

**“Deference as Property”: The Economic Lives of Black Barbers in Nineteenth-Century Baltimore**  
**Marcus Anthony Allen**

During 1850s free blacks in some sense “prospered as never before.”<sup>1</sup> No other group demonstrated this “prosperity” and the economic possibilities for African Americans during this period better than black barbers.<sup>2</sup> These men were entrepreneurial in their orientation and economic activity, even if they were not considered business owners in their own right. Cyprian Clamorgan wrote a book called *The Colored Aristocracy of St. Louis*, wherein he “presented the argument that people should be judged by their degree of respectability instead of by their race. Clamorgan intended his sketches of individual members of the colored aristocracy to win over readers to his point of view.”<sup>3</sup> The idea of aristocracy set out to articulate social gradations in the black community. Pro-slavery advocates, those loyal to the Slave Power, aimed to use logic, the Bible, and any other measure including pseudo-scientific evidence to prove the polygenic, innate inability of black people. People like Clamorgan and others, wanted to separate themselves from other blacks who they viewed as truly lazy, obdurate, and dependent totally on the larders of whites. In some sense too this idea of interracial differentiation is found in the concept of *respectability* appearing in antebellum black communities. Respectability separated not only country Negroes from refined Negroes, but it also spoke to one’s understanding of representing the race in a certain fashion to an often hostile Anglo-American public. Patrick Rael explains the importance of this concept:

If one word encapsulated the rewards of self-improvement efforts and the benefits of living under the guidance of its resulting virtues, it was ‘respectable.’ That term, uttered countless times in the antebellum press, served as a master value, encompassing a host of traits--not all of them compatible--that come to define an ideal for human character in an expanding market society.<sup>4</sup>

## Deference as Property

Thus when, T. Evans Fernandis, son of well-known barber John Fernandis, wrote of a “barber aristocracy” this entailed both an elevated sense of identity in a semi-skilled profession, as well as a feel of separateness within the larger black community, at least at some level.

These black barbers “went each morning to the homes of the wealthy to practice their tonsorial art.” A glimpse into their work illuminates another exchange between these barbers and their white clients besides the barber’s chair and razor:

These colored barbers, alert to every whim of their customers and veritable encyclopedias of family histories-on which they kept discreet silence, however-were ‘on call’ to homes for touching up before the Bachelors’ Cotillions [sic], gay dinners at the Kennels or other social events where man had to look their best.

There were some who added an art to their repertoire which is now extinct. When one of the white gentry awakened in the morning with one or two eyes blue or blackened-often no recalling the origin-it was the barber who lightly painted out the bruises, a crude sort of water-color surgery.<sup>5</sup>

All at once these barbers code-switched as barbers, historians, cosmetic surgeons, and servants to the elite and those who desired to be (possibly the rougher group that did not “recall the origin” of their bruises). While *The Sun* is known for representing the black community in an unfavorable manner, there seems to be some validity to an idea of not only a barber aristocracy, but also something like a *black* aristocracy in Baltimore with its foundation being the black barbers in Baltimore.

Possibly, what is more important though is the experience of these black barbers spending so much time in the homes of their white clients. Black barbers’ experiences complimented the abstract ideas of whiteness and the middle class from their clients. Of course, it is highly likely that black barbers appropriated middle class values of taste and designs from these homes, which would have been delightful to the eye. The main idea here is not that blacks mimicked whites in their homes, tastes, or value, but that the barbers potentially imbibed middle

## Deference as Property

class culture and as a result took these acculturations into their interactions with other members of the black community.

Barbers' appropriation of this middle class culture was tainted by both their environments and what they believed. Gutman responding to the common idea that treatment of slaveholders alone determined slave behavior explains:

Despite variations in their treatment, these slaves acted on common beliefs . . . .How owners treated their slaves affected how individual slaves behaved. But how slaves behaved depended upon far more than their 'treatment' . . . .Slave naming practices and marital rules (as well as the length of slave marriages in setting where slaves could remarry) are unmistakable evidence of the importance of *interior* slave beliefs and *experience* in shaping their behavior.<sup>6</sup>

Gutman labels "erroneous," "mimetic theories of Afro-American culture," which were ubiquitous in scholarship on slavery during the 1950s and 1960s. Furthermore, Gutman uses a bicultural model posited by Charles A. Valentine to explain the external and internal realities that shaped slave culture, which aids in understanding middle class acculturation of antebellum black barbers. Quoting from Valentine, Gutman explains, "Biculturation 'helps explain how people learn and practice both mainstream culture and ethnic culture at the same time. Much intragroup socialization is conditioned by ethnically distinct experience . . . but at the same time members of all subgroups are thoroughly enculturated in the dominant culture patterns by mainstream institutions.'" <sup>7</sup> Thus perceived or real elitism of black barbers or others differed from the elitism found in the Anglo-American middle class. This means these barbers had the potential to imbibe white culture, but how this actual process happened depended on internal, familial, and communal relationships and experiences.

These appropriations of Anglo-American middle class culture by black savers added to what Emma Lapsansky calls "differences of worth." Lapsansky explains how these "differences" played out in black elite circles:

## Deference as Property

First, until the Civil War and Reconstruction opened a new avenue, no black person could gain prominence and influence through official public service. Second, black leaders always stood in the contradictory status of being both ‘elite’ and ‘working class;’ that is, their upper-class never exempted them from earning a living by selling their labor. Also, wealth, dependent as it was on so many variables defined and dominated by the white world, evidently had less importance for black elites than for white. Status was conferred more on the basis of personal qualities than on possession or background.<sup>8</sup>

Being a black elite and thus often by default a black leader in antebellum America had different connotations than that found in white leadership. Black men and women could not hold public office, a symbol historically of upper class status. Although “elite” within the social circles and institutions of the black community, many of this group would have still been considered middle or lower class. In other words, in some sense most members of this group remained workers and never ultimately producers. The last of these “differences of worth” had to do with wealth versus “personal qualities.” As many black leaders before the Civil War were not wealthy, the content of their character versus the content of their wallet defined black elitism.<sup>9</sup> Black barbers could potentially have both: character and money.

Moreover, this group of men “ingratiated themselves with affluent white men in order to obtain the financial and social capital necessary for upward mobility, even if this meant adopting the politics of subterfuge and accommodating white racial stereotypes.”<sup>10</sup> That is, as Quincy T. Mills’ work on black barbers displays, they drew the “color-line” in their barbershops, excluding African Americans from their chairs. Douglas Bristol Jr., gives a description of what it may have meant to be a black barber in antebellum America:

Black barbers . . . invented the first-class barbershop. Combinations of upscale decor and masculine conviviality, these establishments quickly became a favorite destination for white men, a place where they stopped by to debate politics and swap tales as well as to get a shave.

Black barbers struck a bargain with white customers. The barbers assured white men that a barbershop friendship did not imply racial equality, and white men granted black barbers the right to pursue respectability without harassment. The barbers may have conceded too much. They certainly wrestled with the consequences of their decision.

## Deference as Property

Nevertheless, antebellum black barbers established ties to the white elite that would persist throughout the rest of the nineteenth century. The race relations of the barbershop hinged on black barbers' serving as reference points for their white customers. The barbers validated white privilege through elaborate rituals of deference, and, as the hosts of upscale businesses they offered white customers an appropriate setting for demonstration of their own respectability. The barbers' ability to be all things to white men let them become comfortably ensconced on Main Streets throughout the antebellum United States.<sup>11</sup>

One of the main problems (and maybe the only one) with Bristol's description is its lack of negotiation politics. Negotiation occurred daily during plantation slavery, which speaks to black agency (that is blacks were not simply acted upon), but more importantly demonstrates the gumption black people possessed in the face of racial discrimination.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, Mills explains, "Northern free blacks, though small in number, had by 1850, spent thirty or forty years negotiating the meaning of their freedom and citizenship."<sup>13</sup> So to suggest these black barbers only participated in "elaborate rituals of deference" without something more than a "demonstration [of] their own respectability," limits the relationship between barber and patron. Barbers used the money earned from deference for community uplift, educations for their children and those in the community, and possibly even for leaving an inheritance for their children. The black community understood these color-line politics and many would have undoubtedly given them a pass, when they considered the economic benefits of this heinous color-line.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, while Bristol's description encapsulated the tonsorial experience well, however, negotiation in black barber chairs complicated the color-line.

Thomas Green was one of the best-known black barbers in Baltimore. Potentially, he led the black aristocracy. Thomas Green's home was located in Baltimore's "fashionable merchant district," and like John Fernandis and many other barbers, he lived and worked at the same residence.<sup>15</sup> Christopher Phillips calls Green "Maryland's most affluent black resident" during the antebellum period, and he is probably correct in this estimation.<sup>16</sup> Green came to

## Deference as Property

Baltimore from Barbados in 1813. He worked as a barber and over time had a large clientele. Phillips notes that his clientele was both white and black. If this was true, then Green stood as an exception in a day when the best barbers maintained primarily a white clientele. In 1838, Green began purchasing property, “and within two decades [he] owned ten city lots and seven buildings, which he rented out, mostly to black tenants.” When Green died in 1858 his “net worth exceeded \$17,000, nearly \$6,000 of which he kept in cash.”<sup>17</sup> Green’s net worth may have exceeded \$17,000. However, the \$6,000 in cash is debatable, as his account balance in January of 1859 was \$2,084.90.<sup>18</sup> Green could have had more than this at home, like other black savers who kept money at home, or he could have had another bank account.

Green may have actually owned 10 city lots. During one auction Green bought a lot on the north side of Hill Street, near Howard, and at the same auction Green purchased another lot.<sup>19</sup> These pieces of property sold for \$150 and \$153 dollars respectively. It is likely that during this same month Green purchased more property for he withdrew \$906.33 on October 30<sup>th</sup>, 1854, more than enough for the property purchased on the 10<sup>th</sup>. Green also rented out a “school room...in the basement of Madison Street Church.”<sup>20</sup>

After Green died Thomas Owings and Charles W. Ridgely handled his estate. In a classified ad they give insight to how Green continually made large deposits in his SBB account.

### **VALUABLE STORE AND PREMISES NO. 28 LIGHT ST. FOR SALE**

. . . .The ground is in fee, and very valuable, being in a CHOICE BUSINESS LOCATION, and of great depth, and by its binding the entire distance on a 20 feet alley, enjoying the benefit of good light, so much needed in mechanical pursuits. The premises are under lease to Mr. John W. Yeatmen until the 21<sup>st</sup> June, 1861, at the rent of \$600 per annum [sic], payable monthly, besides the hydrant rent. »Terms of sale-One third cash; the balance in equal installments in six and twelve months from the day of sale. The credit payments to bear interest and to be secured by notes satisfactory to the Executors.<sup>21</sup>

## Deference as Property

Green then received monthly payments from his tenants often for six-month agreements and yearly agreements. Presumably the six-month payments would have been a higher amount than the yearly.

Green's account is an example of black depositors who displayed an even savings pattern, withdrawing and depositing large or small amounts because of either their income or from real estate activity. Although Green applied this savings pattern and remained wealthy, other black savers using it resembled Penelope weaving all day and unweaving at night, making little economic progress. Like real estate investors today, Green bought land and then rented it out to others, with the intent of earning on his investment. For example, on May 10, 1852 Green withdrew \$180 from his savings account, and during the same month bought a piece of property on the north side of Mulberry Street by mortgage from Peregrine Young.<sup>22</sup> Then in November of 1852, Green and company sold a piece of property to Lancaster Ould on the north side of Mulberry Street.<sup>23</sup> The relationship between Green and "company" is not clear but it appears that Green bought this property in May as the primary party and then sold it to Ould in November. On November 15 1852, Green deposited \$225 into his account. If this deposit was from Ould's purchase then Green made a profit of \$45.

A further look at Green's savings record demonstrates the even trend in his banking activity (See Figure 15). During the first cohort Green made 17 deposits totaling \$2,985.47 or an average of about \$175.62 per deposit. Green benefited from the interest/dividend policy earning \$944.94. Altogether Green deposited and earned from the Bank, \$3,930.41. On the other hand, during the same period Green made 10 withdrawals for \$2,306.33, which suggest that between 1850 and his death in 1858 Green saved \$1,624.08. There were three withdrawals from his account after 1858 totaling \$2,352.47 (Green began his 1850 with 728.29 in his account), which

## Deference as Property

were probably made by the executors of his will or relatives. Green deposited only \$679.14 more than he withdrew over the eight year period of the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort, which although impressive illustrates Green's view that aggressive investing produced more dividends than pecuniary caution. Also, although Green is silent in the land records in the 1850s, his large withdrawals probably still relate to real estate.

Ultimately, Green represents what every barber envisioned for themselves. However, every barber did not become "Maryland's wealthiest citizen." Although considered "n\*\*\*er work" by some, and offensive for even the barbers themselves ("John Rapier, despite being the twelfth wealthiest black man in Alabama after operating a barbershop for thirty years," opined, "To tell the truth, I hate the name barber.") there were other benefits that made barbering desirable:

Opening a barbershop did not take a great deal of capital, and success depended mainly on the ability to please a white clientele—a talent many free Negroes carried out of slavery. Moreover, unlike many of the trades at which free Negroes worked, barbering was not physically burdensome. The diversity of the trade and moderate physical demands allowed hard-working free Negroes to give full rein to their ambition. Free Negro barbers rented carriages, ran bathhouses, sold clothing, and pulled teeth.<sup>24</sup> Free blacks, then, indeed utilized this opportunity, although sometimes reluctantly, to obtain real estate, exercise their entrepreneurial talents, and provide social options for their families and communities. In truth then, the barbering profession undoubtedly aided in developing economic literacy.

Although there was only one Thomas Green, there were other members of the barber aristocracy that illustrate the economic undergirding of Baltimore's black community by black barbers. The 1850 census lists Francis M. Turner, as a 40-year old barber, living with Sarah E. Turner his wife, and Catherine W. Turner, their newborn baby. Also living with the Turner family was Francis Flammer, who could have been a relative or simply a boarder. Three other

## Deference as Property

young males, Frisby Jenkins, 18, Charles James, 16, and Basil Hall, 12, completed the members of the Turner household. These young men were listed as barbers, which suggest that they were probably being apprenticed by Turner. This arrangement seems to have been commonplace for barbers. Turner did not report any real estate holdings, and everyone was supposedly able to read and write.<sup>25</sup> Matchett's Baltimore directory for 1851 gives further insight to Turner's economic success as a barber, for he is listed as a "barber, and bath keeper" living on Bank lane, dw 164 Tyson Street.<sup>26</sup> Thus, Turner owned a luxury-styled barbershop. Many African Americans, then, would not have been able to afford to get a haircut in Turner's bathhouse, because of the luxuries found there.

By the 1860 census the Turner family was growing. Francis and Sarah were still married, Catherine was older, but she had three other siblings: Mary (7), Frank (6), and Sarah (3). A 14-year old, Henrietta Bowser also lived in the Turner household. All of the Turner children except Sarah were in school, and it appears that the older Sarah was at home both in 1850 and 1860. Turner still denoted as a barber, listed \$4,500 worth of real estate and a personal estate of \$1,200 (in 1850 Turner did not report any real estate and he had \$1,285.54 in his SBB account), which means either the 1850s went well for him economically, or he failed to report some of his estate.<sup>27</sup>

Turner like many other black savers invested in real estate. In April of 1852, he purchased a piece of property on the northwest side of Gay Street from Charles Grimes and in May of 1852 he purchased another lot on the corner Cathedral and Tyson Streets from Archer Ropes.<sup>28</sup> On April 19, 1852 Turner made a withdrawal for \$1,100, possibly to cover both purchases, but undoubtedly to cover the one in April.

## Deference as Property

On April 1, 1850, Turner had \$1,285.54 in his SBB account, but by February 20, 1855 Turner's account closed. It is not clear why Turner closed the account, possibly due to a real estate purchase, or maybe something related to his business. A few years after closing his account it appears Turner still ran his bathhouse until he suffered a violent stroke in February of 1859:

Francis M. Turner, a very worthy and respectable colored citizen, the proprietor of the bathing establishment and shaving saloon in Bank lane, was paralyzed on Friday last, while engaged about his business in his shop. One side of the body, from his shoulder to his toe, was suddenly deprived of the use of feeling. He was attended by Dr. Thomas Buckler, and convey to his residence. It is thought he will never entirely recover.<sup>29</sup> Possibly in an attempt at convalescence Turner moved to Canada. In 1865 Turner died in "Dresden, Canada West, at the age of 58."<sup>30</sup>

Before his stroke Turner exhibited the sort of saving pattern that other barbers and real estate investors displayed: he made large deposits, while at the same time withdrawing larger sums (see Figures 16 and 17). Between April 1850 and April of 1853 he made 14 deposits totaling \$1,430.25, for an average of about \$102.16. Unlike Green, Turner's savings pattern appears to resemble the communal capitalism found throughout the SBB records. For example, in April he deposited \$120, in June \$55.25, in July \$230, and in August \$150. These deposits were probably a combination of his income, ground rents, money from boarders, and any income from his immediate family.

These large deposits also demonstrate Turner's financial acumen, for he retained enough of his deposits to earn interest from the SBB. However, during the same period Turner made two withdrawals totaling \$1,995, an astounding average of \$997.50 per withdrawal. Between April 1, 1853 and February 20, 1855 Turner followed the same pattern he made 10 deposits and only had one withdrawal. The withdrawals amounted to \$735, while the deposit was for \$1,873.75. Subsequently, Turner closed his account. What makes Turner's account stand out is that his

## Deference as Property

efforts are found in the 1850s, while many of the others that fit his saving pattern are found in the 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort (1865–1880).<sup>31</sup>

Apprenticing young aspiring barbers was another common practice of the barber elite. William W. Lee, was another one of Mills' "color line" barbers, owning a dressing salon for what appears to be a short time.<sup>32</sup> Unquestionably longevity determined who capitalized the most on their color-line profits. The 1850 census lists the Lee family containing 10 people. Besides William there was Eliza, aged 6, Jacob, aged 11, Mary R., aged 3, and a number of other boarders and possibly relatives. Two of the remaining residents, Leftcot Harison and John Johnston were barbers, which follows a similar pattern of other barbers during the period of the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort.<sup>33</sup> Perry H. Ridout, like Lee was a mulatto barber, whose household contained seven members, one being an apprentice. Ridout, unlike Lee, was married. He and his wife, Ellen had two children John and Mary. Three boarders Collins Jones, George Peters, the apprentice, and Julia Lyles completed the household.<sup>34</sup> Both Ridout and Lee understood the formula of black barber capitalism as both of them had apprentices, which represented income and the future of the profession.

Ridout also demonstrates how quickly barbers made and spent their money. For example, Ridout started the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort with \$686.27, and between May 27, 1850 and December 9<sup>th</sup> 1850 deposited \$120. However, between July 22, 1850 and March 10<sup>th</sup> 1851 he withdrew \$400.<sup>35</sup> By March of the next year Ridout's account closed. Ridout's saving's pattern ultimately illustrates the economic risk found even in the barbering profession, and the reality that there were barbers who were not a part of the "aristocracy".<sup>36</sup> Similar to purchasing real estate and holding a savings account, being a barber did not in and of itself guarantee economic success.<sup>37</sup>

## Deference as Property

James Anderson and John A. Fernandis further exemplify how the lucrative nature of the barbering profession and a close proximity to middle class Anglo-American culture created a different lens through which many barbers viewed their savings accounts. For many members of the barber aristocracy caution, foresight, and frugality took the back seat to variations of collective capitalism and real estate investment.

Anderson's savings behavior was impressive, yet he failed to keep his deposits in the bank. Anderson was a master barber according to the 1860 census, which meant that his income was steady. The 1870 census denotes 13 people living in the Anderson household! The ages range from 58 to 1. James, Anne, James B., Ann L. Mary seem to be part of the immediate Anderson household, while the rest of the occupants potentially represent boarders, relatives, apprentices or friends.<sup>38</sup> The 1870 census, lists no occupations for the Anderson women, but this did not mean that they did not work at home. Mary A. Smith and Emily King worked outside of the home as dressmakers, and probably boarders. James B. Anderson and Robert H. Gibbs most likely worked together or were friends as both of them were grocers, while Lewis Woods found employment as a laborer. Thus in all there were at least six incomes being brought into the Anderson household by 1870. Several members of the household earned and saved significant sums. Robert H. Gibbs reported \$3,000 in real estate and \$500 in personal property in the 1870 census. Whether the living arrangement was temporary is uncertain. Gibbs seems to have been a divorcee or a widower, as his four children, Mary, Robert, Anna, and Charles also lived with the Andersons.

Six incomes most likely translated into more deposits into Anderson's account, an example of the communal savings pattern of the time, Gibbs, though took advantage of the economic benefits of the Bank as an individual, for by 1865 he also had his own an account.<sup>39</sup>

## Deference as Property

Another question for another project is how were these communal accounts divided? There are a number of possibilities, but what seems plausible is that all of Anderson's immediate family contributed and then Anderson potentially just used the rent he received from boarders to complete the total deposit amount.

The 1870 census also denoted that Anderson possessed \$9,000 worth of real estate and \$500 worth of personal property, yet by April 1, 1871 Anderson only had \$7.19 in his SBB account.<sup>40</sup> It remains to be seen if Anderson had another account. Even if he did he still found some usefulness for his SBB account as he attempted to reestablish his previous savings patterns. Anderson began the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort with \$80.73, and by 1865 his account totaled \$16.07. During the period of the 1<sup>st</sup> cohort Anderson made 207 deposits!

This was a substantial amount of deposits for any period. Anderson averaged around a little more than 17 per year. His 207 deposits totaled \$1,890, an average of around \$9.13 per deposit. In 1850 he made deposits in every month between April and December. In 1851 he made deposits in every month except September and October. Between April 1853 and May 1854 he made deposits in every month. These examples illustrate the communal component of Anderson family mentioned earlier. Anderson's job as barber yielded a steady flow of income, but his household of 13 undoubtedly contributed to these 207 deposits.

In spite of this large amount of deposits, as Figure 18 displays, Anderson did not retain the bulk of the \$1,890 he deposited. In fact during the 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort Anderson's savings pattern became more erratic. Although he deposited \$100 on April 27, 1865, he only made two more deposits for the rest of the year, one on May 16<sup>th</sup> for \$3, and another on November 22<sup>nd</sup> for \$5. In 1866, he only made two deposits of \$10 in the months of April and June. The next year

## Deference as Property

possibly because he saved his earnings and deposited them all at once he was able to make more deposits, one for \$60 in March and four more in April, August, and September.

Although Anderson possessed real estate, making large deposits into his savings account was not his customary savings pattern. Thus the deposits in 1868 for \$50 on August 8<sup>th</sup> and \$55 on November 12<sup>th</sup> were the exception not the rule. In 1869, he deposited \$10 in July and \$15 in August, probably his savings for the whole month. The next year, most likely with the intent of preparing for future years of savings or another real estate investment Anderson deposited \$450 in his account, which most likely came either from the collected efforts of his household or from selling one of his real estate properties. Anderson's withdrawals outstripped his deposits. The next month, May 1870, he withdrew \$300 dollars, and by the end of the year he withdrew \$182 dollars. On April 1, 1871, Anderson had only \$6.97 in his account and on December 19, 1872 he withdrew \$2.22, and closed this account. Thus, communal savings initiatives had their limits. As will be discussed more in the next chapter, these communal efforts often helped procure real estate, not build large savings accounts in preparation for death.

John A Fernandis was a well-known barber and community leader in Baltimore's black community. In the 1870 census Fernandis reported \$7,750 worth of real estate and \$650 worth of personal property. Like Anderson, Fernandis had a steady income and a large family. In 1870 the Fernandis household contained nine members, only one of which was not a Fernandis. Fernandis had six children, Walter and Wells were barber apprentices, and Maria was a hairdresser. Moore and John Jr., were in school, and Catherine was only two and thus would have been at home with her mother Rebecca. John A.'s father was from Rio de Janero, Brazil, thus the Fernandis family was partly of South American descent. By 1880, there were two more Fernandis family members, Evans and Charles.

## Deference as Property

Later, during the twentieth century both Evans and Walter would be well known barbers in Baltimore. Evans was more popular than Walter as he had a barber chair in the Johns Hopkins Medical School. Some of his customers included, “President Manuel L. Quezon of the Philippine Islands, General Leonard Wood, Hiram Bingham, former ambassador to Great Britain, James Bone (editor of the Manchester Guardian), the King of Siam...and Dorothy Dix.”<sup>41</sup> Evans and Walter were probably not members of the “aristocracy of Negro barbers” in Baltimore as the barbering trade was changing in Baltimore by the 1860s.<sup>42</sup> This group, though, undoubtedly exemplified communal capitalism amongst each other. Through loans, borrowing of tonsorial resources, and referrals, a communal component rested as foundational to its members’ financial ascent or descent.

John A. Fernandis had a six-chair shop, at 415 South Broadway, in the window you could see Rebecca helping a client as a hairdresser. They “set up their shop together after coming from Rio de Janerio,” according to Evans. While the 1870 census denotes Rebecca as being at home Evans remembers her involved in the family hair dressing business. Rebecca watched her children in between hair appointments, and her earnings contributed to the Fernandis estate. The Fernandis family “lived above the shop,” and as Evans remembers “were the only colored family who ever lived on Broadway in its glory.”<sup>43</sup>

Fernandis, like Anderson, displayed a barber’s saving pattern, only during a later period than Anderson. Anderson displayed a period of high activity, when he made 207 deposits, followed by a downward trend. Fernandis on the other hand, had little activity in the 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort and then during the 3<sup>rd</sup> cohort, his activity increased before ultimately declining, probably around the time of his death (see Figure 19).

## Deference as Property

During the 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort Fernandis made 32 deposits for a total of \$226.30, averaging about \$7.10 per deposit. At the same time he made four withdrawals for \$232, so as Chart 1.14 demonstrates from 1868 to 1880 his account did not increase much. Fernandis only earned \$51.71 on interest and extra dividends. Yet, the same period he reported over \$7,000 in real estate. His account through the period found in this chart overall is not that impressive never totaling more than around \$120. It seems then that for many black savers having a bank account was more of a symbol-probably of middle class status as well as evidence of their ability to participate in American citizenship-than a necessary measure for attaining economic security.

Like Anderson, Fernandis does demonstrate a consistent savings pattern, as demonstrated by the chart. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> cohort period, he made 80 deposits totaling \$550.35, but he still only averaged around \$6.88 per deposit (see Figure 20). Most impressive regarding Fernandis' account in this period are the 62 consecutive deposits of \$5. This stream of deposits took place between January 3, 1882 and September 29, 1883, so for nearly two years. It is not clear if the barbering profession continued to be lucrative or if Fernandis' clientele allowed him to function in a similar fashion as those from the earlier era of the barber aristocracy. At the same time he made six withdrawals for \$613.72, while only earning \$32.06 from interest payments. His diligence and consistency failed to yield substantial savings and thus when the account was closed the last withdrawal was for \$13.72. Black barbers like Green, Anderson and Fernandis, essentially established the precedent that being cautiously upward was not the only path to economic success. Real estate could be used as a tool to earn wealth as well.

While black barbers stood as paragons for what black entrepreneurs could accomplish in antebellum Baltimore, others fell short of demonstrating entrepreneurial success. Many black Baltimoreans like Darius Stokes failed to capitalize on their entrepreneurial endeavors. While

## Deference as Property

black barbers maintained an entrepreneurial ethos in their economic mentality, most combined real estate investments with their tonsorial efforts. Most believed that entrepreneurial activities alone did not equate to economic security and mobility. Concurrently, black depositors like Stokes, learned as well that entrepreneurial efforts alone were precarious and ephemeral. Stokes' entrepreneurial and community activities articulate the frustrations and limitations found in attaining economic security in antebellum Baltimore. Put another way, picking oneself up by one's own bootstraps was impossible. It appears as well that saving money during this cohort (maybe all three) required some sense of selfishness. This paradox must have plagued most black savers. While thinking of one's relatives or even possibly wanting to save to support community institutions one had to ignore the everyday needs of those around him.

---

<sup>1</sup> This prosperity remained ambiguous. See Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters*, Chapter 11, "The Best of Times, the Worst of Times." Also for example, Theodore Hershberg found that in the period between 1838 and 1847 Philadelphia's black community, not only known for their role in aiding runaways, but the education and relative wealth of its community, was actually in decline. John Hope Franklin adds, "The per capita wealth of the free Negroes of North Carolina was only \$34.00 in 1860. Thousands of these were landless and without any kind of property." See Theodore Hershberg, "Free Blacks in Antebellum Philadelphia: A Study of Ex-Slaves, Freeborn, and Socioeconomic Decline," in *Philadelphia: Work, Space, Family and Group Experience in the Nineteenth Century, Essays Toward an Interdisciplinary History of the City*, ed. Theodore Hershberg (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981); John Hope Franklin, *The Free Negro In North Carolina, 1790–1860* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1969), 159.

<sup>2</sup> This idea of barbers possessing the most economic prosperity could vary depending on the city, as Abram Harris writes the food industry was just as or more lucrative: "In no skill or trade was the reputation of Negroes more secure than in cooking." Abram L. Harris, *The Negro as Capitalist: A Study of Banking and Business Among American Negroes* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1968), 11.

<sup>3</sup> Douglas Walter Bristol, Jr., *Knights of the Razor: Black Barbers in Slavery and Freedom* (Baltimore: The Johnson Hopkins Press, 2009), 123.

<sup>4</sup> Patrick Rael, *Black Identity and Black Protest in the Antebellum North* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 130.

<sup>5</sup> “Negro Barber, 65, Is Link With Hopkins Past . . . .,” *The Sun*, February 14, 1942, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: *Baltimore Sun, The* (1837–1986), <http://search.proquest.com/hnpbaltimoresun/docview> (accessed February 6, 2012).

<sup>6</sup> Herbert G. Gutman, *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom, 1750–1925* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), 257. Emphasis mine.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 260–261.

<sup>8</sup> Emma Lapsansky, “Friends, Wives, and Strivings: Networks and Community Values Among Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia Afroamerican Elites,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 108, no. 1 (January 1984): 5–6.

<sup>9</sup> Emma Lapsansky, “Friends, Wives, and Strivings: Networks and Community Values Among Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia Afroamerican Elites,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 108, no. 1 (January 1984): 5–6.

<sup>10</sup> Bristol Jr., *Knights of the Razor*, 119.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>12</sup> For example, like that found in *Roll Jordan Roll*.

<sup>13</sup> “Quincy T. Mills, “‘Color Line’ Barbers and the Emergence of a Black Public Space: A Social and Political History of Black Barbers and Barbershops, 1830–1970,” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Chicago, 2006), 23. R.J.M. Blackett gives a good example of this sense of negotiation in the free black community of Pittsburgh, when free blacks negotiated with local authorities regarding a free black who they believed had been abducted: The suspected slave of Slaymaker, Caroline Cooper, turned out to be a free black. After she was captured, the crowd hurried her through a private alley to Third Street and then to the barbershop of Mr. Davis, from where she was taken to a safer hiding place in another part of the city. Slaymaker subsequently proved to the mayor that Cooper was free, and Delany was brought in to inspect the evidence. Once Delany was convinced that Cooper was free, he agreed to have her returned. Accompanied by an officer, he went to Webster Street, where a small group of blacks were meeting to plan her escape north. They agreed that Cooper was free and returned her from a house ‘somewhere near the intersection of Cherry Alley and Strawberry Alley’ to the City Hotel. In order to ensure Cooper’s safe passage, Delany issued Slaymaker with the a letter addressed to “The Friends of the Liberty.” R.J.M. Blackett, “‘Freedom, or the Martyr’s Grave’: Black Pittsburgh’s Aid to the Fugitive Slave” in Joe William Trotter, Jr. and Eric Ledell Smith, eds. *African Americans in Pennsylvania: Shifting Historical Perspectives* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997): 159–160. This account was taken from the *Pittsburgh Gazette*, March 8, 1855. For other accounts like this one see pgs. 159–160.

<sup>14</sup> For more on black barbershops in general and as counter-publics and political spaces see Melissa Victoria Harris-Lacewell, *Barbershops, Bibles, and BET* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004); Trudier Harris, “The Barbershop in Black Literature,” *Black American Literature Forum* 13, no. 3 (Autumn 1979): 112–118; Hortense Thornton, “The

---

Barbershop and Beauty Parlor in Afro-American Literature,” *Pacific Coast Philology* 14 (October 1979): 76–83.

<sup>15</sup> Christopher Phillips, *Freedom’s Port: The African American Community of Baltimore, 1790–1860* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 99.

<sup>16</sup> *Freedom’s Port*, 153.

<sup>17</sup> *Freedom’s Port*, 153.

<sup>18</sup> SBB, Deposit Ledgers, Series 9, N–1.

<sup>19</sup> “LOCAL MATTERS,” *The Sun*, October 10, 1854, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: *Baltimore Sun, The* (1837–1986), <http://search.proquest.com/hnpbaltimoresun/docview> (accessed June 29, 2012). Other purchases that could have been a part of these 10 city lots were: Thomas Green was granted “2 lots” on the north side of Hill street by John J. Mills, administrator. Gr cont’d.” Baltimore City Superior Court (Land Records, Grantee Index) [MSA CE 166–3] A–Z, 1853–1853, p. 0125, <http://mdlandrec.net> (accessed June 29, 2012). Also it appears that the record keeper forgot to write “Oct” in the left margin, so September appears to have a large number of grantee purchases.

<sup>20</sup> “Classified Ad 14-No Title,” *The Sun*, December 25, 1855, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: *Baltimore Sun, The* (1837–1986), <http://search.proquest.com/hnpbaltimoresun/docview> (accessed June 29, 2012).

<sup>21</sup> “Classified Ad 19-No Title,” *The Sun*, April 1, 1859, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: *Baltimore Sun, The* (1837–1986), <http://search.proquest.com/hnpbaltimoresun/docview> (accessed July 7, 2012).

<sup>22</sup> “Gr cont’d.” Baltimore City Superior Court (Land Records, Grantee Index) [MSA CE 166–1] A–Z, 1852–1852, p. 0153, <http://mdlandrec.net> (accessed July 7, 2012).

<sup>23</sup> “Gr cont’d.” Baltimore City Superior Court (Land Records, Grantor Index) [MSA CE 167–1] A–Z, 1852–1852, p. 0173, <http://mdlandrec.net> (accessed July 7, 2012).

<sup>24</sup> Bristol Jr., *Knights of the Razor*, 66–67 (asterisks mine); Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters*, 236.

<sup>25</sup> “1850 United States Federal Census Record for Francis M Turner,” [www.ancestry.com](http://www.ancestry.com) (accessed May 14, 2012).

<sup>26</sup> *Matchett’s Baltimore Directory for 1851* (Baltimore: Richard J. Matchett), 340, Special Collections at the University of Maryland, Baltimore City Directories Online, <http://archive.org/stream/matchettsbaltimo1851balt#page/n13/mode/2up> (accessed May 14, 2012).

<sup>27</sup> “1860 United States Federal Census Record for Francis M Turner,” [www.ancestry.com](http://www.ancestry.com) (accessed May 14, 2012).

---

<sup>28</sup> “Tu” Baltimore City Superior Court (Land Records, Grantee Index) [MSA CE 166–1] A–Z, 1852–1852, p. 0394, <http://mdlandrec.net> (accessed May 14, 2012).

<sup>29</sup> “LOCAL MATTERS,” *The Sun*, February 22, 1859, Baltimore, Maryland, NewsBank/Readex, America’s Historical Newspapers, 1827–1998 (accessed May 19, 2012).

<sup>30</sup> “DIED,” *The Sun*, December 6, 1865, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: *Baltimore Sun, The* (1837–1986), <http://search.proquest.com/hnpbaltimoresun/docview> (accessed May 19, 2012). In antebellum America, Canada was a popular place for black people to emigrate. Josiah Henson, the real life “Uncle Tom” from Harriet Beecher Stowe’s, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* was a big part of this migration to Canada. See *The Life of Josiah Henson, Formerly a Slave, Now an Inhabitant of Canada, as Narrated by Himself* (1849). In another example, N.W. Shadd, a free black restaurant owner in D.C., sold his business for \$25,000 and moved to Canada in the 1850s. See Henry S. Robinson, “Some Aspects of the Free Negro Population of Washington, D.C., 1800–1862,” *Maryland Historical Magazine* 64, no.1 (1969): 52, MSA SC5881–1–253, <http://mdhs.mdsa.net> (accessed January 19, 2013). Abraham D. Shadd, “a well-known abolitionist,” from Delaware “was active in the underground railroad until he moved to Canada about 1852.” See Harold B. Hancock, “Not Quite Men: The Free Negroes in Delaware in the 1830’s,” *Civil War History* 17, no. 4 (Dec., 1871): 329, Project Muse, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/cwh/summary/v017/17.4.hancock.html> (accessed January 19, 2013). I don’t know if these two Shadds are related.

<sup>31</sup> SBB, Deposit Ledgers, Series 9, 1850–1852, L–1.

<sup>32</sup> Richard J. Matchett, *Matchett’s Baltimore Directory for 1851* (Baltimore: Richard J. Matchett, 1851), 326, Special Collections at the University of Maryland, Baltimore City Directories Online, <http://archive.org/stream/matchettsbaltimo1851balt#page/338/mode/2up> (accessed June 8, 2012).

<sup>33</sup> “1850 United States Federal Census Record for William W Lee,” [www.ancestry.com](http://www.ancestry.com) (accessed June 8, 2012).

<sup>34</sup> “1850 United States Federal Census Record for Perry H Ridout,” [www.ancestry.com](http://www.ancestry.com) (accessed June 8, 2012); Richard J. Matchett, *Matchett’s Baltimore Directory for 1851* (Baltimore: Richard J. Matchett, 1851), 333, Special Collections at the University of Maryland, Baltimore City Directories Online, <http://archive.org/stream/matchettsbaltimo1851balt#page/338/mode/2up> (accessed June 8, 2012).

<sup>35</sup> Series 9, Deposit Ledgers, 1850–1852, L–1

<sup>36</sup> As an example of risk, John Brown brought a subpoena against Thomas Hodge for damages he suffered in a partnership with Hodge. These two barbers owned two barbershops together. After their partnership ended Hodge “collected large sums of money on said notes and accounts due said firm and drew out of Bank all the money deposited there belonging to said partnership,” afterwards he used the monies for “his own use.” See Loren Schweninger, ed., *The Southern Debate over Slavery, Volume 2: Petitions to Southern County Courts, 1775–1867* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 298–299. Petition #143.

<sup>37</sup> Thomas M. Bray, another barber, had an impressive savings record, however, like Ridout, he was not able to maintain a consistent savings record for a long period of time. Likewise, John Plyman, who is mentioned in the next chapter, was another barber that was probably part of this barber elite.

<sup>38</sup> 1860 United States Federal Census Record about James Anderson,” [www.ancestry.com](http://www.ancestry.com) (accessed 1/29/13); “1870 United States Federal Census Record about James Anderson,” [www.ancestry.com](http://www.ancestry.com) (accessed 1/11/12).

<sup>39</sup> The Robert H. Gibbs in the census and the Robert Gibbs are probably the same person. Gibbs began 1865 with \$765.90 in his account. It was also possible that the “household” account switched over primarily to Gibbs’ account as Anderson’s account during the 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort is minuscule. See SBB, Deposit Ledgers, Series 9, 1865–1867, Q–1, passim.

<sup>40</sup> “1870 United States Federal Census Record about James Anderson,” [www.ancestry.com](http://www.ancestry.com) (accessed 1/11/12).

<sup>41</sup> Bettye Collier Thomas, “The Baltimore Black Community, 1865–1910” (Ph.D. diss., George Washington University, 1974), 206; “Negro Barber, 65, Is Link With Hopkins Past . . .,” *The Sun*, February 14, 1942, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: *Baltimore Sun, The* (1837–1986), <http://search.proquest.com/hnpbaltimoresun/docview> (accessed February 6, 2012).

<sup>42</sup> As early as 1853 Frederick Douglass in his conspicuous article “Learn Trades or Starve,” opined that along with other professions the barbering trade was threatened by European immigrants: “White men are becoming house-servants, cooks and stewards on vessels—at hotels.—They are becoming porters, stevidores [sic], wood-sawyers, hod-carriers, brick-makers, whitewashers and barbers, so that blacks can scarcely find the means of subsistence—a few years ago, and a white barber would have been a curiosity—now their poles stand on every street.” Frederick Douglass’ Newspaper, Friday, March 4, 1853, Issue 11; col C, 19<sup>th</sup> Century U.S. Newspapers, <http://infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark> (accessed February 28, 2013). Apparently a similar phenomenon appeared in New Orleans as Donald Edward Everett explains, “Prior to 1840 most of the draymen, cabmen, and servants in the largest hotels were colored, but by 1846 they had been superseded by whites. Irish immigrants were particularly jealous of the free persons of color with who they competed for employment.” See Donald Edward Everett, “Free Persons of Color in New Orleans, 1803–1865” (PhD diss., Tulane University, 1952), 195.

<sup>43</sup> Margot Doss, “Head Master at Hopkins,” *The Sun*, September 4, 1949, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: *Baltimore Sun, The* (1837–1986), <http://search.proquest.com/hnpbaltimoresun/docview> (accessed February 6, 2012). Broadway was one of a number of middle-class areas in Baltimore, living there would have been a symbol of status. “Beginning in the 1850s, horse-drawn public coaches or omnibuses had permitted middle income Baltimoreans to live in neighborhoods a distance from the center of the city—around Union Square, out Broadway, and along Madison Avenue.” Robert J. Brugger, *Maryland: A Middle Temperament, 1863–1980* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 345.