

CONTENTS

I. SHANGHAING AND CRIMPING ON THE LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER:	1
ILLCIT RECRUITING FOR THE MERCHANT MARINE	
II. ORIGINS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF AMERICAN CRIMPING	9
III. CRIMPING IN OREGON	22
IV. LEGISLATION	42
V. CONCLUSIONS	56
APPENDIX A: INDEX OF CRIMPS	60
APPENDIX B: SEAMEN'S UNIONS	63
ENDNOTES	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	75

by

DENISE M. ALBORN

AN HONORS THESIS

Presented to the University of Oregon History Department
and the Robert D. Clark Honors College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts

June 1984

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION: THE SEAFARING LIFE 1

II. ORIGINS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF AMERICAN CRIMPING 9

III. CRIMPING IN OREGON 22

IV. LEGISLATION 48

V. CONCLUSIONS 56

APPENDIX A: INDEX OF CRIMPS 60

APPENDIX B: SEAMEN'S UNIONS 63

ENDNOTES 70

BIBLIOGRAPHY 75

I. INTRODUCTION: THE SEAFARING LIFE

A seaman's job is occupationally unique and was even more so in the past. Before the advent of steam shipping, the nature of sailing compounded many of the problems inherent in the seafaring lifestyle. There were more risks involved, the voyages took longer, and the work was particularly seasonal. Sailing vessels took longer stop-overs in port before they were ready for another voyage, which meant the sailors spent more time ashore between jobs. Necessarily transient, the sailors almost always found themselves isolated strangers in strange towns, although they might have homes somewhere along the coast. They also had unique consumer needs ashore, and were susceptible to being cheated by waterfront businesses in unfamiliar towns.

Occupational hazards during America's age of sail, the nineteenth century and approximately the first decade of the twentieth, far outweighed seamen's problems in more recent years. One of the problems during this period was the much-fabled practice of "shanghaiing," the kidnapping of sailors to man merchant vessels. Although shanghaiing is now largely unknown or thought to be legendary, contemporary evidence confirms some of the legends. The sometimes-incredible stories of shanghaiing are more fathomable when taken in the context of "crimping," a more generalized category of maritime abuses which encompassed shanghaiing and other crimes and exploitations. Crimping, in turn, must be presented in the context of the seafaring occupation's working conditions and legal environment.

The law concerning seafaring workers contributed to their problems rather than relieving them. Seamen's legal position in the nineteenth century more closely approximated medieval status than modern.¹ Union spokesmen in the 1890s through the 1920s were fond of denouncing this oppressed status as slavery or serfdom. In spite of their dramatic choice of words, they had a point: the law considered seamen a class apart which did not have the same rights as other American citizens. The nature of the seaman's contract lay at the heart of the problem. Because discipline was essential on a ship, a sailor's contract bound him to the captain in an extraordinary way. The relationship between captain and crew was analogous to indentured servitude; and perhaps it was more than analogy, for the medieval practice of indenturing or apprenticing boys to ships survived for hundreds of years. The nineteenth-century seaman's subordinate position also resembled military life, reminiscent of the time when the English mercantile marine was considered a naval reserve.

The need for discipline meant that once aboard the captain's word was a law in itself. He enforced his law with the help of ship's officers and a professional thug called the "bucko mate." A Federal statute prohibited flogging in 1850 but not corporal punishment. In the nineties, in order to illustrate the enormity of the problem, the Sailor's Union of the Pacific collected accounts of extreme discipline and published "The Red Record." The Red Record covered a period of eleven years; it listed fifteen charges against captains of causing death by mistreatment and cited instances of lost

limbs, eyes, teeth, several suicides at sea, and cases of insanity among crewmen during the same span of time. Seven ship's officers were convicted of these crimes but received mostly nominal sentences.

The contract was also particularly binding in that seamen had no legal right to quit an unpleasant job early. Breach of contract constituted desertion, punishable by imprisonment. In 1897, four crewmen deserted from the ship Arago in Astoria and, when charged with their crime, pleaded that the thirteenth amendment protected them from involuntary servitude. The Arago Case went to the Supreme Court, which ruled that the sailor's contract was an exceptional one and involved the surrender of a certain amount of liberty, including the right to escape the contract early. Although the dissenting judge told the court that the laws were "enacted at a time when no account was taken of man as man, when human life and liberty were regarded as of little value,"² the law did not change until 1915.

Seamen also had no recourse in collective bargaining, as did other working men. Collective bargaining, in the merchant marine, was tantamount to mutiny. This fact greatly retarded the development of unionism and of wage increases in the occupation. In 1915 the Seamen's Act gave sailors the right to break contract under certain conditions and the right to strike. However, these were restricted rights because they were subject to a judge's interpretation of whether the action was warranted or mutinous.

All of these legal limitations stemmed from an underlying precept that seamen did not have the qualities to be full-fledged

citizens with bargaining and decision-making powers of their own. They were considered wards of the court. The Arago decision reiterated this concept: "Seamen are treated by Congress, as well as by the Parliament of Great Britain, as deficient in that full and intelligent responsibility for their acts which is accredited to ordinary adults."³ This wardship status accompanied the surrender of liberty inherent in the seaman's contract, but it also resulted from the general public opinion of seamen which permeated society. The stereotypical sailor's activities ashore, his affinity for bars and brothels, and a normal fear of transients all helped stigmatize seamen as a lower class of citizens. The prejudice stemmed, in part, from fact: seamen usually came from the lower classes because the job did not pay well enough to attract middle-class citizens. Also, sailors indulged in socially unacceptable recreation because of the austerity of voyages which lasted several weeks to a few months. As strangers in town, they had fewer inhibitions than residents. These factors aroused landmen's distrust of seamen, and branded them as inferiors. The patronizing attitude towards seamen encouraged restrictions on them, but the restrictions were misdirected. The attempt to govern seamen more carefully than others deprived them of full-fledged citizenship, of human rights, and of control over their contracts.

Public opinion as well as legal restrictions on seafaring men helped propagate a system of "commercialized exploitation," to use one historian's words,⁴ which is the subject of this paper. On shore,

a group of merchants, sometimes derisively called "crimps," catered to the needs of seamen which ordinary town businesses did not fulfill. However, in doing so they operated a monopoly over seamen's goods and services which could be, and often was, very harmful to the seafarer's interests. In fact the word "crimp" came to imply that the businessman was dishonest with his customers.

In accord with the view that seamen were irresponsible wards who could not take care of themselves, crimps controlled every aspect of their lives ashore. They usually ran sailor's boardinghouses, saloons, marine supply stores, and perhaps brothels; but most characteristically, and most importantly, the crimps controlled seamen's employment. They "shipped" seamen, that is, found positions aboard ships for them. Though rare sources say that sailors paid for this service in some places, usually it was the captain who paid the crimp for supplying a crew. The fee was ominously known as "blood money." The crimps' functions were not, in and of themselves, disadvantageous to seamen, but the system left much room for exploitation. The financial hold crimps had over indebted seamen enabled them to manipulate and profit from the labor market: their control over the supply of sailors lay in the credit they extended. By accepting this credit, the sailors obliged themselves to accept the crimp's offer of employment as well, rather than finding their own berths and choosing contracts which would be most advantageous to them. The crewmen were often little more than pawns in an exchange between the crimps and seacaptains.

Crimping was basically a parasitical service, a system in which a third party profited from the contract between the captain and crewman. Although many captains and shipowners complained loudly of this, they could not eliminate the middle-man. Because of the bad working conditions, seamen were chronically scarce in the merchant marine; crimps thrived on this shortage, for captains could not find enough seamen for hire except those who were indebted and in control of crimps. It was a vicious cycle: crimps controlled sailors with one hand and captains with the other. And, when even the crimp found himself short of seamen, he would fill the crews with nonseamen, who could be hired under false pretenses or put aboard intoxicated or otherwise unconscious. This practice was known as "shanghaiing."

One of the crimps' most common methods of gaining control over seamen was to lure them to desert and then protect them from the law, making them dependent in this way. By deserting, the sailors forfeited all their wages for the voyage, and came ashore penniless. They deserted for various reasons; conditions aboard might have been bad enough to influence the decision; the crimps may come aboard and promise to find them a better berth elsewhere; or crewmen without shore leave might easily be persuaded to abandon their cramped, prison-like quarters for a good time on the waterfront. Many were already drunk, thanks to a crimp, by the time they decided to leave the ship. Legislation at the turn of the century which forbade "landsharks" to board vessels lying in port bears witness to the extent of the problem. There is considerable evidence that captains

often allowed or even encouraged their men to leave, in order to avoid paying them.

When the crimps shipped sailors for the next voyage, they collected for their debts from advanced wages. The captains paid the crimps from the crew's as yet unearned wages, probably at least the first month's salary, for real or imagined debts. The captain and the crimp worked out this agreement entirely above the sailor's head.

The method by which crimps profited from desertion laws is only one example of how seamen's legal status encouraged the crimping system. Another is the general inaccessibility of the court of which sailors were supposedly wards. The huge gap between theory and practice came about because that distant entity, the court, had no understanding of the realities of the seafaring life, nor did most other landmen. Seamen, for their part, rarely sought recourse from the law, of which they probably had little knowledge, and hardly looked to the court for protection. In fact when the government stationed officials at several ports to supervise hiring in 1872, for the good of the sailors, the sailors' reaction was less than enthusiastic. On the waterfront, the crimping system was deeply entrenched by tradition. The crimps were often ex-sailors themselves and were of the same social class as their customers; they understood how to cater to a sailor's needs and desires. Also, most seamen probably did not consciously feel "exploited" until some union leader pointed it out to them. A sailor's characteristic attitude of

day-to-day existence perhaps often left him indifferent to the question of exploitation: if he left one ship without any wages to show for his voyage, he knew he could get credit, enjoy his stay ashore, and repay the crimp with advanced wages from the next ship. If, on the other hand, he found this routine objectionable, there probably was not much he could do about it anyway. Pro-union writers were correct in their appraisal of crimping as an unfair, parasitical occupation. But the sailor's perspective was somewhat different; the fact that crimping endured for so long indicates that they were generally either unconcerned or resigned to the situation. It does not prove that they were as vulnerable and irresponsible as the judges of the Arago Case perceived them to be.

In order to avoid exaggeration it should be noted that not all waterfront businessmen were crimps, and not all crimps engaged in illicit and illegal business methods all the time. In most ports, outright shanghaiing was fairly rare, and crimps did not govern marine employment as fully as has been described here. However, the description fits some ports at certain time periods: the crimps extended their control in varying degrees in different harbors and different years. The crimping problem was far more extensive than contemporary landmen realized, and frequently formed an integral aspect of seafaring life. By the eighteenth century, the written law no longer required that a man be impressed by a warrant on pain of imprisonment or forfeiture of goods; it merely "admonished" them to accept the appointment "dutifully

II. ORIGINS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF AMERICAN CRIMPING

The word "shanghaiing," along with the fact that many west-coast port cities have a Chinatown or a large oriental population, seems to indicate a Chinese origin for the practice. Also, some crimps, such as Bunco Kelly of Portland, supplemented their incomes by smuggling opium as well as sailors, another evidence of the liaison between of China and American crimps. However, except in the case of opium dealers, the connection is artificial. Despite the misleading terminology, crimps and shanghaiers were caucasians rather than orientals, and the custom came to America from England, not China.

Crimping in England developed as a counterpart to naval impressment. Though one document mentions crimping as early as 1718,⁵ the profession matured and reached its peak in the last half of the eighteenth century. At this time the merchant marine and the Royal Navy competed fiercely for the scanty supply of sailors. While the navy hired press-gangs to deliver draft-warrants and collect men, the merchants retaliated by sending out their own agents, the crimps.

The crimps, however, had the disadvantage of being on the wrong side of the law while the press-gangs worked for the government. The impress was a rather brutal system of naval recruiting. By the eighteenth century, the written law no longer required men to answer impress warrants on pain of imprisonment or forfeiture of goods; it merely "admonished" them to accept the appointment "dutifully

and reverently."⁶ However, the press-gangs had the authority to use force to fill their quotas. Contemporary illustrations and cartoons show unfortunate soon-to-be military sailors being dragged protesting from their homes or overpowered on the street, with wives in the background pleading for the family provider's freedom. Small wonder the crimps had no difficulty persuading men to desert His Majesty's service in favor of the merchant marine. The penalty for desertion, and for encouraging desertion, was death, but in actuality courts of law rarely carried out this sentence. They usually dealt out a milder punishment, like a forced term in the naval foreign service. Naval administration examined various solutions to the problem of desertion including changes in the impress system or improved working conditions and benefits for the crewmen; but little progress was made before the nineteenth century. Meanwhile, the navy contrived its own form of induced "desertion" from the merchant marine, again by force. Sometimes press-gangs would board a merchant vessel as it entered port and impress a good percentage of the crew before the voyage was even over; "to take the sailor afloat was a much easier piece of strategy than to ferret him out of his hiding places after he got ashore."⁷

Often, by comparison to the Royal Navy, the crimps could offer very agreeable terms. They could promise better wages with cash advances, and rum as added encouragement. These elements, of course, show the beginnings of customs which were later exploited to work against the sailor; but at this time, the crimp's poundnotes and

bottle proved to be a welcome alternative to the press-gang's methods of persuasion.

Although the crimp's primary function, as the practice developed in England, was to find crews and military deserters for the merchant fleet, the job varied, for the crimp was always an opportunist and found employment where he could. Ironically, this agent whose very existence originated in competition with the press-gang sometimes found himself working with the gang instead of against it. In 1880, an old British mariner reminisced that:

To the disgrace of the naval authorities . . . anyone who could betray or kidnap a sailor into boarding a king's ship was entitled to the bounty money. This gave rise to a class of men called crimps, who would pretend to be a sailor's friend, and with great secrecy would board him at a moderate price. When he had got a few sailors together, he would ply them with liquor and bring the press-gang down upon them.⁸

However, the navy discouraged press-gangs from resorting to collaboration with crimps.⁹

Another breed of crimps formed themselves into "sham-gangs," or fake press-gangs, who issued forged warrants and then collected bribes to set the seamen free. However, crimps originally and predominantly served as go-betweens for merchant sea captains.

An interesting account gleaned from oral history asserts that even the oriental term "shanghaiing" originated from the British press-gang. This rather isolated claim came from an old sailor named "Spider" Johnson who settled in Portland:

No, it doesn't come from the name of the Chinese port [he told the Oregonian in 1933]. It comes from the British shilling. In the old days in England a guy might come along and offer you a shilling to buy a drink or a flop. You took the shilling, if you were broke, and then you were told that you had enlisted in the queen's army or navy, either one. The guy, of course, was a recruiting agent in civilian clothes. But if you took the queen's shilling you were immediately taken on board a ship or put into a barracks for the army. That's where "shanghaiing" comes from.¹⁰

This connection sounds linguistically feasible, and the shilling trick resembles shanghaiing. Johnson's theory certainly has historical roots, although the custom of giving the monarch's shilling to pressed men had disappeared by the eighteenth century. Either the old days to which Johnson referred were very old indeed, or press-gangs used the ploy long after it was legally required to tender a shilling with the warrant. The "queen's navy or army" refers to Victoria, who did reign during the hey-day of crimps (1837-1901).

Other sources, both dictionaries and history books, contradict this theory by claiming that the term "shanghaiing" was born in San Francisco in the nineteenth century.¹¹ Presumably, the tricked sailors often found themselves on a ship bound for Shanghai, thus they were shanghaiad; perhaps the expression is akin to the phrase "on a slow boat to China."

The crimping profession and associated customs spread to the colonies from England as a matter of course. America was not the only country to inherit the problem from England; for instance, Marseilles maintained a reputation for crimping for some time, and some Canadian ports for much longer. But the practice became most

widespread in the United States. This may have been due to greater interaction and commerce between the two countries; also to the shared language. For years after the Revolutionary War, seamen of both nationalities attempted to acquire or pretend new citizenship by deserting onto the other English-speaking country's ships, in order to evade laws or impressment. For these or other reasons, there was a continuing flow of emigration, especially from the British marine to the American states, even into the late nineteenth century, and mimicry of British customs. Some Portland crimps began their careers as British seamen.

The primary difference between the situation in the eighteenth-century British Isles and the nineteenth-century United States was that in the former case the threat of impressment and bad working conditions or danger in the military made the merchant service particularly desirable. Crimps acted as a seamen's friend, a refuge from the forced navy, except for on the relatively rare occasions that crimps acted in concert with the press-gangs. In the United States, on the other hand, the merchant service was not very desirable by 1850. Working conditions, wages, and the quality of seamen had deteriorated and their numbers dwindled, so that the competition for labor went on within the merchant service rather than between the commercial and military interests. The sailor did not have to be wooed from one profession to another, but from ship to ship, and these were all very much alike. The crimps no longer held the sailors' best interests at heart, but instead catered to the demands

of the captains, who would pay well to have their crews filled by any means possible. The captains looked the other way when deserters signed on, or when drugged, unwilling sailors were carried aboard to wake up the next morning in the middle of the ocean, unaware of how they got there.

The crimping methods most generally employed throughout the United States included inducing desertion and collecting advances, both of which have already been discussed, and the strategic use of drugs and liquor. With the use of these aids, the more general term "crimping" borders on "shanghaiing," because when a sailor was put aboard unconscious he was as good as kidnapped. Spider Johnson related that "knock-out drops were used on occasion and a certain local druggist . . . kept his store going from that trade, but for the most part it was hard liquor or cash that shanghai'd a man."¹² On the very extreme end of the spectrum, the shanghai'd men were landsmen who had never been to sea and never dreamed of going. "I know one ship that went out of Portland which had two real seamen and around forty plowboys from the midwest. I know of another ship . . . which had a bull-teamster signed on as bos'n," Johnson said. These landsmen were also victims of drugs, hard liquor or cash, or false promises of high wages and light work. The crimps often signed on the landsmen, conscious or not, as Able Bodied seamen, because their remuneration for A.B.'s was higher than for Ordinary seamen, those with less experience. Because of the prevalence of this deception, the captains were probably never very surprised when,

once out to sea, the would-be A.B.s knew nothing about sailing.

The Portland Seamen's Friend Society records reveal another method that crimps employed in Oregon and perhaps elsewhere. Again, it was a result of seamen's exceptional legal status: in some states they could be taken from their ships and arrested for indebtedness, unlike other citizens. In 1889, the Oregon legislature outlawed arrest for seamen's debts. When, in 1895, a proposed bill threatened to reverse that provision, the president of the Society protested, explaining how crimps had formerly manipulated arrests of sailors:

. . . a sailor would contract fifty cents or one dollar actual indebtedness in a saloon he would finally ship, would be taken from the ship . . . upon a claim in the Justice Court of anywhere from thirty to sixty dollars, all of which except the one dollar or less was fraudulent. When once ashore he would be discharged, the sailor pirates running him in and finally shipping him for a second profit, with prospects of a rearrest upon similarly trumped-up charges, that a third profit might be realized from re-shipment.¹³

Upon further investigation in Astoria, the Society discovered the most arrests had been on completely perjured charges, and discharged seamen were hardly ever prosecuted at all, only released and re-shipped. The 1895 bill failed, and it remained illegal to arrest sailors for debts.

Despite these rather obvious abuses, crimps did not find their occupation indefensible. In 1905, a representative of the Tacoma Seamen's Union complained to the Merchant Marine Commission that people were shanghaied every day on the Puget Sound. "A vessel left here called the Henry Failing . . . and I know that those men who went on board her were not sailors. Not one of them was a sailor. They

were shoemakers and tailors, and all that kind. . . . One man even jumped overboard, and so far as I know he was drowned before he could even reach the shore." The next day a boardinghouse keeper, named Mr. Evans appeared before the Commission to answer the charges, which he had read in the paper. "I supposed that they were meant for me," he said, although the Union man had never once mentioned boardinghouse keepers. Mr. Evans told the Commission that in his business he offered sailors lodging and board, then shipped them and collected allotments, or portions of the crew's still unearned wages. He said that he knew of no such abuses as the ones described by the Union agent, and explained that he had to take money for the service of shipping men as a measure of self-protection. "If it had not been for the boardinghouse, who is going to take care of these people and feed them? They would be on the streets; they would be in jail. I have no way of getting any money out of them except taking the risk of shipping them when they are ready for the sea." The Commission concluded that there was no "real abuse at this port" in matters of crimping and did not investigate further. The Tacoma Seamen's Union withdrew the charges for lack of proof.¹⁴

Crimps at other ports or time periods may have had more legitimate claims as seamen's benefactors. In Quebec in the 1850s, the situation more closely resembled the British beginnings of crimping than in the port of Tacoma at the turn of the century, and the sailors evidently felt the crimps acted as their advocates on shore. They paid to have someone crimp them off their ships, rather

than being tricked or cajoled into deserting. Then they paid to have the crimps find them a berth which would pay better than the previous one. Quebec crimps often encouraged sailors to bring legal complaints against captains who had cheated or mistreated them.¹⁵

However, this altruism only illustrates that crimps served in any capacity which proved profitable. In Quebec the crimps found themselves in a position to manipulate or cheat captains to the benefit of crewmen; in other North American ports, it usually worked the other way around. One historian comments that in Canada, the interests of the boardinghouse keepers "coincidentally operated in the sailors' favor" at the time.¹⁶ In contrast, the case in Tacoma shows that seemingly harmless crimps and boardinghouses hid blatant exploitations adverse to sailors, or to landsmen who became sailors. Crimps adjusted their methods to fit the conditions at various ports and various decades. They played an opportunistic role, and no generalities held true for every port town except that crimps invented ways to gain.

Sometimes crimps forced their control with violence; Quebec, years later, is a case in point. The situation had almost entirely reversed between 1850 and the 1870s. Where seamen had apparently sought out the crimps' favorable terms, later in the century they could receive very harsh discipline for refusing these favorable terms. Sometimes they were punished with trumped-up fines or criminal charges. Some men were beaten for refusing to desert their ships. In 1872, a captain reported that a sailor-runner, a sort of assistant crimp, came aboard his ship and took a man by force, after

gagging him and beating him with a belaying pin of iron. The rest of the crew looked on, afraid to take any action. The very next day, six seamen were forced from a ship in the same harbor, the ship's boy crying all the while. And during the same year, a Scandinavian sailor refused to desert the N. and E. Gardner. A crimp shot him in the head and killed him, then made off with his clothes and shipmates in broad daylight.¹⁷ These incidents show quite a contrast to the earlier conditions.

In a similar situation, captains entering the port of Portland were prevented, by intimidation, from signing on men independently of the boardinghouse keepers. In 1895, Captain Hodge of the British bark Largo Bay agreed to ship eight men from the Seamen's Friend Society's Mariner's Home, a charity-based alternative to boardinghouses. He was so worried by threats from local crimps that the Society promised him protection while he signed on the men and while he loaded the ship, then sought consent from the Mayor to send an officer downriver with the Largo Bay to safeguard the crew until the last minute before she passed to sea. The Society records for 1899 relate several similar incidents. Sometimes a crimp named Larry Sullivan used forced desertion as a method of coercing the captains. Captain Blair of the Galeno told the Society that when he got into port, six men deserted. He replaced them without the aid of boardinghouse masters, but someone went to Sullivan and told him about it. Sullivan went aboard and stole eight of the original crew, then told Captain Blair that he would not be able to find replacements for these

unless he fired the six new men. Blair did so, then shipped fourteen sailors through Sullivan at fifty-five dollars each. Blair told the Seamen's Friend Society that there was no protection for seafarers in the port whatsoever, and that even some members of their own Society accepted an income from Larry Sullivan. A few days later, Captain Tough of the Poseidon made his own arrangements to hire some men and was told that it was not allowed to interfere with the boardingmasters' prerogative in this way. If he did so, they would see that every member of his crew deserted him, even should it cost a hundred dollars to bribe each one. He accepted their employees instead, at fifty-five dollars each. Finally, a few weeks later, five sailors approached Captain Marcussen of the Akershus and asked him for berths. He said that he would have liked to hire them but did not dare.¹⁸

Other sources indicate that more serious measures were sometimes taken against uncooperative captains or mates, much like the violence in the port of Quebec. Once, after a ship's officer chased crimps off of the Buckingham while it was docked in Portland, the papers say he was found near death behind a shed along the waterfront. In other cases, crimps fabricated legal cases against people who opposed them.¹⁹

The situation on many waterfronts could be compared to mob control of Chicago, because everyone knew that quasi-legal or illegal sanctions kept the unscrupulous boardingmasters in control of the labor market, but no one knew what to do about it. Sometimes the public tolerated or even knowingly supported the situation. Quebec crimps usually escaped legal action without bribing their way out of

it, simply because society accepted their position as the rightful controllers of the sailor market.²⁰ In both Quebec and St. John, crimps were extensively involved in politics and kept the polls on election days.²¹ Similar situations prevailed in the States. An article in the Oregonian in 1891 accused Astorians of countenance in the matter: "It seemed as if the whole community were willing to endorse this heinous outrage for the sake of a few thousand dollars that were put in circulation by it."²² The ways in which both Portlanders and Astorians supported certain crimps will be examined in the next chapter. An earlier example shows how larger political questions sometimes surfaced in this rather politic profession. In 1867, Civil War issues prompted Baltimore crimps to boycott Black seamen. Any ship with a Black sailor aboard could get no other sailors. Therefore the Blacks had to be discharged, though it was illegal to do so without sufficient cause. The British consul at Baltimore was obligated to levy fines against all British captains who did so, although he admitted that the crimps' "combined power in the matter cannot be counteracted by any means. . . ."²³

Collective action worked well for the crimps. In 1896, for example, crimps banded together to successfully block union attempts to control labor in San Francisco. The crimps formed a coalition called the Coasting Seamen's Shipping Association, and came to an agreement with the Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast. The agreement protected the boardinghouse keepers' monopoly over the hiring of seamen. All sailors hoping to get a job had to live in

specified boardinghouses, unless they were strike-breakers, who were exempt because they opposed the union anyway.²⁴

This example of highly organized, federated crimps is not unique. Again there is an analogous example in Canadian history: the Boardinghouse Keepers' Association of St. John operated considerable control in that area. Other North American sources also claim that the crimps in their city were "syndicated" or "federated."

The crimps' association with boardinghouses and other waterfront business, his financial manipulation of sailors and captains, and deceptive recruiting methods are the most basic characteristics of the occupation. Political power and collective action occasionally contributed to the crimping monopoly over labor, sometimes safeguarded by violence as well. The examples collected here paint a general picture of crimping in the United States and Canada, but it must be remembered that there are no good universals, and the situation differed in every harbour of the world.

"Whatever you go, in any part of the world, you are asked by seafaring men, captains, mates, and sailors, the first question is: 'Did you come from Astoria, the silver city by the sea!'"²⁵ Both Astoria and Portland became internationally renowned during the 1890s, while in San Francisco the problem began to wane.²⁶

Of course the profession took hold in Oregon before the 1890s. A committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce reported in 1898 that

III. CRIMPING IN OREGON

A comprehensive history of crimping is problematic and unwieldy due to the regional variation and the difficulties involved in studying a quasi-legal, underground profession. Generalities have little meaning, either in hindsight or in contemporary sources--one reason why nineteenth-century Congressional committees found it difficult to draft enforceable legislation to solve this problem on a nation-wide scale. However, unlike Congressional hearings, a retrospective study facilitates a narrow approach. Focusing on a particular locality adds dimension to the generalities.

Shanghaiing and crimping in San Francisco has been better remembered and better documented than anywhere else on the Pacific Coast. Nevertheless, contemporaries considered the Columbia River and Puget Sound crimps comparable to those in the larger port of San Francisco. ". . . we have got the worst reputation of any nation on earth," wrote one reformed Oregonian crimp. "Wherever you go, in any part of the world, you are asked by seafaring men, captains, mates, and sailors, the first question is: 'Did you come from Astoria, the pirate city by the sea?'"²⁵ Both Astoria and Portland became internationally renowned during the 1890s, while in San Francisco the problem began to wane.²⁶

Of course the profession took hold in Oregon before the 1890s. A committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce reported in 1898 that

crimping began about twenty-five years earlier under the leadership of James Turk.²⁷ While his role as founding father of Oregon crimping remains dubious, Spider Johnson confirmed that "this Jim Turk . . . was one of the original shanghai boys here."²⁸ Johnson added that Turk was a "square-shooter"--no one was ever robbed at his joints, though admittedly he "got a pretty bad reputation" and "may have" shanghai'd a few drunk sailors.²⁹

Turk was born in England and spoke with a strong accent all his life. He migrated to Portland from Pendleton, where he had a partnership in a saloon and sold whiskey to Indians on the side. He and his partner left Pendleton after his partner ran into trouble for wife abuse. In Portland, Turk made his fortune alone. He owned more than one place of business in Portland, including a sailor's boardinghouse, a large hotel in North Portland, and also some of the best property in Astoria. He was married three times, and must have had some interesting ideas on raising and disciplining children: he once shanghai'd one of his own sons. "The boy had been playing around with bad liquor and bad women," Johnson explained, "so Jim got the boy drunk and loaded him aboard a schooner. Jim collected his blood-money from the skipper, too." After several months he returned, cured of his former habits, and eventually became a respectable businessman in California.³⁰

Another of James Turk's sons by his second wife followed in his father's footsteps. Frank Turk ran a sailor's boardinghouse in Astoria for several years, and the local papers, at least, were

convinced that he did not operate his business honestly. About 1899 he moved to Honolulu, where sea-captains evidently did not "take kindly to the idea of having Pacific Coast methods of shipping seamen introduced," pressing charges against Turk for aiding and abetting desertion, and for illegally boarding vessels.³¹ Astoria papers kept track of Turk's legal problems in Hawaii, but these setbacks do not seem to have ended his career.

Frank Turk never achieved the notoriety of his father. The Chamber of Commerce report contrasts sharply with Spider Johnson's appraisal of Jim Turk as a square-shooter: "The inhumanity and cruelty of James Turk toward seamen has never been denied by men who knew him; and the spirit of their progenitor has largely animated his successors in the business, even to the present day."³² Perhaps Turk had mellowed by the time Johnson met him, in the early nineties; but his favorable evaluation of the square-shooting crimp probably resulted from Johnson's philosophy on shanghaiing: "Yes, I know there was a lot of bad stuff went on, and a lot of guys were shanghai'd, but a lot of them needed it." The sailors, he said, would spend their time waiting around for someone to buy them another drink, and eventually wake up on board on a ship somewhere between Portland and Astoria. They were by necessity sober throughout the voyage, came back in good physical condition, and, according to Johnson, with money coming to them at the end. "That wasn't such a bad break."³³

Portland seamen had a slightly different point of view:

Shanghaiing! The curse of these streets it was. . . . It took us months to get our sea-legs and years to get back

home to find that blasted no-good crimp that got us into this God-forsaken mess. We swore that when we hit town--the dock along Burnside--we'd find him.³⁴

In accord with his view on the matter, Johnson related how Turk saved a man's life once by shanghaiing him. The landsman was a doctor dying of consumption, and the sea-life to which he was unwillingly introduced from Turk's saloon cured him. He returned to Portland six months after setting out, and lived there for several years before moving away.³⁵

The Oregonian once interviewed a man named A. E. Clark who began a successful career in the merchant marine when he was shanghaiing from Portland. Although his first voyage was both unpleasant and unprofitable, he later flourished in his new profession. The shanghaiing took place in 1891, and was a very extravagant trick. Just off the farm at the age of twenty-one, Clark came to Portland for the first time and was immediately befriended by "a pleasant sort of fellow" who brought him to the boardinghouse owned by Larry Sullivan and Billy Smith, "the best place to stay in town." At the boardinghouse, he accepted an invitation to a party aboard a riverboat, replete with food, drink, women, dancing, and a three-piece orchestra. The riverboat went to Astoria, where the party continued ashore, but not before the ten guests had signed a "passenger list" supposedly in order to make sure that they all returned safely to the riverboat. Eventually someone asked the inebriated landsmen if they wouldn't like to visit a deep-sea full-rigged ship, and they all went aboard the T.F. Oaks. During the tour of the vessel, they

were suddenly surrounded by four large men with .45 revolvers, the captain, two mates, and the bos'n, who carried large steel handcuffs. Once Clark and the other visitors were chained, the captain explained to them that they had all signed ship's articles when they thought that they were signing a passenger list, then he sent them below decks to be locked in leg-irons until safely out to sea.

Clark did not earn anything in his four months on the T.F.Oaks. He and his companions had signed on as Able-Bodied Seamen for a salary of thirty dollars per month. The crimps collected a two-month advance from each "sailor's" wages, two month's worth being the maximum amount allowed by law. But when the ten sailors turned out to be inexperienced, their status changed to Ordinary Seamen, and the wages dropped to fifteen dollars per month, sixty dollars for the whole trip--all of which had already been paid to the crimps in Astoria.³⁶

Finding himself in Le Havre, France, without any money, Clark shipped again without the help of a crimp. He sailed for seven more years. Clark learned his vocation on his first voyage without any great difficulty. However, some sailors did not find their on-the-job training as bearable as Clark did. In a letter dated July 23, 1888, Frank Richardson explained to his grandfather that inexperienced sailors like himself were sometimes badly mistreated on board. He was shanghaied out of Astoria, and worked very hard, despite his seasickness, even while the ship lay at anchor for ten days before sailing:

Perhaps Billy Smith meant that in Portland, innocent passengers-by force

The other sailors, seeing that I was no seaman, got down on me and treated me like a dog. I had to take the fat meat that they would leave me or have none at all. They would make me cut tobacco and fill their pipes and wash their clothes, in fact I was working day and night, very seldom I had over three hours of sleep in one night. If there was anything to do I had to do it and if I forgot any little thing I would be treated very roughly. I resisted their cruelty once and got put in chains all one day and one night without a thing to eat or drink. When I got out the hard chaff bread tasted good. The worst of all they stole my clothes and divided them amongst themselves, and they were clothed warm while I was shivering in the cold, wet through, and no dry change.³⁷

Richardson, like Clark, received no wages at the end of his grueling voyage.

One of the two men who hosted the elaborate riverboat party for Clark and the others was a man named "Mysterious Billy" Smith, a Portland prize-fighter and sailor's boardinghouse keeper. In light of Clark's story it is ironic that Billy Smith once told Spider Johnson that men were never shanghaied out of Portland. "Astoria-- that was something else. He says they actually did shanghai men down there. Billy says that all men who sailed out of Portland had signed articles. I guess he's right. Or at least, someone signed the articles for them."³⁸

Despite the hypocrisy of Smith's statement, reputation and folklore uphold his claims to an extent. Though Portland has a network of Shanghai tunnels under the streets near the Burnside waterfront and other documented evidence of shanghaiing, the larger town does not seem to have gained the notoriety or drastic image of Astoria. Perhaps Billy Smith meant that in Portland, innocent passers-by were

not shanghai'd as often as drunken farmers and sailors from the bars. Astoria, on the other hand, spawned dramatic tales of how people could be grabbed off the street and beaten senseless, then sent to sea with little chance of returning for years; or how every unsuspecting customer who wandered into a waterfront saloon would be drugged and smuggled away. This image persists in folk-memory. Of course legends exaggerate, but they are often based on fact; and nineteenth-century sources reiterate the reputation. Mont Hawthorne, a resident of Astoria in the 1880s, believed that the crimps "would knock a man right down on the street and take him out and sell him on a ship." He described the waterfront as a very dangerous place:

. . . I had to cross about three blocks of board street over the water. It was dark . . . I never went no place without a loaded revolver. No one else did neither. When I'd meet a fellow on that stretch I knowed he could be a shanghaier with a boat tied down below. I'd walk careful-like with my hand on my revolver. And, do you know, every fellow that I met on that stretch done the same thing. We'd pass with our hands on our hips, turned sideways, keeping our eyes on each other, and sometimes backing up as we walked away.³⁹

Commenting that the crimps were awfully short of sailors in the winter of 1883, Hawthorne tells stories of kidnappings around town. One woman who ran a boardinghouse sold her husband to a sea-captain bound for Liverpool, for a hundred dollars. Another time, someone attempted to shanghai the night janitor at Hawthorne's Methodist church: "Yes sir, the shanghaiers got so hard up for men they decided to pick one off right inside our church." However, that particular evening the Reverend George Grannis had taken over the janitor's duties while he was away. The Reverend was a large man, and he put

up a fight against the two sailor-runners, who "finally . . . had enough and got out of there." Grannis preached later that night with torn clothes and bleeding hands; the next day one of the town's well-known crimps had three teeth missing. "But no one tried to prove anything. You just couldn't do nothing about nothing them days."⁴⁰ Hawthorne also claimed that sometimes people were arrested on trumped-up charges then shanghaied out of the jail immediately.

In 1882, the Daily Astorian offered a brief discussion of the crimping "state of affairs" which had existed "for a considerable time": because of Astoria's position at the mouth of the Columbia, "a jumping-off place for Oregon and the Northwest," the town had more trouble per yard than any other place in the state, the paper said. Men disappeared, and "found drowned" was all that ever came to the surface. Fishing boats came to the shore without the fishermen that started out on them. Sailors had to be found, it did not matter how, and methods of finding them included "beating and battering men over the heads and running them aboard ships."⁴¹

The Astorian's commentary was prompted by a shanghaiing incident and the riot which followed it. The shanghaied victim, Henry Fredrickson, drowned in an attempt to escape from the ship Storm King while it lay at anchor in the mouth of the river. The Daily Astorian reported that Fredrickson had said he would rather be killed than go to sea, and after a day and a half on board he rushed the rail and jumped into the water. He swam towards a nearby boat, but the Storm

Liberty Bell and formed an organization called The People's Progressive

King's first mate threatened the boat's occupants with a rifle, preventing rescue. Before the Storm King's own boat reached Fredrickson, "the unfortunate man was chilled to death and with a gurgling moan he sank forever. His body was not recovered."⁴²

The riot began the same day that the story appeared in the paper, April 18, 1882. A group of cannery workers assaulted a man named Nicholas Davich, who they held responsible for shanghaiing Frederickson. Davich evaded them by climbing through a window, and went to the city jail for protection. The "rapidly increasing crowd" regrouped outside the jail yelling "No more shanghaiing" and "Hang him." They stormed the locked doors, using a large plank as a battering-ram, but could not find Davich when they got in. The fire bell rang, and the Hook and Ladder Company responded, "greeted with derisive shouts"; after a shouting match, someone singled out the leaders and managed to quiet them down; the crowd gradually left, and the four-hour riot came to an end.

Cyrus Crocker, the mate of the Storm King, was arrested, released on bail, and charged to appear before the District Court. On the 20th of April, the Astorian reported that both Crocker and Davich had left town quickly, Crocker supposedly sailing on the ship Fleetwood, "though other parties claim to have positive knowledge that he was got aboard the Chinese steamer Meath at an early hour yesterday morning."⁴³

The day after the riot, a group of people met informally at Liberty Hall and formed an organization called The People's Protective

Association of Astoria. The Association drafted resolutions amounting to a crusade against sailor-runners and gamblers. They elected a committee of twenty-five men to ask these people to leave town, leaving it up to the discretion of the committee to determine who the crimps and gamblers were.

The events of that April demonstrate that the identity of most Astoria crimps was common knowledge. The rioters all agreed on Davich's guilt, and the People's Protective Association felt qualified to choose which other criminals should be ousted from town. Significantly, both the rioters and the Association felt a need to take the law into their own hands, confirming Mont Hawthorne's insinuations that the legal system in Astoria was corrupt or ineffective. However, the Association's efforts were evidently also unsuccessful in the long-run, for the situation did not noticeably improve. Nic Davich eventually returned, and owned a bar in town; he lived in the area until his death in May 1898.

One written source of uncertain origin mentions farmers who protected sailors from the crimps. The farmers secreted them away in the hay mows and barns, it says. The source identifies C. B. Dow, "a staunch square honest farmer [and] temperance man," as one of the men who defied the sailor's boardinghouse runners.⁴⁴ The 1890 city directory confirms C. B. Dow's residence in Astoria. If discovered, the sailors would be taken forcefully from their place of refuge, apparently not without risk to the farmer. An 1890 indictment fines Larry Sullivan, a known crimp, for beating a rancher in the Astoria

area, "whom he suspected of taking sailors out into the country and training them for farmers, instead of letting them continue on the deep blue sea."⁴⁵ Although Dow's residence doesn't verify the account of his actions against the crimps, it seems feasible that such things occurred, especially in light of the indictment against Larry Sullivan.

Other farmers were perhaps not so helpful to the sailors. A legend which survives in Astoria tells of a farm outside the city limits in Walluski or in the Youngs River area where the excess shanghaied victims were taken. Waking up in the basement of a strange place, which was situated in unrecognizable wilderness, the men rarely made an attempt to escape because they didn't realize town was only a few miles away, according to the story. In fact, the woman who ran the farm had no need of guards to keep the men on the premises. The men worked on the farm until a ship came into port which was short-handed. They were then taken back into town and placed on board by their kidnappers. There is no solid evidence to support this widespread story. It may be founded on or related to the fact that one saloon keeper used to send his indebted customers out to clear trees from his Walluski farmland, both in order to work off the money they owed and to dry out. Many waterfront entrepreneurs held property in the country; prostitutes from Astor street in Astoria went to their employer's farm in Jewell to rest up or recover from venereal disease.⁴⁶

Besides the woman farmer in Walluski, if indeed she existed,

there were other Astoria women involved in crimping. Bridget Grant, "the queen of the boarding-masters' fraternity"⁴⁷ to those who knew her from a business standpoint, was a society lady and respected "pioneer resident"⁴⁸ to the public. She and her husband Peter came to Astoria from Massachusetts in the 1870s and lived there for around fifty years. Bridget Grant was Irish-born, a "tall, well-built, assertive woman,"⁴⁹ who raised seven children and was given to hosting formal gatherings which were always announced on the society page. Bridget's connections proved to be advantageous, judging by a sea-captain's testimony to the Chamber of Commerce. He said that in 1877 he hired some crewmen independently of the crimps, in Portland. When he got to Astoria, Mrs. Grant sent for him. She invited him in and turned the key on him, demanding \$150.00 advance wages for the sailors he had hired on his own. She said she had loaned them money, though the captain was positive that she had never even seen them. He refused to pay and she let him go, but later the sheriff came aboard his ship and compelled him to pay Mrs. Grant.⁵⁰

Other members of Bridget's family were also associated with crimping. A Peter Grant, either her husband or her son, was convicted of harboring deserters in 1893, and was for many years a member of the most successful crimping partnership in Portland, together with Larry Sullivan and R. McCarron. Bridget's son Nace (short for Ignatius) was a farmer and public official rather than a sailor's boardinghouse keeper like the other two Grants, but he shipped sailors on the side. He also owned, at various times, a saloon in the Uppertown district,

a wine company, and began several out-of-town business ventures. Nace, like his mother, was very popular in the area and active in the community. He served in positions ranging from grange-master to chief of the volunteer fire squad, and held office as sheriff and then chief of police. He resigned from this office in 1918 when a member of the city council brought charges of graft against the Astoria police department. Nace Grant's involvement with shanghaiing apparently never surfaced in the news or in the courthouse, but an oral history source recalls that he "would make a deal with the captain of a crew to supply crewmembers," which sometimes entailed shanghaiing.⁵¹

The same informant remembers a man named Patrick Ryan who used to allow himself to be shanghaied, presumably for profit. Once aboard the ship, he would wait until it passed near Pt. Adams on the way out to sea; then Ryan, an expert swimmer, would dive overboard, swim ashore, and go back to Astoria to do it all over again.

In his annual report for 1890, a British Consul stationed at Astoria for the protection of British shipping interests declared that all the crimps had abandoned the mouth of the river for Portland. The following year, the Consul for Portland countered that "nearly all the seamen's boardinghouses have been and are located at Astoria . . . with one or two exceptions, all the most notorious crimps reside there."⁵² In truth many of the Columbia River crimps did not operate exclusively out of one town or the other, but were active in both. Most prominent Portland crimps lived in Astoria at one time or

another, and sometimes did business in the two towns simultaneously through partnerships. The most powerful of these coalitions was that of Sullivan, McCarron, and Grant, dominating the river during the 1890s. Larry Sullivan was the leader of the company. If Bridget Grant was queen, then Sullivan was "the king of boardinghouse operators."⁵³ Larry Sullivan came to Astoria in the early 1880s and made a name for himself as an amateur boxer while in his twenties. He got into the boardinghouse business when he moved to Portland and worked for a Mr. Pratt, the owner of the "Mariner's Home." He became a full partner in a very short time, then opened his own boardinghouse on 2nd and Glisan St. in the North End, as the Burnside area was called. Spider Johnson told the Oregonian that "it was a success from the start, and many a bark and schooner went out of Portland manned by men from Larry's place. Yes, I helped sign on a few of them myself."⁵⁴

Many of the captains who spoke with the Chamber of Commerce representatives in 1899 agreed that Sullivan, Grant, and McCarron had complete control over the shipping of seamen, and that port officials did nothing to censor them. The Harbor Master and the crimps, they said, "all stand in together."⁵⁵ The Portland Seamen's Friend Society echoed the captains' complaints, saying that the Harbor Master "is not enforcing the law, neither is he pretending to do so, nor is he in any way assisting or protecting the seamen."⁵⁶

Similarly, the port of Astoria lacked supervision. The Astoria city council neglected to appoint any port official for law enforcement

in accordance with the state legislation for seamen of 1889, and the city police force offered little help. A member of the Chamber of Commerce tried to enlist a police officer's help with a skirmish on the Astoria docks; the officer "afterwards told his chief that I had asked his assistance. The chief informed me that he did not want his men to interfere with the boardingmasters. I told him to go to Hades, that I would never ask help from them again."⁵⁷

Though simple neglect on the part of the city partially explains the crimps' power, Sullivan's influence played a large part. He once boasted to a visiting German consul: "I am the law in Portland."⁵⁸ Spider Johnson labeled him "almost what they call a Great Man, but the best he really did do was to become a Big Shot; there's a lot of difference, you know." Johnson believed that Sullivan had ambitions to be a U.S. Senator from Oregon, "and then possibly the White House." Actually he never ran for any kind of office, but he engineered politics from behind the scenes:

On election day Larry sat with a double-barreled shotgun across his arm at a window on the second floor of his boardinghouse. The voting booth was just below and Larry wanted to make sure that no one stole the ballot box. At this particular election Larry got a crew from a Dutch ship and had them all vote. I think they got two dollars apiece; not one of them could read or speak English.⁵⁹

One historian writes that Sullivan had connections with the politician Jonathan Bourne, and was his "Chief North End Lieutenant."⁶⁰ Spider Johnson, without mentioning names, affirms that Sullivan acted as a liaison between certain city officials and the "gambling and other joints."⁶¹

The crimping partnership did not take kindly to competition. In May of 1900, McCarron and another man fought Paddy Lynch, an Astoria crimp, because he was "encroaching on their territory"; of the three, only Lynch was arrested for assault and battery.⁶² Another time, in 1895, Sullivan and some of his colleagues used courtroom pressure against two men who tried to begin a Seamen's Institute in connection to the Seamen's Friend Society, which would house and ship sailors at low rates. Sullivan had the two men, Matthew Dee and J. P. Christiansen, arrested for assault and battery, trespassing, threatening to kill Sullivan, and using profane and vulgar language. The Oregonian sarcastically added that Sullivan's "esthetic mind was rudely shocked by the use of such language as he imputes to Dee." Dee insisted that all the charges were a frame-up.⁶³

Sullivan did not always manage to keep his record clean. During the 1880s and 1890s he accumulated minor indictments and accusations for fighting, disorderly conduct, beating a farmer, hiding a sailor, boarding a vessel without a permit, and theft on board a ship. In 1899 a Pendleton man accused him of the more serious crime of shanghaiing his son, but the eighteen-year-old may have agreed to sign on. In 1900, the British Consul, Colonel Laidlaw, had him arrested and fined for "demanding and receiving greater remuneration for supplying seamen than is allowed by state statutes." The law allowed ten dollars per man; Sullivan's going rate at that time was fifty-five dollars per man, which perhaps included some advanced wages, technically; but Sullivan had charged the British bark Nithsdale \$107.50

each for eight sailors. Not only that, Laidlaw said, but Sullivan tried to charge the same amount for a ninth sailor which the Consul had provided himself. "All over the United Kingdom, Portland is known as a place where masters and captains have to submit to extortions in order to get their crews, and in no other port of the world do worse conditions prevail."⁶⁴

Towards the latter part of his career in Portland, perhaps by 1900, Sullivan began working more independently of McCarron and Grant. McCarron went to California at some point, and Grant spent more time in Astoria. Jim Turk had died by the turn of the century. Another prominent crimp named Joseph "Bunco" Kelly went to the State Penitentiary in 1894. Competition in Portland dwindled to two factions in the crimping world, Sullivan against "Mysterious" Billy Smith and his partners, Jim and Harry White. Smith and the Whites made a gentleman's agreement with Sullivan to share the sailor market, dividing the business between them.⁶⁵

In 1905, Sullivan went to Nevada to enter the mining business. His company folded, and in 1910 he went to Los Angeles and sold wireless telephone stock. In 1916 or 1917 he came back to Oregon, got into trouble for bootlegging in Clackamas County, then settled in Portland with a legitimate job in a shipping yard, and died in 1918.

Spider Johnson said that in the days of sailing, the Columbia River was "just a forest of masts . . . and it was a pretty sight."⁶⁶ The port of Portland was fairly active, and accommodated fifty-seven shipping lines around the turn of the century. According to the

Chamber of Commerce's calculations, about eight hundred men deserted from the "forest of masts" over a year's time in favor of the waterfront entertainment, and a little more than eight hundred were sold back to the captains by the crimps.⁶⁷ The busy port supported a Barbary-coast style sailor-town, centering on the North End district. The area boasted of a "mile-long" bar in Erickson's Hotel measuring 684 feet, longer than any other "mile-long" bar in the world. The bar curved in a horse-shoe shape and ran through five separate saloons within Erickson's Hotel, located at Third and Burnside streets; Spider Johnson tended bar there at one time. The complex also included a concert hall, a card-room, and a brothel. Its owner, Gus Erickson, provided a front for many of the city's prominent public figures who dabbled in these illicit activities. A Portland historian named Mike Jones claims that Erickson's established its reputation for hospitality "to the far corners of the world."⁶⁸ He also believes that the tunnels beneath Erickson's were used for shanghaiing.

The present Erickson's building was erected in 1906, but the tunnels date back to the original Erickson's Hotel. They connect several old buildings on either side of West Burnside, and some lead to the river. Jones has explored about fifteen of these tunnels, though most of them have been walled up or blocked by recent constructions such as the Burnside bridge. Some or all of the tunnels may have been built for other purposes: access to sewer lines, in order to repair them; flood control; transportation of freight between the waterfront and shop basements; or quick escapes from gambling and

opium dens. But Jones suspects they were primarily shanghai tunnels. He has discovered various artifacts proving, at least, that people went through the passageways for some reason; and he found a man-sized cage which he believes held the shanghai victims until they were needed. Jones does much of his research through oral history, and his interviews also confirm his theory. One Portland resident, now dead, gave him a map of the tunnels. Another old sailor described how "the tunnels swallowed us up like whales,"⁶⁹ bringing them to berths aboard ships anchored in the river.

Jones estimates that nearly twenty-five thousand men were shanghaied out of Portland, and a good percentage of these came from the North End establishments via the tunnels. His calculation represents a higher estimate than the Chamber of Commerce figures of around eight hundred men crimped per year. If this rate had been uniform for the roughly thirty-year period during which crimping persisted in Oregon, twenty-five thousand would be a reasonable conclusion. But the Chamber collected its data in 1897-1898, and the 1890s were probably the worst years for crimping. An 1899 Portland Seamen's Friend Society report approximately concurs with that of the Chamber,⁷⁰ but the porportion of shanghaied men must have been lower in the earlier years, and also after the turn of the century. The Chamber's report says that these eight hundred men made up about thirty percent of the total seamen visiting the port. During the period under consideration in this study, perhaps the porportion ranged from thirty percent to ten percent or lower. However, this is speculation,

this time.⁷²

and relies heavily on the two contemporary reports.

The Shanghai tunnels were only one of the dangers of the Portland waterfront. Other crimps collected their seamen from floating saloons built on scows. The most famous of these belonged to an Englishwoman named Nancy Boggs, who is credited with introducing organized prostitution to Portland. The scow was eighty feet long by forty feet wide, had two stories, and housed a brothel and dance hall as well as a saloon. By remaining anchored offshore, Boggs hoped to avoid paying the city for a liquor license; the city did not agree, but she repulsed police raids by pumping boiling water through a fire hose at the officers. Another Portland woman named Bridget Gallagher operated a similar scow without as much success: ". . . customers were always falling overboard, which bothered them to the extent that they left immediately for home, once rescued. So Bridget went to dry land. . . ." ⁷¹

Nancy Boggs often cooperated with a crimp named Joseph "Bunco" Kelly, one of Portland's most colorful crimps. It is said that Kelly earned his nick-name in 1885 by shanghaiing a wooden Indian from Wildman's cigar store at First and Glisan streets in Portland. As the story goes, he wrapped the six and half-foot figure in a tarpaulin and passed it off as an extremely intoxicated Able-Bodied Seaman; he put it in the forecandle himself, and received fifty dollars in blood-money. A few days later, some Norwegian fishermen in Astoria snared the wooden Indian in their salmon nets. The Indian eventually ended up back outside of Wildman's cigar store, chained to the pavement this time. ⁷²

Joseph Kelly was born in Liverpool in 1838 and came to Astoria as a sailor in 1874. In his unpublished autobiography, he recorded his first impressions of the Columbia River: it was "something inhuman to see the way them sailors were treated." Crimps equipped with drugged liquor, rope ladders and iron hooks would "climb over the ship's side with their dosed whiskey and commence giving it out to the sailors. When the poor sailor takes one drink, he belongs body and soul to the crimp. . . ." ⁷³

Despite his condemnation of the crimps, Kelly eventually followed their example. He began as a "free-lance" crimp, as the Oregonian once termed it, ⁷⁴ then opened a sailor's boardinghouse at Northwest Third Avenue and Davis street in Portland. He became famous for Kelly's Knock-out Drops, served in drinks to saloon patrons and soon-to-be sailors. Kelly seems to have specialized in fraud. In 1888 he collected \$465.00 from the British ship Rosecrana for a crew he never delivered. Another time he shanghaied two prostitutes, whom he disguised as men.

Kelly's most famous exploit took place in October of 1893. The captain of the ship Flying Prince sent him to find twenty-two crewmen in a hurry. In an incredible stroke of luck, as it were, Kelly happened on the scene of an accident: twenty-four men, already drunk, had broken into what they thought was the basement of the Snug Harbor Saloon at Second and Morrison streets, and tapped the kegs they found there. Actually the cellar belonged to the building next door, Johnson and Sons Undertakers, and the kegs contained formaldehyde

rather than alcohol. When Kelly chanced on the open trap-door and came down to investigate, the men were dead or dying. He hired some sailor-runners and a hack-driver to help him take the corpses to the Flying Prince. The captain accepted all twenty-four of the seemingly unconscious sailors, no questions asked, and paid Kelly \$720.00. By the time the ship's officers tried unsuccessfully to wake their crew the next day, they were heading down-river. They stopped at Astoria to dispose of the bodies, trying to keep the matter quiet, but an Astoria newsman found out about it and sent the story to the Portland papers. A public uproar followed, then subsided after a "police shake-up" in Portland, where all the officers changed to a different beat and the department made encouraging promises to end all crimping activities. No one arrested Bunco Kelly.⁷⁵

However, Kelly did not always escape legal action. In 1890 he was prosecuted for shanghaiing an Idaho logger, Albert Armstrong, who jumped overboard while the ship Noddleburn was anchored in Portland. Armstrong explained that Kelly had falsely promised him light work and good pay aboard the Noddleburn. Further, Armstrong had signed no shipping articles. Kelly told the Oregonian that the case was a set-up. The Grants, Turk, Sullivan, and other crimps had come to him with a proposition to cooperate in raising the price of blood-money to \$87.50 per sailor. Kelly refused, preferring to stick with the legal price of ten dollars per man plus forty dollars in advanced wages. He said that Turk and the others dreamed up the Noddleburn incident in order to get him out of the way.⁷⁶ He also claimed that

he had been taken without a warrant, and obtained a writ of habeas corpus. The case was dropped.

In 1894, Kelly was tried and convicted for the murder of George Sayres. Kelly wrote, "it is said that I killed him while trying to shanghai the old man. I am innocent. . . ."77 As in 1890, he maintained that the charges were trumped-up. He had an alibi: he and Larry Sullivan had been arrested on the night of the murder for fighting. The police produced an alleged confession to the murder by Kelly, but he continued to plead not guilty. He told the court, "I am being tried not as the person who killed poor old George Sayres. I am being tried for all the crimes ever committed in the North End. I am on trial because I am operating a successful sailor's boarding-house, the finest on this coast. I am being tried because I have no influence with the city's politicians. It is all a frame-up, gentlemen."78

Kelly received a life sentence, but in 1904 a petition for his release circulated; it included the signature of the prosecuting District Attorney, Wilson T. Hume. Three years later, in a somewhat delayed response to the petition, Governor Chamberlain granted Kelly a full pardon. He returned to Astoria and advised others to "give up crimping, become men and go to work because there is a curse on the sailor business."79

A year previous to Kelly's release, Governor Chamberlain had pardoned another crimp named Paddy Lynch. In March of 1903, Lynch talked a logger from Missouri into visiting a ship, then left him

there. The logger, Charles Gardner, escaped when a seamen's chaplain came aboard to preach and discovered Gardner's situation. He brought Gardner ashore and had Lynch arrested, as well as a man named Theodore Tobiason who had signed Gardner's name to the shipping articles. Lynch received a sentence of eight years in the penitentiary, Tobiason of one year. However, Governor Chamberlain felt that the evidence against Lynch was inconclusive and that his sentence was unfair in proportion to Tobiason's, and granted Lynch a pardon in July of 1906. This was also prompted by petition.⁸⁰

Charles Gardner was lured aboard the Foylesdale while he was perfectly sober, and with no threats or violence. This demonstrates, as do many other incidents, that one of the most important tools available to crimps was persuasive eloquence. Spider Johnson described how effectively this method could be used, taking one of Jim Turk's sailor-runners, Mike Enright, as an example:

Mike was great at picking up boys who came to Portland from the middle west. He would paint them the grandest picture of a life at sea that you could imagine--the salt air, and how good it was for the lungs and kidneys; the bounding blue and green waves, and the feel of the keen ocean wind. Mike also added a lot of stuff about seeing the world. He was years ahead of the navy and marine recruiting officers. I think Mike had the best seagoing ballyhoo I ever heard--and I have heard plenty.⁸¹

A few years before his stay in the penitentiary, Paddy Lynch received an ironic initiation into the sailor's boardinghouse business. He opened his Astoria boardinghouse in May of 1899, with Frank Turk and J. J. Kenney. In September of 1899, the Astoria papers reported with amusement that Paddy Lynch was shanghaied. It happened

when he went to Tacoma in hopes of recruiting seamen there, since he had heard that business was slow on the Puget Sound. In Tacoma, Lynch tried to "borrow" an entire crew from the local "king of the boardinghouse fraternity," Dave Evans. "Lynch looked with covetous eyes on the assortment of human beings which the magic wand or whiskey of Evans had transformed from farmers, woodchoppers, etc., into able seamen. . . ." Lynch struck a deal with Evans' watchman to acquire the crew, which was already aboard the Rufus E. Wood. But the watchman reported to Evans, and when Lynch returned to collect his crew, he was seized and held aboard the ship until it departed, en route to Australia. ~~He~~ ~~later~~ ~~admitted~~ ~~that~~ ~~he~~ ~~got~~ ~~a~~ ~~crew~~ ~~in~~ ~~1911~~ Lynch made his dramatic escape off the shore of San Francisco. He and four others got away from the Rufus E. Wood on a small boat, and drifted at sea for several days until they were picked up by a steamer and brought to San Francisco. Lynch sent his partner a telegram, which the papers somehow managed to see and reprint: "Just arrived. Five of us got away in boat. Picked up by steamer. No money. Wire money for five fares. (signed) Patrick J. Lynch." After this, the newsmen lost track of Lynch's journey. Apparently he returned to Astoria as quietly as possible.⁸²

Around the time Paddy Lynch was released from prison by Governor Chamberlain, crimping was on the decline in Oregon, evidently because of improvements in law enforcement and the maritime labor situation. Billy Smith once explained, "by 1900 it was a starvation business. I got out of it."⁸³ He became a full-time fighter instead.

In 1906 the Oregonian seemed to think the situation was improving, and began pointing fingers at worse ports elsewhere. Commenting on an incident in Port Townsend, where the master and mate of the bark Morven were arrested for shooting two crimps on board the ship, the Oregonian suggested that conditions on the Puget Sound at that time resembled those in Portland ten or twenty years before.⁸⁴

Although there were no crimps on the Columbia River to compare with Sullivan and his contemporaries after he left in 1908, crimping did not entirely die out for maybe as much as two decades afterwards. Spider Johnson remembered four cases of shanghaiing in 1917.⁸⁵ Captain McDonald of the Moshulu later admitted that he got a crew in 1927 or 1928 through a Portland "man of evil repute" called Shanghai White (one of the White brothers that worked with Billy Smith?)⁸⁶ An old sailor told the Oregonian in 1978 that he was shanghaiied rather late in the game, but that he knew times were changing. When he got back to Portland, "things were different. Progress was a-coming and those tunnels were destroyed. Things were so different that even the shanghaiers were out of business. A few years later they even tore down the waterfront. I guess I was one of the last to get shanghaiied out of Portland."⁸⁷

This law apparently only applied to voyages rounding Cape Horn, and not those to foreign ports.

This law concerning shanghaiing stood unchanged until 1906, but Congress faced other aspects of crimping in various ways. An act of 1790 penalized deserting seamen with imprisonment while the ship lay

IV. LEGISLATION

During the nineteenth century, Congress did not lack for legislation and discussion about crimping, but most of this proved to be ineffective. As seen in chapter one, most aspects of the seamen's law were archaic and unrealistic; laws dealing with crimping were no exception. Congress unsuccessfully attempted to solve the problem by creating statutes which were uniform for the entire United States, while the situation was not uniform but unique in each port. Also, much of the legislation was next to impossible to enforce.

Early statutes against crimping seem almost ludicrous. In 1790, Congress imposed a twenty-dollar fine for shipping a seaman from a port on the Pacific to one on the Atlantic, or vice-versa, without written articles signed by the seaman. Half of the twenty-dollar fine was to go to the shanghaied sailor, the other half to the government. The law did not provide for any enforcement whatsoever; it left the responsibility for prosecution to the shanghaied man. It is doubtful that many prosecuted, or that they knew about the law at all. Also, this law apparently only applied to voyages rounding Cape Horn, and not those to foreign ports.

This law concerning shanghaiing stood unchanged until 1906, but Congress faced other aspects of crimping in various ways. An act of 1790 penalized deserting seamen with imprisonment while the ship lay

in port; when the ship was ready to leave, the deserter went aboard and paid for his imprisonment from his future earnings. An Act of 1829 extended this law to deserters from foreign vessels as well as American ships, while in American ports. In 1872, the penalty became even more stringent with the addition of three months imprisonment and forfeiture of wages. Such provisions struck at the symptom, and overlooked the causes of desertion. Most nineteenth-century attempts to regulate the bad working conditions on board were so loosely worded that they may as well have been nonexistent: an 1835 Act prohibited certain severe punishments "if without justifiable cause," leaving the interpretation of "justifiable cause" to the shipmaster; and the 1850 Act against flogging hardly limited the disciplinarian's methods. The 1872 Shipping Commissioner's Act represents a new trend, however. Besides the strict provision against desertion, the Act tried to remedy the fact that some of these deserting seamen may have shipped against their will. It established the office of shipping commissioner, intended to monitor marine employment; all ship's articles were to be signed before a shipping commissioner in those ports which were provided with one. However, although the Shipping Commissioner's Act aimed at the root of the problem, it remained unrealistic and unenforceable:

Out of the funds furnished them, the commissioners were expected to pay for rent, light, heat, and accommodations for seamen, as well as their own salaries. Thirteen out of twenty-one commissioners each received a total amount of \$1500 for all these purposes. Naturally, the boardinghouse keepers continued in control in the face of such limited appropriation.⁸⁸

In spite of the financial weakness of the shipping commissioners, the crimps found it necessary to protest the Act and to contrive methods of evasion. They found that any sober man, called a "register-man," could sign with a false name in front of the shipping commissioner, fulfilling the Act's requirement that seamen should be sound of mind when they signed; meanwhile the real owner of the name went aboard unconscious or inebriated.⁸⁹ But evasions such as this became unnecessary, because protesting the Act worked even better. Exercising their control over the labor supply, the crimps withheld the already scarce seamen and delayed ships. By opposing the Act they eventually managed to get it revised almost beyond recognition. Most importantly, the clause requiring seamen to sign in front of the commissioner became optional; the commissioner only had to see the signed articles before the ship sailed.

These changes could not have been made without the cooperation of the shipmasters and owners, for the crimps' boycotting only affected them. In 1883, a New York shipping commissioner wrote a San Francisco commissioner asking why no measures were taken in the California port to suppress blood-money payments to crimps. The San Francisco officer answered rather indignantly that he could prevent the boardinghouse keepers from demanding bounty, but could not prevent the captains from voluntarily offering it.

At times we have from ten to fifteen ships waiting for crews and sailors are very scarce. . . . Some of the captains will agree to wait their turn. . . . Another will put his ship in the stream, and finding some eight to ten vessels ahead of him in turn, ignores the question of turn and offers ten to

twenty dollars per man to fill his ship. This, you will readily see, invites others to bid higher and frequently as high as forty dollars per man is paid, and in every case the offer is a voluntary one. I have tried to make captains understand that the payment of this money will not make men more plentiful, but will only act as an incentive for sailor runners to pick up and ship worthless men; but I have no effect upon them; all they want is something to fill their ships. . . . The fact is that the captains themselves are to blame.⁹⁰

The shipping commissioner concluded that shipowners and captains had no right whatsoever to complain about crimps at San Francisco.

The Shipping Commissioner's Act also forbade unauthorized personnel to board ships when they first arrived in port, as a check against induced desertion; yet this clause evidently missed its mark, for similar acts came up in Congress in 1882, 1900, and again in 1904.

In 1884, Congress again passed well-meaning legislation, based on good theory, only to find that in practice the crimps had more influence than the statutes. The Dingley Act abolished advance wages, with the exception of "allotments" payable to near relatives. The bill was intended to allow seamen to receive their full pay-checks at the end of a voyage, to stop living on credit, and to avoid spending their as yet unearned wages in order to get a berth. But once again, crimps opposed the law with obstructionist tactics on one hand, and found loopholes on the other. Shipowners who wanted to purchase crews from the crimps did so by decreasing the actual monthly wages and offering instead a "cash bonus," payable as soon as the term of employment began. Since the cash bonus was not technically an

advance on the lower monthly wages, and not an allotment, the boardinghouse keepers could legally accept it. But the Dingley Act did not survive long anyway: in 1886, it was amended to permit allotments for any creditor as well as for family. In 1905, then the ~~prev~~. In the 1880s and 1890s, the early seamen's unions began a verbal crusade against crimps, which eventually influenced Congressional action. However, maritime unions progressed slowly, hampered by several disadvantages. They had to fight the inferior legal status of the occupation; they had little recourse in striking because it was mutinous; and they faced well-organized resistance from both crimps and shipowners. Nineteenth-century efforts at union organization involved only the coastwise trade, that is, shipping between American ports rather than deep-sea shipping to foreign harbors. Coastwise seamen visited the same ports often and comprised a more coherent ~~group~~ group, much more easily organized than deep-sea sailors who rarely visited the same town more than once or twice a year, if even that often. Although these coasting unions fought a verbal and legislative war with crimps, any gains usually affected only coasting seamen and were therefore not crippling to the crimping problem, which was much more extensive in deep-sea shipping. So, during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, legislation concerning coasting seamen began to diverge from that of long-distance crews. Despite much discussion of crimping in Congress, the resultant laws did not concern both the deep-sea and the coasting industries until the White Act of 1898. This law significantly bolstered the sailors'

position by abolishing imprisonment for desertion; it owed its success largely to the activity of organized seamen's unions. The law also banned corporal punishment.

Shanghaiing became considerably more costly, in 1906, than the previous twenty-dollar fine: instead, a penalty of \$1,000 or a year in prison was imposed against offenders, but as before, this amendment offered no solution to the problem of enforcement. The next legislative step against crimping was the definitive one: the Seamen's Act of 1915, known alternatively as the LaFollette Act, after the Congressman who presented it, or the Seamen's Magna Carta. The Act revolutionized seamen's position under the law, and represented a great success for maritime unions, benefiting deep-sea mariners as well as coasting seamen. Andrew Furuseth, President of the Sailor's Union of the Pacific, won his fame for the part he played in the passage of this act.

The main points of the Act allowed seamen to negotiate a contract whenever he wished, and demand half of his earned wages; if this right was refused him at any time, he could demand all his earned wages; allotments to creditors were forbidden; work-days in port were limited to nine hours; and several safety measures were required. The Seamen's Magna Carta clearly dealt with many of the problems which had contributed to crimping.

However, by this time other factors had already reduced crimping to a significant extent. One of the most important causes of the decline of crimping, besides legislation and unionism, was the growth

of steam shipping. Steamships changed the nature of seafaring life in many ways, and some, including Spider Johnson, believe that it contributed to the crimps' demise more than anything else:

I don't know when or where Bunco died. . . . But whenever he died, Bunco Kelly died in his time. Steam was coming in, and that is what killed shanghaiing. There were a lot of what they call crusades against shanghaiing in Portland, and they had some effect, but the steamship is what killed shanghaiing. When steam came in, it knocked out close to fifty per cent of the men needed to man a ship. When you cut off half a crew, this technological unemployment means something. That's what steam did.⁹¹

Besides halving the number of men needed on a crew, the increased efficiency of steam shipping reduced the total number of crews in the industry. A steam ship carried more freight than a sailer, maybe as much as twice the amount, and made the voyage in shorter time. After a long shortage of seamen, the needs of the shipping industry finally adjusted to the size of the labor market. Also, this new labor market was more specialized than before. Many of the crew members had to be formally trained for the engine room, rather than signing on without experience.

Various factors inhibited the development of steam shipping during the last part of the nineteenth century, and delayed this minor industrial revolution until the early twentieth century. American shipping companies were unwilling to invest in modernized shipbuilding, until it became an absolute necessity in order to compete with foreign shipping. Progress was also deterred by the romanticism of the sail. The American maritime industry had risen

to prominence with the advent of clipper ships in the early nineteenth century; nostalgia for the prosperous era of masted vessels made it difficult to replace them with "an ugly, snub-nosed, pot-bellied tank." The steam tramp was never "touched by that glamor of romance that has hung over the sailing ship since the days when the fleets of Ulysses were sailing the Aegean Sea." Thus the Oregonian eulogized "the Vanishing Sailer" in 1910.⁹²

definition limited to cases where men were physically assaulted and forcibly put to sea. For others it means that bordertown drugged their customers and sold them to the sea-captains. Nineteenth-century evidence verifies these stories, but also reveals how dramatic incidences of shanghaiing were merged into the broader category of crippling: sailors signed on while under the influence of alcohol, or someone signed for them, or prize-bugs were converted into bodied seamen by fast-talking crews. In still broader terms, crippling was basically a matter of maritime labor exploitation, where a third party profited from a sailor's contract.

In the context of these widespread but milder abuses, the tales of violent kidnappings do not appear as absurd and legendary as they do when considered alone. As is often the case, popular memory isolated and preserved the more remarkable details of shanghaiing and forgot the commonplace ones. This narrow definition of shanghaiing which resulted contributed to its fictional or exaggerated appearance.

Even after dispelling the myths and legendary image of shanghaiing, it seems inconceivable that such a thing lasted as long

V. CONCLUSIONS

Today shanghaiing is widely considered legendary. This is understandable, not only because of the scarcity of information about the clandestine phenomenon, but because of various misconceptions. The term "shanghaiing" has acquired, for some people, a narrow definition limited to cases where men were physically assaulted and forcibly put to sea. For others it means that bartenders drugged their customers and sold them to the sea-captains. Nineteenth-century evidence verifies these stories, but also reveals less dramatic incidences of shanghaiing where it merged into the broader category of crimping: sailors signed on while under the influence of alcohol, or someone signed for them, or plow-boys were converted into Able Bodied Seamen by fast-talking crimps. In still broader terms, crimping was basically a matter of maritime labor exploitation, where a third party profited from a sailor's contract.

In the context of these widespread but milder abuses, the tales of violent kidnappings do not appear as absurd and legendary as they do when considered alone. As is often the case, popular memory isolated and preserved the more remarkable details of shanghaiing and forgot the commonplace ones. This narrow definition of shanghaiing which resulted contributed to its fictional or exaggerated appearance.

Even after dispelling the myths and legendary image of shanghaiing, it seems inconceivable that such a thing lasted as long

as it did. Several features of crimping help explain this. For one thing, it was kept alive like any other underground activity, with pay-offs and political influence such as that of Larry Sullivan.

Secondly, any illegal practice will survive if there is a market for it; because of the shortage of sailors before the growth of steam shipping, captains and shipowners encouraged crimping, either directly or indirectly. They cooperated with the crimps, although they also complained to the officials of the injustice of the system. In San Francisco, shipowners even entered into a formal alliance with crimps in fear of seamen's unions.

Thirdly, seamen had little protection from the crimps. Their unique legal status gave them little control over their own employment and discouraged collective action; the law prevented seamen's unions from gaining control of labor-management more effectively than it prevented crimps from taking this position. It also allowed advanced wages, to the advantage of the crimps, until 1915.

Finally, crimping survived out of a lack of public awareness. Sailors were strangers in town, and the waterfront community was far removed from most people's experience. Even when crimps went beyond seafaring personnel to shanghai landmen, the victims were usually strangers in town, perhaps farmers visiting the city for the first time, like A. E. Clark.

Crimping in Oregon, as compared to other places, was characterized by local features and peculiarities. The basic elements were the same as everywhere: crimps capitalized on advance wages, operated

primarily out of sailors boardinghouses and saloons, and induced desertion, though desertion statistics should be considered no more than a symptom. Oregon had very little union activity in the merchant marine. Instead, the crimps' main opposition came from the Portland Chamber of Commerce, the Seamen's Friend Society, and, in Astoria and perhaps Portland as well, from the efforts of private citizens.

Crimping in Astoria apparently involved more shanghaiing than most ports. This was perhaps due to general lawlessness: as Mont Hawthorne said, "you just couldn't do nothing about nothing them days." It may also have resulted from Astoria's location at the mouth of the river, "a jumping-off place for Oregon and the Northwest," as the Daily Astorian theorized. Astoria accommodated a large amount of maritime traffic in proportion to the town's size; consequently, the large group of crimps which catered to the shipping traffic were able to dominate the small community. Portland also had a unique situation which benefited the crimps. As the state's largest city, Portland attracted newcomers and visitors who were vulnerable to crimps. Accordingly, in Portland men were not often shanghaiing in the narrowest sense of the term; rather, unwary visitors signed ship's articles while intoxicated, or under false pretense, or were simply misguided by romanticized tales of seafaring life.

Though myths persist, the quantity of verifiable fact in this subject is surprising. A close scrutiny of the legend of shanghaiing

reveals more than a collection of exaggerated sea-tales; it uncovers a significant and nearly forgotten segment of Oregon history.

APPENDIX A: INDEX OF CRIMPS

This list includes names of sailor's boardinghouse keepers, boardinghouse runners, or others who have been labeled crimps. The sources are noted:

Tony Arnold: A sailor's boardinghouse keeper in Portland. Identified in Spider Johnson's account to Stewart Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Sunday Oregonian, Northwest Magazine, 15 Oct. and 22 Oct. 1933.

J. P. Betts: A shipping commissioner in Portland from about 1883 until his death in 1908. The Oregonian, 30 Dec. 1975, p. 4 sec. B, claims that he was a crimp. Perhaps this means that he was a corrupt shipping commissioner in the hire of crimps; the Portland Seamen's Friend Society records claim in several places that the port officials during those years were in cooperation with the crimps. Obit. Oregonian, 12 May 1908, p. 10.

Sophie Collins: A sailor's boardinghouse keeper, probably in Astoria. Identified and described in a notebook of uncertain origin among the papers of Russell Dark, Astoria Public Library.

Dick Curran: A sailor's boardinghouse keeper. Also identified in the notebook among Russell Dark's papers.

Nicholas Davich: Blamed for the shanghaiing of Henry Fredriksen. The Daily Astorian, April 19 and 20, 1882, p. 3.

Steve Drummond: A sailor's boardinghouse keeper working with Richard McCarron. Astoria Daily Budget, 10 May 1900, p. 4.

Mike Enright: A sailor's boardinghouse runner working for Jim Turk. Spider Johnson discusses him in "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Sunday Oregonian, Northwest Magazine, 22 Oct. 1933.

David Evans: "The King of the boardinghouse fraternity on the [Puget] Sound," according to the Astoria Daily Budget, 14 Sept. 1899, p. 1. He shanghaiied Paddy Lynch. The Oregonian, 30 Dec. 1975, p. 4 sec. B, also mentions him.

APPENDIX A: INDEX OF CRIMPS

This list includes names of sailor's boardinghouse keepers, boardinghouse runners, or others who have been labeled crimps. The sources are noted:

- Tony Arnold:** A sailor's boardinghouse keeper in Portland. Identified in Spider Johnson's account to Stewart Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Sunday Oregonian, Northwest Magazine, 15 Oct. and 22 Oct. 1933.
- J. P. Betts:** A shipping commissioner in Portland from about 1883 until his death in 1908. The Oregonian, 30 Dec. 1897, p. 4 sec. B, claims that he was a crimp. Perhaps this means that he was a corrupt shipping commissioner in the hire of crimps; the Portland Seamen's Friend Society records claim in several places that the port officials during those years were in co-operation with the crimps. Obit. Oregonian, 12 May 1908, p. 10.
- Sophie Collins:** A sailor's boardinghouse keeper, probably in Astoria. Identified and described in a notebook of uncertain origin among the papers of Russell Dark, Astoria Public Library.
- Dick Curran:** A sailor's boardinghouse keeper. Also identified in the notebook among Russell Dark's papers.
- Nicholas Davich:** Blamed for the shanghaiing of Henry Fredriksen. The Daily Astorian, April 19 and 20, 1882, p. 3.
- Steve Drummond:** A sailor's boardinghouse keeper working with Richard McCarron. Astoria Daily Budget, 10 May 1900, p. 4.
- Mike Enright:** A sailor's boardinghouse runner working for Jim Turk. Spider Johnson discusses him in "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Sunday Oregonian, Northwest Magazine, 22 Oct. 1933.
- David Evans:** "The King of the boardinghouse fraternity on the [Puget] Sound," according to the Astoria Daily Budget, 14 Sept. 1899, p. 1. He shanghai'd Paddy Lynch. The Oregonian, 30 Dec. 1975, p. 4 sec. B, also mentions him.

- Bridget Grant: The contemporary newspapers never called her a crimp or discussed her sailor's boardinghouse. She is described in the notebook in Russell Dark's collection of papers, and accused of being the "queen" of crimps in Portland Seamen's Friend Society's records, R. M. Stuart's report, Oregon Historical Society Mss. 292.
- Ignatius Grant: Contemporary papers never called him crimp. Archie Riekkola, in a telephone interview on March 22, 1984, explained that Nace Grant was involved in shanghaiing in Astoria.
- Peter Grant: Worked with Larry Sullivan and Richard McCarron in Portland. This may be Peter Grant senior, Bridget's husband, but judging by the dates he is mentioned in the papers it was probably Peter Grant junior, her son. Astoria Daily Budget, 2 March 1893, p. 1; 13 March 1893, p. 1; 11 Oct. 1905; p. 6. See also Portland Chamber of Commerce, Memorial in Behalf of Seamen, 1899, and R. M. Stuart's report in the Portland Seamen's Friend Society records.
- Joseph "Bunco" Kelly: He does not discuss crimping in his book Thirteen Years in the Oregon Penitentiary, but he does in his unpublished autobiography, partially reprinted in the Oregonian, 13 March 1979, p. 1. His career is discussed best in Stewart Holbrook's two articles, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Northwest Magazine, 8 Oct. 1933, and "Shanghai Nights in Oregon," True, the Man's Magazine, 21 #123 (1947): 62-75. Also Russell Dark's papers; Richard Dillon, Shanghaiing Days, pp. 269-270; Astoria Daily Budget, 22 July 1907, p. 2; Daily Morning Astorian, 2 Nov. 1890, p. 3; 28 Oct. 1891, p. 3; 15 Nov. 1891, p. 3; Oregonian, 27 Oct. 1890, p. 3; 9 July 1957, p. 10; 9 July 1974, p. 17; 30 Dec. 1975, p. 4 sec. B; Oregon Journal, 10 June 1969, p. 11.
- J. J. Kenney: Paddy Lynch's partner. Astoria Daily Budget, 22 Sept. 1899, p. 4; 9 Jan. 1902, p. 9.
- Patrick Lynch: Astoria sailor's boardinghouse keeper. Astoria Daily Budget, 27 May 1899, p. 4; 14 Sept. 1899, p. 1; 22 Sept. 1899, p. 4; 10 May 1900, p. 4; 9 Jan. 1902, p. 4; 10 Oct. 1906, p. 6; 31 March 1908, p. 6; Daily Morning Astorian, 28 Jan. 1903, p. 3; 4 March 1903, p. 3; 17 March 1903, p. 3; 18 March 1903, p. 3; 19 March 1903, p. 1; 19 April 1903, p. 1; 26 April 1903, p. 3.
- Richard McCarron: Worked with Larry Sullivan. See Portland Chamber of Commerce, Memorial in Behalf of Seamen, 1899, and the Daily Astorian, 22 Nov. 1891, p. 3 sec. 1; working with Steve Drummond, Astoria Daily Budget, 10 May 1900, p. 4. With Jim Turk, Daily Morning Astorian, 15 Nov. 1891, p. 3.

Hugh McCormack: A sailor's boardinghouse runner in Astoria.
Described in a notebook in Russell Dark's papers, Astoria
Public Library.

"Mysterious" Billy Smith: A sailor's boardinghouse keeper in Portland.
Worked with Jim and Harry White, cooperated with Larry Sullivan.
Stewart Holbrook knew him personally: "Shanghai Days in the
City of Roses," Northwest Magazine, Oct. 22, 1933; "Shanghai
Nights in Oregon," True, the Man's Magazine, 21 #123 (1947):
62-75.

Larry Sullivan: A sailor's boardinghouse keeper in Portland. See
Russell Dark, papers; Richard Dillon, Shanghaiing Days, pp. 270-
271; Stewart Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses,"
Northwest Magazine, 1 Oct. and 8 Oct. 1933; Portland Chamber of
Commerce, Memorial in Behalf of Seamen, 1899; Portland Seamen's
Friend Society records, Oregon Historical Society Mss. 292;
Astoria Daily Budget, 29 Sept. 1899, p. 1; 4 April 1904, p. 6;
4 June 1915, p. 2; The Daily Astorian, 22 Nov. 1891, p. 3 sec. 1;
Daily Morning Astorian, 9 Jan. 1891, p. 1; Oregonian, 29 Sept.
1895, p. 10; 9 July 1974, p. 17; Oregon Journal, 30 Aug. 1917,
p. 8; 9 June 1918, p. 4; 11 June 1969, p. 10; 12 June 1969, p. 4.

Theodore Tobiason: Worked with Paddy Lynch and was also convicted of
shanghaiing Charles Gardiner, Daily Morning Astorian, 26 April
1903, p. 3.

Frank Turk: Son of James Turk and a sailor's Boardinghouse keeper in
Astoria. Apparently he is not the son that Jim Turk shanghaiied.
See Stewart Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses,"
Northwest Magazine, 22 Oct. 1933; Astoria Daily Budget, 14 Sept.
1899, p. 1 (worked with Paddy Lynch); 6 Feb. 1900, p. 4; 5 May
1902, p. 4.

James Turk: Considered the founder of crimping in Portland by the
Portland Chamber of Commerce, Report of the Committee on Seamen's
Abuses, 1898. See also Russell Dark's papers; Stewart Holbrook,
"Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Northwest Magazine, 22 Oct.
1933; Daily Morning Astorian, 15 Nov. 1891, p. 3 (working with
Richard McCarron).

Jim Vierck: Named as a crimp in the Oregonian, 30 Dec. 1975, p. 4
sec. b.

Jim and Harry White: Sailor's boardinghouse keepers, in Portland.
Worked with "Mysterious" Billy Smith. See Stewart Holbrook,
"Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Northwest Magazine, 22 Oct.
1933; also "Shanghai Nights in Oregon," True, the Man's Magazine,
21 #123 (1947): 62-75.

APPENDIX B: SEAMEN'S UNIONS

Union activity originated in the sphere of coastwise sailing, because deep-sea men were much more difficult to organize. As a coasting seamen's concern, unionism in the nineteenth century is tangential to the main topic of this study, because shanghaiing and crimping were more evident in deep-sea sailing than in the coastwise trade. However, the unions' expressed concern about crimps proves that crimping was not completely limited to the deep-sea trade, and that unions tried to benefit deep-sea crewmen although they could not organize them.

Early efforts at maritime unionism in San Francisco failed to accomplish anything significant. These included a sailor's strike in 1850; the brief Seamen's Friendly Union Society, in 1866; a three-week strike in the same year; and the Seamen's Protective Union of 1878. At first crimps did not always oppose these ventures. Boardinghouse keepers participated in the strike of 1866 and in the Seamen's Protective Union, both of which agitated for higher wages to the mutual benefit of crimps and sailors. But after 1880, the crimps constantly fought the maritime unions, which sought to gain control of hiring. In spite of this, organizations of the 1880s finally managed to accomplish some durability and influence.

The Seamen's Protective Association, born of anti-Chinese sentiment, formed in 1880 when the Pacific Mail Steamship Company vessels needed to ship through the commissioner's office; since the

fired a number of Caucasian sailors in favor of cheaper Oriental labor. During its two-year life, the Association unsuccessfully proposed a bill requiring that two-thirds of every crew on American-owned ships be U.S. citizens; it agitated for a twelve-hour day; and with perhaps slightly more success, it called attention to exploitations of seamen's labor and to the brutality of ship-board discipline. *Shipowners' Association strengthened the grade book system.*

The next organization, inspired by salary cuts in 1885, called itself the Coast Seamen's Union. At first the Union accomplished its goal of higher wages. But the CSU's success prompted a counter-movement by the shipowners. The Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast came into being for the immediate purpose of breaking a seamen's strike in 1886, which it did. After that, the Association issued "grade books" to seamen; the seamen had to relinquish their Union cards in order to get a grade book, and they had to have a grade book in order to get a job from any member of the Association. The CSU, however, survived this setback. After a couple of years of relative inactivity, the union began to function with a slightly more socialist bent. *more without change. Their rotary hiring*

system Union rhetoric began to focus on the legal status of seamen. Andrew Furuseth, the Union's secretary and one of its more socialist elements, discovered a bargaining wedge for seamen of the coastwise trade which brought new impetus to the movement. An 1874 amendment stated vaguely that the provisions of the 1872 Shipping Commissioners Act did not apply to coastwise shipping, meaning that only deep-sea vessels needed to ship through the commissioner's office; since the

Act also contained clauses about imprisonment for desertion, with the Furuseth interpreted the revised law to mean that coasting seamen could not be arrested for desertion. Many courts of law agreed with him. Union members adopted the tactic of using their grade-books to get a berth, then deserting just before the ship was ready to sail, causing expensive delay. They were also able to conduct strikes of a sort. The Shipowner's Association abandoned the grade book system. The CSU in San Francisco grew, then set up agencies in Eureka, San Pedro, San Diego, and Seattle. In 1890, an act intended to curb union agitation extended the imprisonment penalty for desertion to coasting seamen once again. But by this time the Union had strength in numbers, and gained more strength in 1891 by amalgamating with a steamship sailors' union to form the Sailor's Union of the Pacific. In 1892 the SUP joined East Coast and Great Lakes seamen in the AFL National Seamen's Union, which became the International Seamen's Union in 1895. In 1891, the SUP established its own hiring halls in opposition to the boarding house keepers. The hiring halls provided job opportunities for members without charge. Their rotary hiring system allowed seamen to remain in the employ of a ship from one voyage to the next if desired. Shipowners countered with their own employment offices, specifically for nonunion labor. These agencies, coupled with an economic depression, forced the SUP to relinquish its claim on control of hiring, and the hiring halls became an optional service for members.

The SUP demonstrated significant political influence with the election of Congressman James Maguire, who introduced a series of bills leading to the Maguire Act of 1895. This Act repealed the 1890 law concerning the imprisonment of deserting coastwise seamen. It also stated that boardinghouse keepers could not hold tenants' clothing as a lien against debts; in 1904 this became a misdemeanor in order to facilitate more immediate prosecution, since the prosecuting sailor had to go to sea. Seamen's clothing was considered a professional tool rather than a personal possession, since they needed proper clothing to sail. The Maguire Act also renewed the prohibition against allotments, but only for coastwise seamen. The reasoning behind this was that in the coastwise trade, with shorter voyages, relatively frequent pay-days, and brief stop-overs in port, seamen had no opportunity to accumulate legitimate debts large enough to warrant an allotment. However, the clause concerning allotments only applied to those coasting sailors which shipped before a Shipping Commissioner, which was optional; therefore the Act was in no way a comprehensive ban against allotments, nor a serious threat to crimps.

The 1896 pact between the Shipowner's Association of the Pacific and the Coasting Seamen's Shipping Association whereby sailors who hoped to get a berth had to stay in certain boardinghouses, mentioned on page 20 of this study, testifies to the power crimps still exercised over hiring at this time in San Francisco. Unions still had very little authority in the face of dual resistance by both crimps

vessel owners did; the strike was successful.

and shipowners. The 1897 decision on the Arago Case shows that even the advances that had been made in the legal status of seamen were not very solid (see pages 2 and 3 of this study). However, the SUP again showed legislative power by encouraging the passage of the White Act, which abolished imprisonment for desertion and considerably changed ship-board working conditions. In 1899, the Union accomplished a successful strike against the Shipowners' Association for wage increases. Membership grew considerably that year. A larger strike in 1901 included coasting seamen and other waterfront employees, such as longshoremen; it lasted for two and a half months. The strike had begun for fear of anti-union actions by the Employers' Association, and ended in more or less of a draw, with a promise from employers not to discriminate against union employees, but no real gains. After the strike was over, various negotiations continued, and in 1902 the SUP signed a working and wages agreement with the Shipowners' Association. The agreement marked the first full recognition of the SUP by shipowners. The provisions set wages at certain rates for voyages to certain ports; established overtime pay for anything over a nine-hour day; gave the SUP the right to furnish crews outside San Francisco and the Shipowners' Association control over hiring in San Francisco; discouraged sympathy strikes; and established a standing grievance committee. After that, the SUP's activity was largely a matter of enforcing the terms of the agreement. In 1906 there was another strike involving the Steamship Association, because the steamship owners refused to grant a five dollar wage increase when the sailing vessel owners did; the strike was successful.

After 1906, no more strikes occurred until 1921. The Union spent these years building its membership and extending influence gradually into deep-sea shipping as well as coastwise shipping. The International Seamen's Union formed a legislative committee which formulated a coherent program of seamen's legislation, but made little headway until 1915. Furuseth enlisted the aid and interest of Senator La Follette of Wisconsin, who pushed a seamen's bill through the Senate in 1912. The same bill was introduced and passed through the House of Representatives by William Wilson of Pennsylvania. However, President Taft refused to sign the bill, and the seamen's supporters had to reintroduce the seamen's cause at the next session of Congress. The bill passed both Houses again, and was signed by President Wilson in 1915. The Seamen's Act of 1915 was the greatest accomplishment of the unions up to that point. It had profound repercussions in both coastwise and deep-sea shipping, and established the position of seamen's unions more effectively than anything that had happened since the early beginnings of collective bargaining in the merchant marine.

Sources:

Silas Blake Axtell, Merchant Seamen's Law (New Bedford: The Darwin Press, 1945). George C. Garbesi, Consular Authority Over Seamen from the United States Point of View (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968). Joseph P. Goldberg, The Maritime Story: A Study in Labor-Management Relations (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958). Betty V. H. Schneider, Industrial Relations in the West Coast Maritime Industry

(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958). William L. Standard, Merchant Seamen: A Short History of Their Struggles (New York: International Publishers, 1947). Paul S. Taylor, The Sailor's Union of the Pacific (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1923). Rudolf Walter Wissmann, The Maritime Industry: The Role of Federal Regulation in Establishing Labor and Safety Standards (New York: Cornell Maritime Press, 1942).

Maritime History, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1954, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

Journal of Maritime Law and Commerce, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, p. 100.

ENDNOTES

- ¹Elmo Paul Hohman, Seamen Ashore (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952), p. 2.
- ²Joseph P. Goldberg, The Maritime Story (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), p. 15.
- ³Ibid., p. 15.
- ⁴Hohman, Seamen Ashore, p. 2.
- ⁵G. Hinchliff, "An Ostend East Indiaman, 1718-20," The Mariner's Mirror 59 (1973): 291-298.
- ⁶J. R. Hutchinson, The Press-Gang Afloat and Ashore (London: Eveleigh Nash, 1913), p. 7.
- ⁷Ibid., p. 107.
- ⁸Stephen Jones, "Blood-Red Roses; the Supply of Merchant Seamen in the Nineteenth Century," The Mariner's Mirror 58 (1972), p. 432.
- ⁹Christopher Lloyd, The British Seaman (London: Collins, 1968), p. 148.
- ¹⁰Stewart Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Northwest Magazine, Oct. 1, 1933.
- ¹¹The Oxford English Dictionary says only that the term originated in the U. S. The Dictionary of Americanisms (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951) says that the term originated in San Francisco around 1850. Rudolf Walter Wissmann agrees with this in The Maritime Industry (New York: Cornell Maritime Press, 1942), p. 15. Andrew Furuseth, who was a sailor for a few years before becoming secretary of the Seamen's Union, also said that the term came from men being put aboard a ship to China unwillingly: See p. 50 of the Congressional Hearings on H.R. 10026, 64th Cong., 1st sess., 1916.
- ¹²Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Oct. 1, 1933.
- ¹³Portland Seamen's Friend Society, Records, Mss. 292-1, Oregon Historical Society Library, Portland, Oregon.
- ¹⁴U.S. Congress, Merchant Marine Commission, Report of the Merchant Marine Commission (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905), pp. 1080-1083, 1104.

- 15 Judith Fingard, Jack in Port (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), p. 190.
- 16 Judith Fingard, "Masters and Friends, Crimps and Abstainers: Agents of Control in 19th Century Sailortown," Acadiensis 8 (1978), p. 22.
- 17 Fingard, Jack in Port, pp. 214-215.
- 18 Portland Seamen's Friend Society, Records.
- 19 Oregon Journal, 12 June 1969, p. 4.
- 20 Fingard, Jack in Port, p. 201.
- 21 Ibid., p. 197.
- 22 Oregonian, 15 July 1891, p. 4.
- 23 Herbert G. Gutman, "Documents on Negro Seamen During the Reconstruction Period," Labor History, Vol. 7, no. 3, p. 307.
- 24 Goldberg, The Maritime Story, p. 17.
- 25 Oregonian, 13 March 1979, p. 1.
- 26 Richard Dillon, Shanghaiing Days, p. 234.
- 27 Portland Chamber of Commerce, Report of the Committee on Seamen's Abuses (Portland: Chamber of Commerce, 1898), p. 6.
- 28 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Oct. 1, 1933.
- 29 Ibid., Oct. 22, 1933.
- 30 Ibid., Oct. 1 and Oct. 22, 1933.
- 31 Astoria Daily Budget, 6 Feb. 1900, p. 4.
- 32 Portland Chamber of Commerce, Report, p. 6.
- 33 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Oct. 8, 1933.
- 34 Ibid., 26 Feb. 1978, p. 8.
- 35 Ibid., 1 Oct. 1933.
- 36 Ibid., 29 Oct. to 12 Nov. 1933.

- 37 Portland Seamen's Friend Society, Records.
- 38 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," Oct. 22, 1933.
- 39 Martha McKeown, The Trail Led North (New York: Macmillan, 1948), p. 7.
- 40 Ibid., pp. 9-10.
- 41 The Daily Astorian, 20 April 1882, p. 3.
- 42 Ibid., 18 April 1882, p. 3.
- 43 Ibid., 19 April 1882, p. 3, and 20 April 1882, p. 3.
- 44 From a notebook found among Russell Dark's papers, Astoria Public Library.
- 45 Daily Morning Astorian, 7 Nov. 1890, p. 3.
- 46 Archie Riekkola, Interview, 22 March 1984. He refers to a farm owned by his father in Walluski, and one owned by Anna Bay in Jewell.
- 47 Portland Seamen's Friend Society, Records. From R. M. Stuart's report.
- 48 Astoria Daily Budget, 17 Dec. 1923, p. 1. This was Bridget Grant's obituary.
- 49 Russell Dark's papers, Astoria Public Library.
- 50 Portland Seamen's Friend Society, Records. From R. M. Stuart's report.
- 51 Archie Riekkola, Interview, 22 March 1984.
- 52 Oregonian, 29 Oct. 1892, p. 6.
- 53 E. Kimbark MacColl. The Shaping of a City (Portland: Georgian Press, 1976), p. 206.
- 54 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 1 Oct. 1933.
- 55 Portland Seamen's Friend Society, Records. From R. M. Stuart's report.
- 56 Ibid. From a letter to the Mayor of Portland, June 20, 1902.

- 57 Ibid. From R. M. Stuart's report.
- 58 Oregon Journal, 11 June 1969, p. 10.
- 59 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 1 Oct. 1933.
- 60 Kimbark MacColl, Shaping of a City, p. 206.
- 61 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 1 Oct. 1933.
- 62 Astoria Daily Budget, 10 May 1900, p. 4.
- 63 Oregonian, 29 Sept. 1895, p. 10; 12 June 1969, p. 4.
- 64 Astoria Daily Budget, 16 Aug. 1900, p. 1.
- 65 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 1 Oct. 1933; "Shanghai Nights in Oregon," True, the Man's Magazine, 21 #123 (1947), p. 70.
- 66 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 8 Oct. 1933.
- 67 Portland Chamber of Commerce, Report of the Committee on Seamen's Abuses.
- 68 Mike Jones, "The History of Third and Burnside is the History of the North End," Metropolis, Jan. 1975, p. 1.
- 69 See page 23 for the rest of this quote. Northwest Magazine, 26 Feb 1976, p. 8.
- 70 Portland Seamen's Friend Society, Records. From R. M. Stuart's Report.
- 71 Stewart Holbrook, "Portland's Greatest Moral Crusade," Northwest Magazine, 2 Aug. 1936.
- 72 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 1 Oct. and 8 Oct. 1933; "Shanghai Nights in Oregon," True, the Man's Magazine, 21 #123 (1947), p. 65. Oregon Journal, 10 June 1969, p. 11.
- 73 Oregonian, 13 March 1969, p. 1.
- 74 Northwest Magazine, 26 Feb. 1978, p. 8.
- 75 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 1 Oct. and 8 Oct. 1933; "Shanghai Nights in Oregon," 21 #123 (1947), pp. 67-69; MacColl, Shaping of a City, p. 195; Oregonian, 9 July 1957, p. 10; 30 Dec. 1975, p. 4 sec. B; Oregon Journal, 10 June 1969, p. 11.

- 76 Oregonian, 27 Oct. 1890, p. 3.
- 77 Joseph Kelly, Thirteen Years in the Oregon Penitentiary (Portland: 1908), pp. 6-7.
- 78 Holbrook, "Shanghai Nights in Oregon," 21 #123 (1947), p. 70.
- 79 Oregonian, 13 March 1979, p. 1.
- 80 Astoria Daily Budget, 17 Aug. 1905, p. 6; 17 July 1906, p. 6.
- 81 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 22 Oct. 1933.
- 82 Astoria Daily Budget, 27 May 1899, p. 4; 14 Sept. 1899, p. 1; 22 Sept. 1899, p. 4.
- 83 Holbrook, "Shanghai Nights in Oregon," 21 #123 (1947), p. 70.
- 84 Oregonian, 27 May 1906, p. 6.
- 85 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 8 Oct. 1933.
- 86 Dillon, Shanghaiing Days, p. 282; Northwest Magazine, 26 Feb. 1978, p. 9.
- 87 Ibid., p. 9.
- 88 Goldberg, The Maritime Story, p. 14.
- 89 Paul Taylor, The Sailor's Union of the Pacific (New York: Ronald Press, 1923), p. 31.
- 90 The Daily Astorian, 11 April 1883, p. 3.
- 91 Holbrook, "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses," 8 Oct. 1933.
- 92 Oregonian, 13 March 1910, p. 6 sec. 3.

Holbrook, Stewart H. "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses." Sunday Oregonian, Northwest Magazine, weekly series of articles from 1 Oct. 1933 to 12 Nov. 1933.

Based on interviews with Portland residents, especially Spider Johnson and A. J. Clark. Presents contemporary points of view from people who were involved in the Portland underworld as well as from someone who was shanghaiated once.

Holbrook, Stewart H. "Shanghai Nights in Oregon." True, the Man's Magazine, vol. 21, no. 123 (1947): 62-75.

Based on the same as previous entry, with additional details from other oral sources.

I. Shanghaing and Crimping

Dark, Russell. Papers and journals. In the private possession of Bruce Bernie, Astoria Public Library, Astoria, Oregon.

Miscellaneous unsorted papers. Includes a compilation of newspaper references to Larry Sullivan and Joseph "Bunco" Kelly, also a notebook of various details about crimps from Astoria.

McKeown, Martha Ferguson. The Trail Led North. New York: Macmillan, 1961.

Mostly concerns San Francisco, but includes stories from Oregon taken from Stewart Holbrook's research mainly. Not documented or indexed.

Fingard, Judith. Jack in Port. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

A history of crimping in Eastern Canada. This book is useful to a study of crimping in the United States because it provides a more careful analysis of the practice and its causes than most sources.

"Masters and Friends, Crimps and Abstainers: Agents of Control in 19th Century Sailortown." Acadiensis, vol. 8, no. 1 (1978): 22-46.

Brief discussion of crimping and opposition to it. Based on the same material as her book.

Holbrook, Stewart H. "Shanghai Days in the City of Roses." Sunday Oregonian, Northwest Magazine, weekly series of articles from 1 Oct. 1933 to 12 Nov. 1933.

Interviews:

Based on interviews with Portland residents, especially Spider Johnson and A. E. Clark. Presents contemporary points of view from people who were involved in the Portland underworld as well as from someone who was shanghaied once.

Holbrook, Stewart H. "Shanghai Nights in Oregon." True, the Man's Magazine, vol. 21, no. 123 (1947): 62-75.

Based on the same research as the previous entry, with additional details from other oral sources.

Kelly, Joseph. Thirteen Years in the Oregon Penitentiary. Portland: 1908.

Joseph "Bunco" Kelly was a crimp in Portland who served time for murder and was later pardoned. His book is mostly about prison reform and about his own innocence in the murder case of which he was convicted, but he includes other autobiographical details.

McKeown, Martha Ferguson, The Trail Led North. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

The autobiography of McKeown's uncle, Mont Hawthorne, in his own words as related to her. Hawthorne's description of Astoria in the 1880s is detailed and claims that the crimps held considerable power.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Hearing on the Bill (H. R. 383) to Prohibit Shanghaing and Peonage in the United States, 59th Cong., 1st sess., 1906.

Statements and letters concerning the problems of enforcing laws against shanghaing and peonage. Suggestions on how to make the wording of House Bill 383 more effective. Emphasis is on the oyster industry on the East Coast, and peonage on the oyster boats.

Shanghaing in the United States. 59th Cong., 1st sess., 1906. H. Rept. 4267.

Describes and evaluates laws relating to shanghaing and their effectiveness. General conclusion that it is difficult to enforce these laws.

Interviews:

Archie Riekkola, Astoria, Oregon. Telephone interview on March 22, 1984.

Gutman, Herbert G. "Documents on Negro Seamen During the Reconstruction Period." Labor History, Vol. 7, no. 3: 307.

Discussion of an 1867 letter from a British Consul concerning the crimps' treatment of black sailors.

News Sources:

- The Astoria Daily Budget, 2 March 1893, p. 1; 13 March 1893, p. 1; 14 Nov. 1894, p. 1; 27 May 1899, p. 4; 14 Sept. 1899, p. 1; 22 Sept. 1899, p. 1; 6 Feb. 1900, p. 4; 10 May 1900, p. 4; 16 Aug. 1900, p. 1; 9 Jan. 1902, p. 4; 5 May 1902, p. 4; 4 April 1904, p. 6; 10 Oct. 1906, p. 6; 31 March 1908, p. 6; 1 June 1911, p. 6; 6 Sept. 1911, p. 6; 24 Jan. 1913, p. 1; 15 Jan. 1914, p. 6; 4 June 1915, p. 2; 18 May 1916, p. 6; 3 Jan. 1917, p. 1; 9 May 1917, p. 5; 11 May 1917, p. 5; 20 June 1917, p. 5; 7 Aug. 1917, p. 5; 17 Dec. 1923, p. 1.
- The Columbian (Vancouver, WA), 14 July 1980, p. 13, sec. 3.
- The Community Press (Portland), 2 July 1975, p. 1, sec. B.
- The Daily Astorian, 18 April 1882, p. 3; 19 April 1882, p. 3; 20 April 1882, p. 3; 22 Nov. 1891, p. 3, sec. 1.
- The Daily Morning Astorian, 2 Nov. 1890, p. 3; 7 Nov. 1890, p. 3; 9 Jan. 1891, p. 1; 21 Aug. 1891, p. 3; 28 Oct. 1891, p. 3; 15 Nov. 1891, p. 3; 17 July 1895, p. 4; 9 Jan. 1898, p. 4; 28 Jan. 1903, p. 3; 4 March 1903, p. 3; 17 March 1903, p. 3; 18 March 1903, p. 3; 19 March 1903, p. 1; 19 April 1903, p. 1; 26 April, 1903, p. 3.
- The Oregonian, 27 Oct. 1890, p. 3; 15 July 1891, p. 4; 29 Oct. 1892, p. 6; 29 Sept. 1895, p. 10; 19 April 1898, p. 2; 27 May 1906, p. 6; 12 May 1908, p. 10; 9 July 1957, p. 10, sec. 1; 9 July 1974, p. 17, sec. 1; 21 Dec. 1975, p. 9, sec. D; 30 Dec. 1975, p. 4, sec. B; 22 Nov. 1976, p. 1, sec. D; 26 Feb. 1978, p. 8; Northwest Magazine, 13 March 1979, p. 1.
- The Oregon Journal, 30 Aug. 1917, p. 8; 9 June 1918, p. 4; 10 June 1969, p. 11; 11 June 1969, p. 10; 12 June 1969, p. 4; 28 April 1979, p. 1.
- The Morning Astorian, 8 Jan. 1918, p. 1; 17 May 1918, p. 4; 12 Oct. 1918, p. 1; 2 Dec. 1919, p. 1; 23 March 1929, p. 4; 27 March 1930, p. 4.

II. Crimping as Exploitation

II. a. The Problem

- Gutman, Herbert G. "Documents on Negro Seamen During the Reconstruction Period." Labor History, Vol. 7, no. 3: 307.

Discussion of an 1867 letter from a British Consul concerning the crimps' treatment of black sailors.

Hohman, Elmo Paul. History of American Merchant Seamen. Hamden: Shoe String Press, 1956.

Good general history, covering the nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century.

Goldberg, . Seamen Ashore: A Study of the United Seamen's Service and of Merchant Seamen in Port. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.

An excellent study of the occupation of merchant seamen and their unique problems. A good discussion of crimping is included. The Merchant Seamen's Service was an agency which began later than the scope of this study of crimping.

Portland Chamber of Commerce. Committee on Seamen's Abuses. Memorial in Behalf of Seamen. Portland: Chamber of Commerce, 1899.

A lobbying effort directed towards the Oregon legislature. Includes letters from captains and sailors.

Portland Chamber of Commerce. Committee on Seamen's Abuses. Portland: Chamber of Commerce, 1898.

Includes desertion statistics, and recommends legislation against crimps.

U. S. Congress. Senate. The Merchant Marine Commission. Report of the Merchant Marine Commission, Together with the Testimony Taken at the Hearings. 3 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905.

Hearings include various issues involving the merchant marine. Testimonies from sailors, captains, shipowners, union leaders, lawyers, and boardinghouse keepers concerning these issues, including crimping. Volume one, East Coast Hearings; Volume two, the Great Lakes and the Pacific Coast; Volume three, the Gulf Coast.

II. b. Labor-Management Solutions

Axtell, Silas Blake. Merchant Seamen's Law. New Bedford: Darwin Press, 1945.

Comprehensive history of merchant marine legislation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Garbesi, George C. Consular Authority Over Seamen from the United States Point of View. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.

Comprehensive history of merchant marine laws in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Goldberg, Joseph P. The Maritime Story: A Study in Labor-Management Relations. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Discusses the beginnings of collective bargaining in the merchant marine and opposition to it by crimps and shipowners, sometimes captains.

Schneider, Betty V. H. Industrial Relations in the West Coast Maritime Industry. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958.

Good study of unionism, with a brief discussion of crimping.

Standard, William L. Merchant Seamen: A Short History of Their Struggles. New York: International Publishers, 1947.

Comprehensive history of seamen's unions all over the U. S. Interesting reference to crimps and shanghaiing as late as 1935, which is unusual.

Taylor, Paul S. The Sailor's Union of the Pacific. New York: Ronald Press, 1923.

The first part of the book is a pro-union history of the sailors' struggle against the shipowner and the crimp; the rest deals with unionism and legislation after 1915's Seamen's Act.

U. S. Congress. House. Commissioner of Navigation. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Navigation for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1902. 57th Cong., 2nd sess., 1902. H. Doc. 14.

Includes a chapter on the decline of crimping, and gives useful information about seamen's wages and allotments.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Commerce. Advance Wages of Seamen in Merchant Service. 47th Cong., 1st sess., 1882. H. Rept. 1757.

Discussion of the way crimps use advance wages as blood-money, rather than collecting the advances for legitimate debts.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Commerce. Report on Merchant Seamen. 44th Cong., 1st sess., 1876. H. Rept. 438.

Recommendations for amendments of the Shipping Act of 1872. Reports of the ineffectiveness of some shipping commissioners in controlling the crimping problem.

U. S. Congress. House. Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on the Boarding of Vessels. 56th Cong., 1st sess., 1899, H. Rept. 301.

Recommendations for legislation to keep the general public from boarding vessels in port because of the way crimps entice seamen to desert.

Hearings Held Before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on House Bill 11372. 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1911.

Statements and letters commenting on issues such as safety at sea, the imprisonment penalty for desertion, allotments, crimping, etc.

Hearings Held Before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on House Bill 11372. 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1912.

Continuation of the previous hearings.

Hearings Held Before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on S. 136. 63rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1913.

Hearings on the Senate Bill concerning the same issues as the House Bill of the previous two entries.

Hearings Before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on H. R. 10026. 64th Cong., 1st sess., 1916.

Hearings to amend the 1915 Seamen's Act. Same basic issues as the previous hearings, which led up to the Act.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Commerce. Effective Remedy Against the Illegal Detention of Seamen's Clothing. 58th Cong., 2nd sess., 1904. S. Rept. 177.

Report recommends that the offense be made a misdemeanor in order that it can be more effectively controlled.

Wissmann, Rudolf Walter. The Maritime Industry: The Role of Federal Regulation in Establishing Labor and Safety Standards. New York: Cornell Maritime Press, 1942.

Comprehensive history of maritime laws. Covers late nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries.

News Sources:

The Astoria Daily Budget, 28 Jan 1899, p. 1.

The Daily Astorian, 21 April 1882, p. 3; 9 Dec. 1882, p. 3; 11 April 1883, p. 3; 8 Aug. 1884, p. 3.

The Daily Morning Astorian, 23 May 1903, p. 3.

The Oregonian, 4 Nov. 1893, p. 3; 6 Jan. 1909, p. 8; 13 March 1910, p. 6; 24 April 1915, p. 6; 20 May 1916, p. 16.

The Oregon Journal, 20 Feb. 1916, p. 11, sec. 1.

II. c. Solutions of Seamen's Reformers

The American Seamen's Friend Society. The American Seamen's Friend Society. New York: 1953.

Pamphlet about the history and functions of the society, and its goals to reform and protect seamen.

Hines, H. K. At Sea and in Port. Portland: J. K. Gill, 1898.

A biography of William S. Fletcher, who was a seamen's missionary in Portland for thirty years.

Portland Seamen's Friend Society. Records, Mss. 292, Oregon Historical Society Library, Portland.

Incomplete set of records from 1877 to 1915. Includes minutes of meetings and correspondences. Some of the letters are lobbying efforts for legislation against crimping, others include a series of interviews of captains conducted by R. M. Stuart of the Chamber of Commerce.

News Sources:

The Oregonian, 16 Feb. 1910, p. 10.

III. Vice and the Portland Underground

Holbrook, Stewart H. "Portland's Greatest Moral Crusade." Sunday Oregonian, Northwest Magazine, series of articles, weekly from 2 Aug. 1936 to 9 Sept. 1936.

Account of an 1895 moral crusade directed at Portland brothels, gambling houses, vice and graft.

Jones, Michael P. "The History of Third and Burnside is the History of the North End." Metropolis, Jan. 1975.

Description of the Burnside-area sailor-town, especially Erickson's Hotel. Jones has interviewed Portland old-timers concerning this.

MacColl, E. Kimbark. The Shaping of a City. Portland: Georgian Press, 1976.

Portland's political history from 1885 to 1915. Thorough study of political corruption included. He mentions Larry Sullivan in connection with Jonathan Bourne, and "Bunco" Kelly in connection with crimping.

IV. Origins of Crimping in England.

Bromley, J. S. ed. The Manning of the Royal Navy: Selected Public Pamphlets 1693-1873. v. 119 of Publications of the Navy Records Society. London: 1974.

Discusses impressment into the Royal Navy and the problems it presents; mentions crimping as related to this.

Hinchliff, G. "An Ostend East Indiaman, 1718-20." The Mariner's Mirror 59 (1973): 291-298.

Brief discussion of an eighteenth-century merchant who seems to have purchased seamen through a crimp in 1718, a very early reference to the practice.

Hutchinson, J. R. The Press-Gang Afloat and Ashore. London: Eveleigh Nash, 1913.

Thorough history of press-gangs in England, with a brief discussion of crimps as competition to the press-gangs.

Jones, Stephen. "Blood-Red Roses: The Supply of Merchant Seamen in the Nineteenth Century." The Mariner's Mirror 58 (1972): 429-442.

Brief but clear account of crimping, the press-gang, and seamen's working conditions in nineteenth-century England.

Lloyd, Christopher. The British Seaman, 1200-1860: A Social Survey. London: Collins, 1968.

Includes a discussion of press-gangs and of the rare occasion when crimps were hired by the navy.