its first mill. It did not adopt power weaving until 1828, in part because of the shortage of water power. The proprietors claimed to have steadily lost money between 1814 and 1832. One partner sold his \$5,000 share for \$1,875 in the spring of 1832. See Steere, *History of Smithfield*, 115; McLane's *Report*, 1:934-939, 959-961; Bagnall, *Textile Industries*, 394, 451-457.

²¹Photostat copy in the office of the North Stonington town clerk.

²²Steere, *History of Smithfield*, 132-133. Slater paid his weavers in store goods rather than cash; others paid in yarn. See Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 51-52.

²³Rates fell from a third to a half between 1816 and 1820. See *ibid.*, 66-67. The cost of labor for weaving was halved between 1809 and 1820. See Goodrich, *Historical Sketch of Pawtucket*, 67.

²⁴Quoted in Gertrude Selwyn Kimball, *Pictures of Rhode Island in the Past, 1642-1833* (Providence, 1900), 165-166.

²⁵Fenner, *History of Fall River*, 57. According to Ware in *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 72-73, the early power looms caused so much difficulty that the operatives could not earn a fair wage on piece rates. Manufacturers abandoned the wage system only after they had solved the technological problems. Clark, in *History of Manufactures*, 1:395-396, reported that in 1827, 5,000 to 6,000 weavers, dyers, and warpers in Philadelphia earned, on the average, \$5 a week each.

²⁶McLane's *Report*, 1:946, 950, 956, 960, 963, 965. Between 1816 and 1826, the Boston Manufacturing Company averaged 18.75 per cent in profits, partly because of the lower production costs it obtained from the adoption of power weaving. For the differential between the price of cotton, yarn, and shirting, and for data on weaving rates, see Clark, *History of Manufactures*, 1:374, 386-387, 388-389, 433.



THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF A CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST

Joseph J. Cooke's "A Personal Relation"

by CHARLES R. CROWE*

George Washington University

IN MANY RESPECTS the years from 1835 to 1850 marked the most crucial period for American Protestant thought. Deism, which had never been a mass movement, was largely confined during the Jacksonian era to a small number of free thought societies, and two generations of reticent Unitarians did not bring radical changes to the American religious scene. Nevertheless, leaders of the two groups were important as precursors of the New England Transcendentalists, who were more formidable instigators of religious rebellion. Transcendentalism was accompanied by an explosion of new religious forces which produced perfectionists, millenialists, come-outers, spiritualists, Swedenborgians, Christian socialists, and many others, as well as advocates of bizarre beliefs with "spiritual" propensities from phrenology to mesmerism. While some of these factions only generated new fanaticisms and others bred novel variations of "rational" religion, all destroyed orthodox beliefs.

A majority of the reform groups were first presented in the twentieth century with the mirth and condescension of a Gilbert Seldes or an H. L. Mencken examining historical specimen of the religious "booboisie," and the incredible eccentricities may have deserved the treatment given them by amused chroniclers. Still, the influence of the rebels was extremely important for both theologians and laymen. Scores of battles were yet to be fought over Darwinian evolution, "sectarianism," and "fundamentalism," but virtually all inherited dogmas were challenged in the 1840s and American Protestantism would never be the same again.

*The writer was aided in the preparation of this article by a grant from the American Philosophical Society for a study of Fourierism. While there are a few Cooke items in The Rhode Island Historical Society, most of the introductory material on the Providence socialist came from *The Biographical Cyclopaedia of Representative Men of Rhode Island* (Providence, 1881), *The Harbinger* (Brook Farm and New York), and the Records of the Religious Union of Associationists in the Massachusetts Historical Society.

None of the new movements was more interesting or significant than Christian Fourierism. Albert Brisbane's *The Social Destiny of Man* (New York, 1840) brought Charles Fourier's system to the attention of American intellectuals, and a series of articles in Horace Greeley's New York *Tribune* during 1843 helped to create more than three dozen communal experiments (Phalanxes) as well as several hundred thousand converts and scores of urban "Associationist Unions." Americans accepted the French socialist's concern with social exploitation, waste, and disharmony, and they attacked the dominant churches much more vigorously for irrationality and political conservatism. Men who wished to escape cosmic pessimism found in Christian socialism the possibility of internal peace and external harmony with God, nature, and society. In the minds of the unchurched the old religions had died leaving behind nearly insatiable desires for the emotional satisfaction of ritual and religious experience in a context which did no violence to the demands of either reason or social justice. For men such as Joseph J. Cooke, Christian Fourierism seemed to provide a Providential end to decades of spiritual search.

While Cooke (1813–1881) did not become seriously interested in Fourierism until 1846, he quickly became a national leader of considerable consequence and served for several years as an officer of the American Union of Associationists (the national Fourierist organization), a lecturer, and a writer for the official newspaper of the movement, *The Harbinger*. He represented the American Union during several tours of Fourierist Phalanxes and before various labor and social reform meetings.

Shortly before the publication of "A Personal Relation" in the July 19, 1847, issue of *The Harbinger*, Cooke began an affiliation with the Boston Religious Union of Associationists, which ended only with the dissolution of the church in 1854. Among the curious attempts to devise a Christian socialist ritual for the Boston congregation was a public confession in which the participant gave a detailed account of his religious past. Apparently Cooke presented an enlarged and more intimate version of "A Personal Relation" to match the revealing confessions of men such as Marx T. Lazarus, a refugee from orthodox Judaism; Joseph Carew, who had been trained as a Catholic priest; and George Ripley, the former Unitarian minister

then serving as president of the Brook Farm Phalanx. The Rhode Islander led a less turbulent spiritual life, but his narrative was more representative and provides an excellent illustration of the manner in which a variety of radical religious forces combined to produce a new vista for American Protestantism.

A PERSONAL RELATION

ENTERTAINING AS I DO, the belief that the movement in which we are engaged is eminently a religious one, and fraught with the most important and beneficial consequences to Humanity — that it is designed to raise up man from his present comparatively degraded position, to that which it is the intention of his Creator that he should occupy; I would gladly, did I possess the ability, enkindle in the minds of those who assent to the truth, but do not feel called upon to be especially active in its propagation, a degree of the enthusiasm which I feel; and awaken a desire of investigation on the part of those who are unacquainted with the subject. This, I am aware, I am not qualified to do; but, supposing that there may be some present whose mental experience has been somewhat analogous to my own; who, seeking for truth, have been almost humbugged into believing error to be such; who have been taught that their reason should be kept in subjection, and its voice not allowed to be heard — that it is in vain for man to attempt to improve himself, at the same time that he is to be held strictly accountable for not so doing; and who, seeing the inconsistencies of those who profess to be governed by the highest motives, and to be in the enjoyment of close communion with God, have, like myself, almost despaired of being able to find anything on which to rest their hopes, or which they could embrace as universal Truth — supposing that such might be more or less interested in the relation, I have written in the compass of a few pages, the prominent points of my materials and spiritual experience.

I have likewise supposed that such a relation *might* be useful as a warning to others, and possibly, by exposing the danger, prevent the shipwreck of some travellers, and at the same time illustrate, in a measure, the existing evils of society. We must feel sick before we seek for remedies.

It would have been much more pleasant if I could have made use of some other than the first person, singular number; but this the nature of the case rendered impossible.

In order to prevent misconstruction, I would here remark that, in the practice of Association, there is nothing exclusive — all are entitled to their peculiar religious belief, and while all are free to express their own

views, none need feel their prejudices attacked.

The second article of the constitution of the American Union [of "Associationists" or Fourierists] declares its object to be, the establishment of an order of society, based on a system of —

Joint-Stock Property;
Co-operative Labor;
Association of Families;
Equitable Distribution of Profits;
Mutual Guarantees;
Honors according to Usefulness;
Integral Education;
Unity of Interests.

It will be seen that if these principles are fully carried out, the result must be, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, good will toward men;" and it would be difficult to conceive that any one could live long in a sincere attempt to illustrate them, without discarding all narrow views.

I will also take this opportunity to say that we emphatically deprecate the idea which some may entertain, that the *practical perfection* of the science is to be reached at once; but we *do* assert that its most imperfect state, (and one that has been already arrived at in several fragmentary Associations,) is infinitely preferable to the common order of society.

With these introductory remarks, I will proceed to my relation.

I left school at an early age of twelve, my parents having acceded to my wish to enter a store. It will thus be seen that my education must have been *very* imperfect. I was fond of reading, but with the exception of some history and personal narratives, my attention was given to novels — the latter formed the rule, whereas they should have been the exception. I was married some months before arriving at the age of twenty-one, and in less than a year engaged in business on my own account. Previous to my marriage, my mind and feelings revolted against the Bible. I do not know that I ever made this known to any one, with the exception of my elder brother, who had recently become an Episcopal clergyman. His arguments failed to convince. I had never read an infidel work with the exception of the casual perusal of Volney's "Ruins." You will of course notice that my infidelity was entirely of a passive nature. My wife had become a member of ———— Church, Providence, just before her marriage, and when that event took place, naturally wished that her husband should be a Christian. We immediately moved to New York. To oblige her, I read McIlwaine's "Evidences of Christianity," and was

convinced of its truth. I encountered a severe struggle in my mind, being unwilling to give up *all* to Christ. My attention became so much absorbed in business, that my religious feelings soon wore away. For some years I paid no attention to the subject, and only occasionally went to church. Sunday was to me *literally* a day of rest, a newspaper or a novel in my hand. I visited but little and *never* attended parties. I could feel no sympathy with the hollow compliments to unmeaning civilities of general society. One day in the latter part of the winter in the year 1840, my wife requested me to accompany her in the evening to hear the celebrated Mr. ———— preach at the Baptist Church in ———— Street. I went out with her so seldom, and her request was so earnest, that I felt it to be a duty to gratify her. I had never heard a revival preacher, with the exception of Mr. Maffitt (at a very early age), and my prejudices were soon lost in astonishment and admiration. I mentally allowed that if the so called orthodox doctrines were true, this man was pursuing the only consistent course. What! Men going down to Hell in such numbers daily, and only preached to one day in the week? Is it reasonable? On the contrary, should not men entertaining such views, devote themselves day and night, to sound the alarm? I said to myself that I was pursuing a very foolish course, my mind being wholly engrossed with the things of the world, without bestowing a thought upon the future, and I determined to act differently. An invitation was given at the close of the meeting to those who felt disposed, to go down into the Lecture-room, and I wished to go, but my pride restrained me. You may easily suppose that the next evening I did not wait to be asked to go to meeting — I went voluntarily. At the close I went into the Lecture-room, and was soon asked by one of the Deacons to take an "anxious seat." I felt desirous of doing so, but declined. This following evening I took an "anxious seat," and was prayed for. I was affected, even to tears, — not tears of repentance, but of outraged pride as it is called, and as I then considered it. After the prayer, I was asked how I felt? I do not wish to treat such a subject lightly, but I cannot help observing the striking analogy between the questions asked on such occasions, and those addressed by a physician to a patient after the administration of a dose of medicine. I cannot recall my exact replies, but I was invited to call upon the pastor of the Church on the next morning. I was punctual for the appointment. I was told that my feelings were not natural, but must have been produced by the Spirit of God. I was directed to take a decided stand — to look forward and not backward — to take up the cross, and to cut down the bridge behind me, so that I could not return. He prayed for me, and then put into my hand an article on the mode of Baptism. He asked if I loved the society

of Christians, to which I *truly* answered in the affirmative. For such Christians as were devoting their time and means to warn their fellow beings of their dangerous situation, I felt that I could not do too much. (I did not perceive at that time how large a proportion were engaged in adding to the numbers of "our Church.") This, of course, was conclusive evidence that I had been born again, and I was invited to relate experience before the Church, either on that or the following afternoon. I cannot say positively which. I did as I was requested. Two of the Deacons were appointed as the Committee of the Church to converse with me, and they accompanied me home to tea. On being introduced to my wife, one of them congratulated her upon the change I had met with, and said that he supposed that *she* would wish to join their Church before long. I was voted in on the same evening, and immersed in a day or two. (I had been sprinkled in infancy.) I was immediately made a member of committees; had a Bible class; was called upon to pray in their anxious meetings, became a tract distributor, etc., etc. I felt called upon to give up business at once, for two reasons. One was that I did not stand upon firm ground in respect to the faith which I professed, and could not afford to devote the time to business that was requisite for its successful prosecution, or that my duty to my partners required.

This course was opposed to the advice of the principal brethren, and I well remember the remark of one of them, which was that he never knew an individual who did so, that made a useful church-member. It was a sensible remark, and why? Because such a one would have an opportunity for reflecting upon the unreasonableness of such doctrines, and would find that they did not meet the wants of men. But *let* men's thoughts be engrossed in trade, and merely go through with certain forms on Sundays, and they may be kept in the traces. I sold my interest to my partners, and devoted my time to prayer, study and action. I wanted an assurance of that faith which I did not *feel* that I had, but which I was told that I possessed because I wished for it — that any doubts were the temptations of the devil, and that as I did my duty, my feelings would grow brighter. I wished to "live religion." In the course of that year, I gave to what I considered the cause of religion, about one-tenth of my capital. (I wish I had it now, to devote to Association.) But as earnest as were my endeavors (and I could certainly have had no worldly object to gain,) I could not learn to *love* God who had decreed that the largest portion of the human beings whom he had created should be eternally damned. I found that it was necessary that I should be doing something for the support of myself and family in this world, and I accordingly made arrangements with a young man whom

I believed to be conscientious, and who was willing to do business on Christian principles. We had not been together long, before I discovered the impracticability of pursuing that branch (dry goods jobbing) in which we were engaged, successfully, and act in accordance with the Golden Rule of doing unto others as you would be done by. I had some means left with which I proposed to purchase a farm, and by retiring into the country, get rid of some of the many evils of civilization. My partner feeling obliged to continue in business, made arrangements for a special partnership to commence when our year was up. (He failed in the spring of 1846, after four years of struggling.) During the year we lost money. In the spring of 1843, I purchased a farm in the vicinity of this city, and remained upon it three years. Finding I could not derive a support from it, in the spring of 1846 I entered the grocery business with two young men who were engaged in it, and who thought that they were doing well, but that they could do better with an enlarged capital. I found that they had been deceived — they had lost instead of gained, and after a few months we all gave it up as a fruitless endeavor. I forgot to say that previous to my leaving New York, I had gradually become less and less active in the Church, and before my departure I had a conversation with my pastor, and frankly told him the state of my mind. He entreated me for the cause of religion, not to let it be known, but to attend Church regularly, and to keep up appearances. He stated his belief that I would one day confess that I had been regenerated. Allow me to ask how many thousands in the Churches around us have not been aroused from their self-deception, and are now "keeping up appearances" by deceiving others? For the last seven years, I have had much time to read and reflect — much of my reading has been of a nature calculated to improve the mind, and I have glanced at the natural sciences of which I was before almost entirely ignorant. As my understanding enlarged, the less satisfied I was with the idea of faith, as it is generally understood. I have often felt that my life was without an object and have frequently expressed myself as being merely vegetating. I have attended Church but a few times for several years, and have felt more and more repelled by the doctrines inculcated, and their development in the lives of Christians, so called. It seemed to me to be impossible that men could sincerely believe, (as they preached and professed,) that the heathen were perishing by millions for want of the means of salvation, while they themselves were living in a state of luxury. I could not sympathize with such. They practically deny the principles which they profess. I do not mean to be understood as saying that there are no good men in the Churches — undoubtedly there are such among all sects; but I believe

they are the exceptions, rather than the rule, and I should quite as soon look for honesty and benevolence without [the Churches] as within [them]. I read "Omoo" by Herman Melville, and see how little Christianity, as taught by the Missionaries, has really done to benefit the South Sea Islanders. I have supposed that my mind was perhaps, peculiarly constituted. Still, as I was, so was I born, and I *knew* that I had sincerely tried to be a Christian, but had failed to participate in the comforts which Christians about us say they enjoy. I at one time felt strongly attached to the Swedenborgianism and the doctrines of the new Jerusalem Church. To those who are acquainted with them, it is unnecessary to say that the fundamental one is charity, in its true and most enlarged sense. Many of Swedenborg's ideas are so evidently true, and address themselves with so much force to the understanding, that I was almost prepared to believe that those which did not accord with my reason were likewise true, and that I did not see them to be so on account of my own obtuseness. In fact, I understood that some of his well known disciples consider the science of Association to be the perfection of his doctrines. However, it was proved to the satisfaction of my own mind, that his doctrines were the results of his own reasoning, and that his supernatural vision was an illusion. I perused some of the earliest articles published in the Tribune by Mr. Brisbane, on Association, at the time of their publication, and at once said that men were too selfish to reduce the theory to practice; but I never had a connected statement of the Doctrine until later. Then, when I saw the provisions made for the development of the different passions of men — when I caught the idea of Universal Unity — when I reflected upon its justice — and last, though not least, when I had tasted of the Society of practical Associationists [at Brook Farm] — then I said that this was the Truth worth living for: and I will also add, worth dying for. You may ask, as an individual did the other day, "How do you know that in a year or eighteen months, you will not feel the same about this matter, as you did about joining the Church?" I answer, I do not *know*, but I have this assurance, that whereas I at that time did violence to my reason, and to every feeling, (being told that such a course was necessary,) I am now acting according to the best dictates of my reason, and that the subject addresses itself to the highest feeling of my nature. *That* was pain — this is pleasure. That was constraint — this is liberty. There may be those who have not distinctly understood me, not having noticed the distinction that has been made between real Christianity and the common practice of it. The latter I condemn — the former I advocate. It appears

to me plain that Association is the embodiment of the principles of Christianity, and that a sincere attempt on the part of a community to live according to the precepts of Christ, would necessarily lead them to adopt the science of Association. Individuals may endeavor so to live, but they will find that if they persevere they will be martyrs. They must combine and help one another and what would this be but Association? A religion that would allow me to hoard up hundreds of thousands while my fellow beings were in want of the comforts, if not of the necessities of life, I cannot approve of; nor does Christianity. But I ask if this is not its present development? Is not a man who is worth \$100,000, and gives anywhere from \$100 to \$1000 a year to religious and charitable uses, called a pattern of benevolence? And is this *all* that Christianity calls for? We must answer, no. Remember the widow's mite. In answer to those clergymen and others, who have said that they were aware that men did not live up to the requirements of Christ, I have said and will say again, that they do not pretend to *begin* or *expect* to do it. If the entire world was evangelized, as it is called, what would then be its state? Look at those countries which are now called Christian. Look at Great Britain and at our own country — the lights of the world. Are there no wars? No poverty? No slavery? No intemperance? No licentiousness? Look at the churches themselves in our own country. Are not all these things found within them? Is not selfishness, in odious forms, the controlling principle? And what hope is there of a better state? I answer — in the practical development of the science of Association — a science which is calculated to bring out all of the good feelings and repress the bad — a science, the tendency of which is to eradicate all evil, and to bring us into a state of harmony with man, with nature, and with God — the perfection of which is the Christian Millennium — the New Jerusalem — the City of God.

J. J. C.

After the collapse of the Fourierist movement Cooke threw all his energy into the antislavery movement, a commitment which made him a pioneer in Rhode Island Republican politics and a power in party councils until his death. The former opponent of commercial life gradually became a prosperous real estate speculator and the successful head of an agency serving emigrants to California. Despite Cooke's eventual lapse into religious indifference and political conservatism, his devotion to Christian socialism in 1847 was quite genuine.

JOHN SMITH, THE MILLER, OF PROVIDENCE,
RHODE ISLAND

SOME OF HIS DESCENDANTS

by CHARLES WILLIAM FARNHAM

[continued from April, 1964, p. 60]

- 114 III BENJAMIN⁶ SMITH, d. 6 Nov. 1855 in his 89th year and is buried with his relatives in the Smith lot in North Burial Ground, Providence.

After Benjamin was adjudged incapable of managing his affairs, Joseph Randall and Ezekiel Whipple were named guardians for him in North Providence 2 Jan. 1815.⁵²⁴ Daniel Winsor, his brother-in-law, and Daniel Smith, his brother, were named guardians for him in May 1817, and thereafter there was a series of guardianships for him.

On 2 March 1857 a settlement of his estate was made, with distribution of \$199.98 made to Phebe Mason, Susan Whipple, Daniel Smith, children of his brothers Abraham and Thomas.⁵²⁵ There is no indication that he married and had issue.

- 115 IV THOMAS⁶ SMITH, d. 4 May 1850 in his 84th year and is buried in the old Harris cemetery at Morgan Mills, Johnston, Rhode Island. His wife Elnathan, who d. 1830 in her 53rd year, is buried beside him. Since Elnathan was a Harris name, it is possible Thomas and Elnathan are buried in the Harris cemetery because she was a Harris.

Thomas lived in Johnston on land that he had received in the partition of his father's property, but the property had been inherited by Edward from his wife's father, Thomas Harris of Johnston.

Thomas W. Latham was named administrator of the estate of Thomas Smith. A petition for partition of property held by Thomas Smith named the heirs as Ira Smith, Hezekiah Smith, Thomas Smith 2nd, Mary A. McPhail, and Rachel S. Latham.⁵²⁶

- 116 V DANIEL⁶ SMITH, b. North Providence 22 Aug. 1774; d. 10 Sept. 1863; m. at Smithfield 7 Feb. 1799 Abigail Smith, daughter of John Smith of Noah and Sarah Wilkinson, daughter of

⁵²⁴North Providence Probate, 4A:344.

⁵²⁵*Ibid.*, A 12:158.

⁵²⁶Johnston Probate, 7:208.

1964]

John Smith, the Miller, of Providence

91

Hezekiah Sprague, b. 11 Feb. 1777 and d. 15 Aug. 1858.⁵²⁷ Both are buried in the Smith burial lot in North Burial Ground, Providence, along with several of their children. Daniel received his share of his father's property and made his home in North Providence. Bible records of Daniel and his family are on file at The Rhode Island Historical Society.

CHILDREN OF DANIEL⁶ AND ABIGAIL (SMITH) SMITH:

- 1 ASHA⁷ SMITH, b. 23 Sept. 1800; m. 9 April 1826 Nathaniel Angell of Enoch, b. 12 March 1780. Asha d. 20 Oct. 1870 and her husband d. 3 Aug. 1832. They had ANN MARIA Angell, 1829-1833, and AMEY RANDALL Angell, b. 8 Aug. 1827 who m. Obadiah Brown and had six children.
 - 2 PHEBE⁷ SMITH, b. 21 Jan. 1805; d. 9 May 1835 of consumption.
 - 3 ADALINE⁷ SMITH, b. 22 Dec. 1807; d. 7 Nov. 1837 of consumption.
 - 4 JOHN EDWARD⁷ SMITH, b. 23 April 1810; d. 3 Jan. 1894.
 - 5 AMEY⁷ SMITH, 1819-1922.
 - 6 THOMAS HARRIS⁷ SMITH, b. 3 July 1816; d. 17 Aug. 1904.
 - 7 AMEY HARRIS⁷ SMITH, 1819-1822.
 - 8 FRANCES WILSON⁷ SMITH, b. 13 Nov. 1821; d. 19 Jan. 1913; m. a Wilcox.
The family record also includes DANIEL BULLOCK⁷ SMITH who d. 10 May 1873.
- VI RACHEL⁶ SMITH, b. 1759; d. 1830; m. Daniel Winsor of Abraham and Sarah (Smith) Winsor of Greenville, Rhode Island, who was b. 13 Nov. 1762 and d. 17 June 1823. No issue.⁵²⁸
- VII PHEBE⁶ SMITH. North Providence marriages record the marriage of Samuel Olney, Jr., of Ezra and Phebe Smith of Edward, by Ezekiel Whipple, justice, 7 July 1779.⁵²⁹ The *Genealogy of . . . Thomas Olney* places Samuel, Jr., as the son of Ezra of North Providence and his second wife Lydia

⁵²⁷Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield Marriages, 3:68.

⁵²⁸Mrs. C. W. Anthony and Mrs. C. H. Weeden, *Roger Williams of Providence* (Providence, 1949), p. 109.

⁵²⁹Arnold, *op. cit.*, North Providence Marriages, 2:37.

Wales of Coventry. It gives Samuel's birthdate as 1765 and states he married Phebe Harris 7 July 1779, an obvious error. It may be Phebe bore the middle name of Harris because her mother was a Harris. One child is listed for Phebe and Samuel: SUSAN S. Olney, b. 12 Nov. 1800; d. 26 March 1871; m. Amasa Whipple; no issue.

54 **BENJAMIN⁵ SMITH** (*Hezekiah,⁴ Benjamin,³ John,² John¹*). He was mentioned in his father's will, but when his brother Jesse made his will in 1765 he named his brothers and sister but did not mention Benjamin.

The Chad Browne Memorial records that Lydia Brown, b. 24 Jan. 1751, daughter of Andrew and Mary (Knowlton) Brown, m. Benjamin. Benjamin's mother Rachel had become the second wife of Andrew Brown, and Lydia's sister Keziah m. Enos Smith, brother of Benjamin. Several Gloucester deeds in which Enos and Benjamin Smith dispose of lands which their wives had inherited from their father document the relationships. Benjamin and Lydia moved to Norwich, New York. No children of theirs were recorded in Gloucester.

55 **JESSE⁵ SMITH** (*Hezekiah,⁴ Benjamin,³ John,² John¹*). He died in Smithfield 2 Aug. 1766, and his will made 14 May 1765 named his wife Mary; his brothers Asa and Edward; his sister Abigail Aldrich; and a cousin Jesse Smith, "son of my brother Nehemiah." Apparently he left no issue.

Mendon, Massachusetts, vital records list marriage intentions 2 Sept. 1761 for Jesse Smith of Providence and Mary Aldrich. A Providence deed of 29 Oct. 1762 by Jesse identified him as a tailor and was signed by his wife Mary.

56 **ASA⁵ SMITH** (*Hezekiah,⁴ Benjamin,³ John,² John¹*). When Asa's father died in 1753, Asa was left 25 acres in the southwest part of Gloucester on the northwest part of Scituate. He appears to have been the youngest son of Hezekiah, for the will specified that he was to be educated by the executors until he was of sufficient age to learn a trade, and his brothers Benjamin and Edward were to pay him 500 pounds when of age.

Gloucester vital records list the birth of HEZEKIAH of Asa and Anne on 24 Oct. 1787,⁵³⁰ and the marriage of Hezekiah of Asa and Ada

⁵³⁰*Ibid.*, Gloucester Births, 3:62.

Salisbury of Richard, by Cyrus Cook, justice, in Gloucester 5 Aug. 1810.⁵³¹

Asa had d. before 1830 when a Gloucester deed recorded that Hezekiah Smith of Gloucester for one dollar paid by his mother Anna Smith of Gloucester and for release of her dower rights to the land of Hezekiah's father Asa, gave his mother a lifetime lease to part of the homestead farm.⁵³²

Buried in North Burial Ground, Providence, are Ada Smith who d. 3 Feb. 1852 in her 60th year; Dorcas Smith, daughter of Hezekiah and Ada, who d. 14 July 1835 in her 19th year; Mahala, a daughter who d. 9 Dec. 1842; Otis, a son who d. 5 Jan. 1815; a daughter Rispah; and a daughter Ada, who d. 1 April 1845 in her 34th year.

57 **ELISHA⁵ SMITH** (*Philip,⁴ Elisha,³ John,² John¹*). His birth date was not recorded, but he died in Smithfield 22 Sept. 1797 leaving a will made 6 Sept. 1797. He married 9 July 1761 Elizabeth Appleby, daughter of James and Dorcas Appleby of Smithfield⁵³³ who d. in Smithfield at 62 according to *The Providence Gazette* of 25 Sept. 1802.

Elisha's name appears as Elisha, Jr., in Smithfield records after his marriage, since previous to 1766 his grandfather Elisha Smith was still living in Smithfield.

Elizabeth Smith, widow of Elisha, and Thomas Appleby, who had married a daughter of Elisha's brother John, were executors of Elisha's will. His son Junia had died 13 Nov. 1796 and Elisha bequeathed to his seven grandchildren: Silas, Waterman, Appleby, Elisha, Phebe, Wait, and Martha Smith.

CHILD OF ELISHA⁵ AND ELIZABETH (APPLEBY) SMITH:

- 117 I JUNIA⁶ SMITH, b. 28 July 1763;⁵³⁴ m. 24 March 1782 Martha Appleby of James of Smithfield;⁵³⁵ d. in Smithfield 13 Nov. 1796. Martha d. 20 July 1820 in her 58th year.

CHILDREN OF JUNIA⁶ AND MARTHA (APPLEBY) SMITH:

- I SILAS⁷ SMITH, d. 21 Aug. 1856, and the Smithfield death return records him as the son of Junia, age 74, while

⁵³¹*Ibid.*, Gloucester Marriages, 3:35.

⁵³²Gloucester Deeds, 21:164.

⁵³³Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield marriages, 3:67.

⁵³⁴*Ibid.*, Smithfield Births, 3:116.

^{535,536}*Ibid.*, Smithfield Marriages, 3:68.

his gravestone on the Elisha Smith farm, Farnum Pike, Georgiaville, gives the same date but his age as 70. He m. (1) Betsey Harris of Jonathan, Jr., of Smithfield 25 May 1806.⁵³⁶ She d. 22 July 1810 at 24 years, 3 months, and 6 days and is buried in the Harris family lot on Harris Road, Smithfield. Silas m. (2) Esther Phillips of Gideon who d. 22 Dec. 1850 in her 71st year and is buried beside her husband. Also buried in the same lot are Esther, wife of Emor H. Smith, who d. 1 Nov. 1853 in her 52nd year; Patience, wife of Jenckes A. Smith and daughter of Benjamin and Mercy Parker, who d. 3 Dec. 1863 in her 53rd year; and Jenckes A. Smith, who d. 1 May 1870 in his 60th year.

- 2 WATERMAN⁷ SMITH, d. in Cranston 17 Jan. 1852;⁵³⁷ m. Sarah Cory, b. in Plainfield, Connecticut, who d. 26 Dec. 1877 at 87. Among their children was DANIEL ANGELL SMITH, b. 18 Jan. 1812 at Smithfield, who d. in Cranston 14 Nov. 1868. He m. 25 Jan. 1836 Marcy R. Armington of Walker and Marcy (Jenckes) Armington, who d. in Providence 16 Jan. 1886. They had eleven children. Waterman, his wife, Daniel Angell Smith, and some of his family are buried in Swan Point Cemetery, Providence.
- 3 APPLEBY⁷ SMITH, m. Rachel Harris of Jonathan, Jr., and Mary (Jenckes) Harris, who d. 18 Nov. 1815 in her 22nd year. She is buried in the Harris burial ground on Harris Road, Smithfield. In the same lot is buried Miss Rachel Smith, who d. 26 March 1837.
- 4 ELISHA⁷ SMITH, b. 6 June 1794 in Smithfield; d. in Providence 23 April 1873; m. 1 Jan. 1825 Melissa, daughter of Esek and Desire (Eddy) Smith and granddaughter of Emor and Sarah Smith.⁵³⁸ Their children were MARTHA A. SMITH, who m. Alden B. Paine; HENRY ESEK SMITH; and SARAH AMANDA SMITH, who m. Charles E. Harris.
- 5 PHEBE⁷ SMITH, b. 13 Oct. 1784; d. 6 Feb. 1873; m. 30 Dec. 1804 Reuben Mowry of Daniel Mowry 3rd,⁵³⁹ b. 20 Sept. 1778; killed by a locomotive in

⁵³⁷Swan Point Cemetery Records, Providence.

⁵³⁸J. H. Beers and Company, *Representative Men and Old Families of Rhode Island*, 2:1148.

⁵³⁹Arnold, *op. cit.*, Smithfield Marriages, 3:52.

Providence 7 June 1852. Their children were:⁵⁴⁰ JUNIA S. Mowry, b. 18 July 1805; LAMECH C. Mowry, b. 4 March 1807; WILSON W. Mowry, b. 30 Oct. 1810, drowned 18 Jan. 1824; DARWIN Mowry, b. 21 Nov. 1812, d. 6 March 1813; ALICE A. Mowry, 1814–1836; ELISHA S. Mowry, d. young; PHEBE S. Mowry, 1819–1842; REUBEN M. Mowry, 1821–1838; and JABEZ W. Mowry, b. 29 July 1824.

6 WAIT⁷ SMITH.

- 7 MARTHA⁷ SMITH, d. 15 June 1880 in her 85th year; m. 14 Sept. 1820 Robert Harris, son of Robert and Phebe (Jenckes) Harris of Smithfield,⁵⁴¹ who was b. 21 March 1797 and d. 25 Oct. 1888. Their children were RAYMOND PERRY HARRIS, b. 28 June 1822, d. 27 Feb. 1875, unmarried; ELIZABETH SMITH HARRIS, b. 16 Jan. 1824, m. 18 Nov. 1851 Stephen B. Olney; BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HARRIS, b. 27 Jan. 1829, d. 9 May 1909, m. Abby Hawkins Newell of Simon, who d. 15 Oct. 1886 at 59; and ELISHA SMITH HARRIS, b. 13 July 1833, m. 27 Dec. 1859 Martha Phetteplace.

58 JOHN⁵ SMITH (*Philip*,⁴ *Elisha*,³ *John*,² *John*¹). His birth was not recorded in Smithfield, but he d. there 26 Feb. 1807. He m. (1) Phebe Ballou of Abraham and Mary (Sayles) Ballou. He m. (2) Wait Brown 13 Feb. 1794, and the marriage was recorded in *The Providence Gazette* of 1 March 1794 as John Smith and Mrs. Wait Brown. She was the daughter of Charles and Wait (Dexter) Field of Providence and the widow of John Brown, son of Deputy Governor Elisha and Martha (Smith) Brown. Her death notice reads, "Waite, widow of John Smith of Smithfield, died in Providence 20 July 1819." She is buried with her parents in North Burial Ground, Providence, and her gravestone reads, "died July 20, 1819 in her 76th year."

John Smith made his will 3 Feb. 1807, and it was probated in Smithfield 26 Feb. 1807. It provided for his widow Wait and made his son-in-law Thomas Appleby executor. Mentioned in the will were grandson John Smith Appleby; son-in-law Jashub Wing; son-in-law Levi Hunt; nephew Philip Angell, son of his sister Patience Angell;

⁵⁴⁰William A. Mowry, *Descendants of Nathaniel Mowry, Providence*, 1878.

⁵⁴¹Benns manuscript, Thomas Harris, Family, R. I. H. S.

Smith Wing, son of Jashub Wing; daughter Wait Appleby, wife of Thomas Appleby; sister Mary Smith; three grandchildren: Phebe Smith, Wait Harris, and Lydia Wing, children of deceased daughter Mary Wing, "the latter three to care for my sister Mary Smith and provide for my mother-in-law Mary Ballou." Simon Smith, Silas Smith, and John Sayles were witnesses to the will.

John Smith had a farm in Smithfield near Stillwater. Presumably it was the one with an ancient farmhouse (still standing opposite the Stillwater Country Club) which is said to have been built by Elisha⁵⁴² Smith in the early 1700s. The farm descended by inheritance to the Applebys and until recently was occupied by Appleby descendants.

Smithfield deeds record an agreement entered 18 March 1808 by Wait Smith, widow of John; Thomas Appleby; Simon Smith; Jabez Harris; and Jashub Wing (guardian to his daughter Lydia Wing) to set off dower rights to the widow Wait Smith. By terms of the agreement five eighths was to go to Wait Appleby, wife of Thomas, and one-eighth to Simon Smith's wife Phebe (daughter of Jashub and Mary (Smith) Wing; one-eighth to Jabez Harris's wife Wait (Wing) and one-eighth to Lydia Wing.⁵⁴²

CHILDREN OF JOHN⁵ AND PHEBE (BALLOU) SMITH:

- I RISPAN⁶ SMITH, b. 30 July 1762. The marriage of Rispah Smith and Levi Hunt of Rehoboth, son of Isaiah and Mary Hunt, on 4 April 1793 was recorded in the marriages of Providence Friends. Rispah apparently had died before her father made his will because she was not named although her husband was mentioned. The birth of a daughter, MARY, on 12 Dec. 1795 was recorded in Providence Friends births.⁵⁴³
- II MARY⁶ SMITH, b. 4 July 1764;⁵⁴⁴ m. Jashub Wing of Smithfield. Jashub is buried on the Wing farm, Douglas Pike, Smithfield, and his stone reads "died 7 Nov. 1814 in his 57th year." A gravestone for Mary has not been found, but one for Lilles, apparently second wife of Jashub, places her death on 13 Jan. 1857 in her 91st year.

⁵⁴²Smithfield Deeds, 12:14.

⁵⁴³Arnold, *op. cit.*, 7:241.

⁵⁴⁴*Ibid.*, Smithfield Births, 3:116.

CHILDREN OF JASHUB AND MARY⁶ (SMITH) WING:

- 1 PHEBE Wing, m. Simon Smith, Jr., of Gloucester. Her will made in Gloucester 16 Oct. 1850 and proved 8 March 1851 mentioned Phebe Wing, "daughter of my half brother, Harris Wing;" her syster Lydia Clark; a grand niece, Phebe Aldrich, daughter of Arthur Aldrich, and bequeathed residue of the property which came to her from her father and her half brother Smith Wing, to her half brother Harris Wing.
- 2 WAIT Wing, m. in Smithfield Jabez Harris of Stephen of Smithfield, 1 May 1803.⁵⁴⁵
- 3 LYDIA Wing, unmarried when her grandfather made his will, was named in her sister's will as Lydia Clark. She was living in Providence in 1828 and may have been the wife of Stephen Clark.

III WAIT⁶ SMITH, b. about 1767; m. 14 Nov. 1784 Thomas Appleby of James and Esther (Sayles) Appleby of Smithfield.⁵⁴⁶ Thomas was b. 10 March 1760⁵⁴⁷ and d. 26 July 1826. Wait d. 15 Oct. 1843 in her 77th year. Both are buried in the Appleby cemetery on Williams Road, Spragueville, Smithfield. Thomas Appleby inherited the family farm from his father-in-law John Smith.

CHILDREN OF THOMAS AND WAIT⁶ (SMITH) APPLEBY:⁵⁴⁸

- 1 PHEBE Appleby, m. William Harris.
- 2 ESTHER Appleby, m. Elisha Steere.
- 3 JOHN SMITH Appleby, b. 11 Aug. 1787; m. Patience Harris, b. 1789 of Jonathan and Mary (Jencks) Harris; buried on the old Smith farm in Stillwater across the road from the Stillwater Country Club. The 1850 census gave as their children: JOHN SMITH Appleby, 20; ALMA HARRIS Appleby, 30; and PATIENCE JENCKES Appleby, 15.
- 4 JAMES Appleby, m. Amey Harris. James d. 9 Dec. 1843 at 47, and Amey d. 9 May 1866 at 67. Both are buried with their children in the Appleby plot on Williams Road, Spragueville, Smithfield.
- 5 THOMAS S. Appleby, m. Almy Mowry.

⁵⁴⁵*Ibid.*, Smithfield Marriages, 3:37.

⁵⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 3:10.

⁵⁴⁷*Ibid.*, Smithfield Births, 3:87.

⁵⁴⁸Beers, *op. cit.*, 3:1152.

[to be continued]

NEW MEMBERS

March 22, 1964 to June 11, 1964

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Mr. Olof V. Anderson
North Kingstown, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Aram K. Berberian</p> <p>Mr. Arthur Bernstingle</p> <p>Mrs. Franklin J. E. Bidden
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Buell N. Buckingham
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Joseph F. Bunnett</p> <p>Mr. Walter G. Cady</p> <p>Mrs. Samuel G. Caidin
Pawtucket, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Joel A. Cohen</p> <p>Miss Mary L. Crosby</p> <p>Mr. David Emerson
Taunton, Mass.</p> <p>Mr. David Evans
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Paul W. Fletcher
Bristol, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Richard D. Godfrey</p> <p>Mr. John W. Grifalconi</p> <p>Mrs. Harold A. Grout
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. H. David Hedison
Warwick, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Lloyd L. Hughes
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. George C. Hull
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Clifford Hunter
Warwick, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Karl P. Jones
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Albert E. Leach
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Irving M. Leven
Seekonk, Mass.</p> <p>Mrs. Irving M. Leven
Seekonk, Mass.</p> <p>Mrs. William B. MacColl
Wakefield, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Frederick Mason
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Joseph A. McCaull
Harmony, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Wallace McTammany
North Scituate, R. I.</p> | <p>Mrs. Wallace McTammany
North Scituate, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Michael P. Metcalf</p> <p>Mr. William M. Meyers
New York, N.Y.</p> <p>Mr. Charles F. Montgomery
Wilmington, Del.</p> <p>Mr. George F. Moore, Jr.
Greenville, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. George F. Moore, Jr.
Greenville, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Guy N. J. Mortimer</p> <p>Mr. Marcus Munsill</p> <p>Mrs. Marcus Munsill</p> <p>Richard E. Noon, M.D.
North Providence, R. I.</p> <p>Cdr. Dorothy Osborne USNR (ret)</p> <p>Mr. George T. O'Neil
North Kingstown, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Raymond S. Penza</p> <p>Mr. Romeo S. Picerne, Sr.
Cranston, R. I.</p> <p>Michael E. Scala, M.D.
Rumford, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Ernest T. Scattergood
Cranston, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Clinton Shurtleff
Warwick, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Sidney Silverstein
Woonsocket, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Morton Smith</p> <p>Mrs. Morton Smith</p> <p>Mrs. H. Frederick Stephens
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. John A. Stewart
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. John A. Stewart
Barrington, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. Margaret B. Stower</p> <p>Mr. Arnold Van Benschoten</p> <p>Mrs. Anthony Viola, Jr.</p> <p>Miss Evelyn M. Walsh
Rumford, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. Hugh Willoughby
Riverside, R. I.</p> <p>Mrs. M. Tower Wilmot
Cranston, R. I.</p> <p>Mr. F. John Zarlengo
Cranston, R. I.</p> |
|---|--|