OMB No 1024 0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is for use in documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Type all entries.

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Tobacco Buildings in Lancaster City

B. Associated Historic Contexts

Tobacco Industry, Lancaster City, 1880-1940

C. Geographical Data

Within the boundaries of Lancaster City, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (7.3 square miles).

☐ See continuation sheet

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Planning and Evaluation.

Signature of certifying official — Date: 7/31/90

State or Federal agency and bureau

I, hereby, certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Signature of the Keeper of the National Register — Date: 9/21/90

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

Discuss each historic context listed in Section B.

[X] See continuation sheet

HISTORIC CONTEXT

Introduction

In 1681 William Penn, Quaker founder of Pennsylvania, wrote a promotional document called Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania in which he extolled the virtues of the place and enumerated the profitable commodities he thought it capable of producing. On this list containing items such as silk, wines, iron, and furs, Penn included tobacco.[1] Visionary that he was, Penn's statement about the possibilities of successfully growing tobacco in Pennsylvania eventually came to pass--but not until the 1830s. After 150 years of growing only inferior quality tobacco for home consumption, Pennsylvania farmers introduced new strains in Lancaster and York Counties which met with resounding success, especially in Lancaster County. With respect to tobacco production, Penn's expectations of "future ease and plenty"[2] to be had in Pennsylvania were fully met.

This study will examine the tobacco industry resources in Lancaster City, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, during the period c. 1880-1940. It will look at the background of cigar leaf tobacco culture and manufacture, particularly the leaf tobacco warehousing system, and will discuss the the role Lancaster County's tobacco industry played in the economic, agricultural, and social history of Pennsylvania.

Lancaster County

Lancaster County was established in 1729. It was formed out of the back country of Chester County, one of the three original counties laid out in 1682. It was named for the home shire of Englishman John Wright,[3] who was instrumental in having the county established.

One of the border counties of southern Pennsylvania, Lancaster County is situated between York and Chester Counties and contains 941 square miles, or 602,240 acres. It lies on the east bank of the Susquehanna River which separates it from York County. Topographically, Lancaster County, which is southeast of all the mountain ridges of Pennsylvania, is generally made up of undulating plains and gently rolling hills. On the extreme northern sections there are some crests in mountainous areas which rise above 600 feet; however, most of the county is less than 450

feet above sea level. In the early 1880s Lancaster County encompassed forty townships, eight boroughs (the largest being Columbia), and the City of Lancaster, according to Franklin Ellis and Samuel Evans, History of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, 1883. Today there are forty-one townships, eighteen boroughs, and the City of Lancaster.[4]

One-half of the county, roughly forming a wide belt running from northeast to southwest, is underlain with Cambrian Ordovician limestones, highly crystalline, contributing to soil considered among the richest in the United States. Lancaster County has been called "The Garden Spot of the State."[5]

Lancaster County was settled by men and women who migrated in groups, many of them seeking religious freedom. These included the English, Scotch-Irish, French Huguenots, Welsh, and German-speaking peoples.[6]

German-speaking settlers were greatly attracted by Lancaster County's rich limestone soil; many found it similar to land along the upper Rhine River where they and their ancestors had grown wheat. A group of Mennonites, German-speaking sectarians from Switzerland, came in 1709 to the lowland area south of the present City of Lancaster. They were followed c. 1740 by German Lutheran and Reformed groups from the upper Rhine area. In the 1750s the Amish, another group of German-speaking sectarians, also migrated. These groups spread through the county: taking up its farmland, clearing the land, passing the farms down from generation to generation.[7]

The Pennsylvania German farmers respected the land: e.g., they practiced good crop rotation and manured the soil. They were the first in Pennsylvania to use lime as a cheap manure, and the results were often noteworthy. In 1754, following a visit to "the beautiful Valley of the Pequea," Governor Pownall found "on every farm a lime kiln and the land adapted for the best of wheat."[8] By 1800 German farmers had turned Pennsylvania into the leader of wheat production in the country and Lancaster County into the leading wheat-growing county. This richness of the soil and these good agricultural practices would in the nineteenth century be major factors leading to Lancaster County's dominance in the production of tobacco.[9]

Although much of Lancaster County's land mass was taken up by agriculture, the county was also early known for industrial

development, particularly in the production of iron. For example, Elizabeth Furnace on Middle Creek (originally in Martic, now in Elizabeth Township) was built c. 1750 by John Huber, a German. In 1757 Huber sold the furnace to Heinrich William Stiegel, later known for his glass manufactory at the town of Manheim. Other important developments of the county were the long rifle and the Conestoga wagon. It is this juxtaposing of agriculture and industry which is characteristic of the county.[10]

Lancaster County was also early known for the many artisans who migrated there. In addition, it has over time developed large commercial and banking sectors. Much of this activity is centered in its major city: Lancaster.

Lancaster City

The largest city in Lancaster County, Lancaster City was also the largest of the early colonial inland cities in America. It was a very early commercial and service center to the rich farm areas which surround it. Set on gently rolling hills, Lancaster is today a city of brick: block after block of rowhouses, shops, warehouses, offices, and public buildings line its streets. There is a decidedly urban appearance to its downtown areas, but one which is conservative and reflective of its colonial period of prominence and nineteenth-century growth. Increasingly, however, industrial complexes have sprawled around the city's perimeter and numerous pockets of light industry have become interspersed with workers' housing close to the city's core. It is a city of contrasts: elegantly remodeled townhouses share a block with deteriorated nineteenth-century brick rowhouses now sadly sheathed in Permastone; shiny modern buses stop to pick up Mennonite farmers and their wives dressed in traditional garb; the busy downtown traffic is monitored by policemen and policewomen mounted on horseback; and in patches behind old rowhouses, along alleyways near abandoned warehouses and factories, are found carefully tended flower gardens.[11]

Lancaster City, earlier the village of "Hickory Town," was laid out in 1728. It officially became the county seat in 1730. In 1742 it became a borough, and was incorporated as a city in 1818. For a brief time in 1777 Congress convened here; from 1799 to 1812 it was the capital of Pennsylvania. In 1800 Lancaster City's population was 4,292; by 1880 its numbers had grown to

25,769. In 1929, toward the end of this period of study, the population was about 60,000.[12]

The city was laid out as a 4.0 square mile grid (sometime after 1929 its boundaries, particularly to the north, began to change--it is presently about 7.3 square miles). The plan of its streets and blocks is rectangular; at its heart is a central open square, Penn Square, located at the intersection of the main east and west, north and south streets. Outside of the one-half mile central core of the city, the square grid plan is relieved at the corners by radial thoroughfares extending to the principal towns in the area to the northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest. The orderly growth of the city on the original grid and radial plan met with disruption only after the advent of the railroads and factories in the latter half of the nineteenth century.[13]

The Coming of the Railroads

Roads were laid out in what was to become Lancaster County beginning in 1718, connecting back country settlers along the Susquehanna and Conestoga Rivers to Philadelphia, New Castle on the Delaware, Harrisburg, and ports in Maryland. Once the county was formed and the county seat located at Lancaster, a "King's Highway" was opened around 1730 which began at the old courthouse in Lancaster and ran almost to the division line of Lancaster and Chester Counties. For sixty years this "great road," or "Old Philadelphia Road," was the shortest way from Lancaster to Philadelphia. In 1792 the earliest turnpike in the United States was laid out between the (then) borough of Lancaster and Philadelphia. Known as the Lancaster Turnpike, it was opened in 1794; by the time Lancaster became the capital in 1799, the turnpike was heavily traveled by stagecoach. The construction of this advanced road was followed by others which linked the county to far-flung points around the state.[14]

As part of Pennsylvania's internal improvements system, the Board of Canal Commissioners was appointed around 1826 to extend an existing canal program along the Susquehanna. In 1830, despite opposition, the canal along the river was extended southward to Columbia, a borough on the river about twelve miles west of Lancaster City. From Columbia, boats were either filled with produce and merchandise or the contents were transferred to carts or railroad cars to be taken to Philadelphia. At Columbia large privately owned warehouses were erected to accommodate the canal boats. This commercial traffic soon was greatly expanded by rail

and bridges linking Columbia with Pittsburgh: via this route goods and immigrants were shipped to the western states.

In 1820 the Conestoga Slack-Water Navigation Company was chartered with the objective of building several dams and locks between the mouth of the creek and Lancaster for the navigation of boats; however, no progress was made on this until 1825. In 1829 large quantities of coal and boards began to arrive in Lancaster by this method. The navigation company alternated between prosperity and hard times for about thirty more years until it was finally displaced by the railroads.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company was chartered in 1823; two of the incorporators were from Lancaster County. The purpose of the company was to build a railroad line between Columbia and Philadelphia, an ambitious project at this early date and one which predates the opening of the canals. This line was to divert the growing trade down the Susquehanna from continuing on to Baltimore. Although the plan at this time did not come to fruition, in 1826 another rail line was chartered, the Columbia, Lancaster, and Philadelphia. The major decision to building the expensive link between Columbia and Philadelphia, either by canal or rail, fell to the legislature which in 1828 passed an act authorizing the canal commissioners, then in charge of internal improvements, to extend what was known as the Eastern Division of the Pennsylvania Canal to the mouth of the Conestoga Creek and to determine the best means of establishing a route between Columbia and Philadelphia. Accordingly, the commissioners voted in favor of a rail line to be known as the Columbia and Philadelphia Railroad (later the Pennsylvania Railroad).

A novel feature of the new railroad was that while it generally ran east and west, a proposed lateral line was to run from Lancaster City to intersect with the main line near Big Conestoga. When word spread that a rail line would run through the heart of the city, there was an outcry of protest. Yet, after grading work was begun on the north side of the city, residents became enthusiastic about the enterprise. The state legislature later appropriated $60,000 to the City of Lancaster to grade and construct the line through the city.

The state's venture into the business of railroading, however, did not prove profitable; in 1855 an act was passed to sell the "Main Line of Public Works." Meanwhile, several other rail lines had been incorporated in Lancaster City during this

period. The Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company successfully operated several freight and passenger lines, with the central station downtown on King Street (since demolished).

Beginning in 1847, Charles Augustus Bitner (later a leaf tobacco dealer) was active with his brother in establishing a successful fast-freight line between Lancaster and Philadelphia. In 1879 Bitner opened an office and freight-house on the Reading Railroad line. Among his various properties were several tobacco warehouse buildings on both sides of Harrisburg Avenue at N. Mulberry Street (see National Register nomination, Harrisburg Avenue Tobacco Historic District, submitted 1990).[15]

Tobacco Culture

Pennsylvania's primacy in the production of wheat declined after the Napoleonic Wars due to a disruption of trade prices. This eventually led to a drop in wheat prices after 1815 and a deflation in the price of wheat farmlands. The situation was further exacerbated ten years later with the completion of the Erie Canal and the concurrent expansion of steamboat and railroad facilities. Wheat and livestock could now be raised in the old Northwest and shipped eastward, providing strong competition to eastern markets. These economic changes caused Lancaster County farmers to seek an alternative market crop.[16]

Tobacco was considered the crop of choice because it fit into the Lancaster County farmers' crop rotation system and the weather was generally favorable for its growth. Many farmers, however, feared the plant would deplete the soil. It was later found that with planned rotation and manuring the plant could be cultivated without ill effects to the rich soil.

Most early efforts at tobacco cultivation in Pennsylvania had taken place in the Philadelphia area and along the Susquehanna River, generally in Lancaster and York Counties. Farmers in Lancaster County had grown tobacco which had evolved from the species nicotina tobacum as early as 1828 near Ephrata, mainly for local consumption. These early attempts in Lancaster and York Counties produced a tobacco described as "shoestring," i.e., heavy, black, and gummy. Nevertheless, Germans of Lancaster County did grow their own, hang it in the barn rafters to cure, and used it for chewing or smoking. The unused leaf, although generally not properly cured, was rolled into cigars known as

"stogies" (named for the nearby Conestoga River), and sold at local stores.[17]

The problem in shifting from tobacco culture as a local effort to one with commercial possibilities was directly linked to the type of leaf grown in Pennsylvania. Despite William Penn's hopes for tobacco cultivation and the colonists' early forays into its production--fourteen cargoes of tobacco were shipped from the Province of Pennsylvania in 1689--the quality continued to be inferior to that of Maryland and Virginia until about 1837.[18]

The change to a superior product came in the 1830s with the introduction of a Cuban tobacco seed called Havana which produced a broader leaf and a better quality tobacco for use in the manufacture of cigars. Benjamin Thomas of York is credited with experimenting with this leaf in 1837 and distributing it to his friends the following year. It was then favorably received when shown in the Philadelphia market. Thus began the Pennsylvania cigar tobacco industry.

Several varieties of cigar leaf tobacco were grown in Pennsylvania and in Lancaster County, but the primary types were the aforementioned Pennsylvania Havana Seed, used for binders (inner wrappers), and Pennsylvania Broadleaf or Seedleaf, developed to have a broader leaf and used primarily for cigar filler (chopped inner leaves), and sometimes for binders and wrappers (wrappers were the outer leaves). Between 1919 and 1940 the once-popular Pennsylvania Havana Seed, grown on the sand river bottoms and a having a thin-bodied leaf when cured, declined substantially in importance. Pennsylvania Broadleaf or Seedleaf superseded it to become the primary type of tobacco grown in Lancaster County and the state.

The growth in the size of the cigar-leaf tobacco production in Lancaster and York Counties is impressive: in 1840 Pennsylvania produced 225,018 pounds of which York County produced 162,748 pounds and Lancaster County produced 48,860. By 1860 over 3,000,000 pounds were produced in the state with Lancaster County the leader in production. In that year, Lancaster County produced 63% of the total cigar leaf; by 1900 it would total over 90% of the state's production (49,335,407 pounds) valued at eight million dollars. Lancaster County has maintained this position: in 1936 Pennsylvania produced 32,500,000 pounds of tobacco, of which Lancaster County produced 31,024,000 pounds or 96.4%, mainly the Pennsylvania Broadleaf or Seedleaf variety. In 1987 Lancaster

County still ranked first in the state for the production of tobacco. (Presently, any tobacco grown in Pennsylvania is known as Type 41.)[19]

By 1883 Lancaster City was second only to New York City as the largest seedleaf market in the country. The seedleaf product for cigars coming out of Lancaster City at that time, in addition to large quantities of leaf used for filler, now also included a fine wrapper leaf which was "soft, pliant, silky...not light nor flimsy, but thin and tough, with veins so small as not to show above the level of the leaf and only a moderate amount of nicotine." It was said to be "handsome in appearance and of pleasant flavor," with a rich dark-brown color, and it burned with a white ash.[20]

The success of tobacco cultivation in Lancaster County has been credited to several factors, especially the rich soil, favorable weather, and practice of its farmers to manure the soil to protect it from depletion. Another contributing factor was the presence in the area of many farm families, particularly among the Amish and Mennonites, who, with their strong work ethic, provided a ready supply of workers almost year round for this labor-intensive crop.[21]

In addition to soil conditions and tobacco-growing skills, the curing, packing, and marketing of the leaf at the farm level are also important. Tobacco grown in Pennsylvania is stalk harvested, i. e., cut in the field and allowed to wilt in the sun for about an hour to prevent breakage when handled. Next, the butt end is speared on a lathe, hung on temporary portable racks known as "scaffolds" or "tobacco ladders," and then hung in ventilated barns to cure for a minimum of eight weeks. In the ventilated barn or curing shed the green ripened leaf which is harvested full of moisture and is brittle and difficult to burn is converted to the brown, easy to burn, aromatic, finished cigar tobacco by a process known as air curing (in contrast to flue curing). (Additional drying of tobacco for storage and to further develop flavor and aroma is referred to as fermentation or "sweating.") Both dry days and humid days are needed to cure the tobacco in the barn. After drying, the tobacco wilts and is brittle, so farmers then waited for humid days or moist snowy days to allow the tobacco to draw in some moisture before making the final preparations prior to sale. This took place originally in the farmer's stripping cellar, or room with an earthen floor. The moisture softened the leaf and made it pliable so it could be

stripped from the stalk leaf by leaf, sorted into good or trash grades, and baled.

When the tobacco was ready to be examined for purchase, buyers and representatives of tobacco dealers and manufacturers from all over the country came to examine the farmer's tobacco. If a sale was made, the bales were weighed, and a check was issued to the grower. After the grower delivered the tobacco to the warehouse, further processing, curing (sweating), and repacking of the leaf were the responsibilities of the packer-dealer at the warehouse. Proper management of the sweat was vital to the finish of the leaf; therefore, it was far better done in the controlled environment of the warehouse than the barn. Eventually specialized tobacco warehouses were built for sweating (or resweating, as it was called; see National Register Nomination, Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District, submitted 1990).[22] The development of this warehousing system (below) to handle and store tobacco in the second half of the nineteenth century was directly linked to the growth of the tobacco products manufacturing industry, primarily cigarmaking, in Lancaster City.

The Tobacco Industry in Lancaster City

Even prior to the great abundance of locally-grown seedleaf tobacco in Lancaster County, there was a small tobacco products manufacturing industry in Lancaster City, local manufacturers using tobacco imported from other states or abroad. It was not difficult to get a start in this business (even as late as the mid-20th century cigarmaking was a cottage industry in parts of Lancaster County). The leaf stems were stripped and the cigars were rolled by hand using little equipment: boards for cutting the leaves, a mold press, and for trimming the ends, a cigar cutter. Most of the early cigarmakers were Germans who brought the skills of this craft with them when they immigrated to Lancaster.[23]

Although there was already a thriving cigarmaking industry in the Philadelphia area in the early nineteenth century (over 39,000,000 Spanish cigars were reported manufactured in 1810 using imported tobacco), Lancaster was not involved in this trade until about the mid-century.[24]

An examination of the decennial U. S. Census of Manufacturers for Lancaster City gives evidence of the rapid rise in this industry in the post-Civil War period. As a baseline, the 1820 U. S. Census of Manufacturers lists nothing for Lancaster County under the heading of tobacco. The next census available, 1850, lists four firms active in the business, the earliest as well as the largest was that of Lawrence Demuth, tobacconist (a dealer, especially at retail), whose business was located in the southeast ward. Demuth's business, begun by Christian Demuth or his father-in-law, ca. 1770, included a tobacconist shop on E. King Street and a factory in the rear (see Lancaster Historic District, Continuation Sheet, Demuth, H. C., Cigar and Snuff Factory, submitted 1990). In addition to cigars this factory made snuff, a powdered form of tobacco used for sniffing. In 1850 Demuth, who seems to have cornered the market on snuffmaking, had a capital investment in the business of $10,000, far beyond any others involved in tobacco products manufacture. He used 30,000 pounds of leaf tobacco valued at $3,000. By horse and hand power he manufactured 26,000 pounds of snuff annually and 300,000 "Segars," valued at $6,000. Of the three other manufacturers of tobacco in 1850 (cigar- makers), two were in the northwest ward and one in the southwest ward. All employees at that time were men.[25]

The 1860 U. S. Census of Manufacturers shows little change from a decade earlier; only six firms are listed. In addition to Demuth, only one other tobacconist was located in the southeast ward; now, however, there were three cigarmakers and a tobacconist in the northwest ward, later an area of much activity. Of interest in this group is Jacob Frey, cigarmaker, whose business annually used 15,000 pounds of leaf tobacco, employed fourteen men and one woman, and turned out 800,000 Spanish cigars (cigars of a better quality than "common" cigars). Frey, also a dealer in tobacco, is said to have been the first person to offer Lancaster County tobacco for sale in another market. As early as 1846 he brought four cases to New York; a few years later, while working there at another business, he developed a trade in Lancaster County tobacco. Returning to Lancaster City in 1855, Frey began to manufacture cigars and to deal in leaf tobacco; he was the first to take out a license to manufacture cigars in his district. His place of business was on W. King Street (rear of lot; now on W. Grant Street). In 1874 he and his son-in-law, John L. Weidner, entered into a dealership in leaf tobacco under the name of Frey & Weidner. Frey also continued to manufacture cigars (see National Register nomination, Frey, Jacob L., Tobacco Warehouse, submitted 1990).[26]

A significant change occurs in the tobacco manufacturing industry by the time of the taking of the 1870 Census of Manufacturers. Lancaster City now had forty-four individual businesses involved in the manufacture of tobacco products or related items for the cigar industry. There were forty-one cigar-makers, one manufacturer of chewing tobacco, and three cigar box manufacturers. The Demuth firm still manufactured cigars and snuff. Some of these businesses were small, particularly the cigar manufacturers, and often were housed on the second floor of a dwelling, another business, or small hotel ("sweat shops," in all probability).

Not only was there a marked increase in the number of tobacco industry businesses by 1870, there was also growth in the established businesses and changes in the composition of the labor force. Jacob Frey's business, for example, employed twenty men and eight women. Rosette Kuhns, the only female owner listed, employeed six men, ten women, and four children; they annually manufactured 673,000 cigars packed in 6,737 boxes. The economic and occupational benefits of cigarmaking were not lost on the local law enforcement officials either: at the Lancaster County prison that year twenty men produced 240,000 cigars valued at $3,360.[27]

The Demuth family snuff and cigar business, now run by H. C. Demuth, had grown and also changed by 1870. The power by horse of a decade earlier was now steam power--a machine had been added at the snuff mill which produced 9,000 pounds of snuff annually. In addition, four machines at the cigar factory now yearly turned out 300,000 cigars. At S. E. Shrimps's factory for the manufacture of chewing tobacco (made by processing leaf tobacco, sugar, and licorice), some mechanical devices were also in use: a head roller, screws, trimmer, and finishers.

Henry Krauskap (or Krouskop) was the largest of the three Lancaster City cigar box manufacturers in 1880. With a capital investment of $3,000 this firm, employing six men, four women, and four children, turned out 160,000 boxes a year, grossing $14,000 (see also National Register nomination, Krauskap, Henry, House and Store, entered 1982).[28]

The numbers of cigarmakers and box manufacturers changed little by 1880 from a decade earlier, according to the Tenth U. S. Census of Manufacturers. There were fifty-three firms in the cigarmaking business, an increase of about eight; as earlier,

Demuth was still also making snuff and one firm was making chewing tobacco. Only two firms were making boxes, Henry Krauskap being the larger; he employed twenty-one persons now and his capital investment had risen from $3,000 to $15,000. Clearly, supplying boxes to those making the cigars had proven to be good business.

By the mid-1880s, judging by the Lancaster City directories, large numbers of individuals were employed in the tobacco industry. In addition to those making cigars and boxes, there were inspectors, regulators, tobacco dealers, and those occupied in the preparation and packing of leaf tobacco. These latter two groups, tobacco dealers and packers, were often combined as one company engaged in the thriving business of marketing tobacco.[29]

The Marketing of Tobacco in Lancaster City

The outstanding increase in the yield of leaf tobacco grown on farms in Lancaster County during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been detailed above. There was a particularly sharp rise between 1869 and 1879: in 1869 Lancaster County farmers produced 3,362,000 pounds of tobacco; by 1879 the yield had reached an unprecedented 18,000,000 pounds or 45,000 cases; unequaled anywhere in the United States in the nineteenth century. For most farmers to sell their leaf tobacco by dealing with tobacco buyers from all parts of the country would have resulted in an inefficient, if not chaotic, method of distribution. Further, in the interval from farm to cigar factory it was necessary to store the tobacco for proper sweating periods, from about two months to a year, unless bulk sweating methods are used. This required "after-handling" of the leaf gave rise around 1860 to the tobacco warehouse system. These warehouses, a preponderance of them in Lancaster City, processed not only tobacco from Lancaster County, but later as much as three-fourths of all other tobacco grown in the state, much of it from York County.[30]

As early as 1830, John S. Gable of Lancaster City became Lancaster County's first regular tobacco-packer. He remained in this business until his death over fifty years later. The earliest tobacco warehouse in the county was in the village of Mountville (about eight miles west of Lancaster City), built by I. H. Kauffman in 1867 (demolished by fire in 1985).[31]

The men who ran the tobacco warehouses also became dealers, acting as middlemen between the growers and manufacturers. Earlier, the grower, selling to a limited market, carried out all phases of the leaf tobacco business: packing, storing, aging, and distribution to the manufacturer. With the introduction of buyers representing the manufacturers, the packer-dealers also became involved in business of distribution; they were the first group in this industry, apart from growers, whose function was differentiated. Beginning c. 1840, buying mostly imported tobacco, it was possible for a cigar manufacturer in an established cigarmaking center to benefit from trade contacts and standards set by a growing number of these packer-dealers.

With the enormous increase in the domestic leaf production and cigar consumption after 1860, these packer-dealer operations expanded from a few rooms or from small dwellings to permanent headquarters in large warehouses specifically constructed for packing and storing leaf tobacco. The packer-dealer's activities were as follows: after delivery of the tobacco to the warehouse by the grower, the packer-dealer set about the final preparations necessary to ready the leaf tobacco for his customers, the manufacturers, or for resale to other dealers. From the bales which the grower had delivered, the tobacco was repacked into wooden cases. The tobacco next went through a second curing or fermentation: the cases were opened; natural heat or a small amount of artificial heat was applied; the "hands," or pile of leaves tied with a leaf, were aerated or shaken by hand; finally, the tobacco was again repacked in cases and allowed to ferment. Periodically, samples were drawn to inspect the fermenting tobacco to see if it met with the tobacco company's requirements. Sometimes, as at Otto Eisenlohr's Resweating Co., wine stored in large vats was added to flavor the tobacco. The cases of tobacco would be stored for many months or even years at the warehouse for aging (see aforementioned National Register nomination, Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District, submitted 1990).[32]

As the system of warehousing developed, frequently another step was added to the process of preparing the tobacco. The dried leaf would be moistened with water and further stripping (separating the leaf into two and removing the center stem) was done in the raised basement of the warehouse. For example, in 1897 workers at the five-story tobacco warehouse at 3-5 Tobacco Avenue did leaf stripping in the basement and carried on other leaf processing tasks and cigarmaking on the upper floors (see National Register Nomination, N. Shippen/Tobacco Ave. Historic

District, submitted 1990). The damp basements of Lancaster City provided the humid atmosphere needed for this task.[33]

In 1883, according to Ellis and Evans, there were over 100 firms in the county specializing in the buying and packing of tobacco with the same number of specially built tobacco warehouses. Of these, seventy-five packing warehouses were in Lancaster City. Daniel B. Good, in his recent study, "The Localization of Tobacco Production in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania," states: "Since 1883, Lancaster County has had the second largest cigar leaf curing and storing buildings in the country, second only to New York City."[34]

The tobacco warehouses of Lancaster City were described in 1883 as "immense structures, from two to four stories high, and from fifty to two hundred feet long, with a capacity of storing from two hundred to five thousand cases of tobacco each."[35] To these, on "receiving days," specified days of the week when tobacco was received, wagons of all sorts drawn by teams of horses or mules began to come into the city as early as ten o'clock of the previous night in order to have a place in line to unload early in the morning. On some streets where there were several warehouses, such as Tobacco Avenue, the streets were completely blocked by as many as eighty-nine teams on a single block. On 10 January 1880, for example, 600 wagon-loads were delivered. It was not unusual for a single firm to receive 100,000 pounds in a day; this quantity of business, with payment on delivery, often resulted in added pressure on the local banking establishments.

The tobacco warehouse owners of the 1880s generally were local entrepreneurs such as the aforementioned Charles Augustus Bitner. While still in the freight business Bitner built several tobacco warehouses at the Harrisburg Pike and N. Mulberry Street, c. 1875-1880 (see National Register nomination, Harrisburg Avenue Tobacco Historic District, submitted 1990). Another local businessman-owner was Englishman Henry Martin who in 1880 bought two existing tobacco warehouses on the 600 block of the west side of N. Charlotte Street and one at 544 N. Charlotte. He then built several other buildings nearby, including a brick works in 1893 (see National Register nomination, N. Charlotte Street Historic District, entered 1989). Frequently, these warehouses were leased to tobacco dealer-packers; for example, the Baumgardner brothers built three warehouses which they leased on W. Lemon Street, c. 1881, of which only the one at 32-54 W. Lemon survives (see National Register nomination, N. Prince Street Historic District,

entered 1989). An exception to this pattern of local ownership in the early period of tobacco warehouses in Lancaster City is the building at 237-239 N. Prince Street, built c. 1877 by Teller Bros. of Philadelphia, the first of two neighboring tobacco warehouses built by this firm (see National Register nomination, Teller Bros./Reed Tobacco Historic District, submitted 1990).[36]

Around the turn of the century a shift began in Lancaster City from local to out-of-town ownership of the tobacco warehouses; for example, the changes to J. K. Shirk's tobacco warehouse at 336 N. Christian Street reflect this shift. Shirk, one of a family of tobacco dealers, had his tobacco warehouse here by 1886. In 1890 Esberg, Bachman & Co. had their tobacco business in this building (presumably the owners at that time). In 1897 J. M. Bachman took out a building permit to put an addition on the warehouse for J. Vetterlein & Co. of Philadelphia. This transition would be repeated many times for numerous buildings in Lancaster City, and would eventually involve major giants in the tobacco industry; in this way the leaf tobacco business was transformed.

Another example of a tobacco business originally owned and operated by packers and jobbers in Lancaster City which was taken over by a large company is the B. F. Good & Co. leaf tobacco business at the corner of W. James and N. Prince Streets which in 1899-1900 was purchased by the P. Lorillard Co. (see National Register nomination, Good, B. F., Tobacco Warehouse, entered 1985). According to Resources and Industries of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, published in 1912 by the Lancaster Board of Trade, over forty peopler were employed in this four-story building in the tobacco season.

In 1916 H. Justin Roddy assessed the tobacco and cigarmaking industry in Lancaster County. At that time, 25,000,000 pounds of tobacco was being produced annually in Lancaster County, of which about 3,500,000 pounds was used for cigarmaking in the county. Cigar production annually in Lancaster County was about 200,000,000. The filler or inner leaves used was home-grown; the wrapper was almost entirely from outside sources: Connecticut, Cuba, Florida, and Sumatra. Roddy found that Lancaster City had sixty factories where cigars were made. County-wide, investment capital in this industry was about $1,500,000; about 1,000 men and women were employed. Subsidiary employment came, as before, from making snuff and cigar boxes, and also gilt paper and decorative stamped paper. A significant change from the earlier period, of

course, was the addition of electric power; e.g., larger factories used 300 to 400 horsepower for lighting the factories and for driving the machinery.[37]

Industrial Growth and Consolidation

Roddy's survey of the tobacco industry did not reflect the sweeping changes which were taking place nationally in the tobacco industry in the period 1910-1930. At the beginning of the period the leaf tobacco business was comprised of numerous small competing firms of packer-dealers, buyers, and agents. The fortunes of these firms rose and fell with the supply and demand of the market. Also, with so many middlemen, the leaf was bought and sold several times, adding to the price. Manufacturers, in an effort to reduce costs by eliminating so many levels of middlemen, began a concerted effort to change these methods of purchase. By about 1910 there was an acceleration of a movement, begun before the turn of the century, toward concentrating purchases by the leading manufacturers in large quantities. Also, playing a very large part in these industrial changes was the growth of major American and English tobacco companies in this period. The growing size and power of these companies would have a significant effect on most of the tobacco business. For example, in 1901 the American Cigar Company, a subsidiary of the American Tobacco Company, was formed with capital of $10,000,000. By 1907 this company purchased 70%-80% of all leaf tobacco used for domestic consumption by the tobacco industry. With this type of competition, it is understandable that by 1914 many small dealers had been eliminated.

Nevertheless, in the years 1914-1921, despite these economic and industrial developments in the tobacco business, there was a reprieve for the small dealer and independent manufacturer. This was due to unusual demand for cigar leaf which exceeded production, providing a ready market for small firms still in the business. (No explanation is given in the literature for this demand; presumably, this increase in cigar purchases was linked to factors such as rising immigration, economic growth, and World War I). This hiatus, however, was short-lived: the tide began to turn once again at the close of World War I with the beginning of accumulations of cigar leaf and unsold cigars. Willis N. Baer, The Economic Development of the Cigar Industry in the United States, 1933, summarizes the situation: "By 1924 many participants in the industry had been eliminated, and those

surviving established new relationships and new objectives. The time had come for the now large corporation manufacturer to resume where he had left off in 1914."[38]

The tobacco growers as a group had also been under great pressures between 1914 and 1920 from increased taxation, new tariffs, and increased imports of tobacco from other countries. With the reduction in the numbers of packer-dealers after 1924 and the lessening of competitive bidding for leaf tobacco, the farmers faced further difficulties. In order to improve their product and to take part in its distribution, there was a movement among the growers to adapt more scientific methods of growing and toward cooperative marketing efforts.[39]

Cigar manufacturers were seeking changes in this period as well, changes in the ways the leaf was processed and prepared. Methods were sought to scientifically improve the control of the aging process. Large manufacturers established research laboratories where experiments were done to try to chemically shorten the process. Between 1910 and 1930 manufacturers also had to deal with a shortage of skilled labor. In an effort to become less dependent on these workers, large companies increased the use of machinery. Filler-making machines and an automatic wrapping device were introduced. In 1919 a controlled automatic cigarmaking machine was patented and announced. This machine made the entire cigar which formerly had been done by hand. Shortages of labor during World War I in part brought about the need for this device, but also there was a general movement toward mechanization in the industry.

By 1930 cigarmaking and leaf tobacco storage had reached the stage where these businesses were part of giant corporations. In the boom economic years of the 1920s, spurred on by stock market investments, such names emerged as General Cigar Co., American Cigar Corp., Bayuk Cigars, Inc., and Consolidated Cigar Corp. The stocks of these companies were traded on the stock market with impressive earnings. Total capital investment for the ten largest national cigar manufacturers for 1930 was $175,500,000. As to productivity, Baer concludes that the total output for the ten leading manufacturers changed from 22.6% in 1912 to 55.1% in 1930.

Most of these major cigarmaking and tobacco processing companies and other large organizations in this industry were represented by divisions in Lancaster City during the period 1910-1940. The Lancaster City Directory of 1931 lists

Eisenlohr-Webster, Inc., from Philadelphia, originally Otto Eisenlohr & Bros., a long-established company in Lancaster City. After doing business over the years at various locations, by 1923 Eisenlohr occupied a large complex of buildings for the "resweating" of tobacco at W. Liberty and N. Water Streets. Also listed in 1931 was Bayuk Cigar Co., Inc., located in another complex (begun in 1923) just to the west of Eisenlohr. (Both were later combined. They are now owned by one company and still process and store tobacco (see the aforementioned National Register nomination, Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District, submitted 1990). Other companies listed in 1931 were P. Lorillard, American Cigar Co., Imperial Cigar Co., and General Cigar Co. There were also a few large local owners, notably A. K. Mann.

The 1939-1940 Lancaster City Directory lists ten cigar manufacturers; the major firms included as having operations in the city are again Bayuk, Consolidated, and Lorillard. Also listed were two tobacco manufacturers, five wholesalers, and thirteen leaf brokers and importers. An exception to the trend toward ownership by major corporations was the inclusion in this list of the earliest manufacturer-retailer of tobacco products in Lancaster City, Demuth's Tobacco Shop which at that time was still family-owned (and continued so until the 1980s). Although the number of tobacco industry businesses involved in 1939-1940 seems far less that in earlier years, it should be noted that their buildings were much larger than previously. The pair of buildings at 820-830 N. Prince Street, for example, are each 300 feet long (this includes an addition to the rear of each building (see National Register nomination, American/Consolidated Tobacco Companies, submitted 1990).

Conclusion

During the latter part of the period of this study, the most important change for the Lancaster County leaf tobacco industry, which primarily dealt with cigar tobacco, was the marked decline in consumption. This came about despite more than a doubling of the population of the United States. The shift resulted from the the popularity of a new product--the cigarette. With the greater economy of cigarettes over cigars--forty cigarettes could be purchased in the 1930s for the price of five or six cigars--and the popularization by advertising, there was a definite appeal to a new and larger class of smokers. Further, cigarettes could be

carried in pocket or purse easily, and thus appealed to working women; cigarettes, by the 1930s, had attained social recognition.

With the onset of World War II, the cigarette, this easily-carried "short smoke" became extremely popular, to the further detriment of the cigar. In the post-World War II years, Lancaster City businesses continued to process leaf tobacco and manufacture cigars and other tobacco products; nevertheless, the popularity of cigarettes did eventually result in the waning of this once-important industry. Of 131 known buildings or complexes once associated with the tobacco industry in Lancaster City in the period 1880-1940, presently only the aforementioned two complexes are still used for the processing of tobacco (Eisehlohr/Bayuk and American/Consolidated); at least sixty-six buildings have been demolished. Of those remaining, many stand vacant. These brick buildings, with their raised basements and corbelled cornices, yet attest to the heyday of this once-great industry in Lancaster City. At a few of them, even today, traces of that sweet yet pungent aroma of Lancaster County leaf tobacco still lingers.

Endnotes

1. William Penn, Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania, London, 1681; rpt. in Jean R. Soderlund, ed., William Penn and the founding of Pennsylvania 1680-1684: A Documentary History (Philadelphia: U of PA Press, 1983) 58-65, 62.

2. Soderlund, 65.

3. The standard text for the history of Lancaster County is Franklin Ellis and Samuel Evans, History of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1883; rpt. Apollo, PA: Closson Press, n.d.); for a contemporary version see John Ward Willson Loose, The Heritage of Lancaster (Woodland Hills, CA: Windsor Publ., 1978); see also Florence R. Jordon, History of Pennsylvania Counties (Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Farmer, n.d.) 32-33; John Nolen, Lancaster Pennsylvania: Comprehensive City Plan 1929 (For the City Planning Commission, City of Lancaster, 1929) 15.

4. H. Justin Roddy, Physical and Industrial Geography of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (Lancaster, PA: New Era Printing Co., 1916) 1-2; Ellis and Evans, I: Contents.

5. Quote is in Jordan, 33; topographical information in Roddy, 1-2.

6. John Ward Willson Loose, "Our Shared Roots," in Lancaster Today: A Description of Community Life (brochure by Lancaster Tommorrow, n.d., n.p.).

7. Beatrice B. and Charles F. Hummel, The Pennsylvania Germans: A Celebration of their Arts 1683-1850 (Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1982) 16-17.

8. Daniel B. Good, "The Localization of Tobacco Production in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania", in Pennsylvania History, 49 (1982): 190-200, 192. Gov. Pownall's quote is cited in Stevenson Whitcomb Fletcher, Pennsylvania Agriculture and Country Life 1640-1840 (Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum

Commission, 1971; orig. publ. 1950) 133; "Valley of the Pequea" probably refers to the area of present-day Upper Leacock or Earl Townships.

9. Good, 190-2.

10. Jordan, 32; Elizabeth Furnace is in Ellis and Evans, I:303.

11. The best way to see Lancaster City is on foot. For the armchair traveler, a good overview of the physical appearance and some historical background on Lancaster City are in Mary Proctor and Bill Matuszeski, Gritty Cities (Philadelphia: Temple U Press, 1978) 91-110.

12. Background history of Lancaster City and a description in 1887 are in W. Uhler Hensel, Resources and Industries of the City of Lancaster, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (the Lancaster Board of Trade, 1887) 11-14; information about the grid plan, additional historical material, and population figures are in Nolen, 17-18.

13. Nolen, 18.

14. Material on roads, turnpikes, canals, and the railroad system of Lancaster County is in Ellis and Evans, I:309-324; the decision to build the railroad link between Columbia and Philadelphia is on 319. The Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Co. passenger and freight station discussed was at W. King and Water Streets and connected with the mills and industries, c. 1875, in the southern part of the city. A later station in the city, also since demolished, was on W. Chestnut St.

15. Biographical material on C. A. Bitner is in Ellis and Evans, I:323-324.

16. Origin of tobacco culture in Lancaster County is in Good, 193-195; Ellis and Evans, I:354-358; and H. M. G. Klein, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania: A History, 4 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publ., 1924) II:661-3.

17. A major work on the history of the tobacco industry is Willis N. Baer, Ph.D., The Economic Development of the Cigar Industry in the United States (Lancaster, PA: n.p., 1933); on p. 24, Baer discusses the early type of tobacco raised. For an excellent study of tobacco culture, processing, warehouse practices, see William Frear, Ph.D., "The Cigar Tobacco Industry in Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania Dept. of Agriculture, General Bulletin No. 371 (1922), in Bulletins, 5 (Nos. 364-371; PA 1-2) on file at the State Library of Pennsylvania, Government Publications Division; also very useful is Horace Richards Barnes, "Early History of Tobacco," in Papers of the Lancaster County Historical Society, 45 (1942): 1-24, 6; for a summary, see Fletcher, 165-6.

18. Fletcher, 166; Ellis and Evans, 355; Baer, 38.

19. Baer, 37-8; Good, 194-7; see also The North Prince Street Historic District and North Charlotte Street, and the Nissley-Stauffer Tobacco Warehouses, all Lancaster City. Figures for Lancaster County tobacco yields vary somewhat depending on the source, but in general appear reliable; figures for 1936 are from Barnes, 7, citing the Yearbook of Agriculture, 1935; figures for 1987 are from John Clements, Flying the Colors: PA Facts, 168.

20. Barnes, 14, citing The Lancaster Farmer, XV, 2 (Feb. 1883), 23; Ellis and Evans, I:355.

21. Good, 196-7.

22. Special thanks to Geoffrey H. Ranck of Domestic Tobacco Co., Lancaster, PA, who provided much information on the growing, curing, and packing of leaf tobacco, as well as the fermenting and repacking at the warehouse (below); telephone conversations with Gloria O. Becker, Ph.D., 1989. Also, Joe Fanelli, Packing Manager, Lancaster Leaf Co., was very helpful in sharing information about the leaf packing process and in particular, about the buildings at 850 N. Water Street; further useful information on drying and curing of tobacco is in Frear, 28-62.

23. Arthur Reist, "Tobacco Lore of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania" (Ephrata, PA: unpubl., 1974, n. p.).

24. Data on the Philadelpha cigarmaking industry, c. 1810, is in Baer, 41.

25. The U. S. Census of Manufacturers Schedule, 1820, MS, is at Government Publications, State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, PA; for the years 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880, Lancaster County, Lancaster City, see microfilm, Reels #207 and #208, Lancaster County Historical Society.

26. U. S. Census of Manufacturers, 1860, Frey is listed in the Northwest Ward, p.6, #12; Demuth, Southeast Ward, p. 1, #12; biographical material on Frey is in Ellis and Evans, I:358, a portrait engraving follows, n. p.

27. U. S. Census of Manufacturers, see Note 25, above; in 1870 Lancaster City encompassed the 209th through 212 U. S. Districts. Citations from this tax for manufacturers discussed in the text are as follows: Demuth: 211th District, p. 5, #2 and 3; Frey, 209th District, p. 5, #10; Kuhns, 209th District, p. 6, #1; Shrimp, 209th District, p. 6, #7; and the Lancaster County Prison, 210th District, p. 4, #10.

28. U. S. Census of Manufacturers, 1880, Lancaster City; see Note 25, above.

29. Lancaster City Directories are at Lancaster County Historical Society and at the Lancaster County Library, both Lancaster, PA.

30. Ellis and Evans, after-handling is discussed on I:355; tobacco yields are on 357; see also Frear, 68-73. In the historical period some large tobacco growers dealt directly with the buyers. This practice continues for a few large growers; in recent years tobacco is also sold at auctions in Lancaster County (information from Geoffrey H. Ranck, see Note 22, above).

31. Ellis and Evans, I:357; information about the demolition of the warehouse is from Mary Wiley Myers,

Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County, 10/24/89.

32. See Note 22, above.

33. Insurance Maps of Lancaster, PA, Sanborn-Ferris Map Co., 1886, 1897, 1912, 1912 (updated to 1947), microfilm Reel No. Reel 282, Lancaster County Historical Society, Lancaster, PA.

34. Ellis and Evans, I:357; Good, quote is on 197; Barnes, 18-21.

35. Quote and description of the warehouse structures and "receiving days" is in Ellis and Evans, I:357; an illustration in Barnes, op. 16, shows hauling the tobacco to the warehouses by cart and mule.

36. Thanks to Richard Levengood and Amy Jansson, Levengood Hammel Assocs., Lancaster, PA, for information on the Teller Bros. warehouses.

37. Roddy, 92-95.

38. Figures on American Cigar Co. are in Baer, 101-2, quote is on 190.

39. The changes in the tobacco industry are in Baer, as follows: consolidations of companies and changes in grower and manufacturer relations, 198-200; growth of large corporations, 190, 204, and passim; automatic cigar-making machinery, 197; popularity of cigarettes, 206-8, 274.

40. Lancaster City Directories, 1931, 1939-40.

F. Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type: Tobacco Buildings in Lancaster City

II. Description

III. Significance

IV. Registration Requirements

☒ See continuation sheet

☐ See continuation sheet for additional property types

G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.

☒ See continuation sheet

H. Major Bibliographical References

☒ See continuation sheet

Primary location of additional documentation:

- ☒ State historic preservation office
- ☐ Other State agency
- ☐ Federal agency
- ☐ Local government
- ☐ University
- ☐ Other

Specify repository: _____

I. Form Prepared By

name/title Gloria O. Becker, Ph.D., Preservation Director
organization Historic Preservation Trust date January 3, 1990
street & number 123 North Prince Street telephone (717) 291-5861
city or town Lancaster state PA zip code 17603

F- I. NAME OF PROPERTY TYPE:
TOBACCO PROCESSING AND MANUFACTURING BUILDINGS

F-II. DESCRIPTION

By c. 1875 Lancaster City had been established as the locus for the processing and manufacturing of large quantities of cigar leaf tobacco grown in Lancaster County. Other parts of the county had tobacco processing facilities such as barns for the initial stages of processing, warehouses for storage and aging of the leaf, and cigar manufacturing facilities; however, it was in Lancaster City that the greatest concentration of the processing and marketing facilities was found.

Of the 131 buildings (or building complexes) from the period c. 1880-1940 which have been identified by the Lancaster City Tobacco Industry Resource Survey, conducted by the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County in 1989, sixty-five are yet extant. Of these, sixteen are already listed on the National Register or are in three National Register Districts. The final count submitted to the Pennsylvania staff for National Register eligibility was forty-nine tobaccco industry resources, three of which were building complexes. With the exception of John S. Rohrer's tobacco warehouse (Exhibit A, below), all buildings discussed herein are extant.

In establishing the methodology for the survey it was decided to focus on industrial-type buildings, rather than shop/dwellings, cigar stores, or the numerous "cottage industry" cigar factory businesses carried on in rowhouses or over garages. The buildings found as a result of the study, therefore, are all permanent warehouse or factory buildings of brick. In doing historical research on these buildings, frame ells and outbuildings were often found in association with them on historical maps, particularly on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps which were the documentary underpinnings of the survey. However, none of these frame ancillary buildings was found to be extant at the time of the survey.

With the growing industrialization of Lancaster City in the late nineteenth century, and the growth of the tobacco industry in Lancaster County and City, there was a movement toward expanding these brick tobacco buildings to the rear (sometimes as replacement for frame sheds and outbuildings) with brick extensions or ells, and to the raising of roofs to gain one or more stories. Frequently, when the roof was raised the roof style was changed from gabled to flat. The warehouse/cigar factory at J. Kleaman's Tobacco Warehouse at 124 N. Water Street is a good example of a building which was expanded several times to the rear and was raised from three to four stories (see Pennsylvania Historic Site Survey No. 47-TW-1989; first floor easterly facade altered as a storefront).

The preponderance of buildings identified as tobacco resource buildings were warehouses for the processing, packing, and storing of leaf tobacco. A number of buildings, however, were strictly cigar factories; for example, J. B. Milleysack's Cigar Factory at 724 Columbia Avenue, rear (see National Register Nomination, submitted 1990). In some instances, a business might shift from warehousing to a special process, to manufacturing, then back to warehousing; e.g., the aforementioned J. Kleaman's Tobacco Warehouse, c. 1900, which was enlarged and occupied in 1912 by the Lancaster [stem] Stripping Co. for use as a warehouse, and in 1913 was the site of the Lancaster Stogie Co. By 1947 the building was a tobacco warehouse again.

About 1920, when some Lancaster City tobacco businesses had become part of national companies, a few firms combined large-scale specialized processing with warehousing of the leaf. For example, Bayuk Cigar Co., which eventually encompassed neighboring Otto Eisenlohr & Bros.'s tobacco resweating (curing) business (see National Register nomination, Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District, submitted 1990), combined both the tobacco processing and the storage of the cigar leaf tobacco in an industrial complex.

Whether one of these tobacco resource buildings was used as a tobacco warehouse for processing, storing, and packing of tobacco or was a cigar factory, the utilitarian needs were similar: facilities for loading and unloading of the leaf tobacco and finished product; ample windows to provide light to

sort tobacco or manufacture cigars, and large open areas for the storage (often for aging) of the cases of tobacco. The aforementioned Eisenlohr & Bros.'s earliest building in the complex (Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District, Building A) has a clerestory or skylight window which was needed for the sorting and grading of tobacco; the building housed the "casing department." Usually, there was the need for elevators to move the leaf tobacco bales. For example, at Jacob L. Frey's Tobacco Warehouse, c. 1870, a manually-operated elevator is still in operating condition (see National Register nomination, submitted 1990). By the turn of the century, however, the buildings often had industrial-type elevators. Many also had electricity and steam heat. Extant cigar factories and some of the larger tobacco processing buildings and complexes also have smokestacks (see, for example, National Register nomination, Slater's Cigar Co., Building B, submitted 1990).

The tobacco resource buildings in Lancaster City, c. 1880-1940, are utilitarian functional buildings which, while they evolved over time, have the following characteristics in general:

(1) number of stories: 2 1/2 to 5, depending on the date they were built and the function (the earlier ones tended to have 1/2 story on top which was sometimes raised later to a full story); a few 1 1/2 story warehouse buildings are also extant, namely on W. Liberty Street in the aforementioned Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District, Buildings D and E;

(2) rectangular shape: many with the long facade to the street; generally, without a formal entryway (sometimes added later);

(3) brick construction: ubiquitous, brick laid in common bond; except running bond where the facade was rebuilt, or the entire building was constructed toward the end of the period;

(4) raised basement: usually limestone; important to the operation of tobacco processing as a naturally damp work area for leaf stripping (for example, see National Register Nomination, N. Shippen/Tobacco Ave. Historic District, Consolidated Cigar Corp., submitted 1990);

(5) raised loading dock(s): frequently on the longitudinal side or several sides (see National Register Nomination,Good, B. F., Tobacco Warehouse, entered 1985); they needed to be raised to accommodate bales of tobacco which were lifted from wagons (later from trucks);

(6) brick corbelled cornices and pilasters: most of the buildings surveyed exhibited some decorative elements, particularly brick corbelled cornices and, to a lesser extent, pilasters. The Good Tobacco Warehouse is an exemplar of a building having both corbelled cornices and pilasters. It is difficult to precisely date the period of use of this brickwork craft, but it seems to have reached its zenith in Lancaster City in the 1890s. The range runs from elaborate corbel tables on some of the buildings at the General Cigar Co. (see PA Historic Survey Resource Form No. 30-TW-1989) to very simple bands of corbelling found on the facade of the Walter Schnader Tobacco Warehouse (see National Register nomination, submitted 1990). By the turn of the century, corbelling was minimal, often only a double strip with large brick dentils, sometimes on the facade elevation only. Brick pilasters commonly separated recessed bays in which fenestrations, either single or paired, and loading docks were placed (for example, see National Register nomination, David H. Miller Tobacco Warehouse, submitted 1990).

(7) windows: original windows were usually six-over-six rectangular, double hung. As the building type evolved into the twentieth century, increasingly, fixed industrial-type windows were used, such as on the c. 1920 Jacob Reist Tobacco Warehouse (see aforementioned Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District, Building K).

(8) brick segmental arches: almost all the windows and many doorways of the buildings surveyed, until c. 1920, had this trim over rectangular windows with wooden infill under the arch. In a few instances, arched windows were used, usually accented with brick segmental arches. The earlier buildings had two or three courses of arches; the later ones had one row, sometimes a flattened arch, as on the Jacob Reist Tobacco Warehouse.

(9) roof types: moderately pitched gable-ended, gambrel, or flat (sometimes with very slight angle or peak); generally, the smaller, earlier buildings had pitched roofs, for example, in the Harrisburg Avenue Tobacco Historic District (see National Register nomination, submitted 1990), Pritzfeld & Co.'s two-and-one-half story building (541 N. Mulberry Street; Building C). The neighboring C. August Bitner Tobacco Warehouse at 252 Harrisburg Ave. (Building B), was originally the same number of stories and approximately the same roof pitch; later the roof was raised to three full stories and the roof is now flat (evidenced by visible changes in brickwork). Both buildings were part of Bitner's estate and both were presumably built around the same time. The date of construction is not always, however, necessarily an indicator of the roof type. An 1875 engraving of John S. Rohrer's Tobacco Warehouse (since demolished) at the corner of N. Queen and Chestnut Streets shows a three-story building with a flat roof (Exhibit A). This up-to-date industrial building seems to have a stylistic link to the the gable-ended buildings nearby: the owner's name is painted largely in a parapeted peaked-gable end on the short facade. Gambrel roofs are less commonly found on tobacco resource buildings than are flat or pitched roofs. Gambrels sometimes were used on buildings that were designed to house two tobacco warehouse lessees under one roof, separated by an interior brick wall. See, for example, in the same historic district, Rosenbaum Tobacco Warehouse (552-554 N. Mulberry Street; Building E).

(10) interior construction and plan: large open spaces, sometimes divided by a brick interior wall or walls, forming two or three large open spaces; uniformly laid out in grid pattern; post-and-beam construction; wooden plank flooring; exposed ceilings, exposed brick exterior walls; usually an industrial elevator to transport tobacco or products from floor to floor; small stairways for use by employees, usually in corners of buildings; very little equipment: tables for manufacturing cigars (in cigar factories); scales for weighing tobacco, presses for packing tobacco into boxes; tables and pallets. Although our survey did not include a systematic inspection of interiors, from those we saw and

information provided by occupants, it is clear that much of the original interior equipment such as industrial elevators and original features, particularly brick walls and posts, are still present. In many cases, such as at Slater's Cigar Co. and at the Good Tobacco Warehouse, the elevators are still in use.

To summarize, tobacco resource buildings varied in size and scale, depending on interior function and industrial needs. Nevertheless, these buildings typically exhibited the following characteristics: generally 2 1/2 to 5 stories; rectangular shape with raised basement; either long or short facade to the street; constructed of brick laid in common bond; likely were ornamented with brick corbelled cornices and often with pilasters separating the bays; had gabled, flat, or less often, gambrel roofs; had rectangular windows (later fixed industrial windows) topped with brick segmental arches; and generally were of post-and-beam interior construction. In the past fifty years, except for further rear additions, boarding up of windows, and the addition or rebuilding of loading docks, exteriors have changed little.

Tobacco industry buildings were extremely well-built to withstand the weight of heavy cases of tobacco and, later, machinery. Also, the tobacco dust is said to have kept destructive insects away and the moisture in the buildings helped to preserve the timbers. Over the past fifty years many former tobacco warehouses and cigar factories have been pressed into alternative service, mostly as storage facilities. Others have had varied uses: Slater' Cigar Co.'s cigar factory (Building A) was later used in the candy business, today it houses a printing company; R. K. Schnader's & Sons Tobacco Warehouse (see National Register nomination, submitted 1990) was later a burlap bag warehouse and presently is owned by the American Red Cross; and the building at 42-44 N. Water Street (Hersh & Bro., see PA Historic Resource Survey form 12-TW-1989) was used after 1912 in the restaurant supplies and coffee sales business, and presently it is used to store scenery and props for the Fulton Opera Company's productions. Over the past 10-15 years, some of these fine building in Lancaster City, largely due to the preservation movement, have been signifcantly rehabilitated for other uses. For example, the aforementioned Jacob L. Frey's Tobacco Warehouse is now an advertising agency; and Basch & Fisher Tobacco Warehouse at 348

New Holland Avenue (see National Register nomination) is being converted to apartments and an office.

F-III. SIGNIFICANCE

The tobacco processing/marketing resource buildings of Lancaster City are significant in the area of industry under Criterion A because they are an integral part of one of the city's most important industries of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the cigar leaf tobacco industry. They are also significant in the area of architecture under Criterion C because they are representative of typical industrial buildings that were constructed in Lancaster City in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Between c. 1880 and c.1940, as part of the agricultural development of Lancaster County, many millions of pounds of leaf tobacco were processed, packed, marketed, and manufactured into cigars in the tobacco resource buildings of Lancaster City. This warehouse system of "after handling," or processing the tobacco for market, storing it for aging, and either distributing it to manufacturers or converting the leaf into finished cigars, became a specialized industry requiring buildings where this work could be carried on efficiently.

These brick buildings were constructed to be utilitarian and functional. By the turn-of-the-century many had elevators and tobacco processing equipment. Although some were at the rear of earlier buildings, until late in the period, most were prominently located on the major streets, usually following the railroad lines. Not until around c. 1907 with the first of a pair of warehouse buildings at 820-830 North Prince Street (see National Register nomination, American/Consolidated Tobacco Companies, South Building), and the c. 1911 establishment of the Otto Eisenlohr & Bros. complex of resweating buildings at W. Liberty and N. Water Streets is there noticeable movement toward the outer limits of the city. In general, in the latter part of the period, the buildings were built larger in scale, such as the Bayuk Cigar Co. buildings, or were earlier buildings with added portions such as at the H. C. Demuth Cigar

& Snuff Factory (see Lancaster Historic District, Continuation Sheet, submitted 1990).

Architecturally, the tobacco resource buildings are significant because they are representative of a large body of industrial buildings built in Lancaster City in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Generally, these industrial buildings had many shared characteristics and features such as being constructed over limestone foundations, built of brick laid in common bond, and were two to five stories in height. They were rectangular in shape; frequently, the shorter facade faced the street. Roofs were generally gabled or, to a lesser extent, gambrel in the early part of the period, flat by c. 1900. Windows and doors were rectangular, accented by brick segmental arches; generally, placement of fenestrations was symmetrical. Ornamentation was generally sparse and confined to brick corbelled cornices, and to a lesser degree, brick pilasters; corbelling was almost ubiquitous on buildings built before c. 1920.

The tobacco warehouses and cigar factories found eligible generally match these features and characteristics to a high degree. Except where altered, all were of brick laid in common bond, usually over limestone foundations. All were two to five stories in height, except for rear additions. Many were originally two-and-one-half stories, later changed to three or more full stories. Exception are the pair of one-and-one-half story buildings, (Buildings D, 1914; and E, 1921) and the one-story boiler room (Building J, c. 1935) in the Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District.

Today, only two complexes of buildings still actively process and store tobacco: Buildings A through J, Eisenlohr/Bayuk Tobacco Historic District (presently, Lancaster Leaf Co.) and the American/Consolidated Tobacco Co. (presently, Domestic Tobacco Co.) Millions of pounds of leaf tobacco are processed and stored at these two neighboring companies, yet this amount is a far cry from former days when the tobacco business in Lancaster City was at its height.

The tobacco resource buildings, leaf tobacco warehouses and cigar factories, nominated are generally very good representative examples of the important part the tobacco processing and manufacture played in Lancaster City's

industrial development during the period 1880-1940. They are also significant, as a group, as examples of industrial architecture in Lancaster City in that period.

F-IV. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

Although some of the buildings identified during the survey of the tobacco processing and marketing resources of Lancaster City at some time in their histories were used for other types of warehousing, a major factor in meeting the criteria is a documented association with the tobacco industry. Association here is used broadly to mean any or a combination of the following: processing; packing; storing; dealing and importing; and the manufacturing of cigars, snuff, and chewing tobacco. Related associated industries such as box manufacture, case (and shooks) manufacture, and inspection facilities are not included in this property type.

The buildings nominated must be within the 7.3 square miles of the present boundaries of Lancaster City, and have been associated with the tobacco industry in the period 1880 to 1940. They should have many or all of the property type characteristics, and at least have a moderately high level of integrity with all or most of the identified original characteristics intact such as brick corbelled cornices, brick pilasters, and segmental arches over windows. An example of major alterations which would result in a loss of integrity would be the covering of original brick with artificial and incompatible materials, e.g., stucco, artificial brick or stone; or the addition of a large modern entryway in place of an employees' entrance or loading dock.

METHODOLOGY

The project is a comprehensive study of the tobacco industry in Lancaster City for the period c. 1880 to 1940, focusing on tobacco resource buildings, particularly tobacco warehouses. The boundaries of the study are those of present-day Lancaster City which encompasses 7.3 miles. The objectives of this intensive survey were as follows: (1) to fully research the history of this important Pennsylvania industry; (2) to trace all the known tobacco buildings for the period through primary source material (Sanborn fire insurance maps); (3) to visit and record the extant buildings; and from these, (4) to evaluate and document tobacco warehouses/cigar factories in Lancaster City for nomination to the National Register. As part of the historical reseach which formed a basis for the context section, it was necessary to investigate the following: the background of cigar leaf tobacco growing in Lancaster County; the growth of the tobacco industry in Lancaster City; and the development of the tobacco warehousing system. A final task was to evaluate these within the framework of Pennsylvania's agricultural, industrial, and economic past.

When we began the study, we found that about forty buildings had previously been identified as, or were believed to have been, tobacco resource buildings. This information came from the county-wide survey conducted by the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County between the years 1978 and 1985. Of these, about sixteen buildings were already individually listed on the National Register or are within National Register Districts: The Good, B. F., Tobacco Warehouse; the Hess, A. B., Cigar Factory and Warehouse, the Nissly-Stauffer Tobacco Warehouses, the North Charlotte Street Historic District, and the North Prince Street Historic District. We did not include the Krauskap, Henry, House and Store, already entered on the National Register, because it is primarily a shop/dwelling and the period of tobacco industry activity for the property was earlier than our time frame. (Similarly, we did not include a few other shop/dwellings we found because we were primarily looking for industrial buildings.)

The scheduled work encompassed five stages: (1) <u>research</u>: bibliographical and archival surveys at the following respositories: State Library of Pennsylvania (LUIS search and Government Publication); Lancaster County Historical Society (Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, city directories, U. S. Census of Manufacturers Schedules); Lancaster County Court House Archives

(maps, records); and Lancaster County Library (local histories, city directories); (2) historical survey: intensive Sanborn fire insurance map study for four periods (see below) from which each tobacco resource was identified, recorded, and tracked on the historical survey sheet which we designed; this data was then analyzed for historical information and became the basis for a list of sites to visit. Each site thus identified was given a number and file packet; the resources identified were then matched with any previously identified survey forms, research from our files, if any, and other information such as city directory listings; (3) field survey: each site was visited; if the building was demolished it was so noted on the historical survey form, including the present use of the site; if extant, the building(s) was photographed, a site sketch made, and field notes of the architectural description recorded on the Pennsylvania Survey Form; (4) the processing and analysis of the data was compiled; processing of photographs; and the writing of the context and the final versions of the Pennsylvania Survey Forms; (5) evaluation of eligibility by the staff of the Pennsylvania Bureau for Historic Preservation; (6) preparation of National Register forms for all buildings and districts determined eligible for listing.

The period c. 1880-1940 represents the peak years of development and expansion of the storage and handling of leaf tobacco as well as cigar making in Lancaster City and County. The year 1886 was chosen as a research baseline because it is the date of the first known Sanborn maps available in the area for Lancaster City; the others being 1897 (updated with pasted details to 1904); 1912; and 1912 (updated in 1941 and 1947). The only actual atlas edition available at the Historical Society of Lancaster County is the updated 1897; the others are on microfilm. The importance of using the actual maps in conjunction with the microfilm should be emphasized because coloring on the maps was used to denote brick, frame, etc.The index maps included with the Sanborns, particularly for 1886, were helpful in indentifying sites and as checklists, as were the Sanborn Additional Indices of 1904 and 1929.

Other documentary materials which were useful were the decennial U. S. Census of Manufacturers Schedules available at the Pennsylvania State Library (1820) and Lancaster County Historical Society on microfilm (1850-1880); the latter years provided background information in considerable detail on cigar and box makers, but nothing on tobacco warehousing.

At the completion of the historical survey we had compiled forms for 144 sites from the Sanborn maps, most with our sketches of the footprints of the buildings as shown on the maps. Of these forms, five were duplicates. Eight buildings were eliminated from the survey for one of several reasons: outside the present city limits; or was found to be a very small dwelling; or the building was put into service as a tobacco warehouse after 1940. This left 131 files for known buildings or complexes. After deducting the sixteen National Register buildings (above), and duplications and those outside the survey, we were left with 115 files. Of these, sixty-six buildings were found to have been demolished. This left a final tally of forty-nine files, of which three are building complexes of two or more buildings. Survey forms for these properties were evaluated against National Register criteria by the staff National Register Review Committee of the Pennsylvania Bureau for Historic Preservation.

Problems encountered in the field survey were mainly concerned with addresses of buildings. In the nineteenth century some of the factories and warehouses were back buildings, i.e., in the rear yard. Later, an alley was put in behind the building; still later, the alley became a street. Addresses given for purposes of tax parcel numbers, however, often were listed as "rear of...." In such cases, we have used, first, the address given on the tax records; and second, the common address in parentheses.

Occasionally, a problem arose from variations in building heights on the Sanborn maps for the same building in different periods. This seems to be mainly due to the interpretation of the individual surveyor at the time. For example, a four story building in 1897 may be shown with the same footprint in 1912 as three stories and a basement. Visual inspection of the building usually clarified the situation.

In defining the property type it is necessary to bear in mind that sixty-six, or about half, of the buildings identified in the historical research phase of our survey as having been extant in the period 1880-1940 have since been demolished. Furthermore, the pattern of demolition or changes to the tobacco industry buildings usually had to do with whether or not the buildings were in areas of prime real estate development, especially downtown Lancaster City. In particular, with the removal of railroad tracks at or near Chestnut Street around Queen Street, a number of tobacco warehouses were demolished. Since all of the tobacco industry

buildings were utilitarian structures for which there is little or no documentation in the way of photographs or written physical description, it is sometimes difficult to assess the original appearance of many of the buildings identified by the survey. Recording of changes such as alterations or additions was made almost entirely on the basis of the Sanborn maps and visual inspection. (There are no Lancaster City building permits before the end of the nineteenth century.)

After reviewing the section of the draft of the historical context pertaining to the period 1920-1940, more information was requested by the staff of the Bureau for Historic Preservation. Despite our original intensive research which yielded little in the way of documentation, we repeated and expanded our efforts. Primarily, we were hampered by the gap in the Sanborn maps as nothing was recorded between the original 1912 maps and the 1947 update to 1912. Also, we could find no comprehensive county history for Lancaster published between 1924 and 1978 which provided information, nor government publications which provided statistics for the tobacco processing industry in Lancaster City for this period. It also seemed evident that during the Depression size and types of buildings were less important than labor and agriculture figures. Therefore, we relied on good published material on general economic trends in the cigar industry nationally for the period, and extrapolated to what material we had found on tobacco industry businesses in Lancaster City.

The project began March 1, 1989, and was completed March 31, 1990. The project team at the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County consisted of the following: Mary Wiley Myers, Project Director from the project's inception to Nov. 30, 1989; Gloria O. Becker, Ph.D., Surveyor/Researcher/Writer throughout the project, and Project Director, Dec. 1, 1989, to completion; Paul E. Colarik, Jr., intern, who took many of the photos and helped with the survey; Nancy Haubert, who provided clerical assistance; and volunteers Sylvia Evans and Elvin N. Heisey. The project was carried out under a matching grant from the Bureau for Historic Preservation, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg, PA. For this support and for outstanding technical assistance by the BHP staff, we express our appreciation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Authors Cited

Baer, Willis Nissley. The Economic Development of the Cigar Industry in the United States. Lancaster, PA: Arts Printing Co., 1933.

Barnes, Horace Richards. "Early History of Tobacco," in Papers, Vol. 45 (1941), 1-24; Lancaster County Historical Society, Lancaster, PA.

Donehoo, George P. Pennsylvania: A History. Vol. 4. New York: Lewis Publ., 1926.

Ellis, Franklin, and Samuel Evans, History of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, Volumes I &II. Philadelphia: Everts and Peck, 1883.

Fletcher, Stevenson Whitcomb. Pennsylvania Agriculture and Country Life 1640-1840. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1971; orig. publ. 1950.

Garvan, Beatrice B., and Charles F. Hummel. The Pennsylvania Germans: A Celebration of their Arts 1683-1850. Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1982.

Good, Daniel B. "The Localization of Tobacco Production in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania," in Pennsylvania History, 49 (1982): 190-200.

Jordan, Florence R. History of Pennsylvania Counties. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Farmer, n.d.

Klein, H. M. G. Lancaster County, Pennsylvania: A History, 4 vols. New York: Lewis Historical Publ., 1924; II:551-3.

Nolen, John. Lancaster Pennsylvania: Comprehensive City Plan 1929. For the City Planning Commission, City of Lancaster, 1929.

Proctor, Mary and Bill Matuszeski. Gritty Cities. Philadelphia: Temple U Press, 1978; "Lancaster", 91-110.

Roddy, H. Justin. Physical and Industrial Geography of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. Lancaster, PA: New Era Printing Co., 1916.

Stevenson, Whitcomb Fletcher. Pennsylvania Agriculture and Country Life 1640-1840. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1971; orig. publ. 1950; 165-6.

William Penn. Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania, London, 1681; rpt. in Jean R. Soderlund, ed., William Penn and the founding of Pennsylvania 1680-1684: A Documentary History. Philadelphia: U of PA Press, 1983.

Wittlinger, Carlton O. Early Manufacturing in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, 1710-1840. Ph.D. Diss., U of PA, 1953.

Government Publications Cited

U. S. Census of Manufacturers, Federal Decennial Censuses 1850-1880, Microfilm, Lancaster City, Pennsylvania, Rolls #209 and #210, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg, PA, at Lancaster County Historical Society, Lancaster, PA.

The following are on file at the State Library of Pennsylvania, Government Publications, Harrisburg, PA:

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, June 30, 1907. Washington, DC, Government Printing Office, 1907 (State Library No. T22.1).

Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bulletins, Vol. 5, No. 8 (General Bulletin, No. 371, Nov. 1922). (State Libarary No. PA 1-3).

U. S. Census of Manufacturers, Federal Decennial Censuses, 1820, Pennsylvania, MSS.

Maps and Atlases Cited

Everts & Stewart, Atlas of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, 1875; rpt. Knightstown, IN: The Bookmark, 1976.

Insurance Maps of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Sanborn-Ferris Map Co., 1886; 1897 (updated to 1904); 1912; and 1912 (updated to 1947); on microfilm, and 1897 MS, at the Historical Society of Lancaster County, Lancaster, PA.

For further material on tobacco resource buildings in Lancaster City, see PA Historic Resource Survey Forms, compiled from the tobacco resource survey conducted by the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County, Lancaster, PA, during the summer of 1989 as part of this study; all forms are on file at the Trust office and at the PA Bureau for Historic Preservation, Harrisburg, PA.