Trinity College
Trinity College Digital Repository

Masters Theses | Student Scholarship

Fall 2011

The Hartford Female Beneficent Society and the Hartford Orphan Asylum: A Case Study from 1810 to 1890

Katherine M. McNulty

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/grad

 Part of the Organization Development Commons, Social History Commons, Social Welfare Commons, Social Work Commons, United States History Commons, Women's History Commons, and the Women's Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

McNulty, Katherine M., "The Hartford Female Beneficent Society and the Hartford Orphan Asylum: A Case Study from 1810 to 1890" (2011). *Masters Theses*. 29.
https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/grad/29

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at Trinity College Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of Trinity College Digital Repository.

Trinity College
HARTFORD CONNECTICUT

TRINITY COLLEGE

Thesis

The Hartford Female Beneficent Society and the Hartford Orphan Asylum;

A Case Study from 1810 to 1890

Submitted by

Katherine M. McNulty

(B.A. University of Connecticut, 2000)

In Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of

Master of Arts in American History

Fall 2011

Unauthorized reproduction prohibited by copyright law

TRINITY
O
M1698

Dedicated with tremendous gratitude to Dr. Eugene E. Leach, Ph.D.

"At the beginning of the century the urban population of the United States was 3.97 per cent. of the whole, or not quite one in twenty-five. To-day it is 19.12 per cent., or nearly one in three. In the lifetime of those who were babies in arms when the first gun was fired upon Fort Sumter it has all but doubled. A million and a quarter live to-day in the tenements of the American metropolis. Clearly, there is reason for the sharp attention given at last to the life and the doings of the other half, too long unconsidered. Philanthropy we call it with patronizing airs. Better we call it self-defense." Jacob Riis[1]

INTRODUCTION

The world of children perpetually evolves. The way in which society views its progeny is constantly altering, often quite drastically within a single century. The same may be said of the way society views the poor. It is always changing its mind as to the poor man's role and what its responsibility is towards that man, woman or child.

Although poverty has existed in America since the beginning, the manner in which those afflicted with want are treated has changed greatly. So has the issue of blame; whose fault is poverty? Is it the poor man who is weak and lazy, or is it society and its attitudes that generates poverty? In nineteenth century Connecticut we see a reflection of these evolving questions and their answers by studying the changes in policy of the orphan asylum system; specifically by looking at the Hartford Female Beneficent Society and the Hartford Orphan Asylum, known today as the Village for Children and Families. What began as a mechanism to provide a modicum of assistance to young girls in want grew into a whole industry of charity whose purpose was to afford underprivileged children, orphaned by abandonment, death or economic paucity, a chance in life they would not otherwise have had.

---

[1] Riis, Jacob: The Children of the Poor: Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1892. Pp. 1-2.

The history of the two predecessor organizations and their eventual merger reveals much about the history of child-focused charity in general in the City of Hartford. Looking only at the story that unfolded in the nineteenth century, there was a very clear evolution in the manner in which poverty stricken orphans were viewed. Initially, the Hartford Female Beneficent Society endeavored to remove neglected and distressed girls (only some of whom were orphans) from the degradation they were subject to and from society as a whole, in order to protect not only the girls from bad influences but society from the bad influence of the girls. Their motto from the beginning was, as stated in the organization's original constitution, "To do good & communicate."[2] To these ladies doing good meant doing what their Puritan heritage demanded, they firmly believed that "'...from everyone to whom much has been given, much shall be required...'"[3], Communicating meant evangelizing the word of Christ, spreading piety amongst the poor, devilish children whose parents were incapable of Christian virtue or else they would not be poor. The Hartford Orphan Asylum pursued the same goals as the Beneficent Society and for the same reasons; their aim was to reform and instruct the unfortunate boys under their care so that they would grow to be productive, peaceful members of society, which their parents, as poor people, were incapable of teaching them to be.

In order to achieve their aims, the charity ladies (of both organizations) initially instituted a policy of isolation for the orphan children, separating them from the rest of society. Later, however, the boards of the asylums chose to send the children to the City's public schools. This

---

[2] Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 4, Financial: Account Book [includes copy of New Haven Female Beneficent Society Constitution] 1809-1812.

[3] Grant, Ellsworth Strong & Marion Hepburn. The City of Hartford 1784-1984. Hartford, CT: The Connecticut Historical Society, 1986. P. 129.

policy change not only affected the children's day to day association with other children outside the asylum but also their relationships with their impoverished parents. For the purposes of this paper we will refer to the inmates of the asylums as 'orphans,' however, it is important to note that not all of the children were in actuality orphaned through death or abandonment. Many of the children were installed by their parents or a relative in one or the other asylum in order to make sure they were fed and sheltered. Some of the children were removed from the city's almshouse by the ladies of the charity asylums for their own moral salvation. Rather than being held under lock and key away from the outside world the children could now visit with their parents, live only part of the year at the asylum, and generally participate in the world at large rather than just their small sphere of co-orphans. This allowed the orphan children to use the public institution to become as American as possible and then spread that American-ness to their families.

By the close of the nineteenth century the theory behind why poor people were poor had changed radically, but then, so too had the world Hartford residents lived in. Gone was the bucolic existence of a largely agricultural and rural Connecticut and in its place had risen the age of the manufacturer and the wage laborer. The goal of these women was the same in 1899 as it had been in 1809, to remove poverty stricken children from unsuitable, destructive environments, give them a safe place to grow into worthy, useful members of society and then release them into the world. The method by which organizations such as these achieved that goal changed greatly over that period.

Chapter One: The Poor Law, Origins of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society and Making a Home Inside a Home

In 1809 Hartford, Connecticut private aid organizations were thin on the ground or nonexistent entirely. Assistance for the impoverished was found through public organizations such as the almshouse (also known as the poorhouse or poor farm and run by the municipality) and limited financial assistance through the municipal government (*outdoor relief* or small monetary payments to the poor for their basic support). Some history of the initial laws and theories pertaining to the poor in the Connecticut colony is in order before delving into the formation of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society.

The Elizabethan Poor Law was the original basis of care for the needy according to the laws governing Great Britain. It is important to note that the law put in place by the Crown early in the history of Britain's American colonies remained vastly unchanged for centuries despite the removal of England's sovereignty over America and that it was near universally accepted through the colonies as the proper standard for dealing with the poor.[4] Ideally, and legally, a person's family was responsible for them if they took ill, were permanently maimed, widowed, orphaned or were temporarily unable to care for themselves for any reason. Persons unable to acquire assistance through familial links were left at the mercy of the local authorities.

In Connecticut legal provisions for the poor were adopted in 1673 and their implementation was guided by the strict faith of the Congregationalists who made up the

---

[4] Bremner, Robert H. (ed). Children and Youth in American: A Documentary History, Volume I, 1600-1865. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970. P. 68. **Text in Appendix I**

majority in the colony. Ellsworth Strong Grant and Marion Hepburn Grant summarize the early philanthropy in Hartford quite neatly in their text The City of Hartford 1784-1984, saying that, "Religion supplied the spiritual motivation and vision, while business experience made them no-nonsense do-gooders. And the concentration of wealth in Hartford because of its economic diversity provided the wherewithal to share it for the common good."[5] Before the incorporation of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society, however, the residents of Hartford did their part through payment of taxes to the town to maintain the almshouse and provide outdoor relief to be parceled out to the poor by the town authorities. This was not the only way in which the poor were dealt with in the colonies, however; some poor folks were indentured rather than provided with respite at the local almshouse or through outdoor relief. The practice was known as auctioning off:

> Two other methods of aiding the poor existed. One was boarding them out and the other was auctioning them off to the lowest bidder. Boarding out occurred in many towns in early America to care for the old and ill, and also with poor youth or disabled people 'with strong back and weak mind' who could do farm work...Perhaps the most shocking to us today is the auctioning of the poor to the lowest bidder. The ever-frugal early New England Yankees clearly prized economy above all else, and built in a few safeguards against abuse that might occur when a poor person was auctioned off to someone who might use their labor...the results of the auctions varied; some people clearly had sponsors, the same family taking the person year after year. But in an extreme case, the widow Sarah Dill was auctioned off for fourteen years and went to fourteen different households.[6]

The law governing how a poor child could be dealt with differed somewhat from what may befall a poor adult, at least in theory. While the child appears to have a chance at escaping

---

[5] Grant. P. 129

[6] Wagner, David. The Poorhouse: America's Forgotten Institution. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2005. P. 8.

poverty through indenture which eventually releases him or her from service at his or her majority (twenty-one and eighteen for males and females respectively) a number of possibilities awaited the destitute adult including the loss of freedom through auctioning off.

Edward Warren Capen points out in his text that in 1784, about the close of the colonial period, the statutes in Connecticut were revised in order to address a population in an "independent, confederated state"[7] rather than a colony. In 1640 the town of Hartford voted to reserve twenty acres of land to accommodate poor men. This space would become the site of the town poor farm. In order to keep the number of municipal dependents low 17th century Hartford officials instituted a law obliging families to seek permission from the town to have visitors in their home. The town meant by these laws to keep the number of persons who might become public charges low as well as to "...maintain one type of inhabitant and to exclude all who would break down the established standards."[8] By 1651 Connecticut was compelled to institute a law requiring family members to take care of their own sick and poor. This was done at the encouragement of the selectman of Hartford whose resident, John Lord, abandoned his wife without providing financially for her support thus requiring the town to take charge of her care.

The charge of children born out of wedlock was assigned to the man legally found to be the father of the child; this rule was maintained in Connecticut from 1673 to 1903. In 1702 the Connecticut colony enacted laws allowing town officials to take away and bind out any children of poor parents who were found to allow, "...their children to live idly or misspend their time loitering, and neglect to bring them up to employ them in some honest calling, which may be

---

[7] Capen, Edward W. The Historical Development of the Poor Law of Connecticut. New York: Columbia University Press, the Macmillan Co., agents, 1905. P. 17.

[8] Ibid. P. 25

profitable unto themselves, and the public."[9] This tells us that by the 19th century, when the ladies of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society were removing children from the almshouse, a precedent had been set for this action revealing it to have been a regular practice of those in positions of authority. Hartford was authorized by the general assembly in 1785 to build an official municipal almshouse[10] for the support of the poor in the township, despite this, the practice of auctioning off continued to be a legitimate legal avenue if not a commonly practiced one in Hartford past the second decade of the 19th century. Capen states that "...paupers might be removed to any place designated by the town or selectmen for their support and were subject to the orders of the selectman or of the person contracted with to support them."[11] Alternately the state comptroller was empowered to contract out paupers for up to five years at a time and was able to take control of any municipalities paupers and remove them from town support to state support. The law concerning contracting out paupers remained part of Connecticut's state system into the 20th century although by 1901 town officials were no longer allowed to contract out their public charges.

Alternative to the almshouse/poor farm/workhouse, boarding, and the practice of auctioning off, colonial Hartford, as long as residence could be established by the petitioner, was allowed to keep a poor family together by offering *outdoor relief.* This gave the parents the

---

[9] Ibid. P. 55

[10] The first (very small) almshouse was built in 1782 for Neil McLean, a Revolutionary War soldier known as "Old Niel the Soldier" and was located "...south of the gaol, on the bank of the Little River." according to William DeLoss Love in The Colonial History of Hartford. It was not considered large enough and a new almshouse was built across from the North Cemetery on what is today Main Street, Hartford. The property was sold in 1797 and the almshouse was rebuilt on Windsor Avenue. Hartford then bought another property a mile and half northwest of the State House on Vine Street in 1822 and, having already constructed a brick building there, agreed to establish it to function as an almshouse and workhouse, the latter being a correctional institution in this instance.

[11] Ibid. P. 134.

means to care for their children, for their families, while they struggled to get out from under hard times. The difference between the alternatives is vast and the choice to offer outdoor relief versus auctioning off was made based solely on the determination of whether the petitioner was considered to be worthy poor or unworthy poor and whether they had some work left in them or if they were too aged or infirm to be of use. David Wagner explains about the latter in his text, *The Poorhouse: America's Forgotten Institution* that,

> If Mrs. Jones and/or Mr. Smith were accepted as worthy people who had fallen on hard times through no fault of their own, and their infirmities were likely to be temporary and most importantly, they held legitimate settlement within the boundaries of the town or city in which they were applying for aid, they might be helped through *outdoor relief.* Outdoor relief is any aid that requires no institutionalization or removal from the home.[12]

There were few exceptions in colonial and early 19th century Hartford regarding who was a legitimate charity case. The old and infirm, those who suffered from unfortunate accidents rendering them incapable of labor, and children were the only real classifications of worthy poor. A widow of good moral character might be afforded some assistance through outdoor relief if there was the possibility she would not require the assistance with any sort of continuity; more likely she would find herself auctioned off, her children put up for indenture or, perhaps worst of all, she might be forced to relocate to the local almshouse, which, at least in Hartford, Connecticut, was not a savory place for a respectable woman and her progeny.

An unfortunate widow would have been greatly relieved to find assistance from the Hartford Female Beneficent Society (HFBS), even though it would mean giving up her daughter permanently. Imbued with a determination to do charity in the name of Christ, the most upright ladies of the City of Hartford, in 1809 founded the Beneficent Society in order to provide for the

[12] Ibid, P. 7.

poverty stricken daughters of the City. On August 16, 1809, copying their organization's constitution from that of the already chartered New Haven Female Humane Society, the Hartford Female Beneficent Society was formed (constitution located in appendix).[13] The purpose stated behind their formation was "... to relieve the distress and to promote knowledge, virtue and happiness among the Female part of the community."[14] Relief from an existence without food and shelter was available to the poor through public assistance. The motive behind the creation of an entirely separate, private institution for the care of the daughters of destitute families lay in a wish to influence the children morally and religiously; to raise these girls to be self-sufficient, contributing members of society. The women involved in the charitable enterprise felt their direct, and very Christian, intervention in the lives of the youngsters would produce a more desirable outcome as the girls grew to adulthood. The girls would benefit most from the influence of wholesome, Christian family life than they would if auctioned off as workers, raised in the almshouse, or left with parents who weakly accepted outdoor relief. The girls would be raised to not be like their parents, to not fall on hard times and require charity.

Following the constitution in the ledger is a list of ladies who joined the Society and paid their dues. There are more than two hundred persons named as members of the Society, both men and women. This was a very high rate of participation in this organization given that the population of the City of Hartford at the time was around six-thousand. A number of illustrious names appear on the list of members, including: Watkinson, Goodwin, Colt and Wadsworth to name a few.

---

[13] Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 4.

[14] Ibid.

Startlingly the second line of the constitution allowed for the HFBS to extend their charitable activities to residents outside Hartford should the ladies find a worthy charity case. What is so interesting about this is that any adult in the vicinity who was not a resident of Hartford, so a vagabond or the travelling poor, would not be extended assistance by the municipality which was only responsible for providing for their own residents; this means that a parent passing through the city who had fallen on hard times might have been forced to move on, unable to secure relief for themselves, while allowing their daughter to remain in Hartford in the hands of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society. Even if the municipality agreed to auction off the parent there was no guarantee that they would stay in the Hartford area near their offspring. It is doubtful that the ladies would extend outdoor relief to a poor stranger, not when poverty was considered the fault of the poor.

People in Connecticut at the turn of the Nineteenth Century did not feel that poverty was accidental; they felt that it was a punishment for the wicked and so when the constitution for the HFSB indicates an inclination to provide assistance for those who wished for employment but were too retiring to help themselves; the HFSB ladies liked hoped to proffer aid to people such as themselves, to formerly well-off women fallen who were, perhaps, too gentile to work or too unskilled to find work that did not lower their social status. Women they knew who were widowed and unable to support themselves through laboring, those women were welcome to assistance from HFSB. They did not, however, mean the drunken stranger in the almshouse or even, at this early point, her child necessarily. At the founding of the HFSB, these women meant only to help the children of the worthy poor only and not those of the depraved or wicked poor (drunks and prostitutes).

Early in the previous century there had been some movements towards separating the children of paupers from their parents' corrosive influence. In fact, the Poor Law reflected well the colonial view of poverty. The children of the poor were saved from a life of uselessness, which was the height of sinful behavior, and, like the children of other, non-poor parents, were apprenticed out to a learn a craft and become a useful, working member of society. Local officials maintained the ability to remove children from their homes, any child from any home, if there were signs that that child was not being taught a skill. In fact the municipality, "...provided for the binding out of children as apprentices for 'better educateing of youth in honest and profitable trades and manufactures, as also to avoyd sloath and idleness wherewith such young children are easily corrupted' and required that in addition to a trade, children learn to 'read and understand the principles of religious & the capitall laws of this country.'" And so, while poor children were the main target of the law and it was their removal the populaces likely focused on, it was true that any child at all who was not being taught a skill to work would have been subject to indentured apprenticeship. This sentiment, formed by colonial residents, was very much at the forefront of the HFSB ladies' thoughts. This was the sort of direct influence they hoped to have over their charity daughters. While living as public charges families were theoretically able to stay together, the HFSB did not allow this, separating the child out from the influence of the parent.

In addition to removing the girls from corrupting influences, religious attitudes factored heavily in compelling the ladies to offer asylum to these girls. The members of the HFSB were unabashed about pressing their religious and moral principles upon the charity girls. Each meeting they held was opened with a prayer and this lets us know that the HFSB, without a doubt, was a religious organization. Considering the widespread religious prejudice in

Connecticut at the time and the fact that the Congregational Church was supported by the state until 1818, it is safe to assume the members were Congregationalists. The Congregational Church in Connecticut was the official church and supported by taxes but as the population of non-Congregationalist Protestants grew in the state turmoil over the tax issue grew. At the Constitutional Convention of 1818 the Congregational church was disestablished and other churches and places of worship were allowed to flourish in the state[15]. However, the elite populace of the state remained, at the formation of the HFSB, not only Protestant but Congregationalist specifically and so it would have been those specific principles pressed upon the young charity cases.

The HFSB constitution puts emphasis on the managers, the small group of women charged with the leadership duties of the organization, and what their role was, making it clear that, while there were a whole host of members, this organization was not a democracy, it was run by the managers and all the power was with those thirteen women: where the money was spent, who was a proper charity case and who was not, how any additional tactile donations found in the "large Sack" should have been distributed, all this was at the sole discretion of the managers and/or the Chief Manager, in this case Mrs. Ann Hosmer. The setup of the organization makes a lot of sense when taking into consideration the way in which government was handled in this period. The Protestant, white, elite made up the governing bodies in local, state and national government and the ladies of the HFSB followed their example in forming their organization.

---

[15] Grant, Pp. 12-13.

The first child to be served by the charity was the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Jonas and Betsy Sloan, as evidenced by the following entry:

> Last Thursday in September: The Managers passed the following resolutions – first the Daughter of Jonas & Betsy Sloan 8 years old to be taken under the care of a Manager clothed & schooled at the expense of the Society. Also Mrs. Hosmer & Mrs. Ely were chosen to wait on the Rev. Dr. Strong with a request for him to perform divine Service on the Eve of the first Wednesday in October before the Female B. Society at the North Brick Church. Other Managers in different Districts are to invite the Rev. A. Flint – Mr. Rayner & H. Grew to attend & request that each of the Clergy give public notice before their Congregations on Sunday previous to the time appointed for the Service. Also – that a note be sent from the Secretary with a request to the following gentlemen to make a Collection after Divine Services for the benefit of the Society: Peter W. Gallaudet, Norman Smith, Andrew Shingsbury, Eli Ely, And that Miss Burr Miss Cotton & Miss Hosmer & Miss Bull wait on them for that purpose Also That each Printer of News Papers in the town give public notice in their respective papers of the same.[16]

It is interesting that the ledger spends more words informing about the religious service to be performed the next month than it does on the young girl who was the first to be served by the Society. Of course the sermons being requested, along with the announcements the ladies are asking be made at each church, was a fundraising effort. There is a decided lack of records concerning the Sloan family and the child that was left to the care of the Society. While this seems strange it may simply be the result of life in a small town where the ladies did not feel it was necessary to record the Sloan's situation as it was well known by all.

The HFSB constitution illustrates the members' desire to promote knowledge, virtue and happiness to poverty stricken women and their underage daughters; however, there is nothing in the ledgers indicating how specifically they provided these things for the Sloan family. In fact, at first glance it appears that the Society did nothing for the Sloan family that the municipality

[16] Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 4.

could not have done on their behalf. It is possible that Hartford chose not to provide outdoor relief to the Sloan family as they were not in a position to stop asking for the assistance and, therefore, the town might offer a place in the almshouse or to auction off the family rather than money; the more appealing alternative then for the Sloane family would have been to allow the Society to provide an indenture or boarding situation for the child and minimal outdoor relief to the parents having found them to be morally fit enough to receive the aid. Removing the burdensome cost of child care might have allowed the parents the freedom to go where work was available.

However, by looking at the expenses for the Society catalogued in previous pages of the 1809 ledger, we can see that even before Miss Sloan was officially adopted by the Society, so to speak, she was being provided with what looks like outdoor relief funds collected and then distributed by the ladies. On August 20, 1809, the ledger indicates that three dollars and twenty cents was used "For Betsy Sloan."[17] In the month of September, three expenditures are listed, two for the support of the widows Cooley and Stillwell and one miscellaneous expense accounted to the Society. In October, the Sloan name appears again: October 23 forty-two cents for B. Sloan, October 25 eighty-four cents for B. Sloan, and finally, October 27 seventy-two cents for B. Sloan. The Sloan name does not come up again until January 2, 1810 when B. Sloan appears as "For L. Cooley & B. Sloan"[18] in the amount of sixty-nine cents. Nowhere does it indicate that Betsy Sloan was truly orphaned; possibly by this point the parents were auctioned off by the town and were boarded out elsewhere or, most unfortunate, in the almshouse

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

attempting to find work. Was she removed from her parents care for ethical reasons or practical reasons? Were Mr. and Mrs. Sloan still alive or were they dead when Betsy was given into the care of the one of Managers?

L. Cooley was, from what can be deduced from the ledger, the second girl who was taken charge of by the Society. She was followed by Mary Ann Brace, Emmeline Stillwell, Vinia Clark and Louisa Dickey. The ledger reads as follows:

> That Lucinda Cooly age nine years Daughter of Mrs. Cooly Widow is to be received & taken charge of by the Managers.
>
> That Mary Ann Brace Daughter of Mrs. Rhoda Brace is received & put under care of the Managers age 5 years.
>
> That the Children be comfortably clothed to attend Sundays on divine services at the respective Congregations & that each Manager who has the care of a Child see that they attend & that their clothing be returned Spring & Fall
>
> Also such articles as is suitable for the purpose that are found in the Sack be made into bed-quilts & loaned to the poor to be taken care of by different Managers who are to see them returned the first of June.
>
> Also that all Monies either by private donation – Public Contribution – Sale of Sermons Or any other property producing money vested in the hands of Managers be funded in the general fund for future use & that said Money be put into safe hands at lawful interest.[19]

From this entry much can be deduced regarding the assistance the Society was providing to the young girls it took under its care. It appears that none of the girls necessarily lacked a residence in Hartford, but neither can we be sure that they were not being plucked straight out of the almshouse or off the street straight from their parents' care.

The Society's financial ledger makes it look as if Jonas and Betsy Sloan between August 1809 and October 27, 1809 were given five dollars and twenty-eight cents, an amount of money

[19] Ibid.

that would go a long way in supporting a small family if it was outdoor relief. The previous ledger entry seems to show that Betsy was removed from her parents' care and taken in by one of the Managers; which one of the Managers is not indicated and possibly the wording is misleading and the Manager was responsible for overseeing the outdoor relief provided and was not in fact housing the child. However, given the amounts, it seems more reasonable to deduce that the money was not going to support the Sloan household, but only to compensate the Manager under whose care Betsy now was; a tallying of the money spent on the child thus far. This latter theory aligns nicely with the fact that municipalities began pulling back on providing outdoor relief at this point in the state's history.

The removal of poor children from their parents' home to that of an 'upstanding' citizen family was common practice for this period. Society had not yet developed a penchant for institutional care, outside the almshouse, choosing instead to maintain small familial units where the good influence of the morally upright could be transferred to the sinful offspring of the poor. June Axinn and Mark J. Stern point out that

> Where in the eighteenth century, the poor were seen as an organic part of society; in the nineteenth century, they were increasingly cast as *deviants* – outside the 'normal' social order an in need of 'reform.' During the years from the Revolution to the Civil War, well-off Americans alternated between an optimistic hope that they could improve the poor by changing their environment and a pessimistic fear that only by containing the poor could they prevent them from pulling down the entire society."[20]

Considering that the Society had an arrangement with a local grocer and dry goods merchants, it was not impossible that they would choose to provide foodstuffs and other textiles in lieu of removing some girls from the care of their families. Why it was not a possibility for

[20] Axinn, June & Mark J. Stern. Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need, Sixth Edition. New York, New York: Pearson Education, Inc.: 2008. P. 37.

little Betsy Sloan must remain a mystery for the ledger supplies few personal details about her. An educated guess would be that the Sloan parents were considered unfit guardians of Betsy and so were not eligible for the more tactile benefits the Society offered, or that they gave Betsy up completely as there was no end to their poverty in sight. It is also conceivable they were auctioned off by the municipality or died, truly orphaning little Betsy.

In any case it is safe to conclude that, rather than providing food and blankets, and other necessaries, each child that required the assistance of the Society was assigned to the care of a specific Manager which indicates that each woman involved with the Society was willing to bring an indigent child into her home. The Manager in charge of each girl was given the money for the child's support as necessary, as the girl now lived in her household with her family, at least until she was old enough to be indentured. Disbursements of funds are not itemized in the ledgers, so it is not possible to determine how much money the Society allotted for the care of each child or how the money was used (for room and board, clothing, shoes etc). Nor is it clear whether the Society used a fixed formula for allocating its funds or whether allocations were based on each child's specific needs.

The original 1809 covenant that parents were asked to sign when relinquishing their child, or acknowledging that the HFSB was taking charge of their progeny rather than the municipality, reads as follows:

> An Agreement to be signed by the Parents or Guardians of those Children whom the Beneficent Society takes under their care – We do hereby covenant and agree with the Managers to commit to their care subject to the direction of the Female Beneficent Society (and to our advice so far as said Society will consent) our Daughter (or any Female Relative) to be by them bound or put out from the age of ten to eighteen years to such Person or Persons as they may think proper for the

> purpose of bringing her up to suitable employment and education such as is necessary to make her a serious and useful member of Society.
>
> Provided the Managers furnish said female with a part of her clothing and suitable Books for attending School one year or more according as the Managers shall direct – And we further agree that said Female shall attend a school when furnished as above.[21]

It cannot necessarily be assumed, from this Covenant, that these girls were not being removed from their homes with no way for the parents to reclaim them if they were under ten years old and not yet bound out. Possibly parents were asked to sign the Covenant in order to keep the municipality from seizing the children and indenturing them out rather than allowing the girls to live in a Manager's home before finding service on her own or being placed out. Bremner notes that "...weak as the protection afforded children indentured under the poor law was, the public standard for working age (the age at which children were bound out) generally was higher than that observed by those parents who allowed or compelled their own children to go to work at a tender age."[22] So it seems reasonable to assume little girls like Betsy was required to pull their fair share of the workload in the Manager's household of which she became a part. This begs the question of whether it was true Christian charity that impelled the Society lady in question to house the girl, particularly as she was receiving a stipend for her keep, or whether she was motivated by the opportunity to acquire some cheap labor. But it is important to consider what the child's experience would have been had she been left to the municipality to deal with. For any number of reasons the girl would have been better off with a Society Manager.

Regardless of what the HFSB members received for their charity it is clear that the better choice for any parent was to request that their daughters go to the Society and receive the

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Bremner, Robert H. P. 263.

benefits offered by it rather than leave their child's welfare to the municipality to decide. Likely oversight of the child's wellbeing was more closely monitored by these ladies than it was by the municipality, no matter what the law formally required. A girl's growth and development was a could be considered a direct reflection on the abilities of the Manager with whom the girl was placed, so it is likely that these women tried hard to mold their charges into the pious and submissive females society demanded all women be.

It is clear that not all the needy girls in the Hartford area who received Society assistance were entirely orphaned. A September 29, 1813 entry shows a request that Mrs. W. Harwood's granddaughter be furnished with clothing for the coming winter, no mention of giving any money is made, only the clothes. There is no indication that she was removed from Mrs. Harwood's home (until later) or that any form of custody had been granted to the Society at the time. The Society carefully notes, however, that clothes were requested and the vote was favorable in supplying them. The case of Mrs. Harwood leads us to examine the ledger carefully in order to understand the various activities the charity was participating and attempt to deduce why one case received money or in kind goods and why in another case a child's care was undertaken by the managers. From the way the ledger is recorded it is likely that when the child's name first appeared in the book she was at that very time physically taken into the custody of the one of the ladies and the money provided to the manager was used for that particular girl like a stipend, but when an adult's name was listed it was because that adult retained guardianship of the girl and was receiving outdoor relief in kind or in money; this reinforces that it was not in all cases the managers felt a needy individual or family must have their children removed. Mrs. Harwood was likely left with the care of her granddaughter as she

deemed a morally upright citizen whose granddaughter would not benefit in any way from being removed from her home.

Concern developed early on that the Society was acting outside of their power by taking girls from their families; that it was not copacetic for these women, even with the agreement of the child's relatives and the signing of the Covenant, for the girls to be removed from their homes.[23] Perhaps the concern signifies that these girls were being permanently removed from their relative's care without a mechanism for retrieval, maybe like Betsy Sloan they were neither orphans nor abandoned entirely. The 1812 ledger contains an entry that reads:

> We trust the utility of the Society has been sufficiently proved and that the directors have so far met with the confidence of the subscribers that no one would give a dissenting word against its perpetuation, but on rational grounds it cannot continue, without aid[ed] to establish something more permanent than barely organization…as we now stand we are only a self created society. We have no power for collection in case of delinquency…not that we feel the least distrust of the honour [sic] of those men who now hold our money…another great consideration we think worthy of the attention of the society, is in the adoption of children, we can by no Authority of our own secure them to good places when found, and painful experience has taught the Directors that this important part of our institution must be relinquished if we are not favored with an act of incorporation.[24]

There is no record of what the painful experience was that illuminated for the Society their lack of legal right to agree to take charge of a young girl, refuse to relinquish her back to her parents should they wish it and then bind her out in service. Logically it was the permanent relinquishment issue that forced the managers to consider adopting a measure that provides them

[23] 1812 ledger – "1812 Ledger" is used for continuity in referring to the text not because it was titled this; the information included in this ledger goes beyond the year 1812 though that is where it begins.

[24] Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 1; Case Information, minutes, accounts, 1812-1816.

legal custody of the charity girls.[25] That legal custody would have allowed the Society to collect any monies due the poor girls from the city; the City of Hartford would likely owe the charity the outdoor relief amount for the child and perhaps be asked to pay part of her support. Conversely, the HFSB may have needed legal protection from the City itself which might have been insisting the girls be auctioned off for a fee to the City as remuneration for funds already spent on them.

The Society chose to petition the Connecticut General Assembly to be incorporated and to create a set of by-laws to regulate the Managers in order to cement their authority to run an orphan asylum. They also began recording the adoption covenants; though it appears that they are not all recorded in the same place. For example, the first recording of a covenant in the 1812 ledger is for Phyla Buckland:

> I do hereby Covenant and agree with the Managers of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society & commit to their care my daughter Phyla Buckland, to be by them bound to the charge and trust of any family who they judge will fulfill the engagements expected in the constitution of said society under Article 1 to 'no child taken under the care of the Managers shall be intrusted [sic] to any family where it will not receive religious instruction, and be taught reading – writing – and good housekeeping, and that they have a superintending care to see she is treated with kindness. Provided said Managers furnish said Child with comfortable clothing and books to attend school during the time of adoption by said Managers[26]

Elizabeth Buckland marked an 'X' in the 1812 ledger to indicate her consent. Next to her mark is written "her widowed mother,"[27] the entry is dated November 22, 1813 and it indicates that the transaction took place in Hartford. By this point the Covenant makes clear to the parent or

---

[25] Ibid- Interesting note, on the next page of the ledger there is an indication that the Society voted "that Jane Morrison a black, be schooled by the Society."

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

guardian that the relinquished was solely in the care of the Society until the age of eighteen; there was no returning the child to her parent as it was likely the mother would be either auctioned off or indentured elsewhere as was usual.

This makes sense as, "The law permitted the government to separate children from their parents for reasons of destitution, ungovernable conduct, and improper guardianship on the grounds that the state must intervene when the community welfare is threatened...these rules reflected a deep distrust of the ability of indigent parents to carry out the reproductive tasks assigned to all families."[28] A widow could not perform the duties of a mother in a traditional family – duties deemed essential to the raising of a devout, obedient, and useful child. Work outside the home was not available to women for the most part as her role in the family, while considered work, was not meant to be performed outside the home for money. "At a time when women were expected to confine their productive labor to the home, indoor relief effectively penalized undeserving female paupers for being out of the role...In Massachusetts and Connecticut, and elsewhere an idle person could 'be stripped naked from the middle upward, and be openly whipt on his or her body'...and ordered to 'depart the town or parish.'"[29]

The HFSB constitution says that, "The primary and general object of the Society shall be to relieve the distressed poor to promote knowledge virtue & happiness among the Female part of the community the particular design shall be to raise funds for the benefit of the poor belonging to the City of Hartford but relief may be extended to others if deemed necessary."[30]

---

[28] Abramovitz, Mimi. Regulating the Lives of Women: Social Welfare Policy from Colonial Times to the Present. South End Press: Boston, Ma. 1988. P. 91.

[29] Ibid. P. 86.

[30] Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 1; Case Information, minutes, accounts, 1812-1816.

The constitution then says that the next aim of the ladies will be to, "seek out and assist such persons as wish for regular employment or have been reduced to misfortune and are prevented by diffidence or delicacy of feeling from soliciting aid."[31] This line roughly translates to: *go to the almshouse and find women and girls who need help*. The majority of the work done by the ladies focused on providing better homes and futures for poor girls rather than helping the unemployed find employment. However, it is possible that when the women were thinking of "such persons" they were envisioning girls between the ages of ten and eighteen who may be bound out to respectable families to labor and not grown men or women seeking employment.

The next portion of the constitution indicates that the members of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society planned to "...devote a part of the money contributed to the education & clothing of young females & at a proper age the society shall endeavor to place them under the care of such serious judicious person or persons as will give them instruction in reading and writing & good housewifery & improve there [sic] minds with moral and religious principles." Again, at this point no single institution existed for the girls to live in and so they lived with a Manager and received moral instruction and basic educations in these homes until a suitable place could be found for them if they were old enough to be indentured. The text continues on to say that, "Relief shall not be granted to any applicant unless well known by the Managers or visited at their dwelling by one of them & particular inquiring made into their Character & circumstances – gross immorality (except in cases of extreme sickness excludes from the patronage of the Society)."[32] With an approximate population of only six-thousand people in

---

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

early 19th Century Hartford it is unlikely that these women would be unable to find a reference for the good character of any city resident. This was evidently the mechanism they used to distinguish people passing through Hartford from established residents of the City. It is possible that in post-War of 1812 Hartford, there were a fair amount of transient residents with a legitimate claim to the need for assistance who could find that assistance at the almshouse or by allowing the state to contract out their labor. While the ladies of the Beneficent Society clearly preferred to use the money they raised for the good of needy City residents, as noted above, they did make room for exceptions in cases involving the deserving poor.

There were a few circumstances in early nineteenth century Connecticut under which a person might become what was considered to be legitimately destitute, meaning they were not poor due to a natural affinity to sinfulness. A widow whose husband was the sole provider of a large family might find herself unable to support herself and her dependents. Many of the entries record expenditures of funds for women such as this; assistance from a Society like the Hartford Female Beneficent Society would be a godsend even if it did mean they were forced to relinquish their daughter(s) completely, something they may have been required to do anyway. It is likely girls who were fostered, adopted or indentured, the phrasing seems interchangeable, were better off in their new situations than they would have been had they remained with their blood families.

Early in the century non-Protestant religious denominations developed their own means of caring for their poverty-stricken and abandoned children. Hartford, though a fairly small city, boasted several orphan asylums for this very reason. Catholics did not want their children being turned into Protestants; Jews did not want their children turned into Christians. The Grants

observe, "Driven to desperation by famine in their mother country, thousands of Irish had begun flocking into the United States in order to survive. The first few hundred to arrive in Hartford had little to offer but strong backs and willing hands… [men] work[ed] construction the new canal and railroad networks there were essential to Connecticut's emerging manufacturing economy. Many women became domestic servants."[33] These were not jobs, at least the men's jobs, that were necessarily steady and many of these folks, Catholics rather than Protestants, may have found they permanently or temporarily required assistance with child care. In assessing their needs it was likely that a Catholic mother or father would wish to choose a Catholic orphan asylum unless they decided they wanted their child converted and raised a Congregationalist.

Religion had in fact played a central role in the creation of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society as was evidenced by the liberal use of religious language in their constitution. Without the influence of the bountiful Christian heart or the pull of Christian duty, it is unlikely that so much would have been done for these children. One could argue, in fact, that it was the religious fervor beating in these women's hearts that began the Society and helped propel it through the 19th Century and into the next. Certainly they attributed inspiration for the work to their Lord and used their churches to aid in raising funds for it. A good portion of the ledger entries are records of which member had been asked to approach her parish minister for a sermon on the children's behalf or to speak at a fundraising benefit.

Surviving Society ledgers provide what appear to be careful records of the identities and experience of clients only beginning in 1813. It seems likely that such records were kept for the Society's first years (1809-1813) but did not survive. In any event, given the limitation of

---

[33] Grant. P. 57.

available sources it is impossible to say definitively what ratio of girls were indentured, fostered or only received occasional outdoor relief the Society provided out of their Charity Sack which was kept stocked with odds and ends for the poor. The list that survives from 1813 lists Phyla Buckland as its first entry.

Phyla was born on January 26, 1806 and was adopted by the Society on November 22, 1813. The ledger contains no record of where Phyla was born or where she resided (Hartford or one of the surrounding municipalities). The date she was bound out is also not recorded, but the document shows that she was bound to E. Williams of Springfield, Massachusetts and she would be considered to be of age on January 16, 1824.[34] It is approximately twenty seven miles from Hartford to Springfield, a long way for a child to go to work. By 1824 there were a considerable number of employment opportunities in Hartford where manufacturing was growing. According to the Grants, "In 1820, when the population totaled around 7,000, there were, besides several blacksmiths and cabinetmakers, three cotton and wool mills, six tanneries, five potteries, two tin shops, 15 shoemakers, six book binderies, eight distilleries, two hat shops, two looking-glass makers and four coppersmiths." A considerable number of families, middle-class and working-class alike, were likely looking for domestic help. Why Ms. Buckland would have been sent so far afield from Hartford is a mystery. Grant goes on to note that, "The introduction of steam power after 1815 revolutionized not only transportation on land and water but also accelerated the growth of manufacturing and completely changed the living style of works…the factories

[34] The Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 2.

attracted hordes of newcomers. Hartford rapidly urbanized, nearly doubling in size from 1820 to 1840…"[35]

The next entry in the ledger is for Cynthia Buckland, perhaps a relation of Phyla's. Cynthia was adopted by the Society almost exactly one year after Phyla, on September 20, 1814 and was then bound out to Justin Ely of West Springfield, Mass. Whether this was done to allow her proximity to Phyla Buckland is unclear as is, again, the reason why they were sent out of the state and so far from what was likely their city of origin.

Interestingly, the recordings for the Buckland girls are not the only pieces of evidence that seem to indicate that families were suffering enough to give up more than one child, sometimes relinquishing one child at a time until several were under the care of the HFSB. The Lyman family leaves records of their daughters' relinquishment on the 1813 list of children adopted and in an 1815 ledger entry as well.

> I, Elizabeth Lyman, of Hartford in the County of Hartford, Mother of Mary Lyman a female child of six years and nine months age – Born August 14, 1808. Do voluntarily surrender her to the care and direction of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society to be under the Management of the same for the purpose of Education and support, hereby fully authorizing said society or the Managers thereof to take charge of said Child and at their discretion bind her out in some virtuous Family until the age of eighteen years, arguably to the provisions of a resolve of the general assembly to the State of Connecticut incorporating said Society. Witness my hand at Harford the twenty-third Day of May AD 1815[36]

The entry for Adeline Lyman is identical and marked with an 'X' indicating that Honnour Lyman, like her sister, Elizabeth Lyman, was willing to fully relinquish her daughter to the care of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society. Exactly one year later, Emily Lyman was adopted

---

[35] Grant. P. 47.

[36] The Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 1.

by the Society, on May 20, 1816. It would seem that, like the Buckland family, the women of the Lyman family were unable to support their children but were not willing to give them up all at once. We can deduce from these entries that neither Elizabeth nor Honnour Lyman could read or write since they marked their agreement with an 'X'. This tells us that Mary and Adeline Lyman were not from families that were once wealthy and fallen upon hard times. Possibly they were immigrants. There are several possible reasons why these women would have been illiterate but it was not necessarily common for them to be so, not in the United States and especially not in Connecticut. Axinn and Stern point out that, "The colonies took an early interest in expanding schooling because their leaders believed that the population should be able to read the *Bible*."[37]

The five entries in the 1813 ledger following Phyla and Cynthia Buckland are all much the same, with the girls being bound out, until Clarissa Harwood appears. Clarissa, born July 1808, was adopted by the Society on May 28, 1815 and listed as "Returned to the town, July 1816"[38] neatly penned next to her name. Another entry of interest is that of Miss Betsy Ann Masters who was born on January 9, 1811, adopted by the Society at the age of five on May 11, 1816 and listed as "fraudulently removed by her Mother."[39] The remainder of the entries are quite similar with the exception of Miss Prudence Andrefs, who was born January 18, 1818, adopted August 23, 1821 and is listed as "Died." The rest of the girls were bound out by their tenth birthdays to places as close as Hartford and as far away as Rochester, New York and Putney, Vermont. The willingness of the Society to send its girls so far afield indicates their

[37] Axin & Stern. P. 26.

[38] The Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 2.

[39] Ibid.

dedication, one can project, to placing them with families whose creeds most exactly matched their own. The idea that families within state or even county borders could not be found to take on these girls, who were in fact providing them with a source of mostly free labor, is improbable.

CHAPTER 2: Institutionalizing the Poor Children

Americans at this point began to view institutional care for the poor as the best alternative for reforming them. The idea that poverty was a choice a person made rather than the end result of a series of unhappy circumstances came to be firmly rooted in the minds of the American people. Institutions, then, were the best way to reform the lazy poor and reintegrate them into society as useful and self-sufficient members. Outdoor relief began to be seen as paying the poor to be poor and the maintenance of a family atmosphere for the children of the poor and the unfortunate widows and disabled lost importance. And it was easier as well to Americanize these children if they were kept in the same place being pressured into behaving in the American way together and all at once. Walter Trattner supports this conclusion, saying that,

> A sort of division of labor arose. Public assistance would be confined to institutional care, mainly for the 'worthy' or hard-core poor, the permanently disabled, and others who clearly could not care for themselves. Also, the able-bodied or 'unworthy' poor who sought public aid would be institutionalized in workhouses where their behavior not only could controlled but where, removed from society and its tempting vices, they presumably would acquire habits of industry and labor and thus prepare themselves for better (i.e. self-sufficient) lives.[40]

On March 18, 1816, the Hartford Female Beneficent Society issued a pamphlet containing an Address put forth by a committee of nine ladies; a fundraising mechanism meant to tug at the heartstrings of would be donors in order that the ladies could purchase a building for the Beneficent Society to house its girls per the nationwide trend. The pamphlet, simply titled *Address of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society*, reveals a lot about the sentiments of the members of the charity and how they viewed their charges and their charges' parents. It does not

---

[40] Trattner, Walter I. From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America. New York: Free Press, 1974. P. 57.

ease into it, but bullishly states that the charity rose up out of their, "...tenderest concern for poor, wretched female children, who being trained up in ignorance, idleness, and irreligion, are corrupted in early life by the contagion of bad examples, and unfitted for all the duties and offices of society."[41] Despite the different circumstances of the families of the relinquished daughters, the ladies did not allow for a distinguishing factor. An alcoholic lunatic, apparently, was quite the same as the pious young widowed mother fallen upon hard financial times; neither could care for their child and, therefore, both were derelicts. The recipients of the ladies' charity were all in desperate, depraved circumstances on the verge of ultimate corruption before being given into the care of the virtuous ladies of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society who could save these girls by offering them a place in an institution that would help them develop morals and a healthy, American outlook on life. The Society would raise them to not be dependent on the charity of others or on the relief from starvation offered by the municipality.

If some adopted girls were removed from the almshouse, they were being subjected there to behaviors and treatment beyond their parents' control even if their parents were what would have been considered pious members of society before poverty found them. The almshouse in Hartford, and those throughout the country during this period, did not distinguish among their various classes of guests. The drunks and perverts were housed with the lunatics and criminals along with the virtuous destitute and homeless infirm. The almshouse was not set up by the City to provide isolation for the gentler constitutions of the merely downtrodden from the harsh reality of the aggressive alcoholic; there was no alternative in place for the poor once the funding for outdoor relief and boarding was spent, leaving only the almshouse.

---

[41] The Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 3, Folder 1.

The pamphlet indicates that the children were not able to fully absorb the lessons of morality they acquired in the homes of the Managers and the best situation would be to separate them out from society altogether by placing them into a single building under the watchful eye of a suitable governess. While the pamphlet does not provide a detail reason for the trouble the girls were having developing suitable morals it seems feasible that either the managers' high standards of Christian devotion were not being suitably met by the girls and, rather than blame themselves, the managers with charges blamed the influence of society, or the managers found a sufficient number of girls unwieldy enough that they no longer wished to take responsibility for boarding them in their private homes. The pamphlet extols of an institution style asylum,

> Here too they will learn the rudiments of those moral and religious principles which we find so absent among that class of people from which many of the children spring. Nor is there danger that the exertions of the Society in those respects will be lost or impaired by parental interference. The children, thus insulated from the world, are to take lessons only from their Instructor. The object here presented is nothing less than that of saving an entire class of females from vice and pollution, and of placing them in a condition to become useful and happy. To effect this, pecuniary aid is necessary, and is solicited.[42]

One could deduce that the organization was having some difficulty in keeping girls' natural parents from contacting and thus corrupting them (as the Society saw things) once they were placed. If the children were, however, kept in a single building under the supervision of professional staff, it would perhaps be easier to limit their contact with the outside world as well as the outside world's contact with them. Returning them to a parent who had been so sinful as to be poor was impossible. If they slept, ate, took lessons and played all in the same place there was little reason for them to leave the premises of the asylum once they were established there and, therefore, little reason to interact with their parents. The pamphlet points out,

---

[42] Ibid.

> The children, under a Governess of suitable character, can in various ways be kept in subjection, and be made habitually subordinate. Her method of government will be uniform. Indeed the very regularity of their occupations, and the strict discipline kept up in every department, will conduce directly to that end. The complete manner in which every hour of their lives will be filled up, cannot fail, by the time they arrive at the age for being placed out, of fixing them in those useful habits which will in a great measure follow them through life.[43]

Though this may sound harsh to twenty-first century ears, it is likely that for a good majority of these girls, the opportunities for them increased upon their adoption and whether they were kept in a private home until the age of ten or kept in an institution whose purpose was to isolate them from society, made little difference in what eventually happened them. These were not the children of wealthy landed Americans (that small group in the top percent or two of wealth that did not fear financial ruin) they were the children of the poor or the unlucky middle class fallen upon hard times, and their lot in life would likely have been to serve. Quite possibly the interest the ladies of the Beneficent Society took in them gave them an advantage they may not have had had they stayed with their parents and been indentured out to early or hidden away in the almshouse.

The attitude of superiority illustrated in the pamphlet's wording can be attributed in part to these ladies' fear. Middle class women with children and finite liquid assets could find themselves living the lives of the charity cases rather easily. The death, dismemberment or absence of a husband could alter a woman's world entirely; particularly a woman with no skills outside those appropriate according to the cult of true womanhood. In reality, no matter how pious a woman was, if she lost her husband and could not support herself, her options were limited. However, determining that the fault lay with the parents of the charity girls who were

---

[43] Ibid.

not worthy protects the Society women's sense of safety; they are worthy and God fearing and, therefore, exempt from hardship of this kind. The pamphlet goes on to say:

> Will not the benevolent, whose hands are stretched forth to succor the distressed, support a scheme so calculated to administer relief? Will not those, who deplore the fatal consequences attending those vices which are so generally prevalent among the lowest class of females, and who tremble at the dangers which beset our rising offspring, rejoice to patronize a plan for the prevention in future, if not for the removal, of those evils? We will not dilate on the superiority of that Charity which tends to prevent misery, and confer positive happiness, over the lamer efforts of that, which can but alleviate suffering, already too deep and fixed to admit of mitigation only. Neighboring institutions, like the proposed, have established the fact that advantages of the former kind flow from such establishments, as the one in view. Children thus educated would be applied for by virtuous heads of families, who feel the want, and know how to appreciate the advantages of having their household consist of those who, with love of industry, unite a sense of moral obligation – whose minds are open to virtuous impressions and to feelings of kindness.[44]

This example confirms Trattner's point, showing that the ladies felt that if they caught these girls early enough and removed them from the parents who were so morally corrupt as to be poor, they gave them a chance at a moral and upright life. Isolating them from supposed bad influences and turning them into obedient young females may seem harsh. It was not, however, anything that wasn't expected of a woman of any class.

Barber Welter explains in her essay "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860" that:

> In a society where values changed frequently, where fortunes rose and fell with frightening rapidity, where social and economic mobility provided instability as well as hope, one thing at least remained the same – a true woman was a true woman, wherever she was found. If anyone, male or female, dared to tamper with the complex virtues which made up True Womanhood, he was damned immediately as an enemy of God, of civilization, of the Republic. It was a fearful obligation, a solemn responsibility, which the nineteenth-century American woman had – to uphold the pillars of the temple with her frail white hand…The attributes of True Womanhood, by which a woman judged herself and was judged

[44] Ibid.

> by her husband, her neighbors, and society could be divided into four cardinal virtues – piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity.[45]

If this was accurate and women were expected to play an unchanging, constant role in American society under the terms of this ideology of proper womanhood, females who fell into poverty were deemed to be incapable of developing the four essential attributes and had only themselves to blame. Women like this were contemptible to the women of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society and, therefore, ought to have limited or no contact with their offspring, her daughters who still had a chance at a virtuous life in service.

The ladies took, or so they claimed, great pains to identify fit mentor families to bind the girls out to, as one of the ledgers states, "They are bound out to such people as we believe take a Christian interest in their welfare."[46] If the relationship was not wholly symbiotic the girl was removed back to the asylum and then placed again in a new situation. Had she been on her own or if her family were vagrant and placed by the municipality, there would have been no place to turn back to had her situation been unsatisfactory. Whether their parents were alive or not, these young girls were truly orphaned once they were adopted by the Society, yet the ladies provided a decent place for them to go -- possibly the first safe place for many of them.

The language used in the pamphlet from 1816 seems cruel; however, if the ladies truly felt the girls were corrupted by blood, they would like as not have bothered to try to save them. The pamphlet states that the purpose of the Society was to, "take to themselves children, nurture,

---

[45] Gordon, Michael (ed). The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, Third Edition. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983. *The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860*, by Barbara Welter. P. 372.

[46] The Village for Children and Families, Box 2, Folder 1.

educate, and lead them into paths of industry and virtue..."[47] Girls who were considered beyond redemption were left to continue taking care of themselves along with the parents who put them in their dire situation to begin with. While it is distressing in our present time to hear that the Society planned to isolate and 'habitually subordinate' their charges, it is also, as pointed out previously, a fact that the women of this era were all isolated and all subordinate.

Returning to the case of Clarissa Harwood and the other girls who were among the first adopted, we find an entry for February 7, 1816 entered by Mrs. Kingsbury and Mrs. Eggleston reporting on the state of the children taken in. It states: "Louisa Bull reads very well in the testament and spells in words of four syllables; we think she has improved very much particularly in spelling she sews and knits exceeding well. Mary Lyman and Lydia Fielding read in short [?] and spell in words of three syllables they have improved in their sewing and knitting. Clarissa Harwood reads in words of to [sic] syllables and sews very well for a child of her age."[48] This is the same Clarissa Harwood whose grandmother received clothing from the society for her, was adopted by the society and then returned to the town in July of 1816, five months after the entry was made. Returning her to the town would have meant returning her to the almshouse. It is unclear whether it would have been for feeblemindedness or for lack of virtue and industry, though either is a possibility. Either way, she was given a chance before she was discarded as beyond saving.

Timothy Hacsi in his text, *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America*, points out that, "...the dominant view of the poor in American culture sees poverty as a

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] The Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 1.

moral condition and usually makes little distinction between different types of dependence. But most orphan asylums avoided this flaw because their focus on children as innocents needing help effectively separated children from whatever shortcomings their parents might possess. When asylum managers did hold harsh views of poor parents, it led them to pursue full legal control of children far more often than it led them to reject children."[49] The ladies of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society certainly reflected the truth of this statement, as did the ladies who began the Hartford Orphan Asylum.

[49] Hacsi, Timothy: Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1997. P. 215.

Chapter Three: The Development of the Hartford Orphan Asylum & the Isolationist Theory

The 1832-1867 ledger for the Hartford Orphan Asylum (HOA) contains the Minutes of the Board of Managers Meetings for the Asylum and the story of the first child to enter the Asylum as recorded by Miss E.B. Bull on June 3rd 1834.

> History of the first child connected with the Asylum. Joseph Waite Aldrich was born 20th Feb. 1829 at the house of Mrs. Lasage in State St. where his mother was left as board by her husband, some months previous to his birth, and deserted by him before that period, leaving her entirely destitute of any means of support, & taking no notice of letters addressed to him during the autumn, though known to be employed in New York. Mrs. Aldrich died 24th February giving the name Joseph Waite to the child, after a young man who boarded in the family. He was taken to Mrs. Moore to nurse the 30th March, and while at her house was very ill, & baptized by the Rev. N.L. Wheaton, Rector of Christ Church, Hartford – on the 16th July the same year, was sent to board with Mrs. Knox where he remained until Oct 4th 1832, when he was taken to the Orphan Asylum. His father was an engineer, & it was reported that in a steam boat explosion, he was killed. Nothing has ever been heard, definitely of or from him, since his wife's death.[50]

The record was rewritten in 1845 for indeterminate reasons, and can be found in the Appendix (item III.) to this paper.

According to both versions of the story it was the abandonment of Mrs. Aldrich by her husband that compelled her to seek the assistance of the Asylum; there is no censure for her plight in the wording of the story, which is a rather significant departure from the 1816 address of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society. What is most interesting about this story, however, is that Mrs. Aldrich was described as a boarder and not a resident of Hartford. Axinn and Stern point out that, "...the poor and unfortunate were no longer seen as an organic part of the social order. Often they were literally 'outsiders'; addressing their problems was no longer the

[50] The Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 10, Folder 9.

responsibility of respectable citizens."[51] And yet before she died and the HOA took her son in, Mrs. Aldrich was likely relying on the charity of strangers to help her survive the months leading up to the birth of Joseph. The entry notes that she was "entirely destitute of any means of support" yet she obviously was being supported either by the family she was boarding with or through some modicum of charity offered by generous townspeople.

In keeping with Axinn and Stern's theory, however, the story praises Joseph for his determination as he grows and there was no expression of fear that little boys such as he were naturally corrupt. However, the 1845 telling of the story has Joseph going to the farm where he turns from a nice little boy into an unruly one who does not wish to work and causes trouble but grows eventually into manhood. His manhood was so impressive, in fact, that the Asylum raised money for him to go to sea on a whaling ship, to give him a living outside whatever he might have learned at the poor farm.

There was no easy escape from the poor farm once a person was sent there. It appears that during this period once a person sank into poverty it was nearly impossible for him or her to climb out. The programs provided to poor people did not focus on practical ways in which to better a person's circumstances, until the era of Jane Addams and the Settlement House there were only temporary fixes and a great deal of contempt. Historian David Wagner observes:

> The workhouse was meant as a correctional institution in which actual discipline (cells, bread and water, instruments of punishment such as the ball and chain, and later the treadmill) was to be imposed on the 'unworthy poor,' usually men of working age, who were vagrants, beggars, 'indolent,' petty criminals, or intemperate. They would be housed only on condition of hard work. The presumed lazy or deviant person (although in face even workhouses came to often include families or individuals just out of work during slack times) was to be put

[51] Axinn and Stern. P. 30.

> to work, even if it were 'make work,' to press proper morality on them. The discipline of work along with mandatory bible reading and other character-building activities would supposedly help reform society and produce a compliant workforce.[52]

Connecticut's version of the workhouse was the 'poor farm' or the 'town farm' or the 'county farm' depending on the municipality. Certainly it shows a degree of caring and attachment that the ladies of the Hartford Orphan Asylum chose to remove their very first charge from a wretched life of slave-like labor and give him the opportunity to learn a trade. How contemptible could he and his origins have been if they were willing to take that chance on him? If corrupt godlessness was in fact inherent and poverty the outward indicator of moral indecency, certainly the benefactors of the HOA would not have taken the risk that Joseph would eventually spurn hard work in favor of sinful indolence.

On November 24, 1831 at a meeting held at Hartford's Allyn's Hall, the residents assembled there resolved,

> ...the Citizens of Hartford...will endeavor to establish an Orphan Asylum in this vicinity for those indigent boys whos [sic] education, maintenance, and employment are neglected by their parents and friends Resolved That there be a committee to solicit the subscription of citizens generally to this interesting charity Resolved that there be a committee to apply to the Legislature of the State for an act of incorporation with authority to hold property, to receive and bind out indigent boys and to adopt such negotiations and by-laws as may be necessary for the government of the institution.[53]

It is interesting to note that the writer, who must have been attempting to represent the consensus of the group, referred to the boys as neglected rather than unfortunate. The implication was that the children's situations were the fault of their parents; the child was maybe naturally good and

---

[52] Wagner, David. Pp. 4-5.

[53] The Village for Children and Families archive, Box 10, Folder 9.

wholesome from birth and, had his parents chosen a different path (one excluding poverty), their son could have had a life that emphasized education, religious piety and useful employment. It seems a harsh judgment considering the lack of means for survival available to some women, particularly widowed women like Joseph Aldrich's mother.

Susan L. Porter, whose essay "Orphans and Apprenticeship" appears in the book The Worlds of Children 1620-1920, observes, "Widows with children soon found themselves in desperate straits. The outwork –washing, ironing, or sewing –which they could perform at home, even when pursued full time, paid only 30 to 40 cents per day. If the widow gave up her household and found places to board her children, her wages as a servant, generally between $1.00 and $1.50 per week including board could not maintain more than herself and one child."[54] How then could it possibly have been the fault of the widow that her son(s)'s education was neglected while she focused on trying to earn enough money to support the family without the aid of a spouse?

This attitude, though, was popularly represented by author Lydia Maria Child in her book The American Frugal Housewife: Dedicated to Those Who are not Ashamed of Economy first printed in 1828 and reprinted throughout the following decade. Mrs. Child would have felt that it would have been the cumulative effect of the widow's minor frivolities that lead to her poverty and her sons' degradation and not the lack of spouse or fiduciary support. Mrs. Child exclaimed in her text that, "Perhaps some will think the evils of which I have been speaking are confined

[54] Benes, Peter (ed): The Worlds of Children: 1620-1920, Boston University, Boston: 2004. P. 115.

principally to the rich; but I am convinced they extend to all classes of people."[55] The evils of which she had been speaking were extravagance and immorality. According to Mrs. Child extravagance and immorality could be seen everywhere; for instance, it could be seen in the purchasing of unnecessary luxuries which led to poverty and reliance on public assistance. Mrs. Child for all her good advice concerning the best way to stretch a cut of meat into several meals, appears to have had very little experience outside her own class of people.

At least twelve editions of this little book were published which leads us to believe that her ideas were popularly held ones or at least ones that made sense to the middle-class women of the period, women like the ones who ran the Hartford Orphan Asylum and the Hartford Female Beneficent Society. Porter indicates that a widow of the time might find what was considered women's work at about a dollar and a half a week and support herself and a single child on this wage. Child on the other hand suggests that,

> No false pride, or foolish ambition to appear as well as others, should ever induce a person to appear as well as others, should ever induce a person to live one cent beyond the income of which he is certain. If you have two dollars a day, let nothing but sickness induce you to spend more than nine shillings; if you have one dollar a day, do not spend but seventy-five cents; if you have half a dollar a day, be satisfied to spend forty cents.[56]

Mrs. Child touts her advice as universal and her train of thought suggests that no matter what a person earned they were always in a position to save something. Given Porter's deduction that at the time a single adult and a single child might subsist on thirty cents a day, it seems naïve of Mrs. Child to suggest a savings plan for persons in that income bracket. How pervasive might

---

[55] Child, Lydia Marie. The American Frugal Housewife: Dedicated to Those Who are not Ashamed of Economy. Twelfth Edition. Old Sturbridge Village and Applewood Books: Boston, 1833. (this is a reprint of the 12th edition which was printed in 1833, though the actual date of the printing of my copy is not listed in the book). P. 4

[56] Ibid.

that naiveté have been amongst her contemporaries then? How pervasive amongst women like those of the HFSB and HOA? Mrs. Child believed that, "A mind full of piety and knowledge is always rich; it is a bank that never fails; it yields a perpetual dividend of happiness."[57] A virtuous person would not think herself poor and the best defense against poverty was,

> ...a thorough, religious, useful education is the best security against misfortune, disgrace, and poverty, is usually believed and acknowledged; and to this we add the firm conviction, that, when poverty comes (as it sometimes will) upon the prudent, the industrious, and the well-informed, a judicious education is all-powerful in enabling them to endure the evils it cannot always prevent.[58]

Mrs. Child admitted then, that sometimes poverty comes undeservedly, however, on the whole she perpetuated the notion that those inclined to be overly proud and sinful ended up suffering from poverty as it was entirely avoidable.

Certainly not every male child placed in the Hartford Orphan Asylum was the victim of a missing, yet wholly virtuous, parent. Certainly there were boys running wild through the city unwatched by their inebriated fathers or whose mothers were too busy to watch them as they prostituted themselves to make ends meet. And there were boys, such as the one indicated in a December 1833 entry, which were found living in the streets and brought into the Asylum at least for a short time. And while, the managers and committee may have held a harsh view of the parents of the boys at the Asylum, their kindness persevered so that the needs of the child were often put first as indicated in the January 7, 1834 entry regarding the same nameless boy which reads,

---

[57] Child. P. 111.

[58] Ibid.

> The committee reported that the parents of the boy mentioned above did not reside within the limits of the town – consequently the boy might not be considered by the Patrons of the Institution, a proper object to be received at the Asylum, though not limited by the Charter…a fund was…raised for the support of the above named boy at the Asylum until April, when he could be placed in the family of a respectable farmer.[59]

The Managers Report for 1834 tells us more about the work of the Hartford Orphan Asylum and gives us further insight into the official sentiments of these women (reproduced in the Appendix, Item IV). Of the eight children, six were the sons of drunks and prostitutes, one was the child of an "abandoned"[60] woman who cannot support him and one, a three year old, appears to have been truly orphaned with no family to speak of. It is difficult to determine whether the assessments of Asylum volunteers trolling the streets and the almshouse are correct and the six parents were indeed as degraded as to necessitate the relinquishment of their sons to the care of the Hartford Orphan Asylum. As there is no indication that they were dropped off at the Asylum and with the entry that "three were taken from the town poor house"[61] it could very well be inferred that all of them were taken from the almshouse. No record could be found in the HOA files of who these first nineteen boys were.

Whoever they were, the Asylum, a year and a half after giving the report above, voted that the boys "shall not visit their friends in town oftener than once a year without the permission of at least three of the directors" which indicates that they were being isolated from Hartford society. On top of this, they were also unable to see parents who wished to see them as indicated by a November 6, 1837 entry which reads, "A request was proffered by the mother of one of the

---

[59] The Village for Children and Families archive, Box 10, Folder 9.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid.

boys, that she might be allowed to take her son home for the winter, but the request was denied, as it was thought best not to establish a precedent of this sort, because bad mothers might take advantage of it, and cause the Society much trouble." [62]

These boys were separated from society for their own good and for the well being of the upstanding citizens of the City of Hartford very much like the girls under the Hartford Female Beneficent Society's care. Hacsi indicates that there were three types of asylums in the United States in the 19th Century; isolating, protective and integrative[63]. The isolating orphan asylum maintained that the children should be kept away from society and educated both secularly and religiously within the confines of the asylum walls. The children in these asylums were very closely monitored until they were bound out or indentured. The asylum took full legal custody of the children and "...often explicitly sought to break the bonds between parent and child. The managers of isolating orphan asylums were determined to separate children from their heritages, which the managers saw as harmful...The heritages from which isolating asylums hoped to 'save' children included, but were not necessarily limited to, Catholicism, poverty, and the presumed moral flaws of their parents."[64]

Both the Hartford Female Beneficent Society and the Hartford Orphan Asylum's fledgling attempts were skewed towards the isolating philosophy. The children were tainted to a degree by the depths of their parents' depravity which had resulted in poverty and they must be both contained and cleansed before they can be set loose onto society again. It is likely that there

---

[62] Ibid.

[63] Protective and integrative practice and theory will be discussed later in the paper.

[64] Hacsi, Pp. 55-56.

was a strong pull from inside the managers' circle to bind these children out to farmers in order to get them away from the perceived temptation to sin in the City. Susan L. Porter indicates in Orphans and Apprenticeship that this was very much the case for the Boston Asylum for Indigent Boys:

> The boys' asylum was designed to inculcate habits of industry and order in boys that would counteract the negative inducements of what Anthony Rotundo [author of "American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era"] has called 'boy culture' and the city... [because the boys] might also succumb to the temptations of the city. Looking to the countryside as the locus of the fresh air, good habits, hard work, and healthful influences that would make their charges industrious, self-reliant, virtuous men, they sent two-thirds of the boys...to work on farms that were...more than twenty-five miles away from Boston.[65]

Unfortunately, the result of this technique was likely an unfortunate one for the boy involved. A working class boy, completely cut off from his family, with no prospect of actually being able to inherit or purchase a farm himself once he was freed upon his twenty-first birthday, would have had few prospects. The skills he acquired as an apprentice farmer could not be transferred to another area of employment. And so, with clothes for one year and one hundred dollars, boys who were indentured on farms but could not become farmers would have, most likely, returned to the City from whence they came, with no valuable skills and their futures not much brighter than when they left.

Perhaps the more fortunate boys were those indentured to shoemakers or bookbinders or those who were sent to sea. The farmers to whom the boys were indentured, however, benefitted greatly from the arrangement. Farmers were businessmen who craved cheap labor. No intelligent businessman would have told the Asylum patronesses anything that might have cut off

---

[65] Porter. P. 119.

their labor supply. However, Mr. Ebenezer Eldridge of Massachusetts had no problem tattling on his neighbor it would seem. According to Porter's essay. "...his [the orphan's] masters' neighbors presented a realistic assessment...they wrote that the farm 'is not large enough to keep the boy at work *all the time*...his instruction in the business must be very limited...the boy is now and has been principally kept employed in running errands and in household drudgery...Charles Breen [the orphan] is not so situated as to qualify himself to support himself by farming or any other regular laudable business after he comes of age.'"[66] It is quite possible that some of the HOA boys were sent to farmers or farm schools because there were not enough city-situated employers to bind them out to.

The Hartford Orphan Asylum had trouble accommodating the number of boys in need of the services they were providing. An April 3, 1837 entry indicates that the patrons of the Society were regularly trolling the poor house to remove orphaned children and children whose parents were categorically unfit. And yet an entry dated May 1, 1837 reads,

> The committee appointed to visit the poor house reported that they attended to the duties of their appointment a few days before the meeting of the directors, and that they found the child, for whom application had been made, a suitable object of our charity, but as they found another case equally pressing, they decided, not to remove the child, until they had reported to the directors. The directors decided, in accordance with the opinion of the advisory, that as their collections for the past year, have not as yet been all taken up, and as the funds are very low, it will not be advisable to receive any more children at present. M. Abernathy, Sec"[67]

So we see that there were certainly more children in need of assistance than the Asylum could at that point accommodate. At the same time, according to the Secretary's Report for 1832

---

[66] Porter. P. 121.

[67] The Village for Children and Families archive, Box 10, Folder 9

(Appendix, Item V), the Hartford Female Beneficent Society appears to have been experiencing much the same influx of needy children as the Hartford Orphan Asylum.

Despite the heavy influx of children, by 1832 the Society was taking in pregnant girls. Interestingly girls with mental challenges or a 'natural defect,' were sent to the municipality to be dealt with. The increased traffic is surprising because by point in time a slew of charitable organizations had popped up in the state. Some of the first were: the Missionary Society of Connecticut (1798); the Connecticut Religious Tract Association (1807); the Connecticut Bible Society (1809); the Connecticut Society for the Promotion of Good Morals (1812); and the Connecticut Domestic Missionary Society (1816). Lawrence Goodheart says in his text Mad Yankees: The Hartford Retreat for the Insane and Nineteenth Century Psychiatry that two hundred fifty-seven charities were established in Connecticut before 1817.[68] It is clear that the HOA and HFSB were turning away applicants for assistance based on their limited finances and it is not surprising that they did not accept as charges the two girls with mental challenges, even without the surplus of applicants they would not have taken charge of them, what is surprising is that they sent the girls back to the almshouse. It was a thoughtless thing to do when there were so many charities to choose from, one of which specifically deals with those of ill mental health, and the almshouse was considered a filthy cesspool of moral degradation.

There is aggravation in the tone adopted by the Secretary of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society in her 1832 report (Appendix, Item V). She criticized the Managers of the Society for thinking that the children should be in and out of the institution quickly, like goods

[68] Goodheart, Lawrence. Mad Yankees: The Hartford Retreat for the Insane and Nineteenth-Century Psychiatry. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003. P. 14.

through a customs house they ought to only stop through until they can be placed out. The Secretary pointed out that many of these children were too young to be of any use to a family as they were not old enough to work. She went on to say that they could not turn away any girls in need that they must, instead, raise more money to support all the girls who went to the Society for help. And why should they not be given more money, she seems to say, since the program thus far had been so immensely successful? Only look at the little girl who was taken from a situation full of 'sorrow' and 'want' and now never misses church and is considered industrious by her caregiver!

The notes for the Hartford Female Beneficent Society were more sentimental than those given for the Hartford Orphan Asylum. Although they were both run by women, with men playing a mostly phantom benefactor role and handling the money aspects considered unfit for women, there was a definite difference in the manner in which the two institutions viewed their charges. Susan L. Porter, author of the essay "Orphans and Apprenticeship" which can be found in the book The Worlds of Children 1620-1920, says, "Whereas the female managers worried about their wards as potential victims, the boys' managers saw their charges as potential criminals."[69] We lack details about the exact treatment given the boys in the Asylum but may sensibly assume that the asylums in Hartford, while not assigning nonexistent sin to the children, did assume they had a greater than average chance of turning out wrong given their start in life.

The HFSB manager took a keen interest in the welfare of the female inmates as there were cases of abuse on the part of adopters, the managers had to be very careful in screening who the girls were bound out to. Their ultimate goal was to place the girls in families that would

---

[69] Porter. P. 114.

treat them as something in between a family member and a servant. A family who would take an interest in the young female's spiritual life as well as her corporeal life.

The managers at the Boston Female Asylum found that sending girls into upper class homes in the City was not a wise idea, as those families had so many servants to begin with and had such different expectations for the futures of their female offspring, the orphan girls were lost in the crowd, just one more servant. The girls fared better when placed in modest middle-class homes where they were looked after on a personal level by the female head of the household. As noted, there is no record that survived, if indeed one ever existed, recounting the personal trials and tribulations of the boys once they were bound out, or any indication that their employers reported back on their wellbeing or even their usefulness. It is only ever noted when a boy is returned to the asylum or has come across trouble with his employer.

Two such cases were noted in the ledger for the Hartford Orphan Asylum. The May 9, 1836 entry observes that "A letter was read from Jeremiah S. Parsons of Enfield, Conn, making complaint of Ferdinand Smith, Jr., and informing the Society of his resolution to bring the boy before two Justices of the Peace, according to law, to break the indenture of Ferdinand. Should the indenture of Ferdinand Smith, Jr., be broken, he shall be again received into the Society."[70] Ferdinand was indeed received back into the HOA in August of 1836 after his indenture was broken by Mr. Parsons. Next the September 1837 entry reads that, "A complaint was made proffered by Mrs. Brown, respecting the treatment of her son who is apprenticed to Mr. Prentice,

[70] The Village for Families and Children archive, Box 10, Folder 9.

but as the child has never made complaint, save to his mother, it was not deemed advisable to interfere in the matter, and the subject was referred to Mr. Goodwin as advisor."[71]

Soon after this entry, on December 4, 1837 a proposal was put before the managers to change the operating philosophy of the Asylum from one of isolating its charges to a philosophy of striving to integrate them into society. The entry states that,

> A proposition was made by one of the directors, that children should be received under the care of the Society, whose parents are unable to provide wholly for their support, but who would be able and willing to pay a part of their board, and that they should be subject to recall of the parents, whenever they shall feel so disposed...It was reported that the gentlemen decided that Joshua Mason Brown was not to be returned to Mr. Prentice, but that a suitable place was to be found for him, in a retired country place.[72]

While this may not be deemed a full integration it is certainly a step away from the complete isolation, even from parents, that was previously the strict policy.

---

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

Chapter Four: Indentured Orphans & the Purpose of Parental Relinquishment

The 1852 Secretary's Report of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society provides excellent illustration of how the ladies views of their charges changed by mid-century. In this report there is none of the censure towards the poor children found in earlier records. These children are described as unfortunate; they are to be pitied and assisted because their misfortune is not a fault but a lamentable circumstance. Following are exemplary excerpts from a section that appears in its entirety in the appendix:

> It is with sincere pleasure that the Managers of this Institution place their orphan charges in the keeping of those who promise to treat them with the tenderness & forbearance of parents & to manifest toward them not only till they are of age but through life the same watchful and affection interest...With some few exceptions they have done extremely well and generally the families in which they have lived so far as can be ascertained have treated them with kindness & often with affection.

That the ladies of the HFSB in 1852 were carefully monitoring the progress of their former charges is itself highly significant. It demonstrates a strikingly new depth of sympathy on the part of these middle to upper-middle class women:

> Within the years letters have been addressed to those persons with whom children under eighteen years of age are now living, a few extracts from replies to these communications may be of interest.
> Mrs. Henry P. Barnes of Pittsfield, Mass writes 'We are much pleased with Tammy Williams & are happy to say that thus far she has fully met our anticipations. Our little boy has become very attached to her as well as the older members of the family. We shall endeavor to bring her up as one of our own number & give her good instruction. She regularly attends the Day & Sabbath Schools & seems to enjoy her new situation. She is perfectly contented and we cannot but express our great obligation to the Ladies for their kindness in securing for us one whom we take a deep interest & whom we shall endeavor to bring up in the nurture & admiration of the Lord.'
> Mrs. Waterman of Bozrah writes of Mary E. Lathrop 'She is sixteen years old, is healthy, intelligent & well qualified for her station & generally gives satisfaction by obedience and efficiency. She is a good seamstress quiet in disposition and

> retiring in manners. She is not exempt from faults but on the whole we are pleased with her & have reason to believe she is happy in her adopted home. Two years since she thought she has become a Christian, but of late she has not manifested any especial religious interest. She attends gladly the Sabbath and day school[73]

Another case file found in this 1852 Secretary's Report of the HFSB indicates that at this time there lived a five year old girl who was such a pretty girl, with such a way about her that an upstanding family took her in before she had even stayed in the ladies' care for two weeks. The girl was adopted by the foster family rather than taken in on a trial basis and was to be raised as if she were a family member. Certainly it was an uncommon situation for a poor girl to cross social lines to become the doted upon daughter of a middle-class family. Most HFSB girls were indentured as domestic servants. While this little girl was embraced by her adoptive family as their own child it is important to note that family members in many middle-class households were expected to provide domestic service as their new family did much of these chores for themselves. She may have been a true daughter to them but this did not mean she did not work while she lived with them.

As we learned from Mrs. Child's book, The American Frugal Housewife, the home was the woman's sphere and she was responsible for comestibles but also for the cleanliness of the family domain and the general working order of the home. Mimi Abramovitz points out in Regulating the Lives of Women that women were, "To create a 'haven in the heartless land,' the industrial family ethic extolled virtues of domesticity and maintained that wives who did not learn to keep house jeopardized their marriages."[74] As farfetched as it seems the text goes on to indicate that women of the time viewed housework as a means of achieving moral and physical

[73] The Village for Children and Families archive, Box 3, Folder 2.

[74] Abramovitz. P. 116.

satisfaction, "...making beds was good exercise; repetitive tasks resulted in patience and perseverance; and proper home management was a complex art."[75]

Interestingly there is listed a ten year old girl in the ledger who was cited as being returned to the HFSB from service twice seems to have avoided garnering any of the blame for her return. Rather than concluding that it was the girl's nature given her state of poverty that made her 'intractable' the secretary concludes that, through no fault of her own, the girl had simply not been away from her wretched origins long enough to improve. The secretary goes on to say that there was hope for the girl and that she had the potential to be part of a good family. And then there was Cordelia Lathrop who was sickly and, though she was living with the Bingham family, she was not able to pull her weight so the Society decided to send money for her care and the family did not send her back but accepted the money. Certainly this illustrates the potential for deep caring on both the part of the Beneficent Society and the Bingham family. A girl who has been indentured out to a family falls ill and rather than returning her to the orphan asylum and demanding a substitution the family accepts assistance in paying for the girl's upkeep.

Families who wrote to HFSB about their charges provided answers that were so much alike as to suggest that the letters (mentioned in the text) sent out inquiring about the welfare of the girls were very specific, formulaic even. We may deduce that the ladies of the Beneficent Society wanted to know if the family was pleased with the girl and why? Did the girl seem happy and did she go to the day school and/or the Sabbath school? Was she fulfilling her obligation to work? And, I would venture to guess, was she a Christian?

---

[75] Ibid.

The 1852 report includes a letter from Mr. George Ellsworth of Northampton regarding his charge, Elizabeth Wadsworth, born December 14, 1836 and bound out to him on February 14, 1843 at the age of thirteen. This correspondence illustrates that sometimes the family was supremely dissatisfied with the charge. Interestingly, Mr. Ellsworth wrote the letter but did not release Miss Wadsworth back to the care of the asylum. He wrote,

> Her health is good but she is not obedient or pleasing in her disposition, habits, or deportment. She is pretty and fully aware of the fact. She is thoughtless and sometimes brings trouble upon herself and the family by heedless remarks. Her mind dwells much on amusements and fine garments and she is backward in her studies, but this is owing a great measure to inattention. Few children in her circumstances have had her advantages and it grieves us very much to know that she is not improved them as she ought to have done."[76]

If Miss Wadsworth was so much trouble one wonders why Mr. Ellsworth did not send her back to the asylum. According to this missive Miss Wadsworth was willful, unhygienic, troublesome, thoughtless, frivolous, superficial and ungrateful. But she was pretty. Pretty was the only nice thing Mr. Ellsworth had to say about Miss Wadsworth and one can only conclude that she was pretty enough that he wanted to keep her in his household despite how troublesome she was. In any day and age it seems that this should sound an alarm. Something was not right with this situation though no evidence turned up to show that Miss Wadsworth was removed from Mr. Ellsworth's household.

Very different was the case of Margaret Finnegan about whom we read a report from her adopted mother Mrs. Martin Kellogg of Newington. She wrote in the 1852 Report, "We consider Margaret a happy member of our family…She seems courteous and much attached to us…we love her very much and hope to train her for usefulness and respectability in life. She expresses

---

[76] Ibid.

great gratitude to the Benevolent Ladies who have taken so deep an interest in her welfare."[77] Margaret is happy, nicely mannered, feels affection for the family which is returned to her by them and they have great hope for her future; they believe she is capable of attaining a respectable way of life despite her unfortunate start in life. And she is thankful to the ladies of the Beneficent Society which was important for them as too many stories like Miss Wadsworth's would have negated the need for the Society. The girls under their care needed to turn out to be hard workers and pious, obedient and domestic, in order to justify the existence of the asylum.

The 1855 Secretary's Report contains a few paragraphs dedicated to recounting the passing of one little girl and her sister. It reads:

> The general health of the children has been good with the exception of a short period of sickness during the past summer. One little girl Elizabeth James was at that time removed by death. This child attracted the attention of strangers, when visiting the Asylum by her winning ways and the delicacy and beauty of her face. A lady, when calling at that Asylum once remarked, 'that it made her heart sad to think one so interesting, should have to struggle with the future hardships incidental to her station position' It was but a few months after that she was called to a home where neither blight or shadow could mar her happiness. She had lost her little sister, the year previous and when, during her sickness, the little companions of her play gathered about to offer their sympathy, the kind friend who was nursing her, asked 'if she would like to get well and play again' She replied "I would rather go to my little sister' She distributed all her little playthings and turned her thoughts to that invisible land which held her little sister. Who can tell but they two, as spirits, are among the number of these children on this bright afternoon[78]

This entry is highly sentimental and has a religious undertone. It appears that the women of the Beneficent Society mourned the loss of Elizabeth James. The asylum would have needed to explain her death to their members and to the Hartford community, to assure people that the

---

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

event occurred through no fault of their own. They would have attempted to show that it was not by any dereliction on their part that Miss James did not survive the outbreak of illness that swept through the asylum.

While the 1850s reports are most prolific in offering details of the girls' lives, these bits of information are scattered rather randomly throughout the ledgers kept by the Hartford Female Beneficent Society. Not so for the Hartford Orphan Asylum. The HOA case information ledger for 1852-1895 is quite detailed and systematic, meticulously listing each resident boy's name, date of birth, date of entry, date left and location removed to. The first listing is for Samuel M. Auliffe born January 7, 1848, entered the asylum October 12, 1848 and left April 18, 1853 to live with Mr. Tho. [sic] Day on Prospect Street in Hartford. Several entries list boys going away to apprentice with members of the Loomis family in Coventry, Connecticut on their 100 acre farm.[79] William Hogan is placed June 12, 1851 at the age of eleven and runs away on March 12, 1853.

We find an example of the HOA's ability to make exceptions and change their operating procedures in the entry for Uriah King. King, born December 24, 1845 was placed in the Hartford Orphan Asylum on March 4, 1850 and he was removed on April 11, 1854 and listed as "With his Mother to Utica."[80] As previously stated, children adopted by the Hartford Orphan Asylum, at least prior to 1837, were not ever released back into their families' custody. The December 4, 1837 entry suggests that perhaps some parents would have liked to be able to see their children and pay for some of their care and that perhaps this was an ideal situation for

[79] "National Register of Historic Places." *SUPPLEMENTARY LISTING RECORD*. National Park Service, 26 Apr. 1994. Web. 15 June 2011. <http://pdfhost.focus.nps.gov/docs/NRHP/Text/94000370.pdf>.

[80] The Village for Children and Families, Box 17/Case Information, bound volume 1852-1895.

many; however, there is no indication that this idea was acted upon except to move the boy under discussion to a different employment situation. But here in the case information entry pertaining to Uriah King we see that a mother was allowed to remove her son from the care of the asylum. Uriah King was nine years old when he was removed and had spent four years under the care of asylum. Before this instance, though, in July 1853 another boy was removed from the asylum by his mother. His entry is listed later in the ledger because he entered the asylum after Uriah King. John A. Styles, born May 17, 1847, was taken into the asylum on April 22, 1853 and two months and two days later he was removed and listed as "Taken by his mother."[81]

A number of things could account for the apparent policy change in the mid-1850s that permitted some parents to retrieve their children. There is no available record to indicate the precise thoughts behind the managers' change of heart. One reason may have been an increase in need for services.

As the City of Hartford and the surrounding towns became more and more industrialized need for asylum care increased as population and then poverty levels increased; many destitute parents preferred to keep their children at the asylum rather than at the almshouse for safety reasons. The asylum began to recognize the need for temporary care while parents got back on their feet. This is indicative of a change in the way in which poverty was viewed. It appears that the ladies no longer associated pauperism with indecency or intemperance, instead seeing those suffering from poverty as unfortunate persons, victims of society or simple bad luck. It appears, too, that they sympathized with the distress of poo working mothers or fathers without a partner to care for small children during work hours.

---

[81] Ibid.

For example, a woman like Margaret Young would have had no choice but to turn to the HFSB and the HOA for assistance in caring for her children. She is not an ideal case study to make this point, nevertheless, her need was very real despite the eventual determination the HOA made regarding her suitability for assistance. The note on the back of her children's' indenture form for the Hartford Orphan Asylum reads,

> The mother Margaret Young came here from N. Jersey in July last [1853] with her 3 children, Sarah age 6, John W. age 4, and Elizabeth age 1 ½ in search of her runaway husband – totally destitute of everything – several benevolent ladies took great interest in herself and children and assisted her but her habits were too dissipated and she and children were taken to Alms House [sic] Nov. 2 Sarah was indentured to Hartford F.B. Society November 15, 1853.[82]

Then, however, the Hartford Orphan Asylum changed it mind and chose to remove John W. Young and admitted him to the Asylum on January 25, 1854. His indenture to the Asylum can be found in the Appendix to this thesis.

Doubtless little Elizabeth Young was taken into the Hartford Female Beneficent Society to join her sister Sarah shortly after her brother was adopted by the Hartford Orphan Asylum. What alternative did a woman such as Margaret Young have? Without a husband or close family and friends to assist her, in a strange city with three children and no money to speak of, she had no option but to go to the almshouse and ask for assistance. While she herself was eventually found unworthy of assistance by the Asylum ladies both organizations eventually provided assistance for her children; this further illustrates a departure from the early nineteenth century sentiment that the poor person was responsible for their poverty and the sins of the parent blemished the character and weakened the moral fiber of the child. That for any period of time the asylum ladies felt it right to send a six year old, four year old and toddler to the almshouse

[82] The Village for Children and Families, Box 2, Folder 3.

with a parent too dissipated to care for them is shocking; add to this the fact that it was because of the mother's degenerate behavior, either perceived or real, that the ladies would not initially assist the children is beyond callous by any standard. However, that they relented and took the children in shows, again, the shift in attitude regarding the asylum's purpose. In this case it was possible the children would not get to the point where they were bound out for service as their mother could find employment and retrieve them. This change also meant that the ladies' attitude towards the poor in general had continued to evolve until not only the children were able to put themselves above the poverty they were born into, but the parents could do the same.

By mid-century both asylums moved fully away from the isolating system where they sought out poor children in order to give them a better start in life. The theory behind their work fell into line with what Hacsi terms "protective" asylum care. Hacsi tells us that

> Protective asylums also effectively removed their children from the outside world...However, in protective asylums...religious training closely mirrored the children's background. Furthermore, if a living parent could reclaim his or her child at some point, managers of protective asylums were willing, and sometimes happy, to return children to their homes.[83]

Hacsi goes on to wisely point out that some asylums would be protective for some children and not for others, as in the case of a Catholic child ending up in a Protestant asylum. The religious education they received would not mesh well with what they had known thus far and been taught was the correct form of worship.

Keeping in line with the protective asylum theory, however, the case management ledger for the Hartford Orphan Asylum indicates that two young boys, John and William Egan, were left at the asylum on January 26, 1862 and removed from the asylum on February 9, 1863 by a

[83] Hacsi, pg. 56.

Father Hughes. It is possible that Father Hughes took the two young boys to the St. James Asylum for Boys, a Catholic institution, on Church Street in Hartford. This example illustrates the Hartford Orphan Asylums apparent lack of interest in converting children from Catholicism and other religions, or at least the newly found willingness to let the children leave the asylum for religious purposes or respect for the manner in which the child's family wishes them to be raised even if they were not capable of raising them themselves. This would further indicate that the ladies had developed a sense that poverty sometimes left adult victims in its wake as well as juvenile victims; that many of the parents who left their children in the care of the managers were not thoughtless or degenerate sociopaths, but simply unfortunate people who had run out of options. The orphan asylums were some of the only long term care options in the City of Hartford for children, whereas outdoor relief might have helped a parent get through a difficult week or month, it would not necessarily have made a significant impact on the parent's ability to provide a good start for his or her child.

While some parents came to retrieve their children from the asylums, some of the children left of their own volition or were stolen. Such appears to have been the fate of young Henry Hines who was left at the asylum on July 25, 1861 and is listed in the case information ledger as "Stolen from the Asylum."[84] With the advent of the Civil War we have more and more boys listed as "gone" from the asylum. Between 1863 and 1865 a total of thirteen boys are listed as gone (a list can be found in the Appendix). While none are listed as going to war the timing is correct and the lure obvious.

---

[84] The Village for Children and Families archive, Box 17, Case Information, bound volume 1852-1895.

Children left to become soldiers and there was at least one instance in which a soldier's child was left. This was Erastus Deming who was born on March 25, 1863 and listed with the word "soldier" (indicating the occupation of his father) next to his name. He was taken in by the Hartford Orphan Asylum on March 28, 1865, perhaps when his mother realized his father was not returning from the war, and listed as "at Hospital" in the column indicating his fate. Perhaps he died at the hospital, no further information is offered in the archives about Erastus Deming. It would not have been uncommon for a war widow to leave her child at the Hartford Orphan Asylum, there was, however another option in place for war orphans.

The Connecticut Soldiers' Orphans Home was formed in 1864. According to the February 9, 1866 issue of the *Hartford Daily Courant,*

> The Legislature of 1864 granted the charter of the 'Connecticut Soldiers Orphans Home," the object being 'to provide a home, support and education or destitute children of Connecticut soldiers and other citizens of the State.' The charter provides 'that every person who shall pay one thousand dollars into the treasury of the corporation shall be a director for life; every person who shall pay one hundred dollars shall be a member for life; and every person who shall pay twenty-five dollars shall be a member for one year from the date of said payment.' The corporation held a meeting in this city on the 17th day of May 1865, and elected William A. Buckingham [then the Governor of Connecticut] president with one vice-president from each county in the State, and P.S. Gold of West Cornwall secretary. E.B. Huntington of Stamford was appointed agent, and under his direction a little paper, called *The Bulletin* has just been started. It sets forth facts of interest concerning the Home, and contains the following to which particular attention is invited 'The directors of the Connecticut Soldiers' Orphan Home invite proposals for the location of the Home from the citizens of the State. Offers may be made from any town, in the shape of money, land or buildings, suitable for the home – predicted upon its location there: and the directors will hold the right of accepting the offers from any location, or two, that shall present the greatest advantages. Proposals should be addressed to the Rev. E. B. Huntington, Stamford, Connecticut.' As the idea of establishing such a Home was first started in Hartford, and towards the erection of which funds were at once raised by public exhibitions at Allyn Hall, we trust steps will be taken here to

> make liberal proposition to the directors which shall secure the erection of the institution in this city.[85]

The Connecticut Soldiers' Orphans' Home was located in Mansfield, Connecticut rather than in Hartford as the newspaper article suggests. Edwin Whitney of Mansfield invited the managers to use the large building he had recently erected to be a boys' school and the fifty acres upon which the building sat. By law on September 24, 1866 the locale was accepted as a gift from Mr. Whitney to the Orphans' Home. The Home was open from October 1866 to May 1875 after having served some two-hundred needy children. As Walter Stemmons points out in his text *Connecticut Agricultural College-A History*,

> Even orphans grow up, and in 1875 the Home closed its doors, having first and last provided a home and schooling and religious training in plenty to some two hundred or more orphans of Connecticut men who lost their lives in the Civil War."[86]/[87]

Unlike the Hartford Orphan Asylum and the Hartford Female Beneficent Society, the Connecticut Soldiers' Orphans' Home was opened with the sole intent of serving the children of fallen soldiers and once the last beneficiary was of age, the Home closed its doors.

---

[85] "Connecticut Soldiers' Orphans Home"; *Hartford Daily Courant (8140-1887);* Feb 9, 1866; ProQuest Historical Newspapers Hartford Courant (1764-1922). P. 2.

[86] Stemmons, Walter. Connecticut Agricultural College: A History. New Haven, Connecticut: The Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor Company, 1931. P. 31.

[87] Side note: the building that housed the orphans became Storrs College when the building was bought by Mr. Storrs from Mr. Whitney's [original donor] widow, the property was eventually used to begin the Storrs Agricultural School which evolved eventually into the University of Connecticut.

Chapter Five: Merging into One Orphan Asylum

By 1865 the Beneficent Society and the Hartford Orphan Asylum decided they were better able to serve the increasing population of impoverished children by combining their efforts. One major reason for taking this step was probably decrease in donations to the asylums during the Civil War years and a lack of hope for an increase in donations during the Reconstruction.

In 1865 the Hartford Orphan Asylum approached the Hartford Female Beneficent Society regarding integration of their efforts on behalf of the children of Hartford, the Beneficent Society was highly receptive. A resolution was passed in the General Assembly's May Session that year fusing together the two organizations. The Resolution was printed in the *Annual Report of the Hartford Orphan Asylum: For The Year Ending May 1st, 1866*[88] and its stated purpose was for "Uniting the Hartford Orphan Asylum and the Hartford Female Beneficent Society in one institution, to be called the Hartford Orphan Asylum."[89] The Secretary's Report indicates that,

> At the commencement of the year the union of the two institutions known as the 'Beneficent Society' and the 'Orphan Asylum' was consummated. This, it was hoped and expected, would concentrate benevolent effort, and afford a better and surer method of administering relief to the orphan. In this the managers have not been disappointed. Although its funds have not been as abundant as in former years...the supply has equaled the demand, and it has more successfully accorded with the wishes of its patrons.[90]

Among the names listed on the board and as managers, we find some very prestigious entries and not necessarily all ladies who lived in the City of Hartford. Mrs. Charles Cheney, for example,

---

[88] See Appendix

[89] The Village for Children and Families archive, Box 4, Folder 4.

[90] Ibid.

would have lived in the Town of Manchester where her husband and his family owned and operated the silk mills. They are listed as owning property in Hartford in the City Directory for 1861.[91] The names Bulkeley, Goodwin, Jewell, and Colt appear as before.

In 1865-1866, ninety-seven children were living at the orphanage, thirty-two had left during the year and fifty-five had been added, sixteen were the children of soldiers and nine were "refugees." "Refugee" is not defined so these children may have been immigrants. The asylum at this point was still running its own school, both day and Sabbath. A note is made in the 1866 Report that the public school committee skipped over examining the school at the asylum which was regrettable as it would have received a favorable report, so the managers felt, and, therefore, may have received some public attention that might have prompted citizens to make much needed monetary donations.

The 1866 Report goes on to note the worth of the program by indicating the vast depths of depravity from which these children have been pulled by the asylum. The text is recreated below to allow for full appreciation of the ladies' sentiments:

> There have been several especial cases of interest during the past few months, showing the value of these nurseries for the young and friendless. One child was taken from a dying mother, which was so emaciated and enfeebled from neglect that death seemed inevitable; but, under the fostering care of the faithful nurse, has now become bright, healthy, and handsome. A little boy was taken from a vicious and abusive mother, who manifested such fine qualities of heart and mind as to inspire much interest, and afford great prospect of future good. What might not have been made of those talents in the service of sin! Another – a girl ten or twelve years of age was rescued from the lowest haunts of vice. Sin and misery were her boon companions, and the atmosphere of pollution her native air. She remonstrated with her benefactors, who endeavored, by kindness, to win her to a life of virtue and happiness, and rewarded their efforts only with *curses*. Now she is 'clothed and in her right mind.' She is happy and contented, and expresses the

[91] http://distantcousin.com/Directories/CT/Hartford/1861_62/Pages.asp?Pages=077 .

> most entire satisfaction with her new home, a dread of her past life, and a sincere desire to become good and useful. We would not be too sanguine as to immediate results in such cases; still, when we remember the impressible nature of childhood, the promise is great for good seed sown in such tender soil. Such are some of the fruits of our charity. Will not even *present* good amply repay any care, any labor, any sacrifice? The managers bespeak for the future the same kind aid and interest which has thus far been bestowed by a generous public, and pray for the continued smile of an ever-watchful Providence.[92]

This passage indicates that a child was taken from a mother so negligent that the infant was on the verge of death, a child was taken from a mother so abusive that her abuse was bound to change the good nature he was born with and a daughter was taken from a situation steeped in sin and vice. These situations were not the normal ones from which the original asylums would have accepted children. In particular, the entry about the girl is shocking when one considers that it implies that the sin and misery were the girl's, not her mother's or her father's, but hers. This shows that the ladies running the asylum had altered their opinions so vastly that they felt that even if a child was born to sinners and then themselves were made the object of sin, this did not make them innately sinful or without goodness. Sin was situational and any child taken out of the situation had the chance to be rehabilitated and set on a virtuous path.

These annual reports served a dual purpose. They recorded the most important information for the year in one place and they acted as a fundraising tool for the ladies of the asylum. Copies of the reports were likely distributed as dues were paid for the year, reminding the ladies why they paid the dues and involved themselves in this cause; for the children who may die or worse if they were not provided with a helping hand and the ladies did not open their purses in the name of humanitarian compassion. At the back of each report is a list of

---

[92] Ibid.

subscribers, a list of legacies received, non-monetary donations made and, finally, a form to make a donation and a form to grant custody of your child to the asylum.

The ledger for this period containing the children's personal information indicates that while many children remained in the orphanage and were then bound out, many were also retrieved by their parents. In fact, in the section where the female children are listed, every child under the age of five, with two exceptions, was taken back by their mothers or adopted by strangers.

Between 1813 and 1826 the Hartford Female Beneficent Society served forty-one girls, from 1832 to 1842 the Hartford Orphan Asylum served seventy boys and yet by 1865 a total of ninety-seven children were living together at the asylum at once. Even taking into account the number of children who came and went in short bursts or were released to apprenticeships or to be indentured in any given year, the size of the group being served was exponentially larger than it was to begin with. According to Hacsi such growth in the asylum populations was the national norm, given that,

> After the Civil War, industrialization and the increased poverty it brought to urban centers would help fuel the continued multiplication of orphan asylums…it was the combination of wage labor, which left many workers and their families unable to deal with any calamity they might face, and the prevalence of cholera, yellow fever, and other diseases that led orphan asylums to spread across the nation.[93]

The need for the asylums was stunning. Even with various religious orphanages in the City and specific asylums for soldiers' orphans as well as additional city asylums in New Haven, Bridgeport and elsewhere in Connecticut, the Hartford Orphan Asylum saw an amazing amount of traffic. The 1860 census shows us a cross section of Hartford County which contained 88,

[93] Hacsi. P. 21

613 persons total, 27,751 of whom were children fifteen years old and younger.[94] The City of Hartford had a population of 29,152. Hartford County is listed as having had 1,425 apprentices, 15,683 laborers, 12,831 servants, 1,253 students, 14 rag collectors, and 710 other occupations and unknown occupations. There are myriad jobs listed, from three stockbrokers to wool sorters (of whom there were nineteen) and blacksmiths who numbered two-thousand three-hundred ninety-eight to the lone blacking manufacturer. What was not recorded on the census is the number of unemployed or vagrant persons in Hartford County and in the City of Hartford after the Civil War ended. The statistics show that nearly a hundred children served was a lot of children in ratio to the population; this would have been a lot of children for the county to have served much less the City of Hartford alone.

Of course, these statics are based only on who was present in the City or County at the time of the census taking. According to Hacsi there was, "...constant movement in search of jobs [which] reduced the chances that a family would have had relatives nearby if an emergency arose, for native-born people as well as for immigrants."[95] In addition to lessening the likelihood that familial assistance would be available, this movement likely made it more difficult to predict the real population of any city at a given time. Hacsi also observes,

> The overall population of the nation rose from 13 million in 1830 to 31 million in 1860; during the same period, the growth in urban areas was even more rapid. In 1830, less than 10 percent of Americans lived in 'urban' areas of 2,500 or more people, but by 1860, fully 20 percent of the population were urban dwellers.[96]

---

[94] U.S. Census Bureau. Classified Population of the States and Territories, by Counties, on the First Day of June, 1860. No date. Accessed last April 30, 2009. http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/1860a-04.pdf **figures do not encompass non-white populations.

[95] Hacsi. P. 22.

[96] Hacsi. P. 21.

This would also factor into the increase in beneficiaries as the denser population and the rate of immigration amplified the need for services.

Unlike at the beginning of the 19th Century when pauperism was fairly rare and considered to be self-inflicted, by the 1860s and beyond, a number of factors were understood to play a part in the impoverishment of individuals and families. Increased industrialization and the resulting wage labor, denser populations around urban areas that lacked sufficient public transportation mechanisms, increased immigration from abroad, and a war in which a great many lives were ruined through both death and the inability to find employment.

In Connecticut, approximately four thousand Hartford men served in the Civil War and four hundred of those died.[97] Potentially four hundred families were affected by the deaths of the men, but how many more suffered upon their return? How many men came back from fighting unable to hold down a job due to physical, mental, or emotional problems or all three? If a man with a wife and two children but no ready cash returned to his farm without one of his arms, having had it violently removed in the war, how likely was it that he would be able to keep his farm, keep his livelihood with only a small government pension in return for his service? What about a man who did not fight in the war, but whose business was crippled by it? These are examples of circumstantial poverty where through no fault of his own a man found himself unable to support his family. Such harsh realities at the roots of poverty the ladies of the asylum seemed better able to see with a half a century of service under their belts.

---

[97] http://www.chs.org/finding_aides/ransom/049.htm Connecticut History Society; Connecticut's Civil War Monuments, "Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Arch" 3/23/2011.

Chapter Six: The Integrative Orphan Asylum Theory

With fifty years of experience, and perhaps with the opening of the newly combined, coed asylum, the ladies seemed to have acquired a more realistic view of poverty and the poor. This more lenient sentiment aided in their decision to institute what Hacsi refers to as the integrative orphan asylum which "tried to help their children experience the outside world even while they ate and slept within the asylum." Hacsi points out that, "...over the last few decades of the nineteenth century, many older asylums began slowly shifting from an isolating or protective mode toward a more integrative stance...[though] Many asylums retained some protective traits..."[98]

This change in viewpoint can be attributed in part to the changing role of woman in nineteenth century America and to the fact that it was during this century that childhood began to be viewed as a separate stage of life and children regarded not as little adults but as undeveloped human beings who could be molded. Carol Hymowitz and Michaele Weissman point out in their text, A History of Women in America, that the middle class ladies living in the latter half of the nineteenth century, "...more or less discarded the earlier view that children had free will to do good or bad, replacing that idea with the notion that children had to be taught right from wrong. They believed that a mother's influence had a very great deal to do with the sort of person a child would become."[99] With the children under the influence of good, moral mother figures there was no reason to keep them separated from a society that might corrupt them or that they might corrupt. If all children were taught right from wrong in the same manner and their sense of right

[98] Hacsi. P. 57.

[99] Hymowitz, Carol & Weissman, Michaele. A History of Women in America. New York: Bantam Books, 1978. P. 75.

and wrong was developed by their parent figure, the children at the asylum should have no more trouble among their peers than any child being raised in a typical mid-century middle-class home.

Additionally, the ladies of the HOA acknowledged that with war came poverty and the widowing of women and the orphaning of children. It would have been rather difficult, given the Union's reasons for fighting the war, to reconcile the idea that the people left poor by the war, particularly children orphaned because of it, were somehow morally bankrupt due to their poverty or incapable of learning morality if it was not already firmly in place. The Connecticut Soldiers' Orphans Home was opened in 1864 to help care for the masses of children orphaned by the Civil War. This event must have demonstrated to the ladies of the HOA that society was changing its attitude towards the poverty stricken or at least the poverty stricken veterans' families.

Earlier, in 1857, at the death of the highly successful Hartford businessman David Watkinson, a great deal of support for a handful of the impoverished boys was provided by the Watkinson Juvenile Asylum and Farm School which was established through a bequest in his will; evidence that the importance of taking a hand in raising orphaned and impoverished children in order to bring them up morally was gaining increasing popularity even before the merging of the HFSB and HOA.

The Watkinsons, in fact, had much to do with the orphans in the City of Hartford through the early and middle nineteenth century. Mrs. Olivia Hudson Watson, David Watkinson's wife,

was the manager of the Beneficent Society from 1811 to 1849,[100] when she passed away. At the time that the Watkinson Juvenile Asylum and Farm School was formed the asylums for boys and girls were still separate. According to Marian G.M. Clarke in her text *David Watkinson's Library: One Hundred Years in Hartford, Connecticut 1866-1966*,

> One of the public objects that had interested him [David Watkinson] in particular, early in his planning [of his will], was a state institution for orphan and indigent children. He wanted it to be incorporated, and specified that funds should be raised from other sources besides the twenty thousand dollar bequest named in his will in order to relieve 'society from the evils of crime and corruption which involve in their consequences the heavier expense of maintenance in alms-houses and prisons.'...It was to be open to children from six to twenty-one years old, either orphan or neglected, for industrial as well as intellectual, moral and religious training...Through the years it developed into Hartford's Watkinson School."[101]

Clearly Watkinson saw the education and moral training of poor children and orphans as a worthy cause. Had he not thought so he would not have allowed his wife to be involved with the Hartford Female Beneficent Society much less allowed her to act as its Manager. Mr. Watkinson's attitude towards the children was not that of surrogate parent or Christian savior per se, he simply did not want idle poor children roaming the streets of Hartford as they were bound to cause trouble of the criminal kind. Additionally he felt the pecuniary costs of imprisoning a child or supporting him or her in the almshouse was greater than providing an asylum school for them and attempting to reform them.

Watkinson's attitude was antiquated by the 1870s when we start to see the Hartford Orphan Asylum truly discarding the old isolationist methods and embracing the new integrative

---

[100] Clarke, Marian G.M. David Watkinson's Library: One Hundred Years in Hartford, Connecticut 1866-1966. Hartford, Connecticut: Trinity College Press, 1966. P. 5.

[101] Clarke. P. 8.

system of asylum care. Under this very different model parents were allowed to board their children for specific amounts of time and could remove them from the asylum ladies' care as long as they were able to pay back the expense born by the charity. This was an intelligent move that allowed the ladies to serve more children. A widow with children might not have been able to afford to house and feed her children and provide daytime care for them while she worked but she might have found the money to semi-relinquish her children to the asylum's care and pay their support until she could get them back. Or she had the option to drop her children at the asylum, giving their full custody to the Hartford Orphan Asylum and then, as mentioned above, pay back the cost incurred by the organization. Unfortunately HOA records of how much the support of such children cost have not survived.

While the asylum retained some elements of isolationist theory and practice – for example allowing for full relinquishment of children into its care – revised terms for the indenture/adoption agreement appear, rewritten, in the 1879 report (revisions may have been made much earlier, it is not possible to say as some years Annual Reports are not available). The new language shows an increased interest in the welfare of the child rather than the needs of society or its equivalent, the adult petitioning to adopt or indenture. The Form of Indenture for Adoption can be found in the back of most surviving copies of the Asylum's annual reports (see Appendix for language).

Basically the adoptive adult was required to treat the child fairly, as if he or she was one of their own. Especially interesting here is the indication that the adopter was to give the adoptee all the care he would provide for his biological children. This would be a preventative measure

intended to halt middle class families from thinking of this system as a way to purchase a permanent servant – a slave really.

Adopters were legally making a lifelong commitment to the child. In most cases, particularly with the adoption of female orphans it was not probable that this level of commitment posed a problem. To understand why orphan children's induction into a middle-class family in this period may have been rather smooth we must look at the lives of the women of the period, for the home and children were her territory. Firstly, we must note that, for the most part, middle class ladies were not idle. The popular idea of a pale-faced and weak, middle class American woman idly fainting onto silk covered furniture all day is a misconception.

Women on farms in New England worked the same way in which they had through the centuries, alongside their husbands; a division of duties existed, of course, though it existed out of necessity rather than extreme prejudice. Women of the middle class in urban settings, however, found their lives changing rather swiftly with increased urbanization and industrialization in post Civil War New England. Hymowitz and Weissman point out in their text that,

> Among the new middle class, home and family came to be seen as separate from the world of work and money. Women were affected by this change in very significant ways. In their homes, middle-class women continued to perform their traditional work – to cook and clean, make clothing and other household goods, care for children. What they did, however, was no longer considered 'real work,' because, unlike men, they earned no money thereby…[and] As the factory system grew…women who lived in towns and cities came to be dependent on their husbands' earnings to buy factory-made goods.[102]

[102] Hymowitz. Pp. 64-65.

And so we had middle class women coming to be seen as dependents of their husbands, unable to earn a living wage and participate in the new industrialized economy without the assistance of her male family member.

Hymowitz and Weissman quote Thomas Dew, a nineteenth century Southern intellectual, as he identifies the separation of the genders into two different spheres:

> He leaves the domestic scenes; he plunges into the turmoil and bustle of an active, selfish world; in his journey through life, he has to encounter innumerable difficulties, hardships and labors which constantly beset him. His mind must be nerved against them. Hence courage and boldness are his attributes...Her attributes are rather of a passive than active character. Her power is more emblematic of divinity...Women we behold dependent and weak...but out of that very weakness and dependence springs an irresistible power.[103]

Men battled daily to support the women that were dependent on them because women were weak, but they were worthy of men's efforts because they were also divine. Hymowitz and Weissman note that as men and women became less familiar with each other and convinced themselves that there were vast differences between the genders, women began to form very close relationship with one another as they each strove to accomplish the same thing; piety, purity, submissiveness, and respectable domesticity. Being a lady was about presentation rather than birth in nineteenth century America.

The change in attitude towards the responsibilities and roles of women in turn changed their ideas surrounding childhood and children. The role of mother became the most important one in a woman's life as women came to believe that it was through their influence that children were raised to be upstanding citizens. It would stand to reason then that women, having taken responsibility for their own children's outcomes would see it as the onus of women of all classes.

---

[103] Hymowitz. P. 66.

A woman who was poor was not excluded from raising her child with morals and an industrious attitude. The unfortunate poor woman perhaps required a helping hand, one that could be offered by a middle class woman through charitable organizations such as the Hartford Orphan Asylum. If the family was the woman's sphere then the orphan asylum was the perfect venue in which to use her abilities and make herself most useful. Doubtless for many of these women their involvement in their charitable organizations was the only way in which they could exert any influence; this must have been a significant draw for them. The integrative system held vast appeal for the Asylum ladies as it allowed them to influence the children's mothers in addition to the children themselves. Perhaps in some cases a father enrolled his child at the Asylum and returned to remove him or her but it seems unlikely, given the attitudes of the sexes, that the men would have been good receptors of the ladies' child rearing guidance.

As women shared the same concerns and led very similar lives, and as men and women distanced themselves from each other more fully through deep regard for perceived differences, women began to form bonds among themselves that often lasted for life. The relationship between female family members were often times deep as their shared understanding of one another, that unique empathy, was impossible outside their sex and class. A little girl adopted from the Hartford Orphan Asylum and taken into a middle class home where she may cook and clean with the lady of the house and her daughters perhaps found the situation most to her benefit and quite a bit better than she might have ended up with. This girl, given the Asylum's demand that the adopted children be treated as family members, perhaps had the opportunity in these situations to form those aforementioned close relationships with other females that would last their whole lives.

The commitment demanded of the families who adopted children illustrates how dedicated the Hartford Orphan Asylum was to its purpose. Other charities existed that were devoted to the betterment of the lives of lower class families, and these charities, also run by middle class women, often possessed the same depth of commitment to the betterment of the subjects of their charity as long as a certain distance was observed from the object of their charity.

Also interesting to note is that, while the Asylum maintained an open door policy, turning no one away because of race, religion or nationality, the indenture agreement[104] does state that religious 'advantages' were to be provided. As middle class Protestant Americans the managers were most inclined to adopt out children to other middle class Protestant Americans who would raise the children on their common set of values.

Interestingly, the Hartford Orphan Asylum ledger covering the years 1852 to 1895, shows that the Asylum began indicating ancestry or perhaps the origin of the parent(s) of the children accepted by the Asylum. For instance, the lists for boys who entered between January 29, 1866 and November 15, 1871, the page has a heading called "Parentage" and according to this entry there are eighteen Irish children, ten American children, three Scotch children, two German children, one English child, one child listed as "Am. Father, Mother Eur.Pros." which may mean the father was American and the mother was a European Protestant of some kind. Additionally, one child is listed as "Father Irish, Mother American" and one child's "Parentage" is not listed at all.[105]

---

[104] The agreement referred to was drawn up in 1866 after the integration of the HFSB and HOA**

[105] Village for Children & Families, Box 17, Case Information ledger

In the 100 years between 1820 and 1920, approximately fifty-five million people immigrated to the United States,[106] a stupendous demographic movement that transformed Hartford as it transformed most of the rest of the United States. The Asylum in Hartford welcomed the children of immigrants and began to keep track of who they were. Out of the thirty-seven children listed above only ten of them were referred to as American and two were half American. The potential here was for twenty-five children who were not from middle class Protestant American homes to be raised as such if their parents were unable to pay the Asylum back to retrieve them.

Certainly some poor families, newly arrived immigrant families included, were pleased to place their children where superior circumstances may have increased the children's potential for success in adult life. However it tells us something about American culture in this era, mainly that the Americanization of people was thought important. Middle-class Protestants were most comfortable with other middle class Protestants and felt that they way they were living their lives was the correct way, the most American way. According to Hymowitz and Weissman, "The children of immigrants were more readily absorbed into the American culture. This process often led to painful confliction between parents and children. The gap between immigrant mothers and daughters was especially acute."[107] They go on to note that most immigrants during this period were Catholic or Jewish.

Hacsi observes in his text, *Second Home*, that, "Catholic asylums may have been especially willing to help families reunite; Catholic charity was generally 'less judgmental, more

---

[106] Hymowitz. P. 192.

[107] Hymowitz. Pp. 193-194.

ready to help, less quick to condemn' than Protestant charity throughout the nineteenth century."[108] An example is provided in *A History of Women in America* regarding a woman, abandoned by her husband, with two small children who had trouble maintaining a home for herself and her offspring. The text relates how the immigrant woman went to a state run charity [in New York] for assistance and rather than provide her with some outdoor relief until she could get on her feet, or a place for the three to stay until she had enough money for decent lodging, the charity organization put the woman in the poorhouse and her children in an orphanage. Hymowitz and Weissman indicate that,

> In the end, the family was split apart – and the agency expected the woman to be grateful. Instead, she expressed anger and despair at American-style 'help' which must have been felt by many.
>
> 'I don't ask you to put me in the poorhouse where I have to cry for my children. I don't ask you to put them in a home and eat somebody else's bread. You only want people to live like you but I will not listen to you no more...I can't live here without Helen and John [her children]. I am so sick for them. I listened to you and went to the hospital. I could live at home and spare good eats for them. What good did you give me?'[109]

A woman alone without assistance in a new country would probably be unable to comprehend the finality of her decision to put a child in a place like the Hartford Orphan Asylum. Without that understanding she could not be sure surrendering her child would truly benefit the child or her family. The foregoing is an extreme example and not one that appears to apply to the women of Hartford who committed themselves to the wellbeing of the children at the HOA; however, it is interesting to ponder how many parents, even so late in the century with the isolationist policy

---

[108] Hacsi, P. 65

[109] Hymowitz. P.205. - The quoted text above is cited in the book as being taken from William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant In Europe and America* (New York: Knopf, 1927, reprint of 1897 edition), P. 730.

replaced by the integrative policy, did not realize how fully they were severing the connection to their children? The understanding gap would not have been so large for a lower class American to make the connection, but for an immigrant with limited understanding of the cultural differences, it would have been incomprehensible and, therefore, the responsibility of those offering the assistance to explain as fully as possible. The tone of the surviving Annual Reports from the latter half of the 19th century combined with the ledger entries, which show the ease with which children were reunited with parents, lends confidence to the impression that the ladies of Hartford were not inclined to brutally separate families as it appears some other charities were in the habit of doing.

Chapter Seven: An Institution and Religious Influences

Along with the completion of construction on a new institution to house the children in 1879 we may note that the Secretary reported to the managers that finally, as they had all been hoping for so long, twenty-five of the boys would attend the public school in Hartford's South District with the other children of that neighborhood. The Secretary recorded that,

> This arrangement, which we have for a long time earnestly desired, is by the recent erection of the fine new school-house on Lawrence Street, in close proximity to the Asylum, made one of very great convenience. In consequence of this change in our school department, we have been able to dispense with the services of one of our two teachers. With this exception the internal management of the Asylum has remained unchanged. The happy contentment of the children, the excellence of their behavior, and the prosperous condition of the school, all attest the high fitness for their duties of those to whom the daily care of the children can be entrusted.[110]

We see from this passage that the managers for the Asylum had indeed been attempting to integrate their charges into society not only through indentures and adoptions that place the older children back in the bosom of society but through educating the children in the public school system.

The new building was financed through subscription and the Report of the Building Committee observed that, "...Mr. David Clarke generously started with a subscription of five thousand dollars, on condition that nine others should subscribe a like amount; but for want of encouragement or other reasons, that subscription of $100,000 was not completed. In 1873 another attempt was made, and with some delay the sum of $64,140 was subscribed. Of the new subscription, $1,891.67 is uncollected."[111] No doubt the writer of this report deduced that

---

[110] Village for Children & Families Archive, Box 4, Folder 5.

[111] Ibid.

exposing Mr. Clarke's inability to follow through with the gift would scare those who owed part or all of the unpaid $1,891.67 to pay before they too were publicly chastised.

The language used to describe the ladies' hopes for this new building reveals that some distaste for the lives of the lower classes lingered:

> That it should embody the essential elements of beauty seems eminently fitting in a building intended for the occupancy of children, for we must not lose sight of the fact that in childhood impressions of outward objects are formed with especial permanence. Let the child's early impressions be such as are naturally formed amid mean and ignoble surroundings, and the same type of objects and interests will probably satisfy him in later years. But let him in early life be familiarly associated with that which is truly good and beautiful, no matter how simple, and we may hope, in after life, to find his aspirations tending in the same direction.[112]

At the same time this statement indicates how the ladies' views towards childhood had altered. A child could be molded, apparently, to want something better in life, something good and pure and whole, if he or she was surrounded with that which is good and pure and whole.

In her essay "Healing Children," (found in the text Twain's World), Sandra Wheeler argues that, "...Nineteenth-century...buildings were expected to reflect the importance of what went on inside them; that is why so many banks were built to look like Greek temples, and why hospitals were somber piles of brick or stone with little ornament."[113] The hopes the ladies of the Asylum had were wrapped up in the outward appearance of the new institution building. They believed, as many people still do, that the children's surroundings would influence how they felt and therefore behaved; a sort of nineteenth century Feng Shui aimed at currying good behavior.

---

[112] Ibid.

[113] Twain's World: Essays on Hartford's Cultural Heritage. Hartford, Conn: Published by the Hartford Courant, 1999. Pp. 172-173.

A year after the children had occupied the building (1880) the superintendent stated in the annual report that,

> The experiment of sending nearly all the children to the public school has met with gratifying success. By mingling them with other children in various departments more interest and emulation are awakened, and any common sentiment unfavorable to exertion, which is apt to arise in such a body of children when kept entirely by themselves, is prevented. The plan of keeping one or two good boys beyond the age at which they are generally put out, as leaders and examples for the rest, has proved one of the best means of helping the discipline which we have ever tried. All our efforts for the good of the children have been efficiently promoted by the conscientious and intelligent labor of the Christian women employed in the house, and we desire to acknowledge the blessing of the Heavenly Father upon our year's work among his fatherless and motherless little ones.[114]

Here we have confirmation that the children were as fully integrated as possible into the world around them and all of them that were of age and eligible to attend the public schools did so. Additionally we find that one or two of the boys old enough to be indentured remained at the asylum in order to provide a good example to the other children and, perhaps, to entice the boys into good behavior so that one day they too might not have to go to work at twelve but instead remain with their family at the Asylum.

This passage also shows us how religion maintained a hold on the work of the Asylum. The wording tells us that not only are the ladies providing the means to run the charity, but that they are hiring only Christians to work at the Asylum and, therefore, this reinforces that any child who was living at the Hartford Orphan Asylum was being raised a Protestant.

Religion continued to play a large role in the raising of these children. Interestingly, back in the seventeenth century when most colonies were setting up their legal systems based upon

---

[114] Village for Children & Families Archive, Box 4, Folder 6.

English Common Law, Connecticut was mainly basing its system on the Bible.[115] The initial Poor Law [previously cited] allowed for the colony to provide relief to any poor person currently present in the State, the later law, that of the State rather than the Colony, allows for relief, as previously discussed, only for the resident or as Edward Warren Capen puts in it in his work The Historical Development of the Poor Law in Connecticut, "The colonial period naturally divides at 1712, in which year steps were taken towards the first great differentiation, namely, that of tramp and vagrant from the true pauper. A workhouse system was devised for the former, while the latter remained under the care of the town officials."[116]

Capen goes on to theorize that the years 1838 to 1875 saw a period, as we have determined here, in which institutions, such as the Hartford Female Beneficent Society and the Hartford Orphan Asylum came to take the place of boarding poor women and children or providing outdoor relief. The laws in Connecticut developed in accord with the determination of state authorities, "...to maintain one type of inhabitant and to exclude all who would break down the established standards."[117] One of the standards was that a resident of Connecticut publicly worship God. Given the origins of the laws for the state this is hardly surprising as up until 1818 the Fundamental Orders, the constitution for Connecticut, made it clear that the Colony was to provide government to the people according to the word of God as represented in the Gospels. That a state which based its laws on the tenets of the Congregational Church gave birth to charities that infused their purpose with Christian sentiments makes a great deal of sense.

---

[115] Hymowitz. P. 22

[116] Capen, P. 17-18.

[117] Ibid, P. 25.

Even as religious beliefs diversified in the state with the influx of immigrants, we see a strong Christian tone remained in the work of the ladies of the Hartford Orphan Asylum. For example, the superintendent in the 1880 annual report stated that, "The citizens of Hartford whose Christian liberality has resulted in this change [in homes, they had moved to the new building by this point] have every reason to feel well satisfied with their work."[118]

In the opening statement of the fiftieth annual report in 1883 of the Asylum the managers thank God saying,

> In heartfelt gratitude to the Giver of every good and perfect gift, we look back for half a century over the way we have come, and recognize His hand in every blessing bestowed, and His leadership in the many difficulties and trials through which we have passed to reach our present position.[119]

However, the annual report for the Hartford Orphan Asylum for 1895 does not mention God or Christianity other than to note that the children were "trained morally and religiously."[120] Ms. Alice H. Bennett, the Corresponding Secretary for the board at the time, chose to close her accounting of the year without any religious reference, instead saying,

> In closing, we would extend our thanks to all who by their gifts, their interest, and kind words have added to the prosperity of this noble charity, and express the hope that the prudent and wise counsels controlling the affairs of this Institution may be blessed to its future prosperity and usefulness.[121]

Now gratitude was offered to all the people who contributed to the charity and not just to those who were Christian or to the people of Hartford who were assumed to be Christian.

---

[118] Village for Children & Families Archives, Box 4, Folder 6.

[119] Village for Children & Families Archives, Box 4, Folder 7.

[120] Village for Children & Families Archives, Box 4, Folder 9.

[121] Ibid.

It is possible that the contributors *were* in fact all Christian, this matters less than the fact that all the participants in the charity, the ladies who went to the teas to raise money and sifted through the lives of the poor were most definitely Christian. It was for them, after all, that these annual reports were written.

Most of the HOA subscribers did not work intimately with the children being raised at the Asylum. They paid the subscription cost and participated in the activities that interested them. They used the annual report to get a sense of the good job HOA was doing with the poor children and they were able to take some pride in the good their contribution had done, as they should have. Those who went out into Hartford's tenements likely did so with blinders on, unable to truly see the affects of poverty on the entirety of the poor population and the way in which society's structure held the poor down. Those able to see clearly would have felt increased pride in the work HOA was doing as the helping hand that worked to change a life was rare.

Chapter Eight: The Cult of Womanhood's Influence on Charity Children

We find evidence of a 'hands off' attitude in the *Hand-Book for Friendly Visitors Among the Poor: Compiled and Arranged by the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York* published in 1883. A copy was found among the materials in the archive which holds the HFSB and HOA's surviving records. As such, it seems likely that the publication was used by the ladies of the charity to better serve Hartford's orphans. However, while some helpful suggestions may have been gleaned from the text by the Hartford ladies, certainly the tone of the book was not a reflection of the ladies feelings towards the recipients of their charity which leads one to believe that the booklet perhaps survived due to its lack of use by the ladies. That *The Hand-Book* made it to Connecticut from New York City for use by charitable institutions tells us that it may have been a popular guide at the time; used nationwide or at least on the eastern seaboard. This book may be used as an example of the mindset of many charity ladies and we may use it to see if the attitudes of the ladies in Hartford were aligned or ran counter to the ideas of other women of the late century.

The title page of the book states that a,

> **CHARITY MUST DO FIVE THINGS**:
>
> 1. Act only upon knowledge got by thorough investigation.
> 2. Relieve worthy need promptly, fittingly, and tenderly.
> 3. Prevent unwise alms to the unworthy.
> 4. Raise into independence every needy person, where this is possible.
> 5. Make sure that no children grow up to be paupers.[122]

[122] Village for Children & Families Archives, Box 42, Folder 1. Title page.

The respected Charity Organization Society (COS) of the City of New York thus put great emphasis on distinguishing between those worthy of assistance and those who were not. However, the COS rule number five suggests that the New York charitable ladies exempted children from judgment and considered them salvable no matter their original circumstances. This booklet was not meant solely for ladies who ran orphan asylums, or necessarily for those who ran institutions. A wide variety of charitable work was covered by the text. The five tenets tell ladies doing charity work to: find out as much as they can about their subject; help them immediately and with kindness; do not give them money if they are unworthy [moral turpitude]; promote self-sufficiency; and help a child to become a valuable member of society.

This booklet gives us insight into the way in which some middle-class ladies regarded the poor and how best they might help them. The first paragraph of the booklet says,

> The best means of doing good to the poor is found in friendly intercourse and personal influence. The want of money is not the worst evil with which the poor have to contend; it is in most cases itself but a symptom of other and more important wants. Gifts or alms are, therefore, not the things most needed, -but sympathy, encouragement, and hopefulness.[123]

The text goes on to give some sound advice, indicating that the ladies visiting the poor must,

> Be on your guard against encouraging idleness, improvidence, or grosser misconduct, directly or indirectly. Injudicious procurement of alms for the family of a drunkard, or a dissolute, idle, or shiftless person, will invariably do more harm than good.[124]

If you gave money to the wife of an alcoholic to support her children then chances were you were supplying her husband with money for alcohol and inadvertently perpetuating his

---

[123] Village for Children & Families, Box 42, Folder 1, P. 1

[124] Ibid

delinquency. The idea in this case may have been to offer goods to a woman in this situation or direct her to a charitable agency rather than to give her money that her drunken spouse might take from her.

The next section advises that,

> The best method of assisting deserving people when in need, is to help those who are able to work to find employment. In seeking employment for the poor, care should be taken not to find it in occupations or associations detrimental to health or charter, or which would place the applicants in the way of temptation, or compel them to incur obligations that would lower their independence or self respect.[125]

Again this would have been done through a recommendation of where to find an agency or charity that provided assistance (such as the HOA), in this case for employment, since the friendly visitor was meant only to provide information, advice and referrals.

The booklet suggests that poor people were largely in the dark about how to save money and some advice here would be apropos.

> The poor, as a rule, have never learned 'the power of littles.' The habit of watching where the pennies go, and of laying up against a rainy day, is generally wanting to them. A word in season may be of use to keep spare money out of the whiskey-seller's till, and to get it put to better use.[126]

Here the problem lies not with obtaining money but with the lack of saving it. This tells us that COS felt that in most poor homes there was enough spare money to save some of it from each wage period. This also tells us that COS made the assumption that at least most persons with employment were paid a living wage, which was not true. Perhaps this was a common oversight at the time or one specific to the ladies of the COS. It was not an idea that the ladies of the

---

[125] Village for Children & Families, Box 42, Folder 1. Pp. 1-2

[126] Village for Children & Families, Box 42, Folder 1. P. 2

Hartford Orphan Asylum were likely to have embraced as they worked so closely with the families and, running the institution, were likely more aware of the cost of living versus the prevailing wages of the time. Each annual report listed at the back the purchases for the year, knowing the cost of survival was, therefore, unavoidable.

It is not surprising, despite the HOA ladies likely exemption from believing it, that privileged ladies assumed workers made a living wage. The *Hartford Daily Courant* reported ten years prior to the publishing of the booklet that,

> Unions...to protect supposed class interests ignore the wisdom of the old maxim that 'Every tub must stand on its own bottom.' Society bids every man earn his living, and tells him that his work is worth just what it will bring. This rule works well for the industrious and skillful, and contrarily for the thriftless. Good work is always in demand and apt to be well paid.[127]

An 1885 article, also from the *Hartford Daily Courant*, indicates that a woman who chose work in a factory over work in the home as a domestic servant made her own poor choice and ought to live with it.[128] Possibly the prevailing idea was that there plenty of jobs with adequate wages to go around if you were a good, smart, hard worker. It was only if your intelligence was below par would you find yourself in a job that did not pay you enough and required you to work in conditions that adversely affected your health, and, most disturbing of all, that women who chose to work outside of the home got what they deserved.

Women like Hartford's City Missionary, Mrs. Virginia Thrall Smith, worked tirelessly to raise women and children up to a higher standard of living. It is very clear that Mrs. Smith was

---

[127] LABOR UNIONS AND NATURAL LAWS. (1872, August 27). *Hartford Daily Courant (1840-1887),* p. 2.
[128] Shop Work and House Work: Providence Letter to New York Commercial Advertiser. (1885, May 16). *Hartford Daily Courant (1840-1887).* P. 5.

not one of the ladies who went about her charitable work with blinders on, unaware of the harsher side of poverty. According to the Village for Children & Families' website:

> Virginia Thrall Smith (1836-1903) organized the Connecticut Children's Aide Society in 1892. She was a visionary who fought poverty with kind words and practical aide. She organized sewing and cooking schools, a loan fund to help families in crisis, and a free employment bureau. Child saving became her passion...She set up Hartford's first free kindergarten, rescued children from horrifying conditions in the town poorhouses of the day, and created precursors to some of today's Village community programs for children and families. As a member of the State investigating team in 1882, she discovered more than 2,500 Connecticut children living in town poorhouses, surrounded by petty criminals and the mentally ill. With a band of friends, she lobbied for their release, and found foster or adoptive homes for many of them. For handicapped children, who were not so easily adoptable, she set up a Newington home that developed into Newington Children's Hospital and is now the prestigious Connecticut Children's Medical Center.[129]

The assistance of women like Mrs. Thrall Smith was invaluable. Her purpose as the City Missionary was to,

> ...deal with things both spiritual and temporal, and [the work] is unceasing, so far as human work may be unceasing, from year's end to year's end. Our dealings are with human lives under every form of burden, distress, misfortune, and poverty, however caused and however long established. It is a work full of varied problems, often very discouraging and often, by the grace and blessing of God, very comforting. Our unceasing desire is to make the religion of our Savior an increasing force in human lives; to make plain the divine love of Christ, and by patient, faithful, and earnest persuasion bring all to accept Him and to desire to imitate His life. We try to brighten and cheer the waning life and the souls of the old and the sick by reading the Bible and by prayers in the strength of His promises. We try to remember that all our work is what He would have us do and we endeavor to do all duty in the spirit of His life.[130]

---

[129] "Our History." *Welcome to the Village*. Web. 06 Apr. 2011. <http://www.villageforchildren.org/en/who-we-are/history-2.html>.

[130] 37th Annual Report of the City Missionary to the City Missionary Society of Hartford. 1887-88." Press of the Case, Lockwood & Brainard Company. Hartford, CONN: 1888. Village for Children and Families Archive: Box 20, Folder 3. Pp. 7-8.

We can see from this excerpt from the 37th Annual Report of the City Mission to the City Missionary Society of Hartford, that, at this time, the Society was much more religious minded than the Hartford Orphan Asylum. Like the Hartford Orphan Asylum, Mrs. Thrall Smith was comfortable with converting the poor to Protestantism but, while the Hartford Orphan Asylum did not seek out children to convert to Christianity, Mrs. Thrall Smith seems to indicate that this was precisely what she was doing when she comments that the Society's 'unceasing desire is to make the religion of our Savior an increasing force in human lives.'

The City Missionary placed children with families much as the Hartford Orphan Asylum did, though she appears to have boarded them in private homes as soon as possible rather than hold them in an institution until they were of an age where they could be of use and work. One particularly moving story from an annual report of the City Missionary highlights the different approaches to aiding children employed by the Hartford Orphan Asylum and the City Missionary:

> Occasionally we placed children who are crippled and deformed in hospitals, especially adapted to their cases, and they are restored and saved from future dependency. A colored girl of five years, with limbs bent out of shape so that she was almost unable to bear her weight, was by kindness of a physician received at a New York hospital without charge, where a successful operation was followed by a perfect cure. Naturally an unselfish child, she endeared herself to us by her sunny disposition, and by her desire to be useful in every way after her return from the hospital. A well-to-do and childless colored family applied for a girl to adopt, and seeing *her*, chose her as one every way pleasing to them and to-day instead of being a helpless cripple in an almshouse, she is a bright and happy inmate of a Christian home, and destined, if her life is spared, to make a good and useful woman.[131]

The Hartford Orphan Asylum did not take children who were mentally or physically handicapped although there were some records that indicated they did take the occasional

[131] 37th Annual Report of the City Missionary. Pp. 28-29.

African American child which was uncommon. Mrs. Thrall Smith indicates the girl will be saved from future dependency; that she was aware that handicaps caused poverty, and her attitude towards the little girl in the story tells us that this is the kind of person who falls into poverty through no fault of their own and can be saved from it. Stories like this induced Thrall Smith to eventually open her Home for Incurables where children, unlike the little girl in the above quote, who had no chance for a cure could live comfortably.

Hacsi tells us in *Second Home*, that

> Returning institutionalized children to their own homes was a central goal for most asylum managers by the early twentieth century. Even so, for asylums that aspired to be homes to their children, where managers and children formed a large 'family,' it was not without regrets that asylum managers watched their children leave.[132]

Hacsi goes on to quote a passage from the San Francisco Presbyterian Orphanage and Farm's annual report for the year 1900, relating that,

> [O]ne of the saddest things in an Orphanage is the partings that must come. These children grow up together, become fond of one another and then, when some must go away it seems like the breaking up of a large family. We aim as much as possible to keep up the love for their own parents, that they may some time return to them. Thus, while helping the parent and child in their hour of distress, we still lead parents to feel the children are theirs, to be returned to them, whenever they can make a good home for them[133]

By the turn of the century Connecticut had one of the most liberal assortments of asylums in the country, in that public and private asylums alike, across the state, accepted children who were orphaned, half-orphaned or merely destitute. In many states during this period the rules for admittance into an asylum were becoming rather strict and managers in several asylums refused

---

[132] Hacsi. P. 70.

[133] Ibid.

to take in children who had a living parent no matter their financial situation. This, as the men and women running these organizations in Connecticut rightly realized, was entirely beyond the point of the orphan asylum.

CONCLUSION

The ladies of Hartford saw a need in 1809 and immediately began to fill it, forming the Hartford Female Beneficent Society. The Hartford Orphan Asylum followed two decades later, opening its doors to serve the destitute children of Connecticut. Through the nineteenth century, as the two merged into one institution, that institution tells us a lot about attitudes towards the poor during this nearly hundred year period. Antebellum institutions sought to isolate their charges from the public lest their poverty, a sign of their sinfulness, pass along a corrupting influence. The charitable ladies of post Civil War Connecticut acknowledged that poverty was often circumstantial and stipulated that, as the sins of the parents were not transferred to their children, the child was not at fault for its low circumstances and thus should be helped to rejoin society rather than be hidden away from it in an institution.

Later in the nineteenth century emphasis on the home and reuniting families replaced early theories and by the twentieth century social groups and the State of Connecticut turned to foster care and welfare reform in order to keep families together when poverty was the only issue families in crisis faced. Religion influenced the ladies who ran these charities as their own repressed circumstances influenced the decisions that were made within the charity concerning what to do with the oppressed people they could not find common ground with. Keeping in mind the immense gap between the middle-class lady and the poor person in this era, it is really quite amazing that these women reached out to fill a need in the way that they did. While home and

child rearing were considered the sphere of woman, that theory only applied within the home while any issue outside that personal domestic realm was the domain of man; including how to deal with the poor orphan children.

In many ways these women were daring to imagine that they, the demure and inhibited ladies of nineteenth century Connecticut, could make a difference in the world outside their own homes. Society stopped them from having too heavy a hand in the day-to-day operations of a place like the Hartford Orphan Asylum and many of the ladies involved likely maintained only a loose understanding of the problems facing the poor, but enough ladies believed that these children deserved a chance that they organized to make a change and succeeded.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books & Essays

Axinn, June & Mark J. Stern. Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need, Sixth Edition. New York, New York: Pearson Education, Inc., 2008.

Abramovitz, Mimi. Regulating the Lives of Women. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1996.

Benes, Peter (Ed). The Worlds of Children, 1620-1920: The Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife. Boston: Boston University, 2004.

Bremner, Robert H. (Ed). Children and Youth in American: A Documentary History, Volume I 1600-1865. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Capen, Edward W. The Historical Development of the Poor Law of Connecticut. New York: Columbia University Press, the Macmillan Co., agents, 1905.

Child, Lydia Marie. The American Frugal Housewife: Dedicated to Those Who are not Ashamed of Economy. Twelfth Edition. Boston: Old Sturbridge Village and Applewood Books, 1833.

Clarke, Marian G.M. David Watkinson's Library: One Hundred Years in Hartford, Connecticut, 1866-1966. Hartford, Connecticut: Trinity College Press, 1966.

Cohen, Linda Smith, "Virginia Thrall Smith: Hartford City Missionary and Social Reformer" (M.A. thesis, Trinity College, 1990).

Donahue, Barbara Finlay, "The Civic Club of Hartford, Connecticut: A Study of Women's Organizations in the Reform Era" (M.A. thesis, Trinity College, 1992).

Goodheart, Lawrence. Mad Yankees: The Hartford Retreat for the Insane and Nineteenth-Century Psychiatry. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.

Gordon, Michael (Ed). The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective, Third Edition. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983. *The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860*, by Barbara Welter.

Grant, Ellsworth Strong & Marion Hepburn. The City of Hartford 1784-1984. Hartford, CT: The Connecticut Historical Society, 1986.

Hacsi, Timothy A: Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Hymowitz, Carol & Weissman, Michaele. A History of Women in America. New York: Bantam Books, 1978.

The Hartford Courant (Ed): Twain's World: Essays on Hartford's Cultural History. Hartford, CT: Published by The Hartford Courant, 1999. *Healing Children*, Wheeler, Sandra.

Love, William DeLoss. The Colonial History of Hartford. Hartford, CT: Published by Reverend William DeLoss Love, Ph.D., 1914.

Morgan, H. Wayne. The Gilded Age: Revised and Enlarged Edition. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1970.

Nenortas, Tomas J. Victorian Hartford: Postcard History Series. Chicago: Arcadia Publishing, 2005.

Painter, Nell Irvin. Standing At Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1987.

Riis, Jacob A. Children of the Tenements. New York: Macmillan, 1903.

Riis, Jacob A. The Children of the Poor. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892.

Stemmons, Walter. Connecticut Agricultural College: A History. New Haven, Connecticut: The Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor Company, 1931.

Trattner, Walter I. From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America. New York: Free Press, 1974.

Trumbull, James Hammond. The Memorial History of Hartford County, Connecticut, 1633-1884: Volume I. Boston: Edward L. Osgood Publisher, 1886.

Wagner, David. The Poorhouse: America's Forgotten Institution. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005.

Primary Sources

"The Indigent Orphan Fund," Hartford Orphan Asylum, History Indigent Orphan Fund: Box 1, Folder 7, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"Child and Family Services of Connecticut, Inc.," Agency Wide, History, Misc Papers, Talks, Etc., Box 1, Folder 7, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"Children's Services of Connecticut (Hartford Orphan Asylum and the Connecticut Children's Aid Society) 1680 Albany Avenue, Hartford 5, Conn," Box 1, Folder 7, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"Report of the Hartford Orphan Asylum – 1943," Box 1, Folder 7, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"Talk at Fairfield District Open Meeting, May 17, 1938," Box 1, Folder 7, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"Annual Report of the President, Children's Services of Connecticut, April 15, 1959," Box 1, Folder 7, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"Children's Service History," Box 1, Folder 7, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"Annual Report of the Corresponding Secretary, 1942," Box 1, Folder 7, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"Hartford Female Beneficent Society, Case Information Indenture, 1853," Box 17, Bound Volume, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"The Forty-Seventh Annual Report of the Managers of the Hartford Orphan Asylum, June 1880," Press of The Case, Lockwood & Brainard, Co. Hartford, CONN: 1880.

"City Fiftieth Annual Report of the Managers of the Hartford Orphan Asylum, June 1883," Press of The Case, Lockwood & Brainard, Co. Hartford, CONN: 1883.

"The 62d Annual Report of the Managers of the Hartford Orphan Asylum, June 1895," Press of The Case, Lockwood & Brainard, Co. Hartford, CONN: 1895.

"Annual Report of the Hartford Orphan Asylum For the Year Ending May 1st, 1866; Including List of Officers and Managers, Constitution and By-Laws, Reports of the Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer, Contributions and Donations. Also a List of Legacies to Hartford Orphan Asylum, and Felae Beneficent Society Previous to Their Union," Press of The Case, Lockwood & Brainard, Co. Hartford, CONN: 1866.

"June 3, 1834 Minutes," Hartford Orphan Asylum, Minutes Board of Managers Meeting, 1832-1867, Box 10, Folder 9, Village for Children and Families Archives.

"Report on Baby Farming and the Annie, Alias 'Nan,' Brown Case, Presented to The Hartford Board of Selectman By Its Chairman," The Fowler & Miller Company, Printers. Hartford, CONN: 1892. Box 20, Folder 4, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"The History of Child-saving Work in Connecticut: By Mrs. Virginia T. Smith of Hartford, Conn." Press of Geo. H. Ellis, Boston: 1893. Box 20, Folder 3, Village for Children and Families Archive.

Case information, c. 1813-1821, Box 2, Folder 3, Village for Children and Families Archives.

"Defence [sic] of Mrs. Virginia T. Smith, Hartford City Missionary, Against the Charge of Baby Farming, Made by G.W. Fowler, First Selectman, in a Report to the Board of Selectman, August 5, 1892: Prepared by John Hooker." Hartford, CONN: Case, Lockwood & Brainard Co.,Printers, 1899. Box 20, Folder 4, Village for Children and Families Archive.

"37th Annual Report of the City Missionary to the City Missionary Society of Hartford. 1887-88." Press of the Case, Lockwood & Brainard Company. Hartford, CONN: 1888. Box 20, Folder 3, Village for Children and Families Archive.

Web Articles

"CHS: Civil War Monuments of Connecticut: Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Arch, Hartford." *Connecticut Historical Society*. 13 Dec. 2010. Web. 30 Mar. 2011. < http://www.chs.org/finding_aides/ransom/049.htm>.

Connecticut Soldiers' Orphans Home. (1866, February 9). *Hartford Daily Courant (1840-1887),* p. 2. Retrieved March 30, 2011, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers Hartford Courant (1764 - 1922). (Document ID: 831970482).

"Hartford, Connecticut 1861 - 62 City Directory Page 077." *Genealogy and Family History Research*. Web. 30 Mar. 2011. < http://distantcousin.com/Directories/CT/Hartford/1861_62/Pages.asp?Pages=077>.

"Labor Unions and Natural Laws." (1872, August 27). *Hartford Daily Courant (1840-1887),*p. 2. Retrieved March 25, 2011, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers Hartford Courant (1764 - 1922). (Document ID: 847258572).

Obituary 1 -- No Title. (1849, April 25). *Hartford Daily Courant (1840-1887),*p. 2. Retrieved March 30, 2011, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers Hartford Courant (1764 - 1922). (Document ID: 829698172).

"Our History." *Welcome to the Village*. Web. 06 Apr. 2011. <http://www.villageforchildren.org/en/who-we-are/history-2.html>.

Shop Work and House Work: Providence Letter to New York Commercial Advertiser. (1885, May 16). *Hartford Daily Courant (1840-1887),* p. 5. Retrieved March 25, 2011, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers Hartford Courant (1764 - 1922). (Document ID: 817650432).

U.S. Census Bureau. "Classified Population of the Territories, By Counties on First Day of June, 2860." U.S. Census Bureau. Web. 30 Mar. 2011. < http://www2.census.gov/prod2/decennial/documents/1860a-04.pdf>.

APPENDIX

I.

Bremner, Robert H. (ed). Children and Youth in American: A Documentary History, Volume I 1600-1865. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970. Pp. 68.

"If any poor person or persons that have had or shall have relief or supplies from any town, shall suffer their children to live idly or misspend their time in loitering, and neglect to bring them up or employ them in some honest calling which may be profitable unto themselves and the public; or if there be any family that cannot, or do[es] not provide competently for their children, whereby they are exposed to want and extremity; it shall and may be lawful for the selectman and overseers of the poor in each town, and they are hereby ordered and empowered, with the assent of the next magistrate or justice of the peace, to bind any poor children belonging to such town to be apprentices where they shall see convenient: a man child until he shall come to the age of twenty-one years, and a woman child to the age of eighteen years or time of marriage; which shall be as effectual to all intents and purposes as if any such child were of full age, and by indenture of covenant had bound him or herself..."

II.

The Society's first constitution read as follows:

"The name shall be the Female Beneficent Society. The primary and general object of the Society shall be to relieve the distress and to promote knowledge, virtue and happiness among the Female part of the community.

The particular design shall be to raise funds for the benefit of the poor belonging to the City of Hartford, but relief may be extended to others if it is decided expedient.

The next object shall be to seek out and assist such persons as wish for regular employment or have been reduced by misfortune and are prevented by diffidence or delicacy of feeling from soliciting aid.

Another object shall be to devote a part of the money contributed to the Education of young Females who shall be placed under the care of such serious, judicious Person or Persons as will give them instructions in reading serving and good housewifery and impress them with moral and religious Principles. At a proper age the Society shall endeavor to place them in a situation to obtain a living for themselves.

Every Subscriber who will pay two cents per week or 25 cents per quarter can be a member of the Society. And any Female who will advance Fifteen Dollars shall be a member without any further payment...

Thirteen Managers whose business it will be to seek out proper objects of relief for the Society. They shall have a right with the advice of the Chief Manager to draw upon the Treasurer for such sums as She shall deem necessary and shall give account to the Society how those sums have been applied – They shall meet once a month on such days as they think best and choose from among themselves a Chief Manager who shall preside at their meetings...Every meeting of the Society shall be opened with Prayer...The Society has agreed to have a large Sack provided

which shall be placed in a situation where each member may if she pleases put in at any time Clothing or other things which may be useful to the Poor. This sack will be lodged at the house of the Chief Manager who with the assistance of a majority of the Managers may dispose of the contents in such a manner as shall by them be thought best.
At a Meeting of the Subscribers to the Hartford Female Beneficent Society held the 16th of August 1809 the foregoing Constitution was read and adopted.
The Members present then proceeded to a choice of Officers and appointed
Mrs. Ruth Patten, President; Mrs. Mary Averill, Secretary; Mrs. Elizabeth Rogers, Treasurer; Mrs. Ann Hosmer; Mrs. Mary Grew; Mrs. Esther M. Chester; Mrs. Lucy M. Brace; Managers: Rebecca Burr; Laura Cotton; Mary Olcott; Ruth Bull; Mrs. Bathsheba Ely; Mrs. Hempstead; Holly Babcock; Ann Hosmer
At a meeting of the Managers the 24th of August Mrs. Ann Hosmer was appointed Chief Manager[134]

III.

It was an evening in February of 1828 (or 9) cold and snowing, That we were sitting around a cheerful wood fire when a very kind man – Mr. Lasage who lived in State near us – came in to our house to tell us of the birth of a child the day before, under sad circumstances to which he recalled Thursday. The mother had been boarding in his family a few weeks, her husband came with her, but went away in a few days he said to New York – She had not heard from him since and as he left her without money she had been anxious and disturbed. Til the birth of the child, and was feeble and low not likely to recover
This narrative was an appeal to feeling and a call for action. My sister Elizabeth with her usual energy of kindness told Mr. Lasage that she would go directly and ask for assistance among our friends which the next day she went forth to do of course she did not ask in vein [sic] – I can recall the names on the first list – They were the beloved and honored of Christ Church parish the Rt. Rev. Bishop & Mrs. Brownele – Rec. N.L. Wheaton Sumner – The Beraley's Mrs. Tudor Mrs. Ward Mrs. Nichols and Mr. Daniel Wadsworth.
The mother died, the next day and left a waif upon the world's wide wilderness.
But the interests which was no transient emotion on the contrary it [ ] into a habit for three years to pay his boarding and bread and when about that time [ ] other boys there added to make a family [ ] and the comfort of the children. The house where the beginning of the Asylum a widow for some years had the oversight of the family. The boys of the social [?] of the present Orphan Asylum – was like other boys. Their human nature principle thoroughly developed – If I were writing for a magazine, I should probably omit the rest but I [ ] has had a fine specimen of young humanity. Some pleasant kindly boys he had for Mr. & Mrs. Hamilton who had charge of the Asylum for many years had hand of him. He went at the usual age to a farm, was very unhappy and afterwards was put to [work?] but he was not a well conducted lad, and taxed the kindness of Mrs. Sumner & her sister very often. But he grew up to manhood all the same as imperfect boys will.
While Joseph was yet the first orphan of the Asylum to [ ] the Ladies his care takers in order to secure a certain sum of money for him concluded to make a [ ].

---

[134] Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 2, Folder 4

As it was a novelty and recommended by the object it has a success of several hundred dollars was raised. By the advise [sic] of Mr. George Sumner it was put in Savings Bank and at one time when there as an in [ ] of sending the lad on a Whaling Voyage his outfit was furnished from it.
The clean conditions and arrangements of the Orphan Asylum for many years past is to have grown to the dear friend for whom this [ ] match is made all of her [ ] him would more than sacrifices of Mrs. James Goodwin. The institution and each individual child is deeply indebted. And [ ] the names of those who be commended as friends of the [ ] friendship. The dear Women who began and those who came on this [ ] of [ ] be held in harmony.[135]

IV.
Your Managers report that nineteen boys at different periods have received the protection of the Society – thirteen of which are now enjoying its patronage. At the last anniversary nine only had been admitted to the Asylum. During the past year eight boys in addition, have been received and four bound out. These four have been apprentices to farmers residing within the State – men of enterprise and industry, good moral character, and in two instances professing the Christian religion; the boys are to receive instruction in their business, a good common school education, their support during their minority, and, on achieving the age of twenty-one years, they are to receive clothing sufficient to serve them one year and one hundred dollars lawful money of the United States.
Of the eight boys received during the past year, three were taken from the town poor house, their fathers non living – their mothers are degraded characters. Three have no mothers living and their fathers are victims of intemperance. Another has a mother who is living in East Hartford, an abandoned character. The remaining one is an orphan of three years of age.
Of the thirteen boys now at the Asylum, being from the ages of three to eleven years old, four can read well in the New Testament, five can read tolerably well, and the remaining number except one, know their alphabet.
In conclusion your Managers would express their approbation of the treatment of these orphan children have received from Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton, the benevolent individuals who have charge of them. During the year none of the children have been so ill as to need a physician, except a little boy who has been affected with scrofula [a form of tuberculosis] for two years and he is gradually regaining his health.
The Managers are solemnly reminded by the death of a beloved associate, 'to do with their might whatsoever their hands find to do'; and they feel that this institution continues worthy of your patronage; they cannot doubt but its funds will be so increased, as to enable them to extend its benefits to a larger number of destitute orphans. They are confident that the balance of enjoyment will be increased to those who fulfill their Savior's Command, to protect faithfully, by contributing their substance. Julia B. Kilsam, Sec'Y.[136]

---

[135] The Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 10, Folder 4

[136] Ibid

V.

Fifteen children are now under the care of the Society including two [who] are afflicted by a maternal association [likely this means they were pregnant] – two others have been received who on account of natural defect have been returned to the Alms House – Two are out on trial in families & one has during the year been bound out. From the extreme youth of the children before you the Managers can hardly expect to place them out immediately & as other objects present themselves shall they say you must wait till we are better able to receive you? Or shall they go out into the streets & lanes of the city & seek out & lead to a happy asylum those who are alike needing a home & a guide in parental example which they may safely follow? Encouraged by the prompt assistance that has ever been rendered when the wants of the society have been made known to the public the Managers have already ventured to increase the number of children fully believing that such an Institution will not be left to languish for want of support While the Managers sometimes hear the complaints of disappointment with regard to children received from the Society, they are often encouraged by favorable accounts – A number of children are in & about N. Haven – for them the following statement has recently been received from a lady of the highest respectability who has one of the children living with her she writes 'I am gratified in being able to give a satisfactory account of those whom your Society have rescued from poverty & perhaps infamy & to whom your kind sympathies are still extended – The little girl who lives with me is in most respects a good girl – she has some faults which are perhaps peculiar to children of her age but is generally obedient & industrious & promise to be very useful in my family' – the others for whom you inquire have generally given satisfaction – of one her employer says she is unexceptionable in her character & conduct & the best child she ever knew – I am not authorized to say that any one of these children is pious, but three of them to my knowledge are regular attendants at Church & seem highly to value the privilege of the Sabbath school of the one with me I can truly say she is never absent from the house of God. To appreciate the pleasure experienced from such a letter it would be necessary for the subscribers to have seen the children as the Managers found them in the abodes of sorrow & want & to contrast with scenes from their present state of comfort & means of improvement.[137]

VI.

During the past twelve months five children have been received into the Society. Two are now on trial and three have been indentured – one of these is a little girl only five years old and peculiarly winning and attractive. Within a fortnight of her entering the Society she was taken into an estimable family on trial. The gentleman has since adopted her and it is his intention to educate her with the care and affection befitting his own child.

Another little girl has been adopted by an excellent family residing in an adjoining town. They seem much attached to her and are desirous that her advantages should be the same as tho she had always sustained the relation of daughter.

It is with sincere pleasure that the Managers of this Institution place their orphan charges in the keeping of those who promise to treat them with the tenderness & forbearance of parents & to manifest toward them not only till they are of age but through life the same watchful and affection interest.

One little girl ten years old, stout & healthy, has been twice on trial, but was each time returned

---

[137] Ibid

because she did not prove tractable. It is only about two years since she was removed from the influences of a miserable home & it may be some time before the habits there formed can be so far eradicated as that she will become what we do earnestly hope she may, a useful member of some good family.
Cordelia Lathrop has been for two years in the family of Henry A. Bingham of Bozrah in this state, but owing to ill health she remains indentured. Her constitution is so delicate & illness so frequent, the Soc. have decided to pay for her expenses while she remains with Mr. B.
There are nine children in the Asylum at the present time – the oldest is ten & the youngest is three & a half years old.
Since the incorporation of the Society in 1813 one hundred & twenty five children have been adopted. Of this number the greater part have fully rewarded the care of their kind patrons. With some few exceptions they have done extremely well and generally the families in which they have lived so far as can be ascertained have treated them with kindness & often with affection. While on their back they have proved efficient & valuable domestics. It is hoped that not a few of this number have become disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ and are [?] and felt for good in their families neighborhood and in the Church.
Within the years letters have been addressed to those persons with whom children under eighteen years of age are now living, a few extracts from replies to these communications may be of interest.
Mrs. Henry P. Barnes of Pittsfield, Mass writes 'We are much pleased with Tammy Williams & are happy to say that thus far she has fully met our anticipations. Our little boy has become very attached to her as well as the older members of the family. We shall endeavor to bring her up as one of our own number & give her good instruction. She regularly attends the Day & Sabbath Schools & seems to enjoy her new situation. She is perfectly contented and we cannot but express our great obligation to the Ladies for their kindness in securing for us one whom we take a deep interest & whom we shall endeavor to bring up in the nurture & admiration of the Lord.'
Mrs. Waterman of Bozrah writes of Mary E. Lathrop 'She is sixteen years old, is healthy, intelligent & well qualified for her station & generally gives satisfaction by obedience and efficiency. She is a good seamstress quiet in disposition and retiring in manners. She is not exempt from faults but on the whole we are pleased with her & have reason to believe she is happy in her adopted home. Two years since she thought she has become a Christian, but of late she has not manifested any especial religious interest. She attends gladly the Sabbath and day school[138]

VII.
This indenture, made by, and between the undersigned, a majority of the Selectman of the town of Hartford on the one part, and the Hartford Orphan Asylum on the other part. Witnesseth, That said Selectmen do find that John W. Young a male child residing in said town is a poor child, exposed to want and distress, and that there are none to take care of him, and that he is by law liable to be bound out and apprenticed by said Selectmen. Now, to provide the better for the support and education of said child, the said Selectmen, by and with the advice of Henry Francis a justice of the peace for Hartford County, do, by these presents, put and bind out the said John W. Young to the said Hartford Orphan Asylum, it being a society incorporated by the Legislature

[138] The Village for Children and Families archive, Box 3, Folder 2

of this State in May, 1833, for the purpose of providing for indigent children who are objects of charity, and whose place of business is in said town of Hartford; said child to be, and remain under, the care and direction of said Society, until he shall arrive at the age of twenty-one years which will be on the (15) day of July AD 1870. And during said time, said Society shall over said child the same rights and authority, and said child shall be subject to be disposed of, in the same manner as if said child had been surrounded by his parents to said Society: as by the act of 1850, said Selectmen are empowered to do. And the Hartford Orphan Asylum on their part, do agree to care for and provide for said child during the term aforesaid, in the same manner as if said child had been surrendered to them by his parents, according to the charter and by-laws of said Society. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have hereunto set their hands and seals at Hartford, this 25 day of January AD 1854[139]

VIII.

Male asylees gone missing during Civil War period:

George Cone, April 1863; Dwight Chapman, April 1863; Charles Brumley, July 1863; George Thresher, February 1864; James Thresher, February 1864; Eugene Jackson, February 1864; George R. Gibbons, February 1864; Robert G. Avery, March 1864; Charles W. Webster, April 1864; Henry J. Webster, April 1864; Isaac Francis, October 1864; John Francis, October 1864; and Henry Shell, November 1864.

IX

The Annual Report for 1879:

That whereas said Orphan Asylum hath, under the provisions of the fourth section of said Act [by the Connecticut General Assembly], received into said Asylum…a child who is now an inmate thereof or under its care and control…Now, therefore, the said Orphan Asylum, at the request of said party of the second part, and under the provisions of said Act, doeth hereby bind, put, place, and so far as they have the power, give said child unto the said party of the second part, for instruction and adoption, and to live with and in the family of said party of the second part…said party of the second part shall be entitled to the control, direction, management, and service of said child to the same and as full extent as if said child was an own child of said party of the second part. And said party of the second part hereby covenants and agrees with said Orphan Asylum and their successors to take and receive said child into the home and family of the party of the second part, and during said term instruct, properly clothe, lodge, feed, kindly treat, take care of, support in sickness and health, and give, provide, and furnish said child with all such comforts, and social, secular, and religious advantages and education which parents in the same station in life are wont to give to their own children; and at the expiration of said term will suitably provide for and advance said child in life, or aid in establishing said child in some suitable business or employment, and, in short, will treat and provide for said child in a reasonable manner during the lifetime of said party of the second part, or, at said party's death, by will or otherwise, as if said child was an own child.[140]

---

[139] Ibid

[140] Village for Children and Families Archive, Box 4, Folder 5

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

HARTFORD ORPHAN ASYLUM,

FOR THE YEAR ENDING MAY 1st, 1866;

INCLUDING

LIST OF OFFICERS AND MANAGERS,

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS,

REPORTS OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY AND TREASURER,

CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS.

ALSO, A LIST OF

LEGACIES TO HARTFORD ORPHAN ASYLUM, AND FEMALE BENEFICENT SOCIETY PREVIOUS TO THEIR UNION.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OF CONNECT
PLEASE RETURN

HARTFORD:
PRESS OF CASE, LOCKWOOD AND COMPANY.
1866.

Officers and Managers.

OFFICERS.

MRS. E. A. BULKELEY, *President.*
MRS. LEWIS WELD, } *Vice-presidents.*
MRS. JOHN WARBURTON, }
MRS. JAMES GOODWIN, *Treasurer.*
MISS MARTHA P. CLARK, *Recording Secretary.*
MISS MARY J. WOODBRIDGE, *Corresponding Secretary.*

MANAGERS.

Mrs. E. A. Bulkeley,
Mrs. Lewis Weld,
Mrs. John Warburton,
Mrs. James Goodwin,
Mrs. Thomas S. Williams,
Mrs. Charles Hosmer,
Mrs. Haynes L. Porter,
Mrs. Thomas Belknap,
Mrs. John L. Bunce,
Mrs. Samuel S. Ward,
Mrs. Pliny Jewell,
Mrs. Sheldon P. Thacher,
Mrs. George M. Bartholomew,
Mrs. Samuel Colt,
Mrs. Charles H. Northam,
Mrs. Gustavus F. Davis,
Mrs. Charles Cheney,
Mrs. James Bolter,
Mrs. Olcott Allen,
Mrs. Thomas Roberts,
Mrs. William H. Richardson,
Miss Mary Sheldon,
Mrs. John F. Judd,
Mrs. John B. Eldredge,
Miss Sarah Woodbridge,
Miss Mary J. Woodbridge,
Mrs. Caleb Strong,
Mrs. Charles F. Howard,
Mrs. James L. Howard,
Mrs. James C. Jackson,
Mrs. James Goodman,
Mrs. Oswyn Welles,*
Mrs. Lewis S. Crittenden,
Mrs. Anna B. Douglass,
Mrs. Elizur T. Goodrich,
Mrs. Jonathan S. Curtis,
Mrs. Elisha T. Smith,
Mrs. Henry L. Rider,
Miss Martha P. Clark,
Miss Rebecca Brainard.

* Deceased.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Mrs. Eliphalet A. Bulkeley,
Mrs. Lewis Weld,
Mrs. John Warburton,
Mrs. James Goodwin,
Miss Martha P. Clark,
Miss Mary J. Woodbridge.

BOARD OF ADVISORS.

Mr. James Goodwin,
Mr. E. A. Bulkeley,
Mr. Thomas Belknap,
Mr. Samuel S. Ward,
Mr. George M. Bartholomew.

PHYSICIANS.

Dr. Gurdon W. Russell,
Dr. George B. Hawley,
Dr. P. M. Hastings,
Dr. A. W. Barrows,
Dr. M. Storrs.

RESOLUTION

UNITING THE HARTFORD ORPHAN ASYLUM AND THE HARTFORD FEMALE BENEFICENT SOCIETY IN ONE INSTITUTION, TO BE CALLED THE HARTFORD ORPHAN ASYLUM.

General Assembly, May Session, A. D. 1865.

Resolved by this Assembly:—Section 1. That Mrs. Eliphalet A. Bulkeley, Mrs. Lewis Weld, Mrs. James Goodwin, Mrs. John Warburton, Mrs. Pliny Jewell, Mrs. Sheldon P. Thacher, Mrs. George M. Bartholomew, Mrs. Thomas Belknap, Mrs. John L. Bunce, Mrs. Olcott Allen, Miss Martha P. Clark, Mrs. Charles F. Howard, Mrs. Lewis S. Crittenden, Mrs. Gustavus F. Davis, Mrs. Haynes L. Porter, Mrs. Thomas Roberts, Mrs. Elisha T. Smith, Mrs. William H. Richardson, Mrs. Charles H. Northam, Miss Mary Sheldon, Mrs. Charles Cheney, Miss Rebecca Brainard, Mrs. Thomas S. Williams, Mrs. Charles Hosmer, Mrs. Samuel S. Ward, Mrs. James Goodman, Mrs. John B. Eldredge, Mrs. James L. Howard, Mrs. Elizur T. Goodrich, Mrs. Henry L. Rider, Mrs. Samuel Colt, Mrs. James Bolter, Mrs. John F. Judd, Mrs. Caleb Strong, Mrs. Oswyn Wells, Mrs. James C. Jackson, Mrs. Anna B. Douglas, Mrs. Jonathan S. Curtis, Miss Sarah Woodbridge, Miss Mary J. Woodbridge and their associates, be and they hereby are, formed, constituted and made a body corporate and politic by the name of the "Hartford Orphan Asylum," and by that name they and their successors shall, and may have, perpetual succession, shall be capable of sueing and being sued, pleading and being impleaded in all suits of what nature soever, may have a common seal, and may alter the same at pleasure, may elect additional members from time to time, may make by-laws respecting the number, qualifications and duties of their

officers, the mode of election and admission of members, and all other by-laws which they may deem necessary for the due regulation of said asylum, not repugnant to the laws of this state or of the United States, and hold estate both real and personal by purchase, gift, devise or other ways, free from taxes; and the same to sell, demise and convey for the use and benefit of said asylum.

SEC. 2. The said asylum shall on the first Monday in June of each year, elect a board of managers, to consist of not less than twenty, nor more than forty members, who shall have power to choose a president, secretary and treasurer, and such other officers as they may deem advisable, all of whom shall hold their respective offices one year, and until others shall be elected to succeed them, except in case of vacancy, by death or otherwise, in which case the said board of managers may supply such vacancy until the ensuing annual election; and the board of managers shall have power to call a meeting of said asylum at their discretion; and it shall be their duty to call such meeting whenever thereto requested by twenty members of said corporation. Not less than five managers shall form a quorum for the transaction of business, and all questions shall be determined by a majority of the managers present.

SEC. 3. That the treasurer of said asylum shall give bonds, if required by the managers, for the faithful discharge of the duties of that office, and shall account with the managers when by them required.

SEC. 4. That the board of managers, for the time being, shall have the entire control of the concerns of said asylum, and they shall make application of all the subscriptions, donations, funds and estate belonging to the same, solely for the use and benefit of said asylum, and for the charitable objects for which it is incorporated; and no sale or transfer of any part of the estate of said asylum shall be valid, until approved by them. The said managers shall have power and authority to receive into the asylum such indigent children as they may judge most suitable objects of charity, and also to accept a surrender, in writing, by the father, or when there is no father, by the mother, or guardian, or from the selectmen of the town

of Hartford, or other towns in this state, of any indigent child, as aforesaid, to bind out in suitable families, or to respectable trades or occupations, and also to retain and instruct in such manner as they deem expedient, until the age of twenty-one years if a male, and until eighteen years if a female, or until marriage of said female within the age of eighteen, any such indigent child or children thus surrendered, and if any such child being destitute of parents within this state, shall have been relieved or supported by said asylum, the parent of such child who shall thus have been supplied, or bound out, or employed as aforesaid, shall have liberty, on his return within the state, to withdraw such child, upon paying to the treasurer of the asylum, the expenses incurred in its relief and support as aforesaid.

SEC. 5. That all conveyances or instruments for that purpose in writing on behalf of said corporation, shall be signed by the president, or secretary, according to the order of the board of managers.

SEC. 6. That the first meeting of said Hartford Orphan Asylum shall be held in Hartford, in the month of June, 1865, until which time the officers of the Hartford Orphan Asylum and the Hartford Female Beneficent Society shall hold their respective offices, notice of which meeting, and all future meetings, shall be given by advertising in two newspapers printed within said city, at least five days previous.

SEC. 7. That all property and estate of the Hartford Orphan Asylum and of the Hartford Female Beneficent Society shall be vested in and held by the Hartford Orphan Asylum as now constituted, and the treasurers of said societies respectively shall be authorized to make any and all transfers of the property of each of said societies of which they may be treasurers, as may be necessary to perfect the title to the same in the said Hartford Orphan Asylum, and all debts and liabilities existing against the said institutions or either of them, and all claims and demands in their favor may be enforced against the said Hartford Orphan Asylum. All legacies, bequests, or devises, made or which shall be made by any person or persons to the said Hartford Orphan Asylum, or to the

said Hartford Female Beneficent Society, or for the benefit of either, (if no provision be otherwise made by the testators in their respective wills,) shall vest in the said Hartford Orphan Asylum to the same extent as the same would have vested in either of said corporations if this resolution had not been passed.

SEC. 8. That the said Hartford Orphan Asylum, as now constituted, shall have power and authority to make suitable and proper contracts, engagements and arrangements with the trustees of the Watkinson Juvenile Asylum and Farm School, for the purpose of carrying out more fully and beneficially the design of said Orphan Asylum, and of accomplishing the objects intended by the incorporation of the trustees of the Watkinson Juvenile Asylum and Farm School, made a corporation by the General Assembly at its May session, A. D. 1862. And said Orphan Asylum shall also have power and authority to make such provision and arrangement for the temporary support and maintenance of poor and indigent children, as they may find necessary and expedient.

SEC. 9. That this act shall remain at all times liable to be modified, amended, or repealed by the General Assembly.

BY-LAWS.

No. 1.

The Board of Managers shall hold stated meetings on the first Monday in each month at 3 P. M., the meeting to be opened by reading a short portion of Scripture, followed by a silent prayer.

No. 2.

The Society shall consist of forty managers, from which number shall be elected a President, two Vice-presidents, a Corresponding Secretary, Recording Secretary, and Treasurer.

No. 3.

The President shall preside at the meetings of the Society, preserve order, state questions for decision and declare the result; when the meeting is equally divided on any subject or question, she shall have the casting vote. In her absence these duties shall devolve upon the Vice-president, or, in her absence, upon a Manager chosen by the meeting.

No. 4.

The Corresponding Secretary shall conduct the correspondence of the Society and prepare the annual report.

No. 5.

The Recording Secretary shall give due notice of the annual and especial meetings of the Society, keep a faithful record of their proceedings, and at the opening of each meeting read the minutes of the preceding one for correction or approval.

No. 6.

The Treasurer shall receive all moneys of the Society, and make all disbursements ordered by the Board of Managers. She shall keep a faithful account of all expenditures, and report the same quarterly to the Board, and at least one week before the annual meeting of the Society shall submit to the Board of Advisors a full report of the receipts and expenditures to be audited by them.

No. 7.

The entire Board of Managers shall feel themselves pledged to exercise a conscientious supervision over the asylum in its varied departments, also to attend regularly the monthly meetings; an absence of three months from the same, unless explained, to constitute a vacancy in the Board.

No. 8.

A Visiting Committee of three Managers shall be appointed by the Board, monthly in alphabetical succession. They shall inspect the order, economy and neatness of the house and premises, and see that all the duties are faithfully discharged. This committee shall visit the asylum at least weekly, and be present, if possible, at some meal, and shall report at the next meeting.

No. 9.

There shall be an Executive Committee, composed of the officers of the Board, whose duty it shall be to examine into the details of the household in all its departments. The book of records kept by the Superintendent shall be subjected to the committee quarterly. The committee shall report monthly to the Board. Their stated meeting shall be held on the Wednesday preceding the monthly meeting of the Board, at ten o'clock A. M.

No. 10.

The Board shall appoint a Finance Committee, School Committee, and such especial committees as may be required for the interest of the institution.

No. 11.

Any person placing a child or children in the asylum as boarders, shall bind him or herself in writing to pay the board regularly, and in case the board of said child or children is not paid in six months, and at any six months succeeding, and they refuse to pay the same, the said child or children shall be considered as surrendered to the institution, and all claims on them given over to the Society.

No. 12.

No person shall be at liberty to withdraw from the meeting without giving satisfactory reasons; and no conversation but such as relates to business can be allowed until the Board have adjourned.

REPORT.

In reviewing the history of the Orphan Asylum for the past year, some new features in its operations present themselves. At the commencement of the year the union of the two institutions known as the "Beneficent Society" and the "Orphan Asylum" was consummated. This, it was hoped and expected, would concentrate benevolent effort, and afford a better and surer method of administering relief to the orphan. In this hope the managers have not been disappointed. Although its funds have not been as abundant as in former years, (this being the first year when it has received no legacy,) the supply has equaled the demand, and it has more successfully accorded with the wishes of its patrons.

The present building has become so much dilapidated, and is in every way so entirely unfitted for the accommodation of its increasing inmates, that the question of a new building has been widely agitated. This has resulted in a generous subscription, originating with Mr. David Clark, which, as it was entirely unsought, was most gratefully received by the Board of Managers, and the prospect is now very fair of a new building, adapted in all points to the necessities of a home for the orphan.

There are at present ninety-seven children in the institution, thirty-two have left during the past year, fifty-five have been added, sixteen are the children of soldiers, and nine are refugees.

The School Committees' report is favorable. The pupils are especially to be commended in penmanship, and the exercises of the boys at Sabbath School merit great praise. They have excelled in Scripture recitations on many public occasions. One new feature has been introduced into the school

with marked success—that of needle-work—in which the children have made good proficiency, and which bids fair to be of much service in the future. It is to be regretted that the public school committee in its examinations has lost sight of *this* school. Were such attention called to it, the community at large might be more interested in its operations, and it would also afford a greater stimulus to effort, both in teachers and scholars.

The matron and her assistant have bestowed a motherly oversight and affection upon the little ones, while the infant department, under the supervision of a kind and watchful nurse, has been equally cared for.

The health of the children has been uniformly good during the year, and for trifling ailments the city physicians have ever manifested a willingness to bestow their kind services.

The thanks of the managers are due to many friends for varied entertainments—to the High School for an invitation to a play, entitled the "Great Rebellion"—to the proprietors of a panorama of the "Garden of Eden," and to Commodore Foote and the "Continentals" for tickets to the exhibitions; also to Mrs. Parker for an entertainment to the boys. A valuable "Wheeler & Wilson's" sewing-machine has been presented by several gentlemen, friends to the asylum. The Thanksgiving and Christmas festivals have been, as usual, accompanied with kind remembrances from numerous friends, and a lady in Vermont sweetened the overflowing cup with ever welcome maple sugar.

There have been several especial cases of interest during the past few months, showing the value of these nurseries for the young and friendless. One child was taken from a dying mother, which was so emaciated and enfeebled from neglect that death seemed inevitable; but, under the fostering care of the faithful nurse, has now become bright, healthy, and handsome. A little boy was taken from a vicious and abusive mother, who manifested such fine qualities of heart and mind as to inspire much interest, and afford great prospect of future good. What might not have been made of those talents in the service of sin! Another—a girl ten or twelve years of

age was rescued from the lowest haunts of vice. Sin and misery were her boon companions, and the atmosphere of pollution her native air. She remonstrated with her benefactors, who endeavored, by kindness, to win her to a life of virtue and happiness, and rewarded their efforts only with *curses*. Now she is "clothed and in her right mind." She is happy and contented, and expresses the most entire satisfaction with her new home, a dread of her past life, and a sincere desire to become good and useful. We would not be too sanguine as to immediate results in such cases; still, when we remember the impressible nature of childhood, the promise is great for good seed sown in such tender soil. Such are some of the fruits of this charity. Will not even *present* good amply repay any care, any labor, any sacrifice?

The managers bespeak for the future the same kind aid and interest which has thus far been bestowed by a generous public, and pray for the continued smile of an ever-watchful Providence.

M. J. WOODBRIDGE,
Corresponding Secretary.

Hartford Orphan Asylum in account with L. M. Goodwin, Treasurer.

DR.

May 1st, 1865.	
To cash paid for stoves, furniture and bedding,	$849.44
" " for repairs on building,	212.72
" " for insurance,	25.50
" " for board,	29.43
" " ⅓ share of Etna Insurance stock,	88.00
" " expenses for school,	692.64
" " incidental expenses and printing,	222.19
" " family expenses,	6,326.64
Cash on hand,	39.21
	$8,485.77

Hartford, May 1st, 1866.

CR.

May 1st, 1865.	
By cash on hand,	$221.36
" from Beneficent Society,	346.66
" subscriptions and donations,	1,311.00
" board of children,	692.50
" board of children for "Watkinson Farm School,"	1,080.00
" interest on legacy of David Watkinson,	780.00
" proceeds of Choral Union concert,	158.75
" interest on bonds, insurance and bank stocks,	3,117.15
" appropriation of town,	418.50
" from School Fund and town tax for school,	235.85
" interest on L. B. Loomis' note,	84.00
" sale of cow,	40.00
	$8,485.77

L. M. GOODWIN, *Treasurer.*

Examined by Mrs. L. S. CRITTENDEN, Mrs. PLINY JEWELL, } *Auditors.*

SUBSCRIPTIONS MADE DURING THE YEAR.

Alexander, T. A.	$5	$1
Adams, Chester	5	1
Allen, Olcott	5	1
Allyn, T. M.	5	1
Ashmead, J. H.	2	2
Adams, Thomas	1	2
Allyn, R. G.	2	1
Allen, S. C.	1	3
Allyn, Mrs. T. M.	10	2
		1
Beach, George	10	1
Barber, L.	15	2
Belknap, T.	10	1
Beach, John	10	3
Beckwith, A. S. Mrs.	10	1
Beach, H. B.	10	5
Beach, J. W.	5	
Butler, E. S. Miss	5	5
Bacon, L. H.	5	5
Brace, T. K.	5	5
Bunce, J. B.	5	5
Brainard, C. H.	5	5
Butler, John A.	3	5
Beach, C. M.	5	5
Bolles, Edward	5	5
Blanchard, H.	5	5
Brainard & Bulkley,	5	5
Burkett, Ralph	5	5
Brainard, L.	5	25
Blodgett, Roswell	5	10
Batterson, J. G.	5	10
Bunce, J. L.	5	10
Buell, D. H.	3	10
Buck, Dudley	3	2
Brinley, George	2	2
Beresford, S. B.	2	2
Benton, Charles	2	2
Bartholomew, Mrs.	3	2
Bartholomew, G. M.	2	1
Bolter, James	2	1
Bulkeley, Frank	1	1
Buell, Robert	1	2
Brown, F. A.	2	1
Boardman, W. F. J.	2	1
Bronson, W. S.		
Barker, L.		
Burdick, R. M.		
Braddock, John		
Baker, William E.		
Babcock, William J.		
Brocket, H. J.		
Burnham, George		
Brooks, D. S.		
Boardman, T. D.		
Bolles & Roberts,		
Brainard, Mrs.		
Blodgett, R. F.		
Burr, A. E.		
Brown, Roswell		
Bissell, G. W.		
Church, Joseph		
Church, Leonard		
Cooley, F. B.		
Colt, S. C.		
Corning, J. B.		
Corning, G. W.		
Coit, Samuel		
Case, Newton		
Colt, Elisha		
Chamberlin, F.		
Clark, Ezra		
Colt, Mrs. S.		
Collins, Erastus		
Cheney, Charles		
Cheney, K. D.		
Cheney, F. W.		
Conner, William		
Carter, Newton		
Chapin, M. W.		
Catlin, Julius		
Crofoot, E. E.		
Corning, Henry		
Chapman, Charles		
Camp, J. B.		
Clark, A. N.		
Cash, G. S.		
Cash,		

Cash,	$1
Cash,	3
Cleveland, E. S.	5
Cash,	2
Cash,	2
Crittenden, L. S.	2
Dunham, Austin	10
Day, Calvin	5
Day, Albert	5
Davis, G. F.	5
Draper, Miss	1
Deming, W. S.	1
Dennis, Rodney	3
Day, A. F. & C. G.	5
Daniels, L.	1
Day, H. E.	5
Eldredge, J. B.	5
Ellsworth, W. W.	2
Ensign, Sidney	1
Ely, Alfred	1
Enders, Mr.	5
Flower, Ebenezer	5
Fisher, T. [illegible]	5
Fessenden, E.	5
Fenn, E. H.	3
Foster & Co.,	1
French, Henry	1
Fellowes, Francis	2
Francis, William	5
	3
Griffin, C. A.	10
Goodwin, J. M.	1
Goodwin, James	1
Goodwin, C. H.	2
Glazier, Carlos	2
Goodman, L. B.	2
Gridley, H. R.	3
Gillette, Ralph	2
Goodrich, Elizur	1
Gilman, G. S.	2
Griswold, H.	1
Gross, W. H.	
Geer, C. G.	
Griswold, S. W.	$1
Gleason, F.	2
Hosmer, J. B.	10
Howard, James L.	10
Howard, Charles F.	10
Hart, Miss H. B.	5
House, W. W.	6
Hungerford & Cone,	5
Humphrey, Mrs. M.	5
Howe, E. G.	5
Hillyer, D.	5
Hillyer, C. T.	5
Hawes, L. P.	5
Harris, N.	5
H. H. & B.	5
Hawley, Dr.	5
Howard, Mark	5
Hooker, B. E.	3
Hoadly, Charles,	3
Hubbard, R. D.	3
Hollister, Nelson	1
Hinckley, N. G.	2
Hammond, A. G.	3
Hudson, B.	1
Hawes, Joel	3
Hills, Ellery	3
Hosmer, Charles	1
Hamilton, E. S.	2
Hunt, L. E.	2
Hendee, L. J.	1
Hatch, G. H.	1
Howard, Chauncey	3
A friend, H. L.,	
	10
Ives, Lawson	1
Isham, William	1
Ives, J. S.	
	1
Jewett, George D.	1
Judd, William M.	2
Jackson, Dr.	5
J. H. & Sons,	20
Jewell, P.	20
Jewell, M.	5
Johnson, Henry	

Judd, J. F.	$5	Porter, A. S.	$5
		Pease & Foster,	5
Keney, Henry	10	Pease, H. & Z. P.	5
Keney, Walter	10	Post, William H.	5
Knous, J.	3	Pond, De Witt C.	5
King, Seth	1	Parish, Oliver	1
Kendall, S. P.	1	Phelps, G. R.	1
Kellogg, E. B.	1	Pettibone, F. E.	1
Kellogg, Edward	10	Powell, J.	3
Kellogg, E. N.	10	Palmer, Nelson	2
Kingsbury, N.	5	Pitkin, A. P.	3
Lincoln, C. L.	5	Ripley, Mrs. E. G.	10
Lyman, C. C.	5	Russ, Mrs. Charles	5
Langdon, Joseph	5	Roberts, Ebenezer	5
Latimer, Horace Mrs.	3	Russell, J. B.	5
Lincoln, Levi	3	Ransom, H. C.	5
		Roberts, Enoch	5
Mather, Roland	10	Robbins, P. F.	2
Mather, Samuel	5	Riggs, Dr.	1
Mix, J. G.	1	Russell, Dr.	5
Morris, J. F.	3	Read, Rawson	1
Morgan, H. K.	3	Robinson, H. C.	2
Matson, W. N.	2	Roberts, W. W.	1
Moore, G. W.	5	Richardson, W. H.	1
Merriman, M. M.	5	Russell, J. & H.	2
Merrills, Miss M.	1	Robinson, A. S.	2
		Root, G. Wells	5
Niles, James N.	10		
Northam, C. H.	5	Sargeant, Mrs. L. P.	10
Newton, P. S.	1	Smith, Morris W.	10
		Smith, Alfred	15
Owen, D. K.	2	Seyms, John	10
Owen, Galusha	2	Smith, Thomas	10
E. H. O.,	5	Seymour, Charles	5
Olmsted, John	5	Smith, Charles B.	5
		Sheldon, Miss M.	2
Perkins, H. A.	10	Smith, A. Jr.	2
Porter, H. L.	10	Shepard, Charles	1
Pinney, Sidney Mrs.	5	Skinner, A. R.	1
Pond, Charles F.	10	Seymour, Harvey	2
Pond, Mrs. C. F.	5	Smith, R. C.	2
Parsons, J. C.	5	Stone, C.	2
Pond, Charles M.	5	Starr, B. P.	3
Phillips, Daniel	5	Sykes, F. A.	1
Pratt, Miss E.	5	Stillman, P. D.	1

Stillman, A. S.	$2	Turner, W. W.	$5
Savage, William	1	Tuttle, Samuel I.	5
Smith, C. H.	2		
Seyms, Mrs.	5	Ward, S. S.	10
Steele, Thomas	3	Watkinson, R.	5
Shipman, N. P.	2	Watkinson, Miss	5
Sill, George	1	Warburton, Mrs.	10
Spencer, Ambrose	1	Williams, Mrs. Dr.	5
Smith, C. G.	1	Wells, Oswyn	5
Smith, E. T.	3	Wells, Miss Mary	5
Sisson, Thomas	1	Woodruff, Samuel	10
		Welch, A. H.	5
Terry, O. G.	3	Woodbridge, Miss	2
Taintor, Mrs.	5	Waterman, N. H.	1
Taylor, H. W.	1	Welch, George M.	2
Trumbull, Gurdon	2	Wiley, Sylvester	1
Tiffany, E. D.	3	Winship, Thomas	1
Tuller, William	1	Wells, J. G.	2
Taft, Dr.	2	Wells, C. B.	1
Tryon, J. S.	2	Wells, L. T.	2
Tuller, C. W.	1	Whiting, G. S.	1
Talcott, Mrs. R. G.	2	Woodruff, J. S.	3
Talcott Brothers,	5	W. & B., cash,	2
Talcott, Caleb M.	5		

DONATIONS.

Mrs. Lewis Weld, 3 chairs.
Taylor & Sons, 1 barrel shavings.
Miss Bull, 1 hanging lamp.
Mr. Burgess P. Starr, 100 cakes.
Mr. Hurlburt, 1 bushel potatoes.
Mr. Irad Edwards, 6 loaves bread.
A lady from Vermont, 20 lbs. maple sugar.
Mrs. Noyes, 12 pair hose.
A few gentlemen, 1 sewing-machine.
Mr. Barber, 1 bedstead.

This list does not include the Christmas and Thanksgiving donations.

LEGACIES TO THE HARTFORD ORPHAN ASYLUM.

1836, Mr. Normand Smith, Jr.,	$200.00
1838, Miss Martha Goodwin,	2.68
1838, Mrs. Hannah Ellery,	100.00
1841, Elizabeth G. Moore,	50.00
1848, John Webb,	500.00
1849, Roderick Terry,	50.00
1850, Misses R. & M. Patten,	100.00
1851, Miss Lucy Osborne,	25.00
1853, Mrs. Beach for her late husband, B. W. Bull,	500.00
1858, Miss T. Beresford,	200.00
1855, Mr. Nathaniel Goodwin,	100.00
1860, Mr. A. W. Butler,	500.00
1860, Miss Amelia Webb,	50.00
1860, Mrs. Joseph Morgan,	2,000.00
1860, Mr. David Watkinson,	100.00
1860, Mr. David Watkinson, by will,	10,000.00
1862, Mr. Utley,	500.00
1863, Hon. T. S. Williams,	1,000.00
1863, Mrs. Eunice Averill,	7,775.00
1864, Simeon L. Loomis,	100.00
1864, E. G. Ripley, 5 shares Ætna Fire Insurance stock.	
1864, James E. Seymour, a farm valued at about	2,000.00

25352.68

LEGACIES TO THE FEMALE BENEFICENT SOCIETY.

1825, Mr. John Mosely,	$100.00
1825, Miss Martha Goodwin,	2.68
1831, Mr. John Hale,	100.00
1836, Mr. Normand Smith, Jr.,	200.00
1836, Mrs. H. Ellery,	50.00
1839, Mrs. Martha Rogers,	100.00
1849, Mr. Roderick Terry,	50.00
1849, Mrs. Mary Kingsbury,	50.00
1851, Miss Lucy Osborne,	25.00
1850, Miss Mary Patten,	100.00
1851, Miss Lucy Calkins,	100.00
1855, Mr. N. Goodwin,	100.00
1858, Miss E. B. Webb,	$500.00
1860, Miss Amelia Webb,	50.00
1860, Mr. D. Watkinson,	250.00
1860, Mr. D. Watkinson, by will,	10,000.00
1862, Hon. T. S. Williams,	1,000.00
1864, Mr. Simeon L. Loomis,	100.00
1864, from Mrs. Averill's estate,	6,690.00

19,267.68

Please Note:

The "**Village for Children and Families Archive**, formerly the Hartford Female Beneficent Society and Hartford Orphan Asylum," refers to the Hartford-based organization now represented online as:

The Village (Hartford, CT)

https://thevillage.org/

Note: The Trinity College Archives added this page prior to digitization.

ECS 3/10/2021