

## The Fear of Contagion 1832

The 'Ghosts Of Duffy's Cut'\* is a nom-de-plume attached to men who set sail from Derry on the ship *John Stamp*, or on the ships *Ontario*, *Prudence* and *Asia*, on a two-month voyage in the Summer of 1832 in pursuit of a vision of what life could be like in America. The arrival of these young Irish labourers and weavers in Pennsylvania coincided with the arrival in America of the peak of the second cholera world pandemic of the 1800s. A Pennsylvania and Columbia Rail Road administration report in a secret file, kept for 170 years until bestowed to the Watson family then dusted down, recorded that the entire squad of fifty seven men died from that cholera at a stretch of railway known as Mile 59 in Malvern, Chester PA, and since called Duffy's Cut.

The Duffy's Cut Project has been going for ten years and is led by the Watson brothers, Bill and Frank, one a professor of history and one a professor of theology in Pennsylvania. A forensic team they called in, on the foot of a discovery of the remains of four men and one woman, painted a much more sinister scenario. They say that not only these young people, but the entire squad of fifty seven, were murdered by vigilantes. An undetermined number of bodies are said from sonar findings to remain untouched under the railroad lines. Until those are exhumed there cannot be a definitive number of causes of death. What is clear, thanks to the persistence of the Watson team, is that the bodies that have been exhumed show what appears to be blunt-force trauma to the head and large gaping holes consistent with musket balls. However, although there were musket balls found in the graves there were no matching exit holes found in the skulls. These signs, the Watsons say, point towards a heinous act that occurred with the knowledge of the Philadelphia and Columbia Rail Road, out of fear that news of the cholera outbreak would spread.

What may appear at first sight to be an extreme explanation is a working hypothesis based upon what has been discovered already and the Watson's follow-up book next year may reveal more. Meanwhile, and to assist the Watsons in their endeavours, a small amateur team of ancestor-hunters hope to accomplish what the rail road did not - correctly identify those young men by name and restore their memories to their families back in Ireland. This task is formidable and it is working backwards from the usual direction of genealogical research. Instead of seeking to find ancestors of living relatives, here the task is to find living relatives from the scanty or nonexistent records of the Disappeared. The Watsons themselves have gone to great lengths for over a decade to try to identify these dead, including an appearance on the Shaun Doherty Show on Highland Radio.

The number of men who were killed cannot be certain yet, whether fifty seven or some lesser number. Neither can it be certain that the men said to have been killed at Duffy's Cut came solely off the *John Stamp*. They could just as easily have come off the *Ontario*, the *Asia* or the *Prudence* as all these boatloads carried a large number of young, strong-abled men from Tyrone, Donegal and Derry. To simplify the task of identification of those exhumed and also of a bigger number as yet unearthed, the plan is to concentrate on waxwings rather than house sparrows, meaning to focus on the more distinctive names from 1832, irrespective of which boat the young Irish labourers came off. This strategy may score some early and initial success.

These rarer specimens on the *John Stamp* from Donegal, according to Griffiths Evaluation, are William Devine, Robert Ewing, John Doak, and David and William Patchell. On the *Asia* from Donegal were Robert Arthur, James Bryan, Joseph Cochrane, Edward Edgar, Henry McFadden, Arthur the John Stamp McQuade, James Vance, James Snodgrass and Peter Darmond. On the *Prudence* from Donegal were David Peoples, James Ball, Anthony McDonagh, William McPhilemy and Richard Weir On the *Ontario* from Donegal there were Francis Hood, Tim McBrearty, James McHenry, John Boal, the Harold (Harrell) brothers Connell and John, Daniel Nee, John McQuigg and John Aiken.

If that small sample draws a blank, the likelihood increases that the Watsons' theory of foul play of a bigger number than those exhumed may have to be looked at again. In other words, if a parallel sample of young men known not to have been at Duffy's Cut, cannot be traced from existing records, then there is no reason to suppose that absence of Duffy's Cut men from the records means that they were murdered. The 'evidence of absence' protocol, based as it may be on absence of evidence, used by the Watsons did not help in the identification of John Ruddy. Identification was done instead through discovery of a dental anomaly. The protocol used by the Watsons has since located two other possible John Ruddys in the 1850 census. Both lived in Pennsylvania and both fitted available information on the John Ruddy who disembarked from the John Stamp in June of 1832. Neither was found buried under scree in Duffy's Cut.

Was it just by chance that Philip Duffy, a fellow Irishman and railroad contractor, lit upon these young men as they disembarked at Philadelphia or was it set up beforehand in Ireland? Also, who belong to the names from Duffy's Cut engraved today on a memorial tombstone in West Chester? If some number of the names on the headstones is correct, it would appear that these men mostly came from the same small corner of Ireland in North West Tyrone and North East Donegal. These are just some of the many riddles that accompany the story and, whichever way, the fates of these young Irishmen were sealed the minute they set foot on a boat in Derry.

In the spirit of the Watson enquiry, these unfortunate young men (whether four or fifty seven) deserve better. They were not just rail-fodder, they were all sons and brothers. Some of them came from a respectable family, like the Patchells who were a respectable Huguenot family who escaped to Ireland from France to escape persecution. The Patchells even had a distinguished family member in Colonel John Patchell who was a hero of the American Civil War. Some of the less prominent families were of native Irish nobility stock and it would ill-behave the archives of American and Irish history to have some family member honoured and others, who were equally without blame or fault, to have been rubbished and disremembered.

So what were the pressures upon these young men to emigrate, some of them as young as fifteen? Firstly, even before the Famines visited rural areas like West Donegal, the general state of health was poor. Some of these young men, despite being described as 'superfit', were probably in a state of semi-starvation. *Cribra orbitalia stigmata* were found in the skulls of the exhumed bodies, pointing towards anaemia and malnourishment due to a restricted and vitamin-deficient diet, or possibly even roundworms or tapeworms. These findings are also consistent with scurvy which was prevalent in Ireland at that time.

If one were to look beyond just the *John Stamp* and include the other ships, almost half of the young men on these boats from Donegal were Protestant weavers, judging by their names. The names of particular interest are Ball, Callan, Patchell, Peoples, Weir, Elliott, Gregg, McCahill, McClay, Hood, Elder, McBrearty, Griffin, Snodgrass, Greer and Leckey. Most of them were from the flaxgrowing parts outside Letterkenny, from Inishowen or from a fringe in the South West of Donegal outside Donegal Town towards Mount Charles or Ballshannon. These Donegal weavers would have been English-speaking and perhaps better educated than labourers from the Boylagh Barony of the Gaeltacht.

Because of the coincidence of most of the family names on the Flaxgrowers List of 1796 also appearing on the Petition for the Union of 1800, the question arises whether those Donegal people who petitioned in droves to become part of the United Kingdom might have by now become disillusioned. An envisaged or expected advantage from any lowering of trade barriers and tariffs had not appeared and showed no signs of doing so. In fact, the situation was becoming worse and their means of production had become antiquated. As Denis O'Hearn wrote in his chapter in 'Ireland in the Atlantic Economy', "even as factory spinning became routine, mechanisation of linen weaving lagged behind. Power looms were used in Scotland as early as 1810 but were barely known in Ireland until after 1850". The gist of his argument is that England would not allow fair trade and monopolised Irish manufacture to service its own industrial revolution. Ireland had become an economic handmaiden and even after the Act of Union the Irish had been hoodwinked.

Had the weavers stayed in Ireland, they could have had immunity to cholera from the bleaching process used on flax in the production of linen. Linen cloth was given at least twelve boilings in a witch's brew of cow's urine, solutions of cow dung, buttermilk, potash, bran, salt and other ingredients depending on the weaver's whim. Between each boiling, the contaminated bleaching solution was rinsed out in the nearest dam or stream. The cloth was then spread on grass to dry, after which it was again watered and dried. The boiling process was then repeated. No cholera bacterium could survive that. It wasn't until 1852 that the discovery was made that the cause of cholera was a contamination of drinking water.

It was a particularly shocking disease. A death rate of forty per cent, often within 24 hours of onset, resulted from a rapid loss of bodily fluids due to nausea, vomiting and diarrhoea. Simple measures such as straining water through filters, not wearing contaminated clothing and plentiful hydration instead of bloodletting would have been sufficient. The men that set sail from Derry to work on Mile 59 were described as 'superfit'. They should have had a better resistance and certainly not a hundred per cent mortality. It was this statistic that first caused the Watsons to be suspicious of a cover-up or a murderous plot fuelled by prejudice towards immigrants and a fear of a contagion.

No doubt there was a business motive as well as a scandal or delay through quarantine would have resulted in financial loss by the Pennsylvania and Columbia Rail Road. If these young men were murdered for having contracted the disease, this over-reaction was nonetheless a crime, all the more so when quarantine in a health facility was the best response. Philadelphia prided itself on how well as a city it was in control of the epidemic and quoted a mortality rate of 25%. Even this seems too high as eighty per cent of people who are infected do not develop symptoms, and only one in five of symptomatic cases,

including the most vulnerable young and elderly, die from the disease. These statistics alone tell the story that whatever other bodies are still to be discovered under the railtracks did not die from cholera. Despite the best efforts of the authorities to educate the public on the best measures, people like Bishop Henrick of Philadelphia inflamed the populace by labelling cholera as a scourge sent by God against the ungodly, amongst whom the Irish were ranked the highest, to turn them back to a path of righteousness.

The medical community in Philadelphia in 1832 attributed the cholera epidemic to 'something in the air' known as miasma, not to the huge influx of Irish immigrants from cholera-stricken Europe. They concluded that it was unnecessary to detain persons on ships at all, let alone for more than ten days as in other places. In fact it was believed that quarantine was harmful by interrupting commerce and depriving thousands of employment and subsistence, making them more liable to succumb to cholera. The general public however did not buy into this theory and they believed it was no accident that the disease followed trade and emigration routes.

This view was supported by the Philadelphia Daily Chronicle which observed that the disease must have been brought to by emigrants from Great Britain, especially the Irish who "live in damp, low-lying areas. They live as six and even ten families in a tenement formerly inhabited by one and they are a depraved and indigent population". The disease did not reach epidemic proportions until 27 July and the two districts outside the city limits most affected were Southwalk and Moyamensing which had limited or no access to fresh water. In Moyamensing, where there was no uncontaminated water, 198 cases of cholera were reported in a population of 6,822. Within the city itself, with its population of 80,458, there were 407 reported cases. This then was the Philadelphia that awaited the Irish emigrants.

Whether disillusioned or desperate, caught three-ways between disillusionment with the State, economic hardship and fear of infection with a fatal disease, these young, healthy able-bodied Irish labourers were bound in the summer of 1832 for Duffy's Cut and the weavers were bound for the mills in Philadelphia. Perhaps unknown to them, the Irish cholera pandemic had already arrived just as they left Ireland but cholera was waiting for them on the far side. Scaremongering was rife in Pennsylvania, fuelled by the knowledge that certain ethnic groups, which included the Irish, had a mortality rate that was three-to-four times higher than expected.

The gap in knowledge in the search for the deceased of Duffy's Cut may have to be filled by response from the readership of bulletins and newspapers to this appeal to amateur family researchers who are out there. The challenge to the Watsons' hypothesis is done in good faith, in the spirit of rigorous inquiry, and is with all due deference and thanks to the Watsons for bringing the story into the public arena. The memories of the deceased can be brought home and the Watson hypothesis may yet become a theory based upon an even more solid platform of evidence. Any readers of this paper who have nuggets of information should post what they have on the Duffy's Cut page of a dedicated website ([celtdomain.com](http://celtdomain.com)) or reply by letter to the post-box of the newspaper in the usual way.

'The Ghosts of Duffy's Cut' (2006) Watson WE, Watson JF, Ahtes JH and Schandelmeier EH, Praeger Press.

## **Additional Material to be referred to, Written up or Developed**

*Taken from the post in reverse order*

11/17

‘except in Northern Ireland, the middle-class man is termed a middleman – a perfectly useless drone, aping the manners and habits of the class above him, living on a profit-rent which he neither uses skill nor exertion to enable his wretched under-tenants to realize. His superior knowledgs never directs them . He is of no use to society’.

‘the upper classes on the other hand almost entirely neglect their duties. These well-disposed but mere nominal owners of their estates are in apprehension of their lives and leave to agents the duties of their positions, and so the door for neglect and abuse is left open’.

The gist of the rest of Foster’s book is that 80% of Irish peasantry, which formed the bulk of the population, lived off a piece of sub-letted land of between 1-15 acres, insufficient to support an exponentially increasing extended family. They had no money and any outside occupation that the 20% had was seasonal. Emigration to North America or England was the safety-valve and this source of cheap labour created hardship for home-grown labourers who became jobless.

In other words, the aristocrats fiddled while Rome burned. Foster is more inclined however to blame the infantile, lazy and feckless Irish for living off scraps and Poorhouse hand-outs and not getting off their own backsides. This being his position, Foster is seemingly amazed at the vitriol he received when all he was trying to do was to help! The truth of the matter was staring him in the face but he chose to take the easy way out. Instead, he blamed the powerless, something which he said in his Introduction that he would not do.

11/16

Foster took considerable pains to detail conditions in this area prior to Lord Hill’s purchase of his estate, using extracts from a memorial drawn up in 1837 by the resident schoolmaster, one Patrick McKye, who sought to impress upon the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland the stark poverty of its people. McKye brought to his task the experience of a well-travelled man of his times.

In his memorial he stated: “the parishioners of this parish of West Tullaghbegley, in the barony of Kilmacrennan and county of Donegal, are in the most needy, hungry, and naked condition of any people that ever came within the precincts of my knowledge, although I have travelled a part of nine counties in Ireland, also a part of England and Scotland, together with a part of British America. I have likewise perambulated 2,253 miles through some of the United States, and never witnessed the tenth part of such hunger, hardship, and nakedness.”

McKye cited statistics in support of his case. Using the census of 1831 he gave the population as 9,049, with “but one cart and one plough, 20 shovels, 32 rakes, 2 feather beds, and 8 chaff beds. None of their married or unmarried women can afford more than one shift, and some cannot afford any; more than one-half of both men and women cannot afford shoes to their feet, nor can many of them afford a second bed, but whole families of sons and daughters of mature age indiscriminately lie together with their parents.

They have no means of harrowing their land but with meadow rakes. Their farms are so small that from four to ten farms can be harrowed in a day with one rake. Their beds are straw, green and dried rushes, or mountain bent; their bedclothes are either coarse sheets, or no sheets, and ragged filthy blankets; and, worse than all I have mentioned, there is a general prospect of starvation.”

These were the conditions before the famine. The article goes on to further state that the only obstacle for his lordship in improving the land was the continued presence of the aboriginal Irish on the land.

11/16

I know he has some humanitarian interests but the rest of us are still treading water to pay out bills while the rich keep getting richer. In 2011 in the 1% of wealthiest people had 90% of the wealth in America. The rich go into politics to fund their own interests.

On a TV program on The Society Of Wealth of this country they conducted an experiment where they had played the game Monopoly. The players representing the rich and poor were selected at random. This is reflected that in a society the poor and rich are seen as a random event. Personally, I don't think that this is a random event. Being in poverty runs in families over many generations. Half the players represented the poor in the US and half were the rich in the US. When the rich players passed "Go" they got the full \$200.00. When the poor passed go they received half this amount. The rich also received more assets in the game. as a result they felt empowered and in turn, less sympathetic for the poor players. The property was bought up in the game by the rich players and by the end of the game the rich players won. The poor in most countries live in unsafe neighborhoods, poor diets, more medical issues, they lack opportunities. There are not enough resources to meet the demand. In America our upward mobility is less than other civilized countries. I think this is what president Jackson was driving at: to spread the wealth in this country and land is not just for the rich. When people own their own land they feel empowered, perhaps they participate in government, take an interest in their cities, state and country.

11/16

The thing I am not clear about, and it appears not to be recorded anywhere, is what was the levy of rent passed down to the tenants who were on less than an acre of land. It was not until 1870 that the Land Act came in to try to protect the rights of tenants and it is said to have failed miserably. Landlords resorted to all sorts of jiggery-pokery to frustrate its proper implementation. The upshot, as far as I can see, is that it took a Land Court to look into what rents were being passed down to tenants who could be evicted for non-payment of even unreasonable rents. The onus then fell upon tenants to foot the cost of a court appearance. They were already living hand-to-mouth so they could not challenge the eviction and if they tried to stay put a posse of local constabulary forced them out. End of story.

Why have I gone off half-cock and started looking at landlords? This is to drill down and to get a grasp of what relationships were like between tenants and landlords, and to equate this with the pressure to emigrate. I can't figure out yet why, for example, the likes of Lord George Hill (landowner for John Ruddy I think) had by far the lowest valuation of his land. Was this because the land was so poor, hence the tenants upon his land might be the hardest pressed to exist? Also, what kind of landlord was Hill anyway? There are very mixed accounts and I already have found quite a bit of material on him. Once I have figured out George Hill I will look at the other landlords who came from the parts of the country that our waxwings came from and see if I can spot a trend.

11/15

In 1820-1860 and as a result of the Great Famine 1.9 million immigrants came from Ireland to the major east coast ports. Unable to afford the costs of supporting a family many individuals left Ireland for America. The Irish Catholics worked in interior improvement projects on the canals, railroads, sewers, construction sites, mill work and in physical work of the public works projects in the northeast and southern states. Irish woman during this period favored the labor-intensive 24/7 position of domestic service. The position paid better wages than mill-work and housing was provided but was considered demeaning and the work was difficult.

11/15

Landowners marked \* have charged too much or too little rent when compared to the norm.

From that it appears that the City of London owned almost a third of County Derry.

The situation in Derry was even worse than in the other counties for poorer people. They paid five hundred times as much for their bit of land compared to rich people.

Total

1380 owners of land of more than one acre owned 511k acres and paid £311k in rent.

798 owners of less than one acre owned 228 acres and paid £53k in rent.

11/14

Tyrone Total:

1717 owners of land of above one acre. Total acreage (775 thousand). Rent £400k.

1070 owners of less than one acre. Total acreage (270 acres). Rent £17.5k.

As with Donegal, it costs a hundred times as much to be poor as it does to be rich.

11/14

Area of Donegal: 1.2 million acres or fifteen hundred square miles.

1170 Owners of less than one acre: 339 acres. Rent: £286k

1000 Owners of more than one acre: 1.17 million acres. Rent:£54k

Unless my arithmetic is all wonky, the list is riddled with clear cases of daylight robbery and extortion by the rich upon the poor. The less land you had, the more rent you paid for it, often by a factor of a hundred viz 50p (a dollar) per acre for the rich versus £50 per acre (100 dollars) for the poor. No wonder at that rate that people fell so badly behind in their rent. The situation (see later) was far worse in Derry where poor people were being squeezed by the fatcats in the City of London.

11/14

The following who claimed to be farmers shared a surname with major landowners:

Birney

Caldwell

Cochrane

Fleming

Greer

Kyle

Lecky

I would take from this that they were poor relations or young turks on the make, possibly sent off with money in their pockets, who looked the part and should have landed on their feet. If they then fell upon hard times they had a better chance of hoofing it back to Ireland.

11/13

I think we need to look at land records for Ill, OH, PA, NC for our farmers. I think the weavers stayed local to Philadelphia secondary to the mills. Also the churches were in Philadelphia, Pittsburg, PA, Cumberland OH, Illinois. Maybe if we look at migration of the people who may have followed the westward expansion of the Presbyterian church. They may have purchased land. The laborers may have purchased land after working on the canals in PA and Ohio

11/12

James and Rebecca may have found a greater sense of displacement here than in Ireland; so they decided that Ireland was the better, more familiar, evil. It was a known that they could deal with on more even terms. They also must have felt placed lower on the socio-economic scale in America than they had been in Ireland. My question is, what if there isn't any leader, either from the beginning or no one stepping up to assume the role? If they are unable to establish an identity on their own, do they flounder in America or do they return to Ireland?

The following FFT is completely logical in my head, but I am pretty sure it is not going to come out that way. Here goes—

Are we to believe the ratio and percentages of those emigrating from Ireland, taking into account money as being the major factor for the lack of Irish Catholic emigrants during this time period? That is to say, that the lack of native Irish emigration is due in large part to the lack of money. The majority of passengers on these early 19th century ships would be non-Catholic and if the percentages hold true, then over 130 passengers on the John Stamp would be non-Catholic, whether they were Presbyterian, Church of Ireland or some other. That would leave roughly twenty passengers eligible to be at 'The Cut'.

According to all the articles we have read on the men at 'The Cut', the workers were Irish Catholic. So two conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, those that were Catholic were recruited in Ireland and made up the rest of the passengers on the John Stamp, entirely filling Duffy's crew. Possible. Or secondly, Catholic workers were also hired from the other three ships. If this is true, did Duffy pay for their passage? I suppose the main question is, would there have been enough Catholic labourers onboard for Duffy to fill a crew solely from the John Stamp unless he had prior recruiting knowledge? Confusing, I know.

Now from that, we can also do a secondary search based on religion. Our first assumption has to be that the 'Cut' workers were Irish Catholic. This can be proved or disproved through the search. If we begin eliminating all of the non-Catholics from the list, we should come up with the same work crew that the Watsons did. Right? If we do not, then either the crew was not entirely Catholic or the names are wrong.

11/12

### **Correspondence from Frank Watson**

"Sounds like you have a good cohort to work with! And yes, Ancestry.com does have its limits. There are some transcription errors in their search protocols and at times in their results pages as well. I have used it successfully to trace some of the folks involved in the Duffy's Cut story (for example I found information on William Ogden's life as well as his burial place this way) by cross checking searches and doing multiple searches in different data bases with names and dates...and sometime by using other known family members in the search (this helped in my search for Philip Duffy).

The more information you can plug in to these searches the better, but even then it is not 100%. Another issue is, of course, transcription errors on the US Census pages and other sources themselves (for example, due to census taker error or even intentionally giving false information to the census taker). Successive searches in later census records where the date of immigration is listed can help clarify some of what is lacking in the earlier material, simplified if a person is living in the same location between several censuses and/or has the same family living with them in the various census listings. The same concerns could be put forth for the death information on these web sites (the sections for wills of deceased persons has been as fruitful as anything else in our search for the names of the folks in the railroad file). As you know, none of the web services are as good as eyeballing the original documents or the microfilm reels at county, state, or the national archives. The National Archive branches may be useful for your folks here in America.

I will add, though, that the listings from City Directories can be pretty helpful on the Ancestry.Com site (again, this helped in tracing Philip Duffy and his family). On a personal note, I successfully used Ancestry.com to trace some of our Irish and Scottish ancestors (on the Donley and Watson side), by using a variety of search protocols. So, long story short, Ancestry.com can be guardedly useful, but don't expect a quick and easy search".

11/12

Perhaps some cues from this chapter might be noted here. In the website Mary put up with the list of names from the Presbyterian faith that immigrated I noticed many of the male names were church elders. Were they acting as church council or were they emigrating to set up other churches? They seemed to be displaced from their home in Ireland and in America they were seeking to find a new identity in their new home.

In the case of the McClay family they didn't find a new identity but may have chosen to return to Ireland instead. From an article I saw on Changing Minds.org, why do people behave in certain situations that may explain their relationships within their social circle. A person needs to feel that they belong. If he doesn't meet this he may feel conflicted and his identity of who he is and how he fits into the group may put his identity at risk. If the McClay's were elders within the church they may have felt the need to motivate the followers. "Factors that affect situational decisions include motivation and capability of the followers. There is a relationship between follower and leader. The leader perceives the followers' stress and mood. The leader's position is to acquire resources, manage the demands, structure and culture of the group. The responsibility of the followers is knowing what to do and how to do it by utilizing resources and tools and collaborating within the group towards a goal. Looking at external and situational factors of a group may help to explain the relationships within the group. It would be interesting to find if those on a certain ship ended up in the same community/church or became farmers/landowners who may have had a common bond within a social network such as a church, club or protective group/union.

11/12

During the years 1816-1818, six to twelve thousand and in 1827 Irish immigrants numbered sixteen thousand. The rate increased to sixty five thousand in 1831. By 1842 over ninety two thousand immigrants reached the US. Contractors whose aim was cheap labor employed three thousand Irish workers for the Erie Canal Project in 1818. In 1826 contractors hired five thousand Irish laborers for four canal projects.

The canals were the first major transportation routes in the US. Many employers sent money to Ireland to pay for the passage of the Irish immigrants who would work as cheap labor building America's internal improvement projects. Almost all Irishmen had to begin in the US as unskilled laborers and many got no further.

The Irish were encouraged to have at least five dollars in their pocket when they immigrated. Often the money was spent on the voyage and they arrived penniless and destitute. The Irish Immigrant Aid Society in NY encouraged the Irish to stay out of the major urban areas and settle in the west. Newspapers and those sympathetic to the Irish emphasized that the Irish should stay away from canal and railroad construction projects secondary to prejudice of the Irish, poor wages, violence and lack of safety measures and unsafe working conditions. They also encouraged the Irish workers to form a protective association which acted like a trade union. The pick-and-shovel workers on the Chesapeake And Ohio RR earned thirty cents per day with board and lodging and a jigger-full of whiskey.

Irish societies such as the Hibernians and athletic clubs were closely connected to the Catholic Church and the Catholic hierarchy. The railroads encouraged the Irish to migrate to the west. Workers on the canals and railroads settled down as farmers along the routes they helped develop. By 1860, eighty seven thousand Irish inhabited Illinois. Ten years later there would be thirty two thousand more immigrants in Illinois.

The Boston Transcript in 1855 stated: “ten families from Newburyport were bound for Illinois. Each family had between \$300-\$1500 per family with the intention to buy land. The Wabash And Erie Canal Company offered immigrant laborer farmers 40, 80 and 160 acres in partial payment for work on the canal. The Illinois Central Railroad paid their workers in scrip in exchange for farmland. Between 1833-1853 three-quarters of the Irish employed on public lands in Illinois took up homesteads.

11/10

I am about half way down the columns in the spreadsheet that tell where the surnames are from. The first row of figures gives the numbers of households around 1847, up till the mid 1850s, that were recorded in the same Ulster counties mentioned in the ship’s manifests. Hence, for example, John Creighton from Donegal, who was a labourer on the John Stamp, left two households (probably but not for certain related) behind him. There were 110 households of that name in Ulster at the time, being 90% of the entire Creighton households in Ireland at that time, but only two of those being in Donegal.

Based upon those figures, one can then devise a search strategy specific to John Creighton, which likely would not be the same as for other subjects being searched for. The 1901 census shows that there were [two families called Creighton](#) still in Donegal at the turn of the century.

Those in Killybegs were two orphaned teenage children living in a Poorhouse, and those in Ballyshannon were an unmarried brother and sister but still young enough to be eligible, especially the sister who was 21. However, in 1911, the only Creightons left in Donegal were middle-aged, two brothers and one sister, living together in Mount Charles. There was no trace in the 1911 census of the Ballyshannon siblings, presumably emigrated, although the sister being 21 may have got married in the meantime and acquired a different name. A marriage certificate might turn that up.

Likewise, with the orphan siblings, there was no trace of them either ten years later. Shipping Lists might show up the younger Creightons but they were no longer in Ireland. Reading between the lines, the Creightons hit upon hard times, from a situation in the case of the Ballyshannon Creightons where two youngish Church of Ireland siblings were able to hire a Catholic housemaid to disappearing off the map ten years later; and in the case of the Killybegs Creightons (probably not from there as that was where the Poorhouse was) to also disappearing off the map ten years later.

11/7

think the filter can be helpful yet unhelpful at the same time. I agree that using the filter for place name will be less useful if we can’t correctly spell the place and person’s name. The Irish records I find difficult because they don’t put a street address and you can’t see the street or home in relation to others on the street. It would be helpful to find a map of Ireland from 1830s. What about the Ordinance Book of Derry or the north west communities where these passengers may have come from? We need the old names of places. The census in Ireland probably won’t help as the date 1832 is early for record keeping. Few records exist before 186. I think without the personal histories we’re going to have to depend on Ancestry family trees on-line and histories that are on-line.

11/7

All of these names, and thanks for this effort, are uncommon in Ireland, being for the most part Ulster-Scots and confined to Ulster. As you say, and nonetheless, too many possibilities are shown in the Ancestry search but was origin in Ireland set as an essential criterion? Unless I am going about it wrongly, I seem to find that when I do an Ancestry search it ignores that filter and lots of possible names are thrown up that disregard the filter. Which of course makes the whole exercise meaningless.

If the filter is working, which I say it is not (?), then that suggests all of the results thrown up by Ancestry are valid and reflect a chain of migration. So they should all be recorded (shock/horror), regardless of number, and put on the tree. Or, failing that, as the task is too large, a representative or even random sample could be put on the tree. Footnotes could refer to the ones that are not put on the tree?

To take stock of where things are at, I have done a little bit of statistical wizardry (!) – not actually, it's kitchen sink stuff. I have made a table of the likelihood of negative, contradictory or confusing results per surname, sticking to the surnames that we have concentrated on. That takes in the list that Eileen has worked on (as shown in her last post) plus the ones that I put up in my last post as the ones that I would focus on. I have highlighted those in bold on the Excel table, put in an adjacent column for Variability, so ignore the rest for now till we see where we are at. A score of 0 means no trace of the name in Ulster for starters; 1 means a waxwing; thereafter lower score means better chance of success and 4 means a needle in a haystack.

We need to know meantime about the Ancestry filter. Is it a joke or does it actually work? If at the end of it all, we have a result that shows all or most of the surnames said by the Watsons to have been buried at the Cut are all showing up in Ancestry, or more likely that names whether allegedly from the Cut or not cannot usually be retrieved, it's OK Corral time?

11/6

Daughters were low in the hierarchy in the family so they had little hesitation in immigrating and the family saved money for her passage. In Ireland in the 1830s there were little economic or social opportunities for woman and immigration was considered in Ireland to be a 'Journey With Optimism'. They could achieve status in America that they couldn't at home. In Ireland there was a 'female exodus' to America in the mid-nineteenth century. The Irish immigrants during this time comprised 50% woman. Single Irish women were called "unprovided-for girls" because marriage opportunities for women were on the decline in Ireland.

In America in the first half of the nineteenth century women were domestics, nurses, teachers and nuns even though the Catholic Church preached that women should be in the home and bear children. Many women put off having children although many couples had as many children as possible despite the economic pressures. Irish men were discriminated against in the workplace and they often abandoned their spouses and children. This led to domestic violence and alcohol abuse in the home. Women handled the finances in the family and they often bore the brunt of the family's responsibilities for child rearing and financial obligations. The Irish were the poorest of the immigrant groups in America in the nineteenth century. Often these families lived in the slums and tenements in the cities like NYC, Boston, Chicago and Philadelphia.

On another subject: Irish in the South:

'Native tolerance was also very important factor in Irish integration into Southern society... Upper class southerners did not object to the Irish because Irish immigration never threatened to overwhelm their cities or states... The Irish were willing to take on potentially high-mortality occupations, thus sparing valuable slave property. Some employers objected not only to the cost of Irish labor but also to the rowdiness of their foreign-born employees. Nevertheless, they recognized the importance of the Irish worker to the production of slavery... the Catholicism practiced by the Irish immigrants was of little concern to the southern natives'. David Gleeson – 'The Irish In The South 1815 – 1877'.

