Father and son left East Saginaw, Michigan in early May 1867. They traveled by train across the state to Ludington (originally Pere Marquette) on Lake Michigan, the western terminus of the Flint & Pere Marquette Railroad. They crossed Lake Michigan to Milwaukee on one of the new steamers operated by the railroad. In Milwaukee, on May 17, 1867, father and son met Dr. Hannibal H. Kimball of Minneapolis. Together the trio traveled by train and river boat to Prairie du Chien on the Mississippi. There they boarded a steamer and arrived in St. Paul on May 20, 1867. Less than six months later, on November 14, 1867, thirty-eight-year-old Glenalvin J. Goodridge died of tuberculosis in Minneapolis. The process that prematurely ended the promising career of one of the nation’s first African American photographers had begun many years before.

The origins of the Goodridge family are hidden by the absence of records to document the lives of individual slaves in Colonial America. According to tradition the family began before the mid-eighteenth century on one of the plantations of Charles Carroll of Carrollton in Maryland. Sometime after 1780 a slave woman whose name we do not known bore a daughter whom she named Emily. During 1806 Emily became pregnant, either on the Carroll plantation or in Baltimore where she had been sent to live with a new master that year. On December 23, 1806 her son William C. Goodridge was born there. Because he was a mulatto young William was not sold as a slave but indentured to a York, Pennsylvania tanner and sometime minister, the Reverend Michael Dunn. Because Dunn was bankrupt by 1822 the indenture ended prematurely and young William was on his own. William traveled for a time, became a barber, and in 1827 married Evalina Wallace of Baltimore. The newlyweds settled in York and established a family that eventually included four sons and three daughters. Their first child, Glenalvin J. Goodridge, was born in York during 1829.

Unlike most children of African American descent at the time Glenalvin could anticipate a future that would include significant opportunity and relative security. He, his brothers, and his sisters were formally educated—the sisters at St. Francis Academy in Baltimore—and could look forward to a role in the family business or even a career on their own. In fact, in 1848, a visitor to York reported that: “There is a good school here, taught by [nineteen-year-old] Mr. G.J. Goodridge, who is also clerk for his father, and quite a young man, but one of excellent deportment and highly exemplary character.”
children’s apparent early success was grounded in part on the parents’ effort and accomplishment.

During the quarter century following their marriage William (Figure 1) and Evalina Goodridge established themselves in York as members of south-eastern Pennsylvania’s emerging African American elite. They were an effective team. From their base at the family barber shop in the center of town the couple experimented with a variety of business ventures that included a bath house, an intelligence office (employment agency), a confectionery, a jewelry store, and, even for a time, a pay-to-view decorated Christmas tree in the family home. Profit from the ventures was invested in various residential and commercial properties throughout the city as well as a substantial three-story brick townhouse for the family on York’s fashionable East Philadelphia Street. William Goodridge’s most significant investment, however, was the purchase from John Hartmann in 1845 of “China Hall” on the southwestern corner of Centre Square. He later sold the property to David and Daniel Rupp for $8,500, a considerable profit. Much of that, in turn, was reinvested during 1847 and 1848 in the family’s most obvious symbol of its success, five-story Centre Hall at the northwestern corner of Centre Square, the largest structure of its type in York at that time.
Figure 2: Sixth-plate daguerreotype of three unidentified children, 1851 or before. G.J. Goodridge, York, Pa.
Centre and China Halls were important because of the financial connection between them, because they were visible symbols of the family's success, and because William Goodridge rented space in them to various long-term and itinerant enterprises that flourished in or merely visited York for a time after 1845. Among the most significant of the latter was the Richmond, Virginia-based daguerreotypist Joseph Reinhart, who rented rooms for his studio in the third story of China Hall from early April to the end of June 1847. Reinhart was one of a series of itinerant photographers who had visited York regularly before 1847. Most, like the daguerreotypists John C. Stinson and Blanchard P. Paige, stopped in York "for a few days." Others, such as Reinhart, extended their stay for two or three months, but apparently none made York a permanent home before 1847.6 Reinhart advertised himself as "a pupil of the celebrated [Montgomery P.] Simons of Philadelphia," and invited Yorkers to view his recently completed daguerreotype portraits of "the Hon. Daniel Webster" and "the celebrated Capt. [Daniel] Walker, commander of a company of Texas Rangers" and a hero of the recent Mexican War. He also advertised "Instructions in Daguerrotyping [sic] at reasonable prices."7

Reinhart's location in China Hall and particularly his newspaper advertisements attracted considerable attention in York, especially that of the young schoolteacher Glenalvin J. Goodridge. We can only imagine that as the end of the school term drew near and as a result of regular visits to the family businesses in China Hall and with a considerable curiosity and appetite for learning, Glenalvin was naturally attracted to Reinhart's studio. He was likely among the Yorkers who took "Instructions in Daguerrotyping" that spring, although no evidence of such a direct connection between the two exists. Nonetheless, when Reinhart left York at the end of June 1847 his studio on the third floor of China Hall, was transformed, almost immediately, into "Goodridge's Daguerrian Rooms."8

When Glenalvin Goodridge began to work as a daguerreotypist in 1847 he joined hundreds of other men and women who, since photography's introduction in 1839, had abandoned earlier careers or chosen to share, like Glen, existing ones with photography. Goodridge was, however, one of only five or six African Americans who, at present, are known to have worked as photographers before 1850. The studio that Goodridge established in 1847 was preceded by those of Jules Lion in New Orleans, John B. Bailey and Edward M. Bannister in Boston, and Augustus Washington in Hartford. J.P. Ball, who also opened his first studio in 1847 in Cincinnati, is much better known. Yet, none of these studios established by Goodridge's African America predecessors and contemporaries lasted as long as or are represented by as large a group of extant photographs as the Goodridge studio which, after 1863, continued to operate in Saginaw, Michigan until 1922.9
Glenalvin worked as a photographer for twenty years. During most of that time he also continued to teach "the young of York." On various occasions, however, he chose, usually for quite specific reasons, to emphasize one role over the other. From 1847 until his marriage in 1851 teaching was his primary occupation while photography engaged his "leisure hours." Marriage, among other motives, prompted a stronger commitment to the potentially greater financial rewards offered by photography. Glenalvin worked during the 1850s to make his studio the most successful in York before the end of the Civil War. In 1859 bankruptcy forced a renewed commitment to teaching and the eventual restructuring and temporary relocation of the photography business. Then in 1862 disaster struck that not only ended his career but shortly thereafter his life as well.

G.J. Goodridge was not York's first photographer, but he was the community's first native son to establish a studio that operated for more than a few weeks. According to the Democratic Press, photographs most likely were first made in York by the daguerreotypists John C. Stinson and Blanchard P. Paige, who visited "for a few days" in March 1842 and rented rooms above F.B. Cook's jewelry store on South George Street. Stinson and Paige were followed by a succession of itinerant photographers who visited York on a regular basis even after 1850. On occasion studios from the not-too-distant metropolises, Philadelphia or Baltimore, also advertised for York's photo business.10

Newspaper advertisements and reports of visitors to York make it clear that even for Glenalvin before 1851 photography was not a full-time activity. Teaching continued to be his primary occupation. Goodridge's initial advertisement, the "China Hall" ad, ran in the Democratic Press for only six months, until January 25, 1848. A second appeared in the same newspaper three months later, on April 4, 1848, and lasted for more than two years. It ended on August 21, 1850. In it Goodridge announced that he had "REMOVED his Daguerrian Establishment [from China Hall] to his father's dwelling in East Philadelphia street, where he is prepared to take Pictures in a superior style to any heretofore taken in this place."11 The move corresponded to the family's sale of "China Hall" in February 1848. Had Glenalvin required the studio space he could have continued to rent it from the new owners David and Daniel Rupp. Instead, as "M.R.D." noted during a November 1848 visit to York, Goodridge "keeps a fine gallery at his father's dwellings, where he has his private study, and operates at leisure hours."12

The fact that Glenalvin continued to teach school does not mean that he was not a serious or successful daguerreotypist. During photography's initial decades such a practice was common. Furthermore, Glenalvin's advertised prices suggest that he was more than an itinerant interested in a quick profit.
Figure 3: Quarter-plate daguerreotype of unidentified mulatto man and horse, 1851 or before. Velvet imprint reads "G.J. Goodridge, York, Pa."

Up to $15.00 for a gold-cased, half-plate daguerreotype portrait was more than twice that advertised by any of his itinerant predecessors or contemporaries in York. According to one recent account of photography's early development, this placed Goodridge among those who had begun "to transform the nature and organization of photography from an experimental practice into an integrated business system managed by dedicated and respected individuals."13

The quality of the photo images that survive from Goodridge's earliest years in the profession also are a measure of his talent and intent. Figure 2, a studio portrait typical for the time, nonetheless demonstrates that by 1851 Goodridge easily had mastered "the basic essentials needed in portrait taking—lighting, posing, and the mechanical requisites of daguerreotyping procedure." His work also compares well with portraits made by the Philadelphia daguerreotypist Simons, Reinhart's mentor, who may have influenced Glenalvin's work through his pupil Reinhart or even directly.14 Consider the subjects in Figure 2. While his sisters may not have agreed, the young fellow in their midst found Glenalvin's technique sufficiently relaxing to produce at least the beginnings of a smile. Standard posing techniques such as crossed hands, arms on shoulders, and thumbs hooked over buttons designed to relax subjects and prevent movement had their desired effect. And, the effective
use of lighting to highlight buttons, tattersall trousers, bare flesh, pleats and parted hair helps to unite and compose a trio of youngsters obviously intimidated by the camera and the whole experience.

Without doubt, however, the most intriguing image to survive from these earliest years is Figure 3. The young man bears a striking resemblance to known images of Goodridge family members. The age, perhaps twenty-five years, is appropriate. The dress, including the pocket watch, is suggestive of his status. The Goodridge home on East Philadelphia Street included a stable. And the family, both in York and later in East Saginaw, were known horse fanciers. The circumstances suggest that the young man with the horse could have been the photographer, Glenalvin J. Goodridge, himself. Because a self-portrait with the subject “releasing the shutter” would have been technically difficult, although not impossible at that time, Glenalvin may have invited younger brother Wallace who had begun to work in the Goodridge studio to assist him.

On June 10, 1851 Glenalvin J. Goodridge married Rhoda Cornelia Grey. The sixteen-year-old bride was the daughter of Hamilton and Jane Grey. The Greys originally were from Maryland and had lived for a time in Harrisburg before settling in York, probably in the mid-1840s. Rhoda was a first cousin to Ralph Toyer Grey of Baltimore, who would marry Glen’s sister Emily O. Goodridge in 1855. And, in fact, when Emily travelled west to join her husband in Minneapolis it was in the company of Hamilton W. Grey, Rhoda’s brother, who had returned east that year to marry Mary Smallwood, a Goodridge neighbor in York. Rhoda’s father Hamilton Grey is listed by the 1850 census as a “laborer,” but one who owned $1,800 in real estate. An April 1850 ad in the York Gazette which announced the opening of a “New Livery Stable” owned by Hamilton Grey and operating at “Mr. Erb’s Stage Stable, in this Borough,” may explain the family’s real estate holdings. In any case, Glenalvin’s and Rhoda’s marriage was more than a personal union in that it further cemented the bonds between two of York’s well established African American families.15

Glenalvin’s marriage no doubt was one of the reasons that he decided by January 1851 to devote more of his energy and talent to photography. While he would continue to teach part-time through the 1850s, photography held out the prospect of a greater financial reward. His “Daguerrian Gallery” had been operating successfully from “China Hall” and then the Goodridge home for more than three years and still the York newspapers carried no ads for full-time competitors. The opportunity to expand, therefore, existed. The late 1840s and the decade of the 1850s also were a prosperous time for many Americans. Photography, as a result, underwent a significant and rapid expansion. During the 1840s photography, through the daguerreotype, repre-
sented simultaneously the cutting edge of practical technological development, akin to the railroad and the reaper, and an almost magical transformation of reality. Glenalvin’s background as an educator and certainly the family’s business sense may, therefore, have made the attraction of a career as a professional photographer irresistible.

This renewed commitment to photography began with a new studio in the fifth story of the family’s business block, Centre Hall. Near the northwest corner of George and Main Streets on Centre Square—see Figure 4—the new studio was at the crossroads of York County’s economic, social, and political activity. No photographer, itinerant or resident, who located in York before 1860 was ever more than a block from the Square. The fifth and uppermost story of Centre Hall provided an abundance of natural light, preferred for quality daguerreotypes and ambrotypes, through two large gables and a skylight. A later ad described the studio as a complex of four rooms that included a “Sky Light Operating Room, Ladies’ Private Room, and two large Work Rooms,” all supplied with water and gas. To this impressive setting, which Goodridge claimed was “fitted up in a style unsurpassed by any other in the country,” the photographer invited “the Ladies and Gentlemen of York and its vicinity,” where “in clear and cloudy weather,” he could “take likenesses in a few seconds with perfect natural expressions.”

Through 1853 Glenalvin faced little competition in York. His newspaper advertisements, which earlier had been straight-forward and business-like, now became whimsical, almost playful, in their appeals to Yorkers. At the same time samples of his work from this period demonstrate that Goodridge did not compromise his commitment to quality and that he continued to attract the patronage of York’s elite. His success also was recognized by the photographer’s magazine Humphrey’s Journal, which reported in January 1853 that “G.J. Goodridge, of York, Pa., has pleasant rooms, with every convenience for producing the finest Daguerreotypes.” Later that year the same journal noted that “G.J. Goodridge of York, Pa. has just visited New York, and supplied himself with all that is desirable for the ladies of York.” And shortly after his New York visit the Democratic Press listed Goodridge as a winner of a “second premium” for a “case of Daguerreotypes” at the 1853 York Agricultural Society Fair. The “first” went to Dr. Barr of Harrisburg.

Glen’s professional success was reflected as well in his personal life. He and Rhoda began a family. Between 1853 and 1857 a daughter, Emily, and two sons, William and Ralph, were born to the Goodridges. In April 1853 they also moved from the family home on East Philadelphia Street to their own residence, just around the corner on North Duke Street, which they had purchased from Rhoda’s parents. Although their first property was a modest acquisition, the young Goodridges soon added five additional parcels to this original purchase.
Figure 4: "Centre Hall," Centre Square, York, Pa., after 1855. Stereo View, von Nieda & Coombs, York, Pa.
During the summer of 1853 Glenalvin’s first significant competition, other than the occasional itinerant or out-county invader like Dr. Barr of Harrisburg, also had established himself strategically in York next to the Post Office, only a few doors from the Goodridge studio in Centre Hall. Although York County, with a population of more than 57,000 in 1850, could support several resident photographers comfortably, J.T. Williams was a formidable competitor. During 1851-1852 he had been located in Baltimore with a studio at 211 West Baltimore Street, but during 1853 decided to move north to York. In his initial newspaper advertisement Williams proclaimed to Yorkers that with “an experience of twelve years,” he “has been at the business longer than any one else in this part of the country, and understands it better.” Furthermore, his studio was “fitted up with the most POWERFUL INSTRUMENTS [and] Large Sky-Light...” enabling him “to produce DAGUERREOTYPES OF THE BEST QUALITY, with clear eye, and colored in natural colors.” And, in an obvious swipe at Glenalvin, who likely continued to devote at least some time to teaching, Williams declared that he was “the only one in York who devotes his entire attention to the art.” In fact, such already had been the response “as to require the engagement of an experienced assistant.”

Williams’ ad was not all rhetoric. Although Dr. Barr again won the diploma for “best specimens of Daguerreotypes” at the York County Fair in 1854, Williams also received a diploma for “a beautiful group of 61 Daguerreotype likenesses of the Young ladies of Professor Hay’s College.” There was no prize listed for Glenalvin that year. The Hay’s College commission was exactly the sort of business that no photographer could stand to lose. By spring 1855 Williams not only was crediting himself with the “Best Likenesses,” but also reminding potential customers that “a Committee appointed by the York Bank, after careful examination awarded to Williams, ONE PREMIUM OF $20.00, ONE PREMIUM OF $10.00, [and] ONE PREMIUM of $5.00, for the best likenesses of York.” In addition to the diploma from the York County Fair, he also received one that same year from the Lancaster County Fair “for large and handsome DAGUERREOTYPE GROUPS.” In April 1855 the York Gazette went so far as to editorialize that Williams’ work “cannot be surpassed.”

Glenalvin, of course, responded to Williams’ competitive challenge. The series of advertisements that he had begun to run for the new studio in 1851 were expanded, often in association with other Goodridge family enterprises, in an effort to capitalize on the family name and its success in York. Glenalvin also, for example, distributed coupons (see Figure 5), sometimes known as “daguerrean dollars,” that entitled the holder to a complimentary or reduced price for a photograph. His father had used exactly the same sort of coupon with a value of up to ten cents on the dollar to promote his variety store in Centre Hall earlier. In addition the coupons indicate that Glenalvin now had
the assistance of his teenage brother Wallace as “Cashier and Operator” to handle the anticipated increase in business.\textsuperscript{23}

Of greater consequence is the fact that Glenalvin, as the coupons reveal, also introduced Yorkers to the very latest, most up-to-date photographic technique, the collodion positive or ambrotype, during summer 1855. While the quality of the daguerreotype could never be challenged, the cost, length of time for the exposure, and talent usually necessary to create that quality would, by the mid-1850s, begin to give way to the glass collodian negative that could be used to create a multitude of acceptable paper prints, ultimately in a variety of photographic formats, and often at a fraction of the cost, time, and talent required for the irreplicable, unique daguerreotype.\textsuperscript{24}

The collodian positive or ambrotype was a stage in the evolution of photography midway between the positive and negative processes in that it employed elements of each. The Englishman F. Scott Archer, who in 1851 introduced the collodian negative, suggested that an underexposed and weaker version of the negative could be backed with black (painted glass, paper, metal, or cloth) to create a positive image. A variation of the process that came to be known as the ambrotype was patented in the United States by James A. Cutting of Boston in July 1854. Cutting’s method was an excellent one in that it sealed the image protectively between two plates of glass. His patent specified balsam of fir as the sealant. That and Cutting’s attempt to license the process for between $100 and $1,000 depending on the size of the population the photographer served gave rise to many variations of the Cutting ambrotype. Montgomery Simons, for example, evaded the patent requirements by using “any varnish except balsam of fir” to cement his plates of glass. Many ambrotypes were made simply by using a single piece of glass with the black backing serving to protect the image. Like daguerreotypes, ambrotypes were matted and cased. And like daguerreotypes, ambrotypes were one-of-a-kind images.

*Figure 5: “Daguerrean Dollar,” 1854 or after.*

Courtesy of Historical Society of York County, York, Pa.
on glass, not a silvered copper plate. But, in addition to being much less expensive and technically less complex, the ambrotype image did not temporarily disappear, as did the metallic daguerreotype, if not held at the correct angle to the light. Although ambrotypes were made as late as the 1880s, perhaps because of the Cutting patent but more so because of the rapid and widespread popularity and ease of using the collodion negative to make photographs on paper, the process never was very popular in larger cities. As a result, many of the very best ambrotypists were more modest local and regional photographers. G.J. Goodridge was one of them.25

That the introduction of the ambrotype carried Glenalvin to the zenith of his professional success as a photographer in York in 1855 and 1856 is clear from an editorial in the same newspaper which, six months earlier, had suggested to Yorkers that Williams' photography “cannot be surpassed.” The Gazette now reported that:

We had an opportunity, a few day ago, of examining some very fine specimens of AMBROTYPES, which is the name given to a recent and very important improvement of Daguerrean pictures. The Ambrotype is decidedly superior to the Daguerreotype, Crystallotype, or Talbottype. It has the advantage of being without the peculiar glare of Daguerreotypes which renders it necessary that the picture, to be seen, be held in a particular light or at a particular angle. The Ambrotype is like a fine, richly toned steel engraving; and, like such an engraving, presents its lights and shades at any angle of light. The specimens we saw were by Mr. Glenalvon [sic] Goodridge, who is constantly vigilant in seizing and mastering every successive improvement in the wonderful photographic art—to his credit he is never content to remain a single step in the rear of its progress.

The editorialist also revealed that Goodridge was the first York photographer to introduce his customers to the enchantment of the stereoscopic view. “We consider,” he concluded, “Goodridge's ambrotype pictures, with the stereoscopic application, the very perfection of the art—the relief being, in very truth, so life-like, that the beholder finds it difficult to persuade himself that he is looking upon a plain surface.”26

Goodridge may have purchased a license from Cutting for 1855 and 1856 that granted him the exclusive right to make Cutting's pine balsam ambrotypes in York County. Some of Glenalvin’s ambrotypes surviving from this period bear the imprint “Patent July 4th and 11th, 1854” in the lower right corner of the mat. The dates are those of the Cutting patent.27 In a full-page advertisement in the 1856 York City Directory Goodridge stated his exclusive
rights to the ambrotype and included a number of testimonials from clients extolling its excellence. The introduction of the ambrotype also was the occasion for Glenalvin to enlarge his aspirations for the studio. No longer could it simply be “Goodridge’s Daguerrian Rooms,” or even the “Extra Sky Light Gallery,” as it had become with the move to Centre Hall in 1851. Henceforth it was to be “Goodridge’s American Photographic Gallery.”

The consequences of the decision to meet Williams’ challenge through expansion and growth can be measured in a variety of ways. On the positive side it is clear that, for a time at least, perhaps because of their novelty and exclusivity, Goodridge’s ambrotypes captured the attention of York’s citizens. The glowing endorsement by the Gazette in 1855 was echoed by the judges at the 1856 York County Fair who awarded Glenalvin the premium that year for “the best Ambrotypes.” Without doubt the ambrotypes which survive from these years also include Glenalvin’s very best work and validate the testimonials, editorials, and premiums. The clarity and directness, as well as the ability to distill the essence of the character of the young man in Figure 6 reveals much more than simple technical competence on the part of the photographer. The subtle use of lighting and the three-dimensional effect from a reduced depth of field create an intimacy of feeling in the portrait that accentu-
ates Glenalvin's level of empathy with his subject. To be sure, however, the most captivating of Glenalvin's ambrotypes is Figure 7. Not only because few such ambrotypes exist—most are portraits of human subjects—but because Glenalvin was able to capture the very instant at which he attracted his subject's curiosity, it remains the most outstanding example of his work!

Glenalvin's professional success at this time also is reflected in his more private dealings. Between December 1854 and March 1859 Glenalvin and Rhoda added six parcels of real estate to their initial acquisition from Rhoda's

Figure 7: "Cat on Chair," sixth-plate ambrotype, 1854 or after. Case signed "G.J. Goodridge/York, Pa."
parents. The properties included two one-and-a-half-story frame weatherboarded houses with lot and improvements, two two-story frame weatherboarded houses and accompanying one-story back buildings with lot and improvements, a double frame weatherboarded stable and lot, and a vacant lot. The properties were all near or in the "Goodridge-Grey" residential block bounded by East Philadelphia Street on the south, North Duke and North Queen Streets on the west and east respectively, and on the north, by a public alley running between Duke and Queen. Although neither the census nor existing directories specify, it is likely that the younger Goodridges resided in one of the two-story houses on North Queen Street at this time.

As apparent as is Glenalvin's success during the 1850s, it also is manifestly clear that by 1858 he had passed the pinnacle of his accomplishments as a photographer in York. Both personal financial difficulties and continued professional challenges began to take their toll during that year. A brief but intense economic depression that began in 1857 resulted in a sheriff's sale of most of William C. Goodridge's real estate in January 1859. Two months later Glenalvin's and Rhoda's holdings suffered a similar fate. The evidence suggests that William Goodridge had overextended himself and co-signed notes for friends. Because the family's holdings were so closely associated it is likely that Glenalvin's fate necessarily followed that of his father. But there were, as well, circumstances specific to Glenalvin's situation that may have precipitated or at least intensified his own financial difficulties.

In spite of the expansion to the studio and the innovations he had introduced—and possibly because of them—Glenalvin also never completely overcame Williams' competitive challenge. In fact, the very same judges who awarded Goodridge the premium for the "best Ambrotypes" at the 1856 York County Fair conferred on Williams a diploma for "View of York and Harrisburg." While the language of the award is not absolutely clear and the use of the term "view" was yet to be standardized, it is likely that Williams' diploma was for stereoscopic photographs on paper, which had only recently begun a two-decade period of extraordinary popularity in the United States and which is what the term "view" at that very time was coming to mean. Although the York Gazette had raved about Goodridge's "ambrotype pictures, with the stereoscopic application," none are known to exist and Glenalvin did not include them in his advertising, even in the rather elaborate 1856 York City Directory ad introducing his ambrotypes. William C. Darrah also has concluded that while the ambrotype flourished briefly between 1854 and 1860 "as a cheap competitor of the daguerreotype," only "a few stereo ambrotypes were ever produced."

Glenalvin's decision to concentrate on the ambrotype in 1855 may have been a mistake or at best resulted in only fleeting success. Although the ambrotype had provided an inexpensive but viable alternative to the daguerreo-
dangerous opportunity

Type during the mid-1850s it, in turn, was eclipsed by the even less expensive but more durable tintype (collodion positive on metal) and literal deluge of cheap paper portraits, the cartes de visite, by the end of the decade. There is no evidence that Glenalvin was able to adjust to these developments after 1855. Although he may have created them, no example of a tintype or photograph on paper in any format produced by the Goodridge studio in York before 1860 is known to exist.34

By the end of 1856 J.T. Williams had decided to move on from York, possibly to Harrisburg or even back to Baltimore, but that did not mean York was left exclusively to Glenalvin and Wallace Goodridge. In Williams’ place they now faced an even more concerted challenge from a variety of Philadelphia photographers heading west and seeking opportunity in the Pennsylvania hinterland. In summer 1857 Henry Barratt opened his “Sunbeam Gallery” in Hartmann’s Building on the southeast corner of Centre Square and began to advertise “Melainotypes” [tintypes] as an inexpensive and more durable alternative to Goodridge ambrotypes. During 1858 Evans and Seiling, also Philadelphia transplants, settled into Williams’ former studio near the Post Office, and immediately initiated a price war that forced Glenalvin to consider teaching on a full-time basis once again.35

Evans and Seiling were an early example of what later came to be described as “the ‘cancer of the profession,’...so-called ‘cheap-johns,’ commercial photographers who used the declining cost of materials and processing to sell photographs at dramatically reduced prices.” According to Sarah Greenough’s recent analysis of the practice, “when they could attract and maintain a steady, high volume of business through creative promotional schemes and advertising, these unscrupulous professionals forced more established businesses to lower their prices, and thus cut their margin of profit, or risk losing all their clients.”36 Such may have been Goodridge’s fate, for Evans and Seiling advertised price cuts of between forty and sixty percent and although Glenalvin’s ads no longer specified prices, earlier he had not been known for keeping them especially low.37

The sheriff’s sale of his and Rhoda’s real estate in March 1859 and the bleak prospect it presented, as well as the continued pressure from creditors and competitors, drove Glenalvin to return to fulltime teaching once again. In September 1859 “Mifflin,” a correspondent for The Anglo-African, reported that “Our schools [in Baltimore] have opened [and] Mr. G.J. Goodridge of York, Pa., is now occupying Mr. Wm. T. Dixon’s former position” as teacher. Glenalvin worked in Baltimore only for the school year and was back in York by the summer of 1860 where he would teach during the following year at “the Colored High School.”38

Whether Glenalvin with Wallace’s assistance continued to operate
“Goodridge’s American Photographic Gallery” on even a part-time basis in the fifth story of Centre Hall after its sale is not known. During winter 1860-1861, however, he and Wallace developed a plan of action to reestablish the gallery on a firm financial basis once again. Their father always had believed in taking advantage of an opportunity when it presented itself and the sons decided to follow the example. In spring 1861 Henry Barratt vacated his “Sunbeam Gallery” in the Hartmann Building across the square from Centre Hall and the Goodridges moved their “American Photographic Gallery” into Hartmann's in its place. In fact, the York Gazette later reported in its account of the city's Fourth of July festivities that while the parade was forming “a photographic view was taken of the line by Glenalvin Goodridge, from his gallery in Hartmann's building.” According to the reporter, he also had “seen the negative plate, which is about 4 by 3 inches, and although the figures are extremely small, we were able with the aid of a magnifying glass, to recognize a number of them quite plainly. The photograph is considerably larger than the negative, and will be on exhibition this week.”

The notice is significant because it reveals that the Goodridge studio had relocated and was headed for success once again. Of even greater consequence, however, is the information that Glenalvin and Wallace had abandoned their earlier reliance on daguerreotypes and ambrotypes and had begun to create collodian negatives and then used them to print enlarged paper photographs. In addition the reported “4 by 3” negative was the standard size for the production of stereoscopic views then becoming very popular and the photograph of the Fourth of July parade could have been marketed in this format as well. A 1985 letter from William C. Darrah to the author confirms that during the early 1860s the Goodridges were making paper stereos although none is presently known to exist. Mr. Darrah wrote that during 1967, in a town near York, he had acquired two stereographs of York from “Goodridge’s American Photographic Gallery, Centre Square.” The views were on “pale yellow mounts, [with] black imprint.” The first was a “Residential street, horse and carriage at curb. No driver; no people in scene.” He suggested that it may have been “taken on Sunday without traffic; appears to be looking eastward.” The second was a business block, rather distant view, building fronts mostly three stories high, other two. Could be Market Street, but if so, looking eastward (street is nearly level).” Mr. Darrah believed they were made in the “early 1860s, about 1862, not later.” Both have since been lost. Nonetheless, it is clear that photography again was becoming more attractive to Glenalvin than teaching.

In spring 1861 Glenalvin also decided to open a branch of the “American Photographic Gallery” in Columbia, a town about twelve miles from York on the east bank of the Susquehanna River on the main road to Lancaster. It was an excellent move. The local newspaper, the Columbia Spy, extended a
warm welcome:

Goodridge, the well known Photographer of York, has taken the gallery opposite the Spy office...and offers his services to the citizens of Columbia. Goodridge has a reputation as a photographic artist. He has been familiar with the business in all its progressive stages, from the infancy of daguerreotyping to its present high perfection, and his experience has not been wasted. He is known as the best operator in York, where he has long been established, and his pictures invariably give satisfaction.

Glenalvin advertised “Ambrotype and Melainotype Likenesses [with] Satisfaction warranted in all cases, or no charge.” Renewed success appeared to be within reach in Columbia and York when disaster struck.

On August 28, 1862 Glenalvin J. Goodridge was indicted for rape by the York County Grand Jury. He pleaded innocent the same day and a trial was set before the Court of Oyer and Terminer in York for November 5. The prosecution was conducted by District Attorney William C. Chapman. Glenalvin's lawyers were Vincent K. Keesey and John Gibson, both of York. According to the indictment Glenalvin “did make an assault” and “have unlawful carnal knowledge” of Mary E. Smith of York on March 30, 1862 at his studio in Hartmann’s Building. According to Smith’s testimony and that of the witnesses called in her support, she had come to Goodridge’s studio at the end of March for a portrait after which, on the pretext of showing her some frames, Glenalvin had assaulted her in a room above the studio.

Glenalvin’s defense argued that Smith was a woman of poor reputation who consorted regularly with soldiers of the 27th Regiment stationed in York, that Smith had contradicted herself in her testimony as to the day of the assault, that on the day originally designated by Smith for the assault Glenalvin had been at work in his branch studio in Columbia, and that Smith was motivated by the hope of financial gain at the expense of the accused.

The case went to a jury of twelve York County citizens the same day. According to a report in the York Gazette “the Jury, after being in the room an entire night and the greater part of the next day, rendered a verdict of guilty.” A motion for a new trial was denied on November 8 by Justices Robert J. Fisher and Adam Ebaugh, with Justice David Fahs in favor of the motion. As a result Glenalvin was sentenced on February 17, 1863 “to undergo an Imprisonment in the Eastern Penitentiary in the City of Philadelphia in Separate and Solitary Confinement at labor in the Cells and work house yards of Said Prison for and during the term of five years.”

Glenalvin entered Eastern Penitentiary at Philadelphia on February 19.
After almost two years there he was pardoned by Governor Andrew G. Curtin on December 13, 1864 and released from the prison six days later\(^4\). The pardon was primarily the result of a herculean effort begun by Glenalvin's father William, with the assistance of his lawyer John Gibson in spring 1863. Gibson drafted and Goodridge personally circulated a petition to Governor Curtin that was endorsed by 105 of York's leading citizens. The petition argued that the alleged victim had made "no complaint...until three months...after" the alleged attack, that evidence presented by the defendant proved he was in Columbia and not York on the day of the alleged attack, that the jury had been able to reach a verdict only after more than twenty hours of deliberation, that the alleged victim's "character for chastity was impeached," and "that no conviction for rape would or could have taken place under the evidence, if the defendant had been a white man."\(^4\)

During June 1864 the elder Goodridge also solicited a series of letters directly to Governor Curtin from justices, lawyers, and businessmen in York protesting the jury's verdict and the quality of the Commonwealth's case. For example, Justice Fahs, who had favored the motion for a new trial, wrote that Glenalvin "never would have been convicted if he had been a white man under the evidence...." William Hay, a prominent York lawyer, stated that "from the testimony which I heard I believe that the conviction of Goodridge was improper." Mr. David E. Small, a respected York entrepreneur, wrote to Governor Curtin that given "the state of feeling against coloured persons here during the 2 previous years, it was not a difficult thing for a York County jury to render such a very severe verdict." York's dentist Dr. Charles Bressler suggested to the Governor that there "is not a man in our party but is satisfied that he never would have been convicted if he had been a white man and if he had been a democrat..."\(^4\)

There is truth to the arguments presented in the letters. Political emotion ran high in York during the 1860s; during the first week of July 1863 York was occupied by units of Robert E. Lee's Army of Virginia that had crossed into Pennsylvania that summer. The length of the jury's deliberations, twenty hours, was considered unusual at the time and suggest some doubt or at least debate as to the validity of the evidence. And, Glenalvin's sentence of five years was considerably less than the fifteen years handed down to a white citizen of York convicted of rape by the same court in May 1862. Furthermore, the text of the governor's pardon noted that "the health of Goodridge is failing, [and] that as he has a large family and promises if pardoned to leave the State, perhaps it would be as well to release him...[as] he is a man of good education and a good teacher and may be useful in that capacity elsewhere...."\(^4\)

Governor Curtin's information was indeed accurate. Glenalvin's discharge
record from the Eastern Penitentiary notes that when he had entered the prison his health was “good,” but by his release it had become “delicate.” In fact, during his almost two years in prison Glenalvin had contracted the beginnings of tuberculosis. By the time he and his family were able to honor their commitment to the governor to leave York and Pennsylvania and join sister Mary and brothers Wallace and William in East Saginaw, Michigan, it was already too late. During summer 1863 Wallace Goodridge had reestablished the family studio in the booming lumber town of East Saginaw where he and young William would continue the family tradition of artistic excellence and commercial enterprise until Wallace's death in 1922. During the three years following his pardon and arrival in East Saginaw and until his death from tuberculosis in November 1867, Glenalvin served no doubt as the wellspring for the inspiration that would make his and his brothers' studio the most important in the region, although his own career had come to an unfortunate and premature end.
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