“LIVERPOOLE”, said Daniel Defoe, “is one of the wonders of Britain”.\(^1\) And so it must have seemed to himself and his contemporaries. For, although possessing an ancient charter, its real growth dated only from the development of its overseas trade and commerce in the late seventeenth century. This development initiated a rapid expansion which has continued to the present day. People flocked to the flourishing town from all parts of the British Isles. Building sprawled out along and behind the river as the docks were extended to north and south during the nineteenth century.\(^2\) One by one old agricultural villages on the periphery of the town were engulfed. A great new city, the hub of a great new urban region of Merseyside, was created.

This development of modern Liverpool is of great interest from many viewpoints; of historian, economist, sociologist and geographer. Numerous aspects of it have been dealt with. But others remain little known, among them the precise nature of population development. It is with one facet of this problem that this paper deals. The decennial returns of the census of population enable us to trace changes in numbers and distribution of the people from 1801 onwards. Not until 1841, however, did detail concerning birthplaces, population structure (by age and sex) and occupations become reliable. Only in 1851 was the format used in subsequent censuses established. Thus, for a period of immense importance in the growth of Liverpool, there is much valuable information concerning its population.

During the century or so after the first census of 1801 the major lineaments of present-day Liverpool were created.\(^3\) In 1801 Liverpool alone existed of the present-day Merseyside urban region. The main built-up area was entirely within the bounds of the borough and mostly concentrated within the old township of Liverpool. Here a population of 77,653 was crowded into a restricted area and overcrowded courts and alleys presented many social and health problems, particularly in the town centre. By 1851 the population


\(^{2}\) Of the present dock system Salthouse dock (opened in 1753) is the oldest, but the rest were developed during the period between 1821 and 1913.

\(^{3}\) It is true that in the post-war period there has been a considerable economic revolution on Merseyside, but the genesis of modern Liverpool and the region around it lies essentially in the nineteenth century.
FIGURE 3. POPULATION TRENDS IN LIVERPOOL, 1801-1911
(Based upon the Census of Great Britain, 1851, and the Censuses of England and Wales, 1861-1911)
Total populations are shown on a logarithmic scale in which changes in trends as well as numbers are accurately portrayed.
Graph (a) deals with Liverpool Registration District and the Sub-Districts within it.
Graph (b) shows populations of townships around Liverpool.
The totals for Litherland are affected by boundary changes between 1901 and 1911.
The sample areas are shaded.

**Area I** lies between Dale Street, North John Street, Lord Street-James Street.

**Area II** between Lime Street and Skelhorne Street.

**Area III** Abercromby Square and parts of Crown, Oxford, Chatham, Chestnut, Mulberry, Cambridge, Bedford Bootle Derby Road and streets off (e.g. Pleasant, Everton, Sheridan, Princes and Bedford Place).

**Area IV** between Bold Street (part) and Gradwell Street-Parr Street.

**Area V** Bell Street and Courts.

**Area VI** Waterloo Road, Great Howard Street and connecting streets between Oil Street and Porter Street.

**Area VII** Dryden Street, Oswald Street and parts of Scotland Road and Little Homer Street.

**Area VIII** Everton Village.

**Walton** Walton Village.

**Litherland** All the township west of the Leeds-Liverpool Canal including, chiefly, Seaforth and part of Waterloo.

**Aintree, Allerton and Childwall** the entire townships.

**Wavertree** All that part south of Dunbabin Lane-Penny Lane, including Mossley Hill.

**Garston Village and salt works.**

---

**FIGURE 5. OCCUPATIONS IN SAMPLE AREAS.**

The symbol is proportionate to the total of gainfully employed population and shows the proportion of people occupied in (each of eight main groupings.

---

**FIGURE 6. BIRTHPLACES OF THE POPULATION OF SAMPLE AREAS.**

The size of the symbol is proportionate to the total population of the sample areas.

- (a) Those living in the township of their birth distinguished by the initial letter of the township, e.g. L Liverpool, W Wavertree, etc.
- (b) Those born in local townships (Lo) including all those townships within the present-day boundaries of Liverpool, Bootle, Huyton with Roby, Litherland and Crosby.

---

**FIGURE 7. POPULATION OF SAMPLE AREAS BY AGE AND SEX.**

Each diagram shows the percentage in the total population of 5-year age-groups (0-4, 5-9, 10-14, and so on to 80+). Males are shown to the left of the central line and females to the right.
had grown five-fold to 375,955 (see Figure 3). As the line of the
docks extended, so the built-up area grew and reached out further
into its hinterland. As Liverpool township became fully built over
the town extended into the adjacent districts of Kirkdale, Everton,
West Derby and Toxteth Park. Into this area people flocked from all
over Britain. Liverpool became a cosmopolitan city.

The general outlines and nature of this development have been
traced elsewhere. Here we are concerned with the nature of the
population of Liverpool in a single year; 1851. It is possible to
analyse this in very great detail. For the census of that year the
enumerators' books, which record house by house and person by
person the full details required by the Registrar General, can be
inspected at the Public Record Office. They contain for each
person residing in Liverpool on the census night of 31 March 1851
details of name, place of residence, age and sex, relation to the head
of the household, occupation and birthplace (by parish and county).
It is from these books, entry by entry, that I have drawn my material.
For a city of over 375,000 people I have had to be content with
samples. Seventeen areas were selected, eight from within the
borough boundary, nine from outside, ranging in size of sample
from 153 to 1,138 and totalling, in all, 13,932 people (see Figure 4).

Area I is representative of the crowded wards of the commercial
centre. Around this core was a ring of very high density areas
ranging from crowded dockside districts (areas V and VI) to busy
trading and servicing areas (areas II and IV). These were all at
about their peak population in 1851 and were destined to lose
population, on aggregate, from this time onward (Figure 3a).

Already, indeed, many of those who could afford to do so had
moved away from their place of work or business into areas on
the outskirts of the town or even beyond it into adjacent town­
ships. Furthermore, as the line of the docks was extended,
industry and commerce went with them and housing spread along
the river and behind it to a depth of a mile or more. To the mid-
and latter-nineteenth century belongs much of the blanket of terrace
housing wrapped around the Georgian and early Victorian town
which is the core of the present city. Thus, while the Scotland
Road area (area VII) was associated primarily with a working-class
population in fairly crowded conditions, the Abercromby Square
sample (area III) consisted of spacious residences of merchants and
traders interspersed with better-class artisan property.

By 1851 new things were to be seen on the map. The built-up
area, hitherto confined to a single block growing outwards from
the old town, began to reach (and was ultimately to engulf) old
villages away from the river. The first to experience this was Everton

(4) See, for example, W. Smith (Ed.), A Scientific Survey of Merseyside (Liver-
pool, 1953).

(5) Public Record Office, H.O. 107 (various).

(6) Movement was also going on "across the water" into Wirral, though this
does not concern us here.
village (area VIII). Thus a place which had been one of the first to receive the merchant looking for space and prospect near to the town was being linked to it by terrace housing advancing up the slopes of Everton hill from the crowded areas behind the north docks. Its society was also in a state of transition.

As such inner residential areas of a higher quality declined, and as it became increasingly the fashion of those who could afford to do so to live away from their business, so there developed outer residential areas, spatially divorced from the main urban fabric. Such old villages as Walton, Wavertree, Allerton, Bootle and Litherland received migrants from town. Secondly, residential parks and districts of new origin developed, one of the best and earliest examples being Grassendale Park. Another example of a new district, Mossley Hill, is contained in the Wavertree sample. Garston village, with its own docks and industry, is a special and interesting study. At this time, before the development of an adequate public transport system, the range of influence of the city was limited. It did not penetrate beyond the sandstone ridge of the Liverpool upland. Such villages as Childwall and Aintree felt the influence of the town only indirectly. They lost rather than gained people in the late nineteenth century (Figure 3b). Their absorption by Liverpool dates only from the post-1918 era.

Thus each of these seventeen areas illustrates, in its several way, some aspect of the cosmos that was Liverpool. Together they help us to paint in some detail a portrait of the character of its population. Separately they draw attention to distinctive zones of different economy and society within the city. As this study is concerned with a time when much of the modern city had begun to take shape, this material is of substantial value in an appreciation of the Liverpool of today, not least in its problems of planning. Further to this, however, the study of Liverpool’s population is a type-study in the genesis of a conurbation. The first stage of suburban development was already under way and with it the corresponding decline of the city centre as a residential area. This is typical of other major conurbations of nineteenth and twentieth-century Britain.

ANALYSIS OF THE 1851 SAMPLES

A. OCCUPATIONS

The Liverpool of 1851 was a centre of trade and commerce rather than of manufacture. The economy focussed on the port, and the evolution of the urban fabric and development of population was intimately related to this feature. Liverpool’s contacts were world-wide and its imports went to all parts of the country.

These contacts can be seen in the enumerators’ books in many ways. The merchants were East India merchants, in the American (especially West Indies) trade and the like (8) The town attracted people concerned in such trade either as permanent settlers or on business visits. In addition, vast armies of labourers were needed to unload and transport cargo from ship to warehouse. Thus service industry (trade, commerce, transport, etc.) was the dominant element in the occupational structure. Liverpool had its industry, of course, but much of this was directly connected with its trade (e.g. in sugar refining, soap and salt manufacture) or its ships. Ship-building was on the decline as the demands of docks and warehouses restricted available riverside sites, and the industry transferred to the Cheshire shore, But ship-repairing was still important.

Difficulties inherent in my method of sampling preclude a complete picture of the economy from occupations. In the first place, the strong coincidence between place of work and place of residence in the working-class districts means that specific industries may be omitted. Thus for a full account of soap works, sugar refineries and the like one must go to other sources such as the directories of the period. Secondly, the classification of a host of occupations into a few significant categories is not easy. Bearing in mind the nature of Liverpool in 1851, I have deliberately not followed the census classification of the tabulated and published summaries. I have plotted the employed population only—the size of symbol is related to numbers. I have separated the very large group of service industries into domestic and other personal services, shipping and transport, commerce, trade, and professions. Manufacture and craft industry were of much lesser significance and have been confined to a single grouping. The resulting classification and diagrams are occupational rather than industrial. Thus a “clerk” may be classified under “commerce” while he was in point of fact employed in an industrial establishment. However, in the majority of cases some further description was attached to such occupations and this facilitates the process of classification. Thus, only those returned as dock labourers are included in the transport and shipping section. Labourers alone are given a separate classification. It is usual also to distinguish between warehouse porters and railway porters, and so on. The classifications draw attention to the general nature of the economy of Liverpool and to certain distinct zones within it (Figure 5).

The inner city areas (I and II) present certain common characteristics, though contrasting facets. Each was primarily a servicing area. In the first (I) we are in the very heart of the commercial centre. Residential buildings were few and confined to courts and alleys off the main streets. These unattractive, crowded and insani-

(8) The numerous merchant households of Abercromby Square (area III) included a Jamaican-born timber merchant, two East India merchants, a general merchant whose wife and two elder children were born in Barbados, one whose wife and elder children were born in the U.S.A., two Brazil merchants, and two German-born merchants.
tary dwellings were inhabited primarily by unskilled workers employed in or around the docks; dock labourers, porters in the corn and cotton warehouses, and the like. Much of the population was transitory. In the hotels and lodging-houses were many concerned in commerce visiting the city on business, and those who catered for them swelled the domestic service element in this area.

From many of the main streets private residences had largely gone; whole blocks in Castle Street were returned as uninhabited and elsewhere it was the “office keeper” rather than the banker or merchant who remained. They, together with the clerks rather than the merchant, formed much of the commercial group. Occasionally, as at the Bank of England in Castle Street, the bank manager’s place of work was still his residence. But this was rare. Thus in 1851 the business core of an actively growing Liverpool was already dying from a residential point of view. This character is further displayed in other ways (e.g. by its predominantly adult population) as we shall see in due course.

The second central area (II) shows a very varied occupational structure. Many of the people were engaged in trade and craft industries, typical of the large city with its considerable consumer hinterland. There were many domestic servants employed in hotels and lodging-houses. Most of the traders were small rather than big business men and were often craftsmen, such as tailors and cabinet-makers, making, as well as selling, their own goods.

The third inner area (IV) was part of the “new town” as described by Defoe, which developed largely in the eighteenth century. In 1851 Bold Street formed one of the principal shopping streets. Gazetteers and directories of the time indicate this, and the traders’ advertisements often stress that their goods were made in their own workshops. This is reflected in the very large trading element in the population, with large numbers of shop assistants, still at that time chiefly male, housed on the premises. Most “industrial” workers were engaged in a substantial craft industry which supplied consumer goods like clothing and furniture. There were cabinet makers, gilders, upholsterers, tailors, watch-makers, jewellers, etc. The direct links with port industries and trade in this area were few, though there were a number of Irish labouring families in some of the cellars of residential streets behind Bold Street (e.g. Fleet Street).

One of the reasons for the limited number of well-to-do merchants and traders in the town centre is to be seen when we consider the Abercromby Square area (III). Here, in part of what Wilfred Smith described as “Liverpool’s Bloomsbury”, is a fine example of the merchant-class residential area of the town proper. These classes inhabited the larger houses but some of the adjoining streets (e.g. Mulberry Street) were occupied by skilled artisans and traders. To supply these households an army of servants gathered (up to a dozen in some households) and formed in toto the major element in the working population.
In contrast to the “town” areas already discussed, the dockside areas were almost exclusively bound up with the port. The dominant occupations were dock labourers, porters and artisans associated with ships and shipping, such as riggers, shipwrights, carpenters, and boiler makers. The high proportion of the population not gainfully employed (especially in area V) reflects a high birth-rate and relatively few openings for female labour, though many worked as charwomen, washerwomen and in other forms of domestic service. These influences had penetrated inland, especially in the north dock areas, and affected the Scotland Road sample (VII). The working element in the population was again a relatively low one associated primarily with large families in a crowded residential area. Much of this population was concerned with varied craft industries and small trade, but unskilled labour (mostly of Irish origin) had settled in the courts of the area and was often concerned in dockside industry. Their womenfolk swelled the “trade” section in such occupations as “orange dealer”.

So far we have been primarily concerned with sample areas lying within the continuously built-up area of the town proper. Everton village (VIII) is clearly in a zone, and a state; of transition. The large merchant households with their considerable domestic staffs are there, but so too are artisan and even occasional labouring households. Moreover, with no agricultural group left, it was, by 1851, closely and completely bound to Liverpool.

Migration of population, especially of the well-to-do merchant, trading and professional elements was actively taking place to formerly agricultural villages on the periphery of the town. Such people were, in the main, carriage folk, who could manage the journey to work thus entailed, but involved with them were numerous servants in their households. Moreover, there remained in such villages a considerable agricultural population, while the spread of new building involved many builders’ craftsmen and labourers.

Though still spatially divorced from Liverpool, Walton village was becoming linked firmly in occupations and society to the city. For, superimposed upon a considerable agricultural foundation, were a number of commercial and professional households which, with their associated domestic staffs, were prominent in the occupational structure of this small village.

Some of this outward growth was bound up with the river itself. Thus Bootle had a two-fold development at this time: first, swelling the old village which was set back some distance from the river; second, the growth of a new, riverside Bootle. Our sample is this new Bootle. It was linked with commerce and shipping and already involved in new dock construction. Thus it had not only the large households of merchants moving from town, but artisans, sailors and labourers directly linked with the docks. The docks did not actually

(9) Even the Liverpool of today abounds in its market women and flower sellers.
front on to Bootle until the 1880's, but the Sandon and Huskisson system nearby was opened in 1851 and 1852. Moreover, it was rapidly being built-up and a large proportion of the craftsmen were employed in the building industry.

Litherland (including in my sample Seaforth and Waterloo chiefly) lay further afield and was much more the fashionable better-class residential area. The "industrial" element in the population was chiefly involved in the building trade. The rural society on which this pattern had been recently superimposed was much obscured by the growth of Liverpool. Thus only a relatively small section was still agricultural. There were many merchants and traders and a large domestic service group.

In contrast to this the agricultural population of the southern portion of Wavertree township (i.e. the Mossley Hill area in the main) and of Allerton township was still prominent. Indeed in these cases the "big houses" were as yet relatively few and included some of Liverpool's most prominent citizens, for example, in Allerton, Joseph N. Walker of Calderstones, Thomas Brocklebank of Springfield, Hardman Earle of Allerton Tower, John Bibby of Harthill, and Theodore G. Rathbone of Allerton Priory, and, in Mossley Hill, Muspratt, the chemical manufacturer, Lawrence, merchant, magistrate and county lieutenant, and Kinderman, a Prussian-born merchant.

Beyond these the outer villages remained largely agricultural. Childwall, basically a small farm hamlet in character, had, however, the Hall with its large domestic staff and the Abbey Hotel, even then, it would seem, a house of some repute attracting business men visiting Liverpool. Aintree, a larger village, shows a structure typical of the mid-nineteenth century rural township community, with varied crafts serving local needs adding diversity—and a considerable measure of self-sufficiency—to a largely agricultural population.

Garston village and Grassendale Park are particular cases with distinctive features. Grassendale, one of the earlier residential parks of Merseyside and still in the course of construction, was exclusively the residence of carriage folk and their establishments. Garston, however, was a fairly large agricultural village to which had been added docks and industry. It was these new features which accounted for much of its working population. The commercial element was limited, for business in Merseyside was centred in the city of Liverpool and Garston village was not an important city man's residential area. Its industry was, however, intimately related to an important element in Liverpool's trade—that in salt. Garston Saltworks was the main employer of industrial labour and was as important as the numerous craft trades, which were especially connected with building and which made up about half of the "industrial" group.

(10) The Bootle docks of Langton, Alexandra, Hornby and Gladstone systems were not completed until 1881, 1881, 1884 and 1910-14 respectively.
B. POPULATION AND MIGRATION

Contemporary reports, the evidence of the census and vital statistics, and the polyglot origins of the population of present-day Liverpool leave us in no doubt that the natural growth of population, resulting from excess of births over deaths, could not alone account for the rapid rate of growth of Liverpool’s population in the mid-nineteenth century. Figure 8 shows the relationship between the rate of total population growth and the change due to the balance between births and deaths. By 1851 the peak of inner Liverpool’s growth had passed and there was a progressive decline associated with outward movement, and little or no natural increase of population. Even so, in 1851 out of a total population for the Registration District of 258,236, 53.2% were born outside Lancashire. In the West Derby District the high natural increase did not alone account for the total increment. A large immigration into the District continued until the end of the century. Even in 1851, 39.2% of a total population of 153,279 were born outside Lancashire.

A very high proportion of the population was Irish by birth. One-sixth of the considerable total of Irish immigrants in England and Wales up to this date was to be found on Merseyside (chiefly in Liverpool).

Although there were many people drawn to Liverpool from adjacent areas, Liverpool’s power to attract population was countrywide. The general pattern of such immigration can be plotted from published census returns of birthplaces for 1851. But the manuscript returns give us very much more significant detail. For each person the township and county of birth is given. Not only does the proportion of immigrants differ from sample area to sample area, but so do the patterns of their birthplaces. These differences were in part the outcome of contrasts in the economic structure of different areas of Liverpool, in part of contrasts in social structure. In their turn they helped to strengthen these contrasts, especially social contrasts, in different parts of Liverpool. Moreover, as we shall see, they strongly affected the demographic structure.

A general map has been produced showing the birthplaces of the inhabitants of the seventeen sample areas under eight main headings: first, locally-born, using that term to cover all townships now within the built-up area on the Liverpool side of the river. This section is subdivided where relevant to show the proportion living in their native township and those from adjacent townships; second, short-distance immigrants from Lancashire and Cheshire the majority of whom are from quite close at hand. Other sections (giving medium and long-distance migrations) are from the rest of England, Wales (chiefly in these cases from North Wales), Ireland, Scotland, and a last group from overseas.

These birthplace tables present some problems of interpretation so far as the study of population movement is concerned. For
The Irish n. always go to urban city areas, according the as yet still agric. outskirts of l'hort. Presumably there was more chance of work in inner city close by works or not. Domestic service area...
example, the head of the house at 58 Crown Street was born in York, but the record of family birthplaces suggests that he reached Liverpool by a very indirect route. His wife and eldest son (aged 23) were both born in Bristol, his second son (21) in York, his daughter (19) in Hull, and three other sons (17, 15, 13) in Leeds. One cannot assume that "birthplace" is synonymous with "migrant from". But the family record helps to trace details of movement in many cases. The vast majority of households show no such complexity and it is fair to say that the diagram is a valid indication of the amount and pattern of population movement into Liverpool up to 1851 (Figure 6).

In the samples covered as a whole the proportion of those born outside the immediate locality was everywhere high, though less notable in outer areas. Short-distance migration (from Lancashire and Cheshire, but much of it from close at hand) varied in amount but was most notable in outer areas, especially in former agricultural villages recently affected by the growth of Liverpool. Medium and long-distance immigration was important in all but the villages unaffected or recently affected by the growth of the town. It was least in Aintree and Childwall. Thus a distinction can be clearly made between those areas in town and outer areas of new development. In town the proportion of longer-distance immigrants was generally high and was most marked in the inner districts. Moreover, many of these migrants came from far afield, notably in certain districts from Ireland, for which Liverpool was the principal point of entry into England. In the outer districts, however, much of the recent population increase had clearly been supplied from the local area, notably from Liverpool itself, while longer-distance immigration was less prominent. This contrast is, in part, bound up with the general nature of urban development in Liverpool and is probably typical of the majority of the great cities of Victorian England. It represents the suburban movement of the well-to-do from already decaying residential areas in the town centre. Moreover, a great many of the merchants and professional people involved were local men or to judge from their families' birthplaces had long been established on Merseyside (Figure 9). Often it is the servants in such households who were recruited from far afield. This is particularly noticeable in the sample from Wavertree township, but is typical also of Litherland, Walton, Allerton and Grassendale and in the town proper in Area III.

The long-distance immigrant was initially attracted, often as not, to the varied opportunities of the town centre. The attraction of Liverpool, lacking as it did large manufacturing industries requiring specific skill, was general rather than particular. Much of the labour (as opposed to commercial and professional classes) needed in a great port was unskilled. The craft industries were such as were attracted to large and growing towns all over England at this date. Thus few specific regional connections developed on economic grounds, such as, for example, one finds in the migration
BIRTHPLACES OF
(a) MERCHANTS, BANKERS, ACCOUNTANTS, BROKERS, ETC. IN ALL SAMPLE AREAS.
(b) DOMESTIC SERVANTS IN AREA III.

The symbols are on identical scales and are proportionate to the numbers born in the township in which they are placed. Where only the county of birth is given in the returns, an open symbol has been used and placed in the centre of the county of birth.
FIGURE 9b
Nevertheless, other factors made for the growth of very distinctive immigrant elements in the population of the town, elements which, moreover, had a very distinctive distribution within the town. The largest single immigrant element in the city was Irish. Very often the Irish occupied unskilled labouring jobs, especially round the docks (Figure 10). Their womenfolk were important as domestic servants. The Liverpool Irish were not, of course, wholly a single-class community. But they tended to be so. For although there were Irish-born craftsmen, they were often poor tailors and dressmakers rather than artisans, and the proportion in business and professions was low. Thus the Irish immigrants were chiefly concentrated into the areas of the town centre behind the docks in which so many of them were employed and which was, of course, at their precise point of entry into the country. Not all stayed in Liverpool. Ultimately many moved on to other parts of England or abroad. Thus the very high proportion of Irish-born enumerated in area VI in 1851 (59.7%) comprised not only Irish immigrants to Liverpool, but many persons and some families awaiting passage to America and elsewhere. There were numerous lodging-houses in the area packed with such emigrants. In area V, however, the very large Irish colony (41.4%) was composed of permanent settlers. Many of them, to judge from the birthplaces of their families, had moved to Liverpool in the previous four or five years, that is after the severe potato famines of 1845-47. As one moves away from the river, so the Irish element in the population tended to decrease. They were prominent in the Scotland Road area (VII) (27.8%); many of them here were immigrants of some eight or ten years previously. But even in this area the Irish tended to be concentrated into colonies inhabiting the poorer courts in very crowded conditions. Towards the outskirts of the city and into the residential districts beyond, the proportion of Irish-born declines and in such areas they mostly occupied unskilled jobs as labourers or as domestic servants.

I have considered the Irish immigrants at some length because they formed such a large part of the city’s population. They were rather a special case in that while in terms of the distance moved they formed long-distance migrants, they were settling in one of the nearest points to Ireland in Britain. Often many of them moved on in due course from Liverpool. As the great swell of immigration of the Irish into Britain in the mid-nineteenth century declined, the Irish element in the population of Liverpool decreased. By 1911 only 4.6% of the population of Liverpool borough and 6.7% of Bootle were Irish born, though, of course, a very high proportion of the population was of Irish descent. However, socially and economically, these distinctive nineteenth-century “colonies” left their mark on present-day Liverpool. The strong social stratification of nineteenth-century Liverpool and the gulf between unskilled worker and merchant at opposite ends of the whole gamut of
FIGURE 10.
BIRTHPLACES OF DOCK LABOURERS AND STEVEDORES IN ALL AREAS.

Note the overwhelming emphasis on immigrant Irish labour.
FIGURE 11a

FIGURE 11.

BIRTHPLACES OF (A) SALT WORKERS, AND (B) AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS IN GARSTON.

The symbols are not on the same scale.
Attention is drawn to the migration of more skilled salt workers from the Cheshire salt area, contrasting with the mainly local birthplaces of salt works labourers and farm workers.
occupations linked with the port has tended to perpetuate these features. Liverpool had too its Welsh and Scottish colonies. But they tended to be smaller in numbers, to be less concentrated in distribution, and found in a wider range of occupations and society. Nevertheless, the Welsh were prominent in domestic service, and as small traders and craftsmen, especially in the building trade. The Scots had similar jobs, but were also quite important in the merchant class, as for example, in the Abercromby Square area, and as doctors.

The single exception to the general rule that in Liverpool there appears to have been little direct recruitment of labour from areas of similar economy in other parts of Britain, was in Garston. Of the substantial immigration from Lancashire and Cheshire one part came from adjoining rural townships of south-west Lancashire. The other, major part (85 people) came from the Cheshire salt area and worked almost wholly in the Garston salt works. Of the 70 persons in my sample employed at the works, 33 came from this area. They were mostly employed in the more skilled work as salt boilers (see Figure 11a). The labourers were more widely recruited from adjacent agricultural townships and from Ireland in the main. This distribution is in marked contrast to that of the birthplaces of agricultural labourers in Garston (Figure 11b).

There is much evidence therefore from these detailed samples to support the contention that long-distance migration into Liverpool—as to other large towns—up to 1851 was of considerable importance, more important indeed than many previous writers on the general theme of population migration in nineteenth-century Britain have suggested. It is true that many people followed a short distance drift from adjoining rural areas to town, or from town to outer residential districts, but in the city centre in particular, the least proportion of longer-distance immigrants was 42·0% (in area VII) and even in outer areas a general figure was about 25% to 30% of the total population. The main exceptions to this are Garston village and Aintree, both with a distinctive or separate existence, and the latter losing, rather than attracting, population by migration.

Thus the nature of immigration was affected by the economic structure of Liverpool and the character of its urban growth. In its turn it added distinctiveness to the population and strengthened social and economic contrasts between different parts of Liverpool. Moreover, the nature of the immigration made its mark on demographic characteristics, notably on age and sex structure.

C. AGE-SEX STRUCTURE

As compared with England and Wales in 1851 (see Figure 7), Liverpool Registration District had a considerably lesser proportion

(111) See A. Redford, Labour Migration in England, 1800–1850 (1926). Professor Redford was, however, writing of an earlier period when much migration was short range.
of people in the groups 5 to 14. In West Derby District there were more in the 0 to 9 groups but less in the 10 to 19 groups than in England and Wales. The reasons are to be sought in a high birth rate, the effects of which were, however, soon negatived by a high infant and child mortality rate most pronounced in the crowded and insanitary residential areas of the inner parts of the city. Another notable feature was the bulge in the middle age-groups, especially those between 20 and 44. This represents the effects of a large number of immigrants which accounted for so much of the rapid increase in population. The greater bulge in the female side of the pyramid in West Derby district was because of the large numbers of women (often unmarried women) employed “in service” in the better-class households of many parts of that district. Finally the “hollowing” of the upper age-groups, especially in Liverpool, represents, in part a higher death-rate than was general in England and Wales as a whole.

One or two examples will suffice to show the relationships between this and other population features already described. These features were not constant throughout the Liverpool of 1851. The numerous immigrant population of the inner districts, especially areas I and VI had a relatively low birth-rate. Much of their population was composed of immigrants of mature years and individual households were generally small, partly because of the high death rates accompanying crowded conditions, partly because of the relatively high proportions of transitory population (see page 111). The middle age-groups are considerably swollen by this immigrant element. In the town centre (I) the 10–29 female age-groups were particularly large and must be related to the large numbers of women drawn into employment in the numerous hotels and lodging-houses of the area. The inflated male groups from 15-44 represent the large number of “commercials”, merchants and travellers in particular. Indeed, in the town centre as a whole this increased middle group is characteristic, though there were significant variations in it. Thus around Abercromby Square (area III), there was a large excess of female population, especially between 15 and 34 related to the very large domestic establishments of many of the houses there. Areas II and IV were less irregular because in the many artisan and labouring-class households typical of much of these areas there were large families. Even there, however, much of the population was composed of adults who had come into Liverpool from other parts of the country. In area IV many of these were to be found in the large shops of Bold Street where there were large numbers of shop assistants (largely male) “living-in” on the premises. Areas V and VII, each with a large immigrant Irish community, had high birth-rates and a broad base to the population structure, but much of this was quickly negatived by a high infant death-rate.

\[\text{[12]}\] A graphic picture of these is given in the early reports of the Liverpool Medical Officer of Health from 1847 onwards. See also Sheila Marriner, “History of Liverpool 1700-1900,” in W. Smith, Ed., \textit{op. cit.}, especially pp. 114-116.
and the bulge in the middle age-groups was due wholly to immigration of people of mature years. This insistence upon the significance of immigration into Liverpool as an important factor in its demographic structure is stressed by an examination of birthplaces in relation to age. The vast majority of those under fifteen years old were born in Liverpool. It was their parents who were the migrants.

In the outer areas the old villages affected by outward movement of people from town had common characteristics of a large excess over the general figures for England and Wales in the middle age-groups due to immigration. Much of this was due to large domestic staffs, generally giving a bigger bulge to the female side (notably in Grassendale, also in Litherland, Wavertree and Allerton). This factor more than counteracted the large size of many families, and indeed in many cases these families were of mature years. Bootle, with its varied male occupations (labouring and craft industry as well as commercial) had rather less stress on the female side. Garston is unique among the outer areas affected by the growth of Liverpool in that it had an excess of male population. It was still, in part, an agricultural community and farm labourers remained, while dock workers and those employed in the building and salt trades were important. Moreover, it was not an area where there was the same outlet for female labour in domestic service (the chief employer of women throughout Victorian England as a whole) as, say, in Mossley Hill or Allerton.

Aintree is the best example of the rural township of declining population. The narrow base in the lowest age-groups indicates a relatively low birth-rate. The hollowing of the pyramid in the middle groups between 20 and 49, especially on the female side, indicates emigration of population, in its turn a factor contributing to a further lowering of birth-rate. Generally speaking men tended to remain (mainly as agricultural labourers) rather more than the women. It is a characteristic not unfamiliar in similar rural townspheres elsewhere in Britain.

Thus, social conditions (especially in relation to birth and mortality rates and their variations) and economic factors (in relation to the attraction of immigrants) played an important and varying role in the creation of distinctive demographic zones.

D. CONCLUSION.

Therefore, in the Liverpool of 1851 there was a well-marked zoning. Even using a relatively limited number of samples, certain distinctive districts can be distinguished not only in terms of the period and type of development of their buildings, or of economy and society, but also in respect of population structure. This has been viewed from a number of points which are, however, intimately related to one another. A few samples in which the population for
particular areas is plotted from a number of viewpoints side-by-side stresses these inter-relationships. For selected areas the proportion of all the population in particular occupation groupings has been separately plotted for male and female. This can be compared with a chart of birthplaces and an age-sex diagram in which the difference between percentages of different age-groups is compared with the figure for England and Wales. These have been plotted for male and female separately and have the merit of drawing attention to the precise nature and degree of contrasts with the figures for the rest of the country (Figure 12).

Area I shows a relatively high proportion of both male and female gainfully occupied. This is to be related to a large immigration from outside the local area and is reflected in the difference in age and sex structure between the area and the country as a whole. Because of the low birth-rate there is a considerably lower proportion in ages 0–14 and, in the 15–44 age-groups, high immigration gives a large excess over the average figures for England and Wales. To a certain degree this can be correlated with particular occupational groups. For example, the very large excess of female population between 15 and 29 is closely linked to the demand for female labour in the service occupations associated with hotels and lodging-houses and domestic staffs. Other central areas (II and IV) show similar characteristics though with varying emphasis. Thus, because of the large number of men employed as shop assistants in the Bold Street shopping area, the male immigration bulge in the ages 20–55 is bigger than that in the equivalent female grouping.

Area III, an example of the better class "town" residential district, shows the immense influence that a single occupational group could exert on population structure. The excess of female population over the average for England and Wales is here very marked and is linked, in the main, to the great demand for domestic servants in the large houses in the Abercromby Square area. It is therefore associated with considerable immigration and a large percentage in the female age-groups, especially between 15 and 49. This has much in common with a similar district in Everton Village (VIII).

Area V, a dockside residential district of poor class housing, had a large immigrant population particularly from Ireland. But families were large (accounting for the large proportion of the female population not gainfully employed) and the birth-rate high. Thus, the lower age-groups (0–14) were large relative to England and Wales. But the high level of infant and child mortality led to a rapid lowering of this difference so that in the group 15–19 the Liverpool figures are below those for the country as a whole. Thereafter adult immigration swelled the groups between 25 and 44. Similar characteristics are shown by area VII, another example of a relatively crowded working-class district.

These contrast markedly with the dockside area VI where much of the very large immigrant population (chiefly from Ireland) was in transit to America and often consisted of single men rather than
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These show in each case
(a) in the left hand circles—the proportion of all males and females (i) not gainfully employed (white); (ii) in the occupational categories shown in figure 8 (shaded, and with the initial letter as in figure 5); males above, females below.
(b) in the middle circle—birthplaces grouped as in figure 6, the groups indicated by the initial letter.
(c) age and sex showing the difference between the percentage in each male and female group (0—4, 5—9, and to 80+) and the corresponding figure for England and Wales as a whole. Age-groups are on the horizontal scale, percentage differences on the vertical. N.B. For Area III vertical scale for male population should read 0, —2·0, —4·0.
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families. There were relatively few children and a pronounced excess of men between the ages of 25 and 49.

The outer residential areas were gaining much of their growing populations by an outward movement from Liverpool itself. Thus, in cases where an old agricultural village had superimposed upon it a suburban character, the population characteristics were composite. In Walton agriculture was still an important male occupation and those men and their families were usually born in Walton itself. The merchant households were not very numerous but employed quite large numbers of domestic staff. The striking numbers of boys in the 10–14 male group is due to boarders at Walton Academy.

Where the development of population associated with the spread of Liverpool was leading to the creation of new settlement as in the riverside area of Bootle township, the picture is clearer. Here a balanced occupational structure associated with a range of classes of people was linked to considerable immigration, much of it from the local area. The comparison of percentages in different age-groups with England and Wales shows two distinctive features. First, an excess in the younger age-groups of both sexes linked to high birth-rates and large families; second, a swelling due to adult immigration between 25–39.

Where the residential development had been chiefly associated with the moving of upper classes from the town, as in Litherland, there is a considerable similarity to the age-sex pattern in such districts as the Abercromby Square area and Everton. The large domestic service group is linked to an excess of population in the female groups between 15 and 39. The considerable numbers of people born locally but outside the Seaforth and Litherland township point to the large element of outward movement from town already commented upon.

Aintree is in complete contrast to any of the samples previously considered. It was still very much the agricultural township. There was little employment of women and as a result there had been much movement of women in the age-groups 25–54 to employment elsewhere. Agriculture and varied craft trades were more able to give the men employment and this, rather than any positive attraction, accounts for the greater proportion of men than women and the excess of males between 5 and 29. But the people as a whole were local people and the township was losing population by migration and even at this time beginning to decline in total numbers (see Figure 3). As the middle age-groups moved out (note the relatively smaller groups 25–49) so the population became an ageing one and the birth rate declined, giving a much lower figure than was typical for England and Wales in the 0–4 group.

Although these zones were by no means absolutely clear-cut, one can draw certain positive conclusions from them. Central Liverpool was, by 1851, a zone of banking and commerce, though it also had its labourers and small-scale traders and craftsmen. It was, however, very much in decline as a residential area. Indeed
### TABLE I

**SAMPLE AREAS: CUMULATIVE TOTALS OF OCCUPATIONS**

The upper figure refers to total numbers, the lower to (in Column 1) the percentage of the *total* population not gainfully employed. (in other columns) the percentage of the *gainfully employed* population engaged in main groups of occupation.

A cumulative total for all samples is shown in the bottom line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Occupied</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Transpor</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Total Occupied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| VIII  | 567          | 59       | 7        | 218     | 18    | 78       | 42           | 16     | 3           | 441             | 1008  |
| Walton | 336          | 17       | 4        | 113     | 4     | 9        | 12           | 2      | 2           | 214             | 550   |
| Bootle| 814          | 122      | 45       | 120     | 21    | 43       | 24           | 61     | 5           | 441             | 1255  |
| Litherland | 763 | 89 | 24 | 279 | 17 | 63 | 58 | 3 | 42 | 575 | 1338 |

| Aintree | 165          | 32       | 2        | 25      | 4     | 2        | 2            | 18     | 61          | 146             | 311   |
| Allerton | 151          | 8        | 3        | 110     | 1     | 12       | 6            | 12     | 36          | 188             | 339   |
| Childwall | 67           | 3        | 1        | 46      | 1     | 7        | 4            | 3      | 34          | 99              | 166   |
| Wavertree | 359          | 15       | 4        | 218     | 2     | 23       | 17           | 7      | 33          | 319             | 678   |
| Grassendale | 77           | 4        | —        | 51      | 1     | 11       | 9            | —      | —           | 76              | 153   |
| Garston  | 561          | 148      | 65       | 139     | 9     | 2        | 10           | 2      | 121         | 496             | 1057  |

| Total   | 7333         | 1298     | 657      | 2563    | 491   | 449      | 300          | 415    | 426         | 6599            | 13932 |
|         | 526          | 197      | 9-9      | 38-9    | 7-4   | 6-8      | 4-6          | 6-3    | 6-5         | 100-0           | 100-0 |

*Not Distributed*
## TABLE 2

CUMULATIVE TOTALS AND PERCENTAGES OF BIRTH PLACES

The upper figures in each group refer to total numbers, the lower to the percentage these form of the total for each area. A cumulative total for all the samples is shown in the bottom line.

The totals shown in these two tables are not everywhere identical. This is because of a small number of cases of inadequate classification (or omission of information) which has not allowed proper analysis.

Initial letters in column I refer to township of birth, e.g. E = Everton.

| LOCAL L'pool Other Lancs. & Chesh. Rest Eng. | Wales Irel. Scot. Rest Total |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| I  307 9 126 165 105 104 27 41 884 |
| 34-8 1-0 14-3 18-6 11-9 11-8 3-1 4-6 100-0 |
| II 342 12 101 110 19 198 36 18 836 |
| 41-0 1-4 12-1 13-2 2-3 23-7 4-3 2-2 100-0 |
| III 286 31 91 187 45 69 68 70 847 |
| 33-8 3-7 10-7 22-1 5-3 8-2 8-0 8-3 100-0 |
| IV 492 11 105 283 86 241 57 49 1324 |
| 37-2 0-8 7-9 21-4 6-5 18-2 4-3 3-7 100-0 |
| V 285 7 47 94 25 798 47 36 1336 |
| 42-5 4-3 4-0 2-1 41-4 1-9 1-0 100-0 |
| VI 282 7 47 94 25 798 47 36 1336 |
| 21-1 0-5 3-5 7-0 1-9 59-7 3-5 2-7 100-0 |
| VII 495 37 146 97 26 325 27 16 1169 |
| 42-3 2-3 12-5 8-3 2-2 27-8 2-3 1-4 100-0 |
| VIII L'p area E.103 442 101 171 52 66 34 26 995 |
| 10-4 44-5 10-2 17-2 5-2 6-6 3-4 2-6 100-0 |
| Walton W.221 L.A.135 115 45 11 8 7 12 554 |
| 39-9 24-4 20-7 8-1 2-0 1-4 1-3 2-2 100-0 |
| Bootle B.175 L.A.378 256 225 45 122 38 14 1253 |
| 14-0 30-2 20-5 17-8 3-6 9-8 3-0 1-1 100-0 |
| Litherland S&L 317 L.A.415 201 197 48 82 37 36 1333 |
| 23-8 31-1 15-0 14-8 3-6 6-1 2-8 2-7 100-0 |
| Aintree A.139 L.A.81 69 3 1 15 3 1 312 |
| 44-5 25-9 22-1 1-0 0-3 4-8 1-0 0-3 100-0 |
| Allerton A.37 L.A.115 70 60 30 11 13 3 339 |
| 10-9 33-9 20-6 17-7 8-9 3-2 3-8 0-9 100-0 |
| Childwall C.50 L.A.42 42 16 2 6 3 6 167 |
| 29-9 25-1 25-1 9-6 1-2 3-6 1-8 3-6 100-0 |
| Wavertree W.130 L.A.270 89 92 19 33 21 23 677 |
| 19-2 39-8 13-1 13-6 2-8 4-9 3-1 3-4 100-0 |
| Grassendale G.13 L.A.61 19 27 11 7 6 6 150 |
| 8-7 40-7 12-7 18-0 7-3 4-7 4-0 4-0 100-0 |
| Garston G.447 L.A.179 258 78 25 41 26 3 1057 |
| 42-3 16-9 24-4 7-4 2-4 3-9 2-5 0-3 100-0 |
| Total 4121 2225 1685 1877 564 2403 477 373 13905 |
| 29-6 16-0 13-4 13-5 4-1 17-2 3-4 2-7 100-0 |
this was true, although to a lesser degree, of other central areas (e.g. II and IV). Moreover, as the town centre declined from this point of view it was increasingly given over to the poorer classes. Some merchants and traders still lived at their business, but increasingly they were to be found in better-class residential districts on the outskirts of the town (e.g. Abercromby Square and Everton). However, even these were in a state of transition. The merchants were beginning to go further afield to suburbs like Allerton, Wavertree, Litherland or new residential parks like Grassendale, where they formed a new element in a hitherto largely agricultural community.

The considerable single-class districts which did exist were to be found chiefly around the centre of the town with its varied commercial functions, rather than within it. They were found in the crowded labouring-class districts behind the docks. Here the alleys and cellars teemed with a numerous and largely immigrant population, chiefly employed as unskilled labour in and around the docks. Where skilled workers were found their crafts were often associated with shipping.

Indeed, the Liverpool of the mid-nineteenth century looked almost wholly to the sea. It was its life and very substance; its influence coloured the development of the town at every turn—its changing morphology, its industry and trade, and, not least, its people.