The dawn of the seventeenth century, immigrants to this country arrived with dreams of conquering a new frontier. Families were willing to embrace a life of strife and hardship but with great hopes of achieving prominence and wealth. Such is the case with the Hambleton family.

From William Hambleton’s arrival on the Eastern Shore in 1657 and through every major conflict on land, sea, and air since, a member of the Hambleton clan has participated and made a lasting contribution to this nation. Their achievements are not only in war but in civic leadership as well. Among its members are bankers, business leaders, government officials, and visionaries.

Not only is the Hambleton family extraordinary by American standards, it is also remarkable in that their base for four centuries has been and continues to be Maryland. The blood of the Hambletons is also the blood of Maryland, a rich land stretching from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean to the tidal basins of the mighty Chesapeake to the mountains of the west, a poetic framework that illuminates one truly American family that continues its legacy of building new generations of strong Americans.
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In our latest offering, *The Road to Jim Crow: the African American Experience on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, 1860–1915*, C. Christopher Brown has broken new ground and filled a long-overlooked gap in Maryland history. Here is the story of African Americans on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, from the promise-filled days following the end of slavery to the rise of lynch law, segregation, and systematic efforts at disenfranchisement. Resisting, as best they could, attempts of the Democratic “White Man’s Party” to render them second-class citizens, black communities rallied to their churches and fought determinedly to properly educate their children and gain a measure of political power. Cambridge, guided by savvy and energetic leaders, became a political and cultural center of African American life.

The Maryland Historical Society continues its commitment to publish the finest new work in Maryland history. Next year, 2017, marks twelve years since the Publications Committee, with the advice and support of the development staff, launched the Friends of the Press, an effort dedicated to raising money to be used solely for bringing new titles into print. The society is particularly grateful to H. Thomas Howell, past committee chair, for his unwavering support of our work and for his exemplary generosity. The committee is pleased to announce the following new title, funded in part through the Friends of the Press.

The Press’s titles continue the mission first set forth in 1844, of discovering and publishing Maryland history. We invite you to become a supporter and help us fill in the unknown pages of Maryland history. If you would like to make a tax-deductible gift to the Friends of the Press, please direct your donation to Development, Maryland Historical Society, 201 West Monument Street, Baltimore, MD 21201. For additional information on MdHS publications, contact Patricia Dockman Anderson, Director of Publications and Library Services, 410-685-3750 x317 or panderson@mdhs.org.
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Archbishop James Whitfield (1770–1834). Concerned with the rising number of virulent anti-Catholic books and articles, Whitfield urged support of Catholic publications. (Small Prints, Maryland Historical Society.)
The Ministry of the Press: Baltimore’s Provincial Council and the First American Catholic Magazine

RALPH FRASCA

Anti-Catholic literature in the early nineteenth-century United States disgusted Baltimore Archbishop James Whitfield (1770–1834). The nation’s top Catholic bishop feared that the deluge of Protestant publications would erode parishioners’ morals and fidelity to the Catholic Church. One of the most objectionable examples of this literature was Scottish novelist Grace Kennedy’s *Father Clement: a Roman Catholic Story*. The 1823 story was published in many editions throughout the following decade, translated into numerous languages, and read throughout Europe and North America. Its ambiguous title lured many Catholic readers who were thereby exposed to pragmatist attacks on basic church doctrines. For instance, one sympathetic character says about Purgatory, “I know it is contrary to Scripture, and was never heard of in the Christian Church till it had become full of corruptions.”

The problem of immoral literature and entertainment troubled Whitfield as he planned the agenda for the First Provincial Council, the first gathering of the young nation’s Catholic bishops. He intended to make the issue one of the Council’s top priorities. In his handwritten notes, “Remarks on the Questions to be discussed in the Council October 1, 1829,” he listed two concerns involving publications. In one, the bishop lamented that “No censures, properly so Called, are incurred in this country by reading heretical books.” Believing that punishment would dissuade Catholics from reading these troublesome works, Whitfield resolved to adopt “some efficacious means by which the faithful may be deterred from such readings, as well as from the reading of immoral books of any Sort, &c., this will be discussed in the Council.”

The next item on his list showed his determination to clamp down on unsanctioned publications that presented Catholic beliefs, mandating “No book, pamphlet, tract &c treating either wholly or partially of Religion, is to be published without the approbation of the Ordinary.” Several Irish-American newspapers especially irritated the archbishop, particularly those that wrongly explained or overtly opposed Catholic teachings. They included New York’s *The Truth-Teller* and South Carolina’s

Ralph Frasca has written books on Benjamin Franklin’s printing career, the Mexican-American War and the press, and the first national newspaper. He has authored dozens of journal articles and essays on early-American journalism.
The Irishman and Charleston Weekly Register. The most troubling of all, though, were several schismatic newspapers that surfaced to support Father William Hogan, the charismatic but disobedient priest of St. Mary’s Cathedral in Philadelphia whom Bishop Henry Conwell excommunicated. The Erin and The Balance both advocated that the trustees of St. Mary’s Cathedral, not the bishop, held the power to hire and fire priests. These topics, among others, were on the agenda, when the Provincial Council convened at the Baltimore Cathedral on October 3, 1829.

Archbishop Whitfield and bishops from six of the other eight dioceses attended. “A large body of priests, selected by the prelates as advising Theologians, filled the Chancel,” The Baltimore Federal Gazette wrote, “The appearance of the Sanctuary was exceedingly striking: the bishops wore capes and mitres, and were seated at each side of the altar; the priests in their sacred vestments occupied the front before the platform.” The council, the first of seven, was called to identify the most important problems facing the Catholic Church in the United States. Through it, the bishops would devise solutions, formalize administration of the Sacraments, and strengthen the bonds between America and the Vatican. The Council was also designed to increase unity among American Catholics, who by 1829 numbered about half a million. Among the attendees, Bishop John England (1786–1842) of Charleston, South Carolina, promoted unity as a vital component of success. “The deranged and unsettled state of the American church can be reduced to order and peace and permanent system only by Provincial Synods of the American hierarchy,” he wrote in 1827.

Whitfield sought to prevent heretical quasi-Catholic publications and punish followers who read scandalous literature, but England proposed an alternative means of dissuading the followers from harmful reading matter: give the people better choices. The South Carolina bishop had extensive experience with Catholic literature. In Cork, Ireland, soon after ordination to the priesthood, he published The Religious Repository, a monthly magazine dedicated to defending the Catholic faith and dissuading people from reading immoral publications. The Religious Repository “was of the highest benefit to the cause of pure religion and true liberty in Ireland,” one Australian newspaper observed, adding that “this periodical united the prelates, priests, and people, as one man against (efforts) to weaken and degrade the Catholic religion in this country.” England later edited the Cork Mercantile Chronicle newspaper before his 1820 appointment as bishop of the newly created Diocese of Charleston, comprising Georgia and the Carolinas.

The new bishop brought his affinity for journalism across the Atlantic, starting the first overtly Catholic newspaper, in the United States, in 1822. In its prospectus, the thirty-five-year-old England clearly stated the United States Catholic Miscellany’s purpose — to explain and defend Catholic teachings, promising that the newspaper would undertake the “simple explanation and temperate maintenance of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.” In addition to presenting explanations, the paper would also be “investigating the truth of many assertions, which have
been, perhaps, too lightly hazarded, and which have obtained too ready and general credence, and which have excited unfounded prejudices in the minds of many well-disposed individuals. Where the cautious Whitfield sought to suppress, the feisty England planned to engage and dispute. England’s free-marketplace approach pre-
PASTORAL LETTER
OF THE
MOST REVEREND
THE
ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE,
AND THE OTHER
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OF THE
UNITED STATES,
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OF THE
United States of America.

But what saith the Scripture? The word is near thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart—this is the word of faith, which we preach.

That if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raised him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

For with the heart, we believe unto justice; but with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation. Romans, C. x. v. 8, 9, 10.

Published by James Murphy, near the Cathedral.
Baltimore, M.D. 1829.
vailed among the bishops, and the Council conveyed it to the nation’s Catholics in the Bishops’ Pastoral Letter to the Laity, issued October 17, 1829. The South Carolina bishop authored the Pastoral Letter, bemoaning the “misrepresentation of the tenets, the principles and the practices of our church” by men and women using “the public press, the very bench of public justice.” As a result of this misrepresentation, “we are exhibited as what we are not, and charged with maintaining what we detest. Repetition has given to those statements a semblance of evidence; and groundless assertions remaining almost uncontradicted, wear the appearance of admitted and irrefragable truth,” the pastoral letter noted.7

To contradict these assertions, the Church needed a vigorous Catholic press, readers, and paying customers. The bishops chided the laity about their nominal support of the United States Catholic Miscellany, which England intended as a national Catholic newspaper circulating “from Maine to Florida, and from Arkansas to the Atlantic.” In the Pastoral Letter, the bishops complained that this newspaper “has been permitted to languish for want of ordinary support, and must, we are informed, be discontinued, unless it receives your more extended patronage.” The bishops noted that two new Catholic newspapers had just joined the ranks: Boston’s The Jesuit or Catholic Sentinel and Hartford’s The Catholic Press. Both swiftly announced their intent to serve the Catholic Church. The rising tide of anti-Catholic prejudice “loudly calls for the publication of a Newspaper, in which the Doctrine of the Holy

The official account of the council proceedings. (Pastoral Letter, 1829.)
The object of this publication is to explain the Doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church,” The Catholic Press announced in its prospectus. “To give a fearless refutation of the calumnies which are daily fulminated against it—and to truly represent her Doctrines, when misrepresented by her enemies.”

The bishops who assembled for the First Provincial Council wanted American Catholics to support these newspapers. “We would advise you to encourage well-
conducted works of this description,” the bishops wrote in their pastoral letter. “If you look around and see how many such are maintained, for their own purposes, by our separated brethren, it will indeed be a matter of reproach should we not uphold at least a few of our own.” Bishop England’s approach, to encourage a faithful Catholic press rather than suppress a schismatic one, met with widespread public support. “The appeal of the venerable prelates, we are happy to learn, has had the effect of giving life and vigor to the press, and we sincerely hope it will continue to display sound knowledge and public spirit,” The Catholic Intelligencer remarked in 1850.9

The American Catholic press desperately needed this injection of life and vigor. The first attempt at a truly Catholic newspaper, published by or for a priest or other church official, occurred in the unlikely frontier outpost of Detroit. In 1809, Father Gabriel Richard, pastor of St. Anne’s Church, published The Michigan Essay, or Impartial Observer to provide moral and pragmatic instruction to residents of his remote early-American village. As Fr. Richard and his sixteen-year-old printer Jamie Miller noted in verse:

A noble aim be ours,
To mend the heart, to raise the pow’rs,
To show the world on one extensive plan,
All that is great, and good and dear to man.10

Although published by a priest, The Michigan Essay was an omnibus product intended to function chiefly as a weekly newspaper in a territory that had none. Teaching and defending the Catholic faith were lesser roles. This newspaper had minimal effect, though, perishing after just three issues.11

The antidote to a rising tide of anti-Catholic publications was clear: growth of the nascent American Catholic press. The bishops’ Pastoral Letter to the Laity challenged the church leaders and adherents to develop Catholic journalism. This was a challenge impossible for young Catholic writer Fr. Charles Constantine Pise to resist. Pise, a priest assigned to the Baltimore Cathedral, was present during the Council. He had already distinguished himself as a Catholic literary figure who used the print media to explain and defend the faith.

Pise began studying for the priesthood at Mount St. Mary’s College and Seminary in Emmitsburg in 1821, where he scrutinized the works of Catholic apologists. “Whenever we talk of grace, I know whom to follow,” Pise wrote to a fellow seminarian in 1822. “When there is a question concerning the Pope’s infallibility, I know what argumentative weapons to wield in defence.” Pise also observed contemporary examples of Catholic opinion leaders, including Fr. William Vincent Harold, an Irish priest who opposed the schismatic trustees and Hogan supporters in Philadelphia’s St. Mary’s Cathedral. Pise wrote that Harold “is the mighty scourge of the Hoganites,
and in the true sense of the word, ‘a pillar of truth.’” Pise also admired Bishop England and his newspaper. “Bishop England is doing wonders in Charleston,” Pise wrote. “His U.S. Catholic Miscellany is much esteemed and contains a good deal of information.”

Drawing inspiration from these examples, Pise sought to contribute to Catholic literature. While a seminarian, he commenced what resulted in a five-volume *History of the Church, from its Establishment to the Present Century*. “I am busily engaged in the study of ecclesiastical History; with which I am delighted,” he wrote to Whitfield’s predecessor, Archbishop Ambrose Marechal, while writing the fifth volume. “I began this Compilation, two years ago; in order to instruct myself thoroughly in that invaluable branch of sacred literature, and have already compiled about 4 volumes, of 400 pages each.” Despite its title, the chronicle ended in the early sixteenth century. Pise ended the fifth volume just before Martin Luther’s Protestant Reformation, promising to start with it in a sixth volume. He wrote, “the revolution in religion which was effected in some of the fairest portions of Europe, and the consequences of the change, are subjects which shall constitute the next, and the last, volume.” However, Pise never completed the final volume. Modest sales, and difficulty collecting payment, may have dissuaded him and publisher Peter Blenkinsop from finishing the work.

Pise also wrote the first United States Catholic novel in 1829, *Father Rowland, A North American Tale*. The book was a device to refute numerous anti-Catholic slurs, particularly those in the popular *Father Clement* book. *Father Rowland* begins as a discussion among the Protestant General Wolburn and his two daughters, one of whom is drawn to Catholicism, about the controversial doctrine of confession. “Did I not read you, this very morning, a passage from the Bible, showing, that power had been given to the apostles to forgive sin?” Louisa asked. Her father retorted with typical Catholic prejudice. “Ah, my dear, you do well to read as much of the Bible as you can before you turn catholic, for then, it will be closed for ever.”

When his book went into a second edition the following year, Pise reflected on his novel’s true purpose. “It has tended to remove the prejudices of many, by stating, in brief, the real doctrines of the Church, and showing how they have been misrepresented,” he wrote. Referring to himself in the third person, Pise offered insight into his preferred method of teaching about the faith. “He wishes to convince the reader, that when the tenets of Catholicism are viewed through a proper medium, they must be admired, and respected. And, perhaps, the most effectual way to convince, is to give to the enquirer a clear, concise, and simple exposition of the Catholic doctrines.” Echoing Bishop England’s desire to engage anti-Catholic writers on the battleground of public opinion, Pise added, “The admirers of ‘Father Clement’ should deem it a conscientious duty to read ‘Father Rowland.’”

In 1831, Pise authored *The Indian Cottage, a Unitarian Story* to explain the doctrine of Christ’s divinity. A Catholic almanac later commented that this book “was
written in vindication of a dogma which is not only questioned, but systematically attacked, by a denomination who style themselves ‘Christians.’” With these works and others Father Pise became the first U.S. Catholic novelist, teaching church doctrine and refuting error through crafted plots wherein his characters discuss religious beliefs affirmatively. “Using the affirmative approach, Catholic novelists so contrived their stories that there were occasions for someone speaking with authority to explain the doctrines and mysteries of the Catholic religion,” a scholar of early-American Catholic novels stated. Under the guise of fiction, these characters taught “the dogmas about purgatory, the sacraments, the worship of saints, the nature of confession, the use of sacred images, and the steps to conversion. With considerable skill, many of the novelists managed to expose Protestant bigotry and theological ignorance in various ways, usually by sending young Catholic champions to do battle with their acquaintances or employers.”

With his growing reputation as a Catholic apologist and writer, the twenty-eight-year-old Pise could not resist the bishops’ call to extend the press. However, the format and longer articles of magazines better suited Pise’s writing style than newspaper journalism. As he explained, “The magazine is peculiarly adapted to the continuous publication of interesting works, especially of fictitious narrative or consecutive sketches, or biography, or historical fragments, or finally of serial
essays.” These were Pise’s favorite types of literature, which explains his choice of the magazine format.17

Displaying his penchant for plentiful punctuation, Pise called his new magazine *The Metropolitan; or, Catholic Monthly Magazine*. It was the first church-affiliated Catholic magazine in the nation’s history and a precursor to many successful Catholic magazines that followed. Others had previously contemplated the idea. For example, Father Benedict Joseph Fenwick planned a Catholic magazine in New York as early as 1813, but work on ecclesiastical matters prevented him from attaining the goal. It took until 1829, when he had become the second bishop on Boston, for Fenwick to launch *The Jesuit, or Catholic Sentinel*. Other plans included Catholic publisher and bookseller Matthew Field’s proposed *The Catholic Magazine* in New York in 1817.18

Pise was determined that *The Metropolitan* would succeed where earlier plans had failed. He would function as the editor and one of the writers for this new journal, and he recruited Blenkinsop, the printer of his five-volume church history, to publish the magazine. Blenkinsop, an Irish immigrant, married a sister of Irish Archbishop Oliver Kelly before coming to Baltimore. Together they had three children: a son who became a Jesuit and president of Holy Cross College, another son who was a longtime priest in the Diocese of Boston, and a daughter who spent thirty-two years as Superior at the Sisters of Charity Motherhouse in Emmitsburg.19

Pise had always felt a calling to write and teach. He felt most fulfilled when writing poems and novels and teaching rhetoric at Mount St. Mary’s, which he
called “a calm and hallowed retreat,” and dreaded the life of a parish priest. When Baltimore’s Archbishop Marechal wanted to assign the newly ordained Pise to serve a parish in Libertytown, twenty miles from Emmitsburg, Pise pleaded to be spared the burden. He wrote to Marechal in May, 1825 that his constitution was too delicate for missionary work. “Indeed, to be candid, I am frightened at the responsibility which such an undertaking would impose upon me,” Pise wrote after the archbishop pressed the matter. Pastoral duties “could not but interfere with my classical avocations.” He added that at Mount St. Mary’s “I am comfortably Situated, no inclination for a change.”

Marechal was disappointed by what he viewed as Pise’s self-indulgence. Marechal was keenly aware that Maryland desperately needed priests in the field, ministering to scattered congregations, and that those who were already there faced hardships. “The scarcity of priests, the numerous and dispersed congregations, their desolation and pressing solicitations for spiritual succor should move stones, if possible, to compassion,” one Maryland priest reported. There is “Scarcely a missioner in Maryland who has not two, three and four congregations to serve, which are 10, 15, and 20 miles distant one from the other. Many priests have 40, 50, nay some 100 miles and more to ride in visiting their congregations.”

Marechal did not permit Pise to remain at Mount St. Mary’s for long, sparing him from missionary work but assigning him to serve as a priest at the Baltimore Cathedral. Pise was unhappy there, though, and yearned to return to his quiet life of teaching, reading and writing. After Marechal died in 1828, Mount St. Mary’s President Fr. John McGerry even considered bringing Pise back to the college faculty. However, Pise remained assigned to priestly duties at the Cathedral, home of the First Provincial Council.
Thus, when the bishops called for a feisty and determined Catholic press in their *Pastoral Letter to the Laity*, Pise saw a golden opportunity to use the print media again to teach and defend the Catholic faith. Viewing Baltimore as “the Rome of the United States,” and keenly aware that there were no Catholic periodicals in the mid-Atlantic region, Pise regarded the city where he was assigned, and where he had just witnessed the First Provincial Council, as the perfect place in which to issue a Catholic publication. By early December 1829, he notified Catholic and secular newspapers of his impending magazine. “A Monthly Magazine, dedicated to Religion and Literature, is about to be issued from this Metropolis,” Pise wrote in the prospectus. He stated plainly that Archbishop Whitfield approved the magazine and its mission to explain and defend the faith. The publication would engage in “the diffusion of truth; the dissemination of knowledge; and the vindication of those doctrines and usages of the Church, which have been, and are still, not unfrequently, misrepresented.” Then, Pise threw down the gauntlet to Protestants, atheists and agnostics. “In pursuing this object, it will be necessary to have recourse to arguments and facts: which, while they strengthen the tenets of the Catholic Church, must tend to the refutation of those of all others.” This challenge was intended to notify anti-Catholic writers that the confident young scholar planned to devote space in the new magazine to dissect and refute their claims. He announced his plan to divide the magazine into four parts, “Religious, Literary, Miscellaneous, and Poetical” and deliver it to subscribers for $4 per year, payable half-yearly in advance.\(^23\)

Numerous newspapers noticed the new Catholic magazine. “A new monthly publication, devoted to the advancement of the Catholic Religion, and sustained by the science and talents of the Clergymen of that Church, was commenced in Baltimore,” a Pennsylvania newspaper reported. *The New-York Evening Post*, *Pittsburgh Gazette* and others also announced its inception. Indeed, there was so much advance notice of *The Metropolitan* that under the heading “Roman Catholic Influence,” a Massachusetts newspaper complained about the large number “who have not hesitated to publish the prospectus of the new Catholic periodical, or a notice of it.”\(^24\)

Although Pise chose the magazine format because it was less journalistic and more suited to his literary inclinations, he was keenly aware that he was publishing the first American Catholic magazine and filling a gap in American Catholic literature. In *The Metropolitan*’s first issue, Pise called it “astonishing” that “so long a time has been suffered to pass, without any thing like a Review or a Magazine, through which interesting and useful instruction might be conveyed to the inquiring mind, and a medium afforded of defending ourselves against the attacks and misrepresentations of the malevolent or the ignorant.” Pise lauded existing Catholic newspapers in Charleston, Boston, and Hartford as allies, not competitors. He saluted Bishop England’s *United States Catholic Miscellany* as “the valuable paper, which, under the auspices of a great and persevering patronage,” has “proved a powerful engine on the cause of truth and religion.” Boston, Massachusetts’ *Jesuit* and Hartford, Con-
necticut’s Catholic Press also “will scatter much light through a hemisphere which has been covered with a more than ordinary darkness.” These journalistic assets aside, Pise saw the need to establish a Catholic magazine to refute anti-Catholic assertions by Protestant magazines.25

In the inaugural issue, the priest diminished the combative tone of the prospectus and seemed conciliatory, hoping that his magazine “by the mildness of its character, and its respect for those who differ from us, it may conciliate their favour, and not be excluded from their notice.” He vowed to use “kindness, patience, and humility” to correct the errors of “our separated brethren” who “by mere accident” became Protestants. Ultimately, he presented a simple goal: “to strengthen the belief of those who appertain to the Church, to remove the prejudices of those who have been misinformed on these subjects, to induce all to read and instruct themselves, and then to leave them to their consciences and their God.”26

The Metropolitan’s first issue appeared January 1830, just two months after the First Provincial Council made its appeal for a Catholic press. Pise’s tame forty-page issue opened with an overview of Baltimore Catholic churches, a biography of St. Peter, an essay on how and why God uses miracles, and a curious review and article-length advertisement of his own Father Rowland book. The Jesuit lauded the magazine’s first issue, predicting that The Metropolitan will “serve as a happy means of eventually connecting and identifying thousands of our dissenting brethren in the One Catholic family in and under Christ.” From its perch in Boston, the newspaper merely wondered why it took so long for “the enlightened, respectable and Catholic State of Maryland” to enter the fray and create a Catholic publication.27

The second issue of The Metropolitan was similarly restrained, containing a theological reflection on winter as “the emblem of the graces of adversity,” the apostles’ role in spreading Christianity throughout Greece, and a discussion of the value of penance, which noted that “To pretend to be the disciples of a God who was born in a stable and died on a cross, whilst we are slaves to the pleasures and follies of this world, is an illusion.”28

Pise first confronted the Protestant press in the March issue. Casting aside promises of gentility toward the “separated brethren,” he responded sarcastically to a writer in Albany’s The Christian Register, who made the traditionally familiar claims that Catholics are the dupes of error and superstition, while priests are verbally abusive and slanderous. “The bosom of the writer appears to be haunted with the most gloomy forebodings: spectre after spectre starts before his fancy, and, wild with afright, ere his judgment has time to act, he seizes his pen, and, in the fever of his terror, writes about the domination of Popery, its rapid advances, its gigantic stridings, through the United States,” Pise chided sarcastically.29

This was the first of numerous essays in The Metropolitan refuting allegations in Protestant publications. Pise replied to anti-Catholic essays in the Southern Religious Telegraph, the Genius of Universal Emancipation and even the Encyclopaedia
The entries in which are “so pregnant with errors, mis-statements, and prejudice against anything Catholic, that, instead of being sources of pure and limpid information, they became troubled and muddy waters.” However, Pise’s chief adversary quickly became Rev. George Bourne, London-born editor of The Protestant magazine. In its first issue, January 2, 1830, just one day after The Metropolitan commenced, the New York-based Protestant made its purpose clear: “The sole objects of this publication are to inculcate Gospel doctrines against Romish corruptions.” After reading its first few issues, Pise was astonished by the overt anti-Catholicism. “The spirit which has actuated you in the institution of your Journal, is the most rancorous and anti-christian that can be conceived,” Pise wrote in an open letter to Bourne, published in The Metropolitan. “[Y]ou have arisen in fierce and unprovoked resentment against us, and, with the desperation of an assassin, attempt to plunge your reeking dagger into the heart of Catholicism.” Bourne kept up the attack, though, especially against Jesuits. He warned his readers of the “appalling fact, that men of that insidious order are rapidly pouring into our dominions.” Pise replied, “you are bigoted and illiberal in the last degree.” Elsewhere, The Metropolitan published an account of the state of Catholicism, probably written by the United States’ first bishop, John Carroll, in 1790. It is one of the few extant accounts of the status of Catholicism in the new nation.30

The Metropolitan existed for twelve issues and 559 pages of religious instruction, literature, poetry, biography of saints, and defense against Protestant publications before succumbing quietly. Indeed, the final issue in December 1830 makes no mention of its impending demise. Rather, it presents the concluding installments of essays on the Church’s triumph over heresy, the promises of Christ to the Church,
and a biography of Adam and Eve. Paul Foik, the only historian to devote more than a few words to *The Metropolitan* prior to the present article, ascribed the magazine's demise to insufficient readership. “This periodical had all the claims to immortality but one, patronage,” he wrote without documentation. Thomas Meehan seems to have followed Foik’s conclusion, writing “This magazine was allowed to perish after the brief existence of one year.”

Although Pise did not inform his readers that the magazine would disband, internal evidence suggests he saw the end in sight. The December 1830 issue did not start any new serialized essays to be continued in 1831, with Pise instead focusing on single-issue treatments of such fertile topics as “The Perpetuity of the Catholic Church” and “The Christian Religion.” The sudden termination of *The Metropolitan* stands in stark contrast to Pise’s confident assurance in the prospectus, “The circumstances, under which it takes its origin, are of a nature, at once, to promise it success, and secure its continuance.”

In 1842, Pise continued his ministry of the press, unveiling *The Catholic Expositor and Literary Magazine* with Reverend Felix Varela. They asserted their intention to oppose “the attacks made upon us so publicly and unjustly” and to “vindicate the cause of Catholics, who have been the subject of long-existing prejudice, opposition, and even persecution.” Sometimes, the fight became personal for Pise. Responding to published criticism, he replied, “If providence has endowed me with ‘a gifted pen,’ from my earliest manhood, nay, even from my adolescence, that ‘pen’ has been used in behalf of our religion.”

*The Catholic Expositor and Literary Magazine* enjoyed a longer life than *The Metropolitan*, surviving for five years in the 1840s. By the nineteenth century’s midpoint, magazines had become much more popular and successful than they were just a few decades earlier. The Industrial Revolution fueled mass production and mechanization, which lowered printing costs and subscription prices. Soon thereafter, a group of professional writers emerged to contribute to literary and general-interest magazines. Also, magazines further distinguished themselves from newspapers by targeting specialized audiences, such as women, children, and farmers. Finally, the growth of advertising revenue in the mid-nineteenth century subsidized much of the magazine production costs, making it more affordable for the average family.

At about the same time, American Catholic bishops felt impelled to reduce the multiplicity of voices claiming to speak on behalf of the faith. As a result, most Catholic magazines and newspapers fell under diocesan control by the 1850s. Thus, every publication advocating Catholicism is “as a matter of course, under the direction of the priests and bishops in the locality where it is published, and consequently authorized to speak for and in the name of the Catholic Church,” one observer noted.

After *The Metropolitan*’s demise, Pise served as a parochial vicar at St. Patrick’s Catholic Church in Washington, where he befriended Kentucky Senator Henry Clay. With Clay’s endorsement, Pise won a close vote to become Chaplain of the Senate.
in 1832. A surprised Secretary of the Senate wrote to Pise, “the Senate proceeded to
the election of a chaplain to Congress on their part for the present session, and on
counting the ballots it appeared that you were duly elected.” He was the first, and to
date, the only Catholic priest to serve as a Congressional chaplain. After a year in
Congress, Pise move to New York, where he pastored congregations at St. Joseph’s,
St. Peter’s and finally St. Charles Borromeo in Brooklyn, built under his aegis in
1849. He remained there until his death in 1866. Given his intellectual and literary
accomplishments, it is surprising that Pise never became a bishop. Perhaps by the
mid-nineteenth century, the Irish-dominated American Catholic hierarchy opposed
Pise on ethnic grounds: his father was born in Italy, and he rose to the priesthood
under the anti-Irish Archbishop Marechal.36

By the time of Pise’s death, the most egregious forms of nativism had dimin-
ished and the explicitly anti-Catholic Know-Nothing political faction had evapo-
rated. However, the anti-Catholicism that Father Pise, Bishop England, and others
had opposed in print never disappeared, and Catholics still experienced prejudice
throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first. Although some publica-
tions fomented that prejudice, others such as The Metropolitan; or, Catholic Monthly
Magazine, battled it with grit and courage. The bishops had intended the rise of
just this type of publication when they discussed the importance of expanding and
supporting the Catholic press during their first Provincial Council of Bishops and
in their resulting Pastoral Letter to the Laity. Reflecting three years later on how
their efforts stimulated the growth of Catholic journalism, Bishop England wrote
to Archbishop Whitfield, “I know that great good has been effected by the former
council, & great evil prevented.” The first American Catholic magazine was an out-
growth of that process.37
Notes

1. According to the Encyclopedia Americana entry on Kennedy, “Her most popular story, 'Father Clement' (1823) is strongly anti-Roman Catholic, and for this reason and on account of the vividness of the characters and situations, became immensely popular and was translated into most of the languages of Europe.” Encyclopedia Americana, 30 vols. (New York: Encyclopedia Americana Corp., 1918–1920), 16:355; Grace Kennedy, Father Clement: A Roman Catholic Story (Edinburgh, Scotland: William Oliphant, 1823), 27.

2. Archbishop James Whitfield, “Remarks on the Questions to be discussed in the Council October 1, 1829,” Whitfield Papers, Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, St. Mary’s Seminary & University, Baltimore, Maryland (hereinafter AAB).

3. Whitfield, “Remarks on the Questions,” AAB; the best source on these early newspapers is Paul J. Foik, Pioneer Catholic Journalism (New York: United States Catholic Historical Society, 1930); Foik, Journalism, 63–74. For the Hogan controversy, see Patrick W. Carey, People, Priests and Prelates: Ecclesiastical Democracy and the Tensions of Trusteeism (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1987).


7. Pastoral Letter to the Laity, October 17, 1829, in Nolan, Pastoral Letters.


12. Charles Constantine Pise to George J. Fenwick, November 29, 1822, Mount St. Mary’s 
University Archives, Emmitsburg, Maryland (hereinafter MSM); Pise to Fenwick, November 29, 1822, MSM.
13. Pise to Ambrose Marechal, September 12, 1825, AAB. See also Pise to Marechal, 
November 17, 1825, MSM; Charles Constantine Pise, History of the Church, from its 
Establishment to the Present Century, 5 vols. (Baltimore: P. Blenkinsop, 1827–1830) 5:373; 
On difficulty collecting payment, see Peter Blenkinsop to Rev. Hilary Parsons, May 1, 1829, 
MSM. Pise complained about the nominal sales of his book in his letter to Fr. Michael 
DuBourg Egan, February 20, 1827, MSM. On modest sales, one Pise biographer wrote, “The 
‘History’ was not a successful venture. There were few Catholic periodicals to promote its sale 
by careful reviews, and it is quite probable that the insufficient sale of the work chilled Father 
Pise’s enthusiasm.” Sister M. Eulalia Teresa Moffatt, “Charles Constantine Pise,” Historical 
Records and Studies, 20 (1931), 74.
14. Pise explicitly stated he wrote this novel “in answer to ‘Father Clement,’ although the name of the abusive little romance is not once mentioned, nor are the misrepresentations with which it abounds, so much as even alluded to.” The Metropolitan: or, Catholic Monthly 
Magazine (hereinafter Metropolitan), (January 1830): 24–25; Father Rowland, A North 
16. The Indian Cottage, A Unitarian Story (Baltimore: Fielding Lucas Jr., 1831); The 
Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity’s Directory (Baltimore: Fielding Lucas Jr., 1851), 
of the American Antiquarian Society, 78 (1968), 27.
18. Numerous sources acknowledge The Metropolitan as the first Catholic magazine, but few 
have discussed it in more than a cursory manner. In the most extensive, Fr. Foik devotes 
two-and-a-half pages to it in Pioneer Catholic Journalism, 152–54; Thomas F. Meehan, “The 
First Catholic Monthly Magazines,” Historical Records and Studies, 31 (1940): 137–38; Thomas 
1919), 406. The Catholic Magazine never came into print.
20. Pise to Marechal, May 23, September 12, 1825, AAB. Years later, Pise still remembered 
Mount St. Mary’s affectionately, calling it “a beacon of light” worthy of “admiration, and 
reverence.” Pise to Rev. John J. McCaffrey, August 9, 1856, MSM.
22. John B. Gildea to Rev. John F. McGerry, February 2, July 31, 1829, MSM.
23. The Metropolitan (January 1830): 31; “The Metropolitan; or, a Catholic Monthly 
Magazine,” in [Boston] The Jesuit, or Catholic Sentinel, November 21, 1829. Similar notices 
also appeared in, e.g., The Pittsburgh Gazette, November 20, 24, 27, 1829; [Hagerstown, Md.] 
The Torch Light and Public Advertiser, November 19, December 3, 10, 1829.
24. [Gettysburg, Pa.] The Adams Sentinel, January 13, 1830; The New-York Evening Post, 
November 17, 1829; The Pittsburgh Gazette, December 1, 1829; The Newburyport Herald, 
March 23, 1830.
26. Ibid., 2–4.
27. [Boston] The Jesuit or Catholic Sentinel, January 30, 1830.
28. The Metropolitan (February 1830): 56.
29. Ibid., March 1830, 81.
33. The Catholic Expositor and Literary Magazine, 3 (January 1843), no. 4 and 3 (December 1842), no. 3.
35. Albany Evening Journal, November 2, 1854.
“Getting On the Job”: Hiring and Promoting Firefighters in Progressive Era Baltimore

MARK J. HANNON

In 1900, Baltimore was at a transition point — a commercial port expanding to include a major Industrial Age manufactory, a city of over half a million people with a Democratic political machine and Progressive-Era reformers competing for power, a largely native-born society giving room to peoples from across the Atlantic, and an urban center adjusting from haphazard growth to large-scale planned development of port, streets, parks, public health and infrastructure. Fire protection in this border city changed throughout the nineteenth century, from the volunteer companies of the pre-Civil War years, to the first paid city fire department in 1859, to the complete professionalization of personnel in 1893. Control of the streets, control of elections, and satiating the thrill-seeking of a violent subculture drove volunteer companies and resulted in an increasingly intolerable level of head-bashing, racketeering, and election stealing. The first major effort to reign in the volunteer fire companies came with the creation of the Baltimore United Fire Department in 1833, a council drawn from the volunteers to set up rules and discipline the members who failed to operate in good order. Regardless of this effort, by the close of the 1850s various factions of the American, or Know-Nothing Party, engineered Election Day riots using volunteer enforcers who pushed the city to the brink of mob rule. The mayor and city council, urged by the state, finally took comprehensive action, eliminating the volunteer companies as public safety agencies and acquiring many of their assets. In their place, they created the Baltimore City Fire Department with one command structure, paid firefighters, horse-drawn steam engines, and a central telegraphic fire alarm system.1

At the dawn of the paid department, the command structure began with the mayor, who appointed the fire commissioners and selected the chief engineer, as the chief of department was then called. The Board of Fire Commissioners was later expanded, and included the mayor, but was abolished in 1883 by the mayor and city council who accused the board of “conducting the Fire Department as a political
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machine, and graver charges concerning the methods of contracting for supplies.” After dismissing the Board of Fire Commissioners, the city created the position of fire marshal and Mayor William Pinkney Whyte, leader of one of the Democratic Party’s factions, appointed J. Monroe Heiskell to remove incompetent political appointees (many given their jobs by the mayor’s political opponents) and to eliminate corrupt practices in the department. Given a free hand and complete power Heiskell “cleaned house,” firing both officers and men who refused to follow the new rules, hired new employees, and promoted those “most worthy by reason of efficient service in a subordinate capacity” according to his standards. After one year’s time, he reported “I feel that I may now congratulate the city upon a thoroughly non-political Fire Department, the members of which know that they must depend upon their merit, and not upon political influence for preferment.” Feeling that their work was done, the mayor and the city council reestablished the board in 1884, this time with three commissioners appointed by the mayor who also served as an ex-officio member.

Despite Heiskell’s assurances, the operation of the fire department was not entirely free of political activity in the latter half of the nineteenth century. One of the most egregious examples of continued partisan political activity involved District Engineer William A. Larkins, who during the election of 1895 collected numerous inebriates from the Cross Street Market area, housed them in the quarters of Hook
and Ladder 6 at Ostend and Hanover Streets and used them as “repeaters,” fraudulent voters who cast ballots for Democratic candidates several times at various polling places. He also acted as one of the Democrats’ poll watchers while on duty, challenging registered Republicans and black voters at the voting places in the 17th Ward in South Baltimore, shoving would-be Republican voters out of line while carrying a pistol in his pocket, “for use if needed.” Late in the afternoon on that election day, after checking a list of registered Democrats who had not voted, he sent members of Hook and Ladder Company 6 in civilian clothes (while they were on duty) to bring the recalcitrant citizens to cast their ballots. At the closing of the polls, he supervised the vote counting and stated “Great God, only a seventy-six majority, and not a nigger voted.” District Engineer Larkins was fired in 1897 for his 1895 political activities by a Republican administration, but was later appointed commissioner of street cleaning by Democratic Mayor Thomas G. Hayes. Larkin remained a force in city politics for years afterward, including as a candidate for chief engineer of the Fire Department.3

In the 1890s, the Progressive Movement was in full flower across America, at-
tempting to replace urban and state political machines, establish civil service hiring methods, and rein in the power of big business. In Baltimore, these “progressives” worked in both parties and controlled the Republican Party for a time. Following investigations into the non-competitive awarding of city contracts, the Republicans overwhelmed the Democrats in the election of 1895, electing Republicans as mayor and many city council positions. Led by thirty-six-year-old Mayor Alcaeus Hooper, the Republicans in 1898 went to the Maryland State Assembly for a new city charter to continue their reforms, claiming to seek a city government “based upon modern administrative, not spoils politics” and appointed the much-decorated Fire Department hero William McAfee as chief engineer. The Democrats, joining the progressive trend, elected ex-Confederate Thomas Hayes mayor in 1899, who stated that the new charter “makes it possible for the administration of municipal affairs upon a strictly business basis and the elimination of evils which may arise where personal and political interests are given preference to public obligations.”

In 1893, when the department became fully paid, the mayor appointed the fire-
men, choosing many of the candidates upon the advice of political powerbrokers such as Issac Raisin and John J. “Sonny” Mahon of the Democratic Party. The men so hired also had their records reviewed by the Fire Board every four years, with the commissioners reviewing each member’s record for disciplinary problems and other matters, perhaps including political loyalty, before voting on the member’s “re-election.” This system was altered in March 1900, when the city council eliminated the re-election process and by ordinance created the Examining Board of the Fire Department. The Examining Board consisted of the three members — the President of the Fire Commission, the Chief Engineer, and a third appointee, selected by the mayor. This board also created lists of those who were eligible for appointment and promotion through a competitive examination process seeking to improve “the efficiency of the Fire Department” and the “removal of this branch of the public service from the arena of spoils politics.”

The firefighters of the early-twentieth-century Baltimore City Fire Department were recruited from the working class of the rapidly expanding industrial city, filling with residents from overseas and rural Maryland seeking opportunity. A look at the department’s 1904 roster shows the previous jobs the firemen held, a mix of skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers, with drivers, laborers, and machinists being the most frequent (see complete listing in Appendix A).

Ethnically, the firefighters bore northern European names with German, Irish, and English the most frequent. The German names are the most common. As the city’s largest ethnic group for several generations they spoke the language fluently and were well established politically and economically. The Irish were not as numerous in Baltimore as they were in places such as New York, Boston and Buffalo, but they arrived speaking English and with a proclivity for civil service and political activities. People whose ancestors hailed from the British Isles were the original European settlers in Maryland, and by 1900 had intimate familiarity with the hiring system and the connections to make it work in their favor. The most recent immigrants to Baltimore from Italy, Poland, and Russia, although numerous, often did not speak English and were yet to make their presence felt in large numbers in the department (see Appendixes B and C).

The Baltimore of the early twentieth century was an extremely segregated society, vehemently so in 1904, following the state assembly’s passage of “Jim Crow” laws that segregated public facilities. Democrats strongly held these segregationist policies and did their utmost to “disfranchise” black voters, the vast majority of whom registered Republican, the party of Lincoln. Further, Democratic politicians would exacerbate racial tensions to keep white voters loyal to their party, claiming that Republican office holders would put black and white children in the classroom together, hire blacks as policemen and firemen to protect their neighborhoods, and assist black workers to make further inroads into jobs tenuously held by white workers. One editorial commented, “Democracy is the friend of the white laborer
and Republicanism the tool of monopolism, whose only hope of success is in the votes of the Negro population, which it expects to obtain at the price of subserving it to Negro dictation, not merely in the matter of public employment, but by means of a revolution in the educational system of this state. . . .” Although the Republicans gratefully accepted black voters and the city hired the first black city employees in 1896 under the Republican Hooper administration, they had a limited commitment to equality. The Fire Department was an all-white workplace in 1904 and would remain so until 1953. However, nothing was formally written in city ordinance, state law, or departmental orders and the whites-only policy was enforced by custom alone. Women were not hired as firefighters in Baltimore until 1986.8

Of the firemen’s religious faiths, little is said. The Rules and Regulations specify “Religion or politics must not be discussed in or about Department quarters. The Fire Department is organized and its members are paid to contend with fires, not with any set of religious or political opinions.” At this time, there were no Fire Department chaplains, and when a reporter suggested their appointment “he made a hurried exit to avoid a rush of books and inkbottles. The information was later vouchsafed that Dr. Alexander Hill, the department surgeon was all the parson that the firemen wanted while actively engaged on the fireground.”9
At the top of the department’s organizational chart in the early twentieth century stood the mayor, who appointed the chief engineer and the Fire Board, which was composed of three Commissioners, two from his own political party, and one from the opposition’s organization, as the city charter required. Democratic Mayor Robert McLane, elected in 1903, appointed two Democrats and one Republican to the Fire Board, who often did not agree, much to the amusement of reporters covering their open meetings. Despite the rhetoric about the Fire Department being free from partisan politics, the two principal parties and their factions fought over appointments, promotions, letting contracts, and disciplinary actions. This gave the press a lot of material for columns such as “Was He Victim of Persecution?” where a probationary fireman, dismissed for insubordination, claimed a Democratic cabal including the captain and lieutenant in Engine Company 9, and a “well known Democratic politician” (Street Commissioner Larkins) worked to get him fired because “he was a Republican.” These differences reveal a form of administration that was not as free of political maneuverings as advertised and, along with personal differences, factors that led to the resignation of Chief Engineer William McAfee in 1901, stating that the “Democratic Fire Commissioners (were) trying to discredit him,” in the course of a drawn-out battle over the awarding of a contract for fire hose.

The Republican commissioner in the early twentieth century was A. Rozel Cathcart, who was first appointed by Mayor Hooper in 1896. Commissioner Cathcart was a man whose background was in the insurance and banking businesses, and he was repeatedly recommended by Baltimore’s insurers for reappointment to the Fire Commission. He was an ardent “box chaser” (an enthusiastic fire buff) who listed “the Fire Department as a hobby,” and as an appointee of a “progressive” mayor, believed in the merit system, but who was quite adept at political gamesmanship as well. The two Democrats on the commission were George W. Gail Jr., president, and Edward M. Parrish. Commissioner Gail’s father was a successful tobacco merchant born in Germany and active in Democratic Party politics, and his son followed him into both ventures, being a prominent member of the Reform League as well. Parrish also started in his family’s spice business, later running a drug company and having an interest in local Democratic politics.

The job of fire commissioner was one of tremendous influence. These men let contracts, did the hiring, made final disciplinary decisions that could demote members, took away their time off or dismissed them, decided on promotions and set departmental policy along with the chief engineer. According to the *Baltimore American*:

> . . . there are fifty or more aspirants for positions on the Fire Board. “The presidency of the board is one of the nicest positions in the city government. In addition to the annual salary of $1,000 allowed each member of the board,
the president is also President of the Dept. of Public Safety, with a seat in the
First Branch of the City Council; President of the Fire Department Examining
Board and a member of the Subway Commission.”

The Fire Board also hired their secretary, who handled much of the day-to-day
work of the commission, was the departmental paymaster, and clerk of the Exam-
ing Board that gave the tests for hiring and promotions. He was the gatekeeper
who could influence which contractors bid on supplies, equipment, and apparatus,
reviewed applications for the Fire Department and doled out salaries. At the turn of
the century, the man was Pinkney Whyte Wilkinson, who would serve the board from
1900 until 1954. His father had been warden of the Maryland Penitentiary and later
the superintendent of Greenmount Cemetery, the first a political position appointed
by then Governor William Pinkney Whyte—for whom the elder Wilkinson named
his son. Although young Wilkinson, a Loyola College graduate and former clerk to
then U.S. Senator Whyte scored second (out of two applicants) on the written test
for the position of secretary, the commission did appoint him in June 1900, about
a week after the tests were scored. Carl Otte, the man who out scored Wilkinson,
was appointed his assistant. In 1902, when Mayor Hayes and Commissioner John
H. Sirich inspected “the intricate set of books of the department,” the mayor com-
mented to the Baltimore Morning Herald reporter, “I do not think there is a better
set of books anywhere.” In that time, if you wanted to get your job application in
or have your firm considered to bid on a contract, “Pinky” Wilkinson was the man
to see, and upon his retirement after fifty-four years Secretary Wilkinson stated to
reporters that he had served under thirty-three fire commissioners “and was never
questioned by any of them about what I did.”

At the opposite end of the chain of command was the position of substitute,
created in 1862, the most-used entry level position into the Fire Department at this
time. This was a part-time position paid at a lowered salary when full-time firefight-
ers were injured, sick, or on vacation. Or, when a full-time firefighter wanted an
unscheduled day off, they could hire one of the substitutes to work for them at their
cost, an expensive and infrequently used procedure.

The substitutes were appointed by the mayor and approved by the Board of Com-
misioners after passing a medical exam, not going through the Board of Examiners,
a procedure that left quite a bit of room in the hiring process for non-meritorious
influence. Each engine and ladder company had three substitutes available and the
city provided their gear. They were trained in the station and were thought “sometimes
efficient, and at other times utterly inefficient and worthless . . . a fruitful source of
friction in the ranks of the regular firemen.” The commissioners would recommend
the elimination of the substitutes over the years and in 1903 the board ordered that
all the men listed as substitutes take the exams for the full-time position of proba-
tioner “or be dropped from the rolls,” signaling plans to hire the best of their ranks and eventually dispose of the rest.\textsuperscript{15}

Probationer, created in 1896, was the entry-level position for full-time employment and in 1904 twenty of these positions were filled. They were regular city employees principally used as detail men moving from company to company where there were openings from resignations, illness, and injury. Probationers bought their own uniforms and equipment, worked the same schedule as the regular members of the various companies, received vacations, and received an annual salary of $600.\textsuperscript{16}

The physical exam conducted by the department surgeon, who in 1904 was Dr. Edwin Geer, tested candidates for disabilities, illness, and injury. He also gave the forerunner of the agility test, but then it simply measured height, weight, and chest size. The minimum required height in 1898 was 5’ 5” tall, and a 34” chest for pipemen (engine company personnel), and 5’ 8” tall, with a 36” chest for laddermen (hook and ladder company members), later changed to 5’ 7” and 34” chest size for everyone, and a maximum size of 6’ 4” and 200 lbs.\textsuperscript{17}

The weight requirements also changed over time, with a minimum 145 lbs., until 1904, when the Fire Board reduced the minimum weight to 140 lbs. “We have failed to get a number of good men because we have expected too much. The small men in the department are among the best we have,” said Commissioner Parrish,
and his Democrat counterpart Gail agreed. Though their argument to change the requirement seems subjective, for there appears to be no data presented to support his proposition, this motion passed over the objection of Republican Commissioner Cathcart, who said, "You know what my attitude has always been in this matter. The big fellows are the best." When questioned about his position on the subject, Chief Engineer George Horton stayed out of the fray, saying, "Big men may pass all kinds of examinations and then not make firemen. Little fellows very often do not possess the required strength." Within a few days of this vote, over 100 men went to the commission's offices for Fire Department applications, no doubt grateful to the Democratic administration for their opportunity.

The adopted standards would also be bent on other occasions, whether to include political favorites or because of a paucity of qualified candidates. In May 1900, shortly after the board began testing potential recruits, the age, height, and weight limitations would be waived for substitutes to include them in the testing process for probationer. Later that month, the board advised the examining surgeon to allow a five-pound variance.18

Applicants sometimes tried to beat the system. Some put weights in their pockets or concealed them in their hands, and on one reported occasion, consulted a book of Fire Department Regulations during a written test. When these deceptions were discovered, the candidates were immediately failed and the Fire Board would not accept any future applications from them.19

After the candidate's application papers were found in order and the doctor's exam was done, or, as the papers put it, "His report being fair, the applicant is then qualified to take the entrance examination . . . thus securing for himself a place on the graded list, determined by the mark he has made." The examination process for probationer included scoring the applicant in the following categories: Physical examination 40 percent, Experience, 10 percent, and Written Test, 50 percent. The written test had five categories, each valued at 10 percent, Spelling, Handwriting, Writing from Dictation, Arithmetic, and Knowledge of the City. An example of a question from this last category was “What streets would you cross in going from the corner of Gay and Baltimore Streets to the corner of Eutaw and Baltimore Streets, using the south side of Baltimore Street?"

The testing process, although an improvement from the political appointments of the past, remained geared towards the well connected. The application credentials had to be “certified by four respectable citizens.” The secretary and then the examiners determined whose name was respectable and whose was not. The politically appointed Departmental Surgeon would score the physical part of the examination, upon his judgment, almost half of a candidate's score. Lastly, experience equaled 10 percent of the score, giving the appointed substitutes an advantage.20

In the examinations for positions above the rank of probationer, the candidates’ performance evaluations factored heavily in the written test. For example, the next
step up from probationer, that of pipeman / ladderman, included, along with a written test valued at 35 percent of the score, the following categories: Violation of Rules (5 percent), Veracity (5 percent), Habits as to Use of Liquor (5 percent), Ability and Energy (5 percent), Coolness and Judgment in Emergency (5 percent), Deportment Towards Citizens (10 percent), Physical Condition, Including Activity and Endurance (15 percent), Fidelity and Promptitude in the Performance of Duty (5 percent), and Commendation for Meritorious Action (10 percent).21

The Board of Examiners who created the written tests included the president of the Fire Board, the chief engineer and yet another mayor’s appointee, who in 1904 was George May, a well-connected lawyer, investment banker, former Fire Commissioner and Democratic politician. The chief engineer wrote the test questions, and along with their secretary (Pinkney W. Wilkerson, again, the commission’s secretary), advertised the positions in the city’s major newspapers, the Baltimore Sun, the Baltimore Morning Herald, the Baltimore News, Baltimore American and Der Deutsche Correspondent. The secretary also oversaw how it was administered. Interestingly, the written exam was composed of fill-in-the-blank answers, not multiple-choice questions as they are today. Those who passed the physical, written, and other exams were then placed on a list according to their numerical score and published in the newspaper, reducing the chances of later manipulation. From these lists, the Board of Commissioners could “appoint any one of the top three candidates on the list to a vacancy,” leaving further room for the commissioners’ preferences—political and otherwise. 22

Some commissioners believed that hiring and promotion should be strictly on the basis of test scores, some believed that experience should be a factor, and some changed their thinking from time to time for reasons unstated. For example, when an opening came up for a hostler’s position (driver), a reporter from the Baltimore American commented:

Length of service in the department, and not a man’s average on the eligible list, obtained after a hard competitive examination, is now the Fire Board’s rule in making promotions in the uniformed force. This was the surprising result of a meeting of the board yesterday afternoon, when Pipeman Charles L. Schute, No. 15 Engine Company was promoted to the grade of Hostler by the votes of President Cathcart and Commissioner Parrish. Mr. Schute’s name was third on the list of eligibles. Commissioner Sirich nominated Pipeman Henry Spittle, No 1 Engine Company, whose name was at the top of the list. “Commissioner Parrish nominated Mr. Schute, and, to the surprise of all, President Cathcart voted for him, thus again deserting his aggressive stand in favor of the man with the highest average and standing at the top of the list.”

The Fire Board continually disputed nominations of the top three eligible can-
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...didates, prompting the newspapers to frequently imply that partisan politics were the source of these disagreements.23

Probationers achieved regular assignments as a pipeman or ladderman when there was a vacancy in the roster of an engine, truck, chemical, or marine company, and once again taking a written test and going on the list from which any of the top three candidates could be chosen. When promoted, they would be designated pipeman if assigned to an engine, marine, or chemical company, and ladderman if there was an opening in a hook and ladder company. These were the men who stretched the hose lines and raised the ladders, extinguished the fires and made the rescues. They were paid $800 per year. They could be transferred, but many remained in the same company for long periods of time, some an entire career.

How fast one moved up depended on a number of factors. If the Department was expanding, as it was in this period, tests for the various positions would be given frequently, and moving up from substitute to probationer to pipeman / ladderman could take less than a year. Another factor that came into play was turnover. The number of people who resigned, were fired, or simply walked away from the job was higher than in current fire departments and if a member were to leave it usually occurred in the first few years of employment. Whether a man stayed with the department depended on how he adjusted to the discipline, long hours, boredom, and occasional life threatening and disabling danger of fire department life. If a young man sought adventure, a steady job for life, good pay, admiration of fellow citizens, and could adapt to the discipline and to spending six out of seven days at work, he would manage all right.

The salaries that the pipemen and laddermen earned were more than double that of an unskilled laborer, a third more than a teamster, and slightly above that of the average tradesman, taking in about 10 percent more than a plumber or a carpenter, and slightly less than an electrician or a bricklayer. A probationer made about as much as a tailor or a blacksmith, which could make it tough to make ends meet if he had a family, and gave him a financial incentive to move up the ladder as well as to achieve a steady position in an engine or truck company. The salaries of the more technical positions in the department and the officers’ ranks, their salaries as well as their status, would do a working family well in turn-of-the-century Baltimore.24

The substitutes already had training and familiarity with the job and their co-workers, and unlike the current situation, where several dozen trainees are hired at once to go to a recruit school, they would be integrated into the department a few at a time and were trained in the individual companies where they worked. In 1904, despite hiring eighty-two men in the previous two years, the firefighters averaged about eight years’ experience and the officers averaged over fifteen years on the job.25 (see Appendix E)

Above the ranks of laddermen and pipemen, there were several technical positions in the department, each requiring a written exam for promotion. One was that
of hostler, or driver. These men drove the rigs and looked after the horses. Another position was that of tillerman, the man who steered the back wheels of the ladder trucks from his seat at the back end of the trailer with the aerial and ground ladders. These men were compensated at a rate of $900 per year.

Two of the most specialized positions in the department were that of engineman and assistant engineman. These were the men that ran and maintained the steam-powered engines that pumped the water, considered one of the more sophisticated "high tech" positions of the time in this age of steam power. Their written test consisted of technical questions such as "For what purpose is a churn valve used?" and "Give the number of ports in a slide valve fire engine and their names." In addition, candidates for engineer were asked several math questions and a memory test, which required them to write sentences from dictation. As qualified candidates for these positions were hard to find, enginemen candidates could be hired from outside the department if they held engineer's licenses issued by the state of Maryland and were exempted from the height and weight requirements. They could not, however, take any other job in the department without achieving those physical characteristics.

Above these men were the officers' ranks of lieutenant, captain, district engineer and chief engineer. All of the engine, truck, marine, and chemical companies had a captain as commander. These men ran the company in the firehouse and on the emergency scene, established the company's standard operating procedures, ran the training exercises, oversaw the maintenance of the apparatus and the housework in the firehouse, kept the records, made sure the horses were ready, carried out the building inspections and led the company on the fireground. The lieutenants were the

Chief Engineer George Horton (undated). Horton joined the department as a substitute in 1862 and worked his way up, earning accolades at every step. He avoided political controversy, turning down the chief engineer's job three times, until McAfee resigned in 1901. Horton led with a steady hand, compromising with politicians as necessary and advancing the department to national prominence. (Author's photograph.)
second in command and filled in as company commander when the captain was not present. A captain’s salary in 1904 was $1,100 and a lieutenant’s was $1,000 per year. 27

The captain’s immediate boss was a district chief, who ran the engine, marine, chemical and truck companies in one of the city’s six districts. When the companies in his district responded, he was the fireground commander unless and until the chief engineer arrived, made sure the captains were doing their job by daily visits and inspections of their companies, called the vet as necessary for the horses, was responsible for all fire department property in his district, made sure all his companies were getting the orders and other communications and made daily reports to the chief engineer. These men were paid $1,400 a year, and could be assigned acting chief engineer in his absence. This was the highest rank firefighters could achieve through testing. The written test for district chief included questions about the area such as the location of companies, alarm boxes, and running routes; technical questions such as pump problems (calculating the engine pressure for flowing water through hose lines) and arithmetic questions; knowledge of Departmental Rules and Regulations, General Orders, and Code of Fire Department Signals (communications and dispatch procedures). 28

The highest ranking man in uniform in the department was the chief engineer.
In 1904, George Horton held the position. At fifty-seven years old he had been with the department forty-two years. He started as a teenager when most of the personnel were still volunteers, worked in both truck and engine companies, and worked fighting many hard-fought fires, including a fire in 1866 at Fayette and Ann Streets where he removed two victims, a husband and wife who later died of burns and smoke inhalation. He also worked the Clay Street fire in 1873 that burned 113 buildings and a fire in a garment factory at Lexington and Howard in 1880 where he and Lt. R. G. Kettlewell of the Salvage Corps rescued twenty-two people from a blaze on the third floor. He had seen firefighting and the department go through considerable change, from mostly volunteer to all-paid department, from hand-drawn, hand pumped engines to horse-drawn steam pumpers, through numerous administrations and myriad political changes. He had worked his way up through the ranks and never been in any disciplinary trouble. He had been a district chief for seven years and had turned down the appointment to chief engineer three times prior to accepting the job in 1901, probably to avoid becoming a political lightning rod. He was appointed by a Democratic Fire Commission who had continual disagreements, particularly over letting contracts and making purchases with the previous chief, the much-admired and decorated William McAfee.29

McAfee not only had running battles with the Fire Board, but also threw Democratic Mayor Hayes out of his headquarters on New Year’s Eve in 1900, telling the city’s chief officer to get out “when he had been celebrating,” and the mayor in turn threatening revenge. The only controversy about Horton appears to be that he refused to shake his predecessor’s hand upon making chief, stating in the presence of reporters, “I have been the best friend you ever had, and for the last four years I have gotten it in the neck from you. Now you take it.” This statement surprised the outgoing chief, who claimed to have treated his successor with nothing but courtesy and respect. Chief Horton led the department until 1912, earned wide respect as a firefighter, and was a strict disciplinarian. He was quite the diplomat with the politicians, unlike his predecessor, who would challenge the commission’s knowledge about purchases, and argue in the public meetings about it. Horton, however, would remain silent or agree with the choice of contractors, deferring to the politicos’ strongly held positions and make proposals for change through careful argumentation that would surely gain the commissioners’ approval.30

Chief Engineer Horton did, however, strongly resist the influence of politicians in the day-to-day operations of the department. Although political friends might help the firemen get hired and promoted, by 1904 using political connections to get a transfer or better assignment was forbidden and Chief Horton strictly enforced the rules. He had undoubtedly seen much political maneuvering throughout his career and refused to allow the politicians to override his authority. For example, in May 1904, Lieutenant Albert A. Torney at 12 Engine was demoted to pipeman “and severely reprimanded by the Chief Engineer” for attempting to have City Council-
man Henry J.C. Hoffman of the 24th Ward, bring influence to bear upon the Board of Fire Commissioners for the purpose of securing a transfer . . .” 31

**Civilians in the Ranks**

Civilians also served in the Fire Department, including the superintendent of machinery, the man in charge of keeping all the steamers and other mechanical units in Baltimore in good order. In February 1902, George Linsenmeyer, appointed by Mayor Latrobe in 1884, died after a long illness, setting off fierce competition for his job. Initially, John Cranford, the Engineman at 12 Engine (located near the superintendent’s office and close to his home) took over the position as Acting Superintendent in October 1901, when Linsenmeyer was unable to continue working.

When Linsenmeyer died, an examination process opened, the first for this position under Civil Service rules, and three candidates sought the rank. The first was John Cranford, a trained machinist with seven years on the job who had been filling in for Linsenmeyer for seven months. The second candidate was licensed marine engineer Thomas H. Meushaw, the chief engineer of the fireboat *Cataract* with seventeen years’ experience, and the third was Thomas Sexton, an experienced engineman who had been on the job since 1888. As with many of these appointments, the newspapers followed the competition and political maneuvering closely. When the testing was completed Cranford had scored first, with a 94 percent and Meushaw second with a 73 percent. Sexton did not receive any votes, was apparently friendless amongst the powerful and not considered a serious candidate.

The Fire Commission, with the authority to promote the candidates, would make the final decision. In this case, the faction led by Commissioner Edward M. Parrish, urged by potent political figures in other city departments and engineering circles in Baltimore, worked with Republican commissioner Cathcart to prevail for Meushaw, although he had scored second on the examination. This vote “astounded” observers. Cathcart, a well-known supporter of the merit system, had consistently voted for the candidate who placed first on the list, and had even earlier proposed to obligate “the board to appoint men at the top of the lists.” The faction favoring Cranford, among them Commissioner Sirich and Chief Engineer Horton, failed in their opposition to those favoring Meushaw. In this case, the first name on the list, Mr. Cranford’s, was bypassed by what the *Baltimore American* called “the ‘if’ clause, that is, (the commissioners) were in favor of the first name on the board, unless there were good reasons why such name should be passed over.” The commissioners did not stipulate their reasons for passing over Cranford, but the newspaper reporters speculated that perhaps a quid pro quo had occurred, when some time later, Commissioner Sirich again allied with Cathcart to support the promotion of others, some also not first on their lists, who were known to be registered Republicans, as was Cathcart. 32

Meushaw’s promotion caused some awkwardness and a degree of hostility in the
workplace. Cranford and Meushaw disliked each other, and when the latter gained the appointment he moved into the acting superintendent’s office at Engine 12 where Cranford was assigned. He then requested a transfer “to any other company in the city,” but his request was denied, leaving them in the same small firehouse until Cranford got a transfer to Engine 7 in 1905 and then left the department two years later.\textsuperscript{33}

Other non-sworn positions in the fire department at this time included those working the fire and police telegraphs, administering the systems that alerted the fire companies. The Superintendent of the Police and Fire Alarm Telegraphs had run the system since 1877, and from 1898 to 1902, Frank Boyd held that job. Mr. Boyd, while seeing to the repair and improvement of the wires, repeatedly found himself out of the decision-making circles amongst the mandarins of the police and fire departments. He could be quite proprietary about the lines in his charge among the many strands of telephone, telegraph, and electric power lines strung about the city. On one occasion, upon hearing that electric power lines had been stretched on the alarm system’s poles in the Locust Point neighborhood, Boyd got on a street car and rode from his office, axe and wire cutters under his arm, and personally cut down power lines and cross-arms that the United Electric and Power Company had recently attached at Hull and Nicholson Streets. Later, when the general manager of that utility arrived at the superintendent’s office to complain, Boyd proceeded to lecture the man, insisting that his permission must be granted before committing such a presumptive act, and insisted he, the superintendent of police and fire alarm telegraphs be consulted in the future before rashly assuming cooperation.\textsuperscript{34}

In 1902, James Yeakle, an electrical engineer (and one of the first so designated) replaced the colorful Boyd. Yeakle joined the department following his tenure as general manager of American District Telegraph Company in Baltimore (better known today as A.D.T.) and before that, a telegraph manager for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. He smoothed relations with the city’s various utility companies, who had considerable clout downtown and methodically improved the system, by testing minor improvements in alarm boxes and horse-stall opening switches, installing new alarm boxes throughout the city, continuing to bury the lines underground in the city’s conduit system, and insulating the wires that remained overhead.\textsuperscript{35}

The operators of the telephone and telegraph systems were also civilian employees. They received the alarms from the many boxes found throughout the city or, less frequently, from telephone calls, and then dispatched the appropriate units via telegraph. It is interesting to note that when the city first hired telephone operators in September 1901, they considered hiring women for these positions. When Republican Fire Commissioner Cathcart first wrote up the ordinance for the City Council’s consideration that would allow this breaking of the gender barrier, his motivation was to increase efficiency and lower costs, as the “Hello Girls” salaries would be lower than men’s and save the city money. However, the Democratic majority on the Board of Fire Commissioners “considered it too radical a departure from established
custom,” and, more to the point, they already had well-connected candidates in mind for these positions (at this time and henceforth) and the measure was defeated.36

Overall, getting “on the job” and getting promoted in the fire department during the Progressive Era was a matter of both connections and merit. Although examinations were given, the qualifications could be arbitrary and variances made from time to time to assist the favored candidates, often on the basis of political affiliation. Gender and race barriers were strictly adhered to, and while ethnicity was not formally considered, some nationalities with the greatest familiarity and closest connections with the system did have advantages. In contrast with today, such non-meritorious maneuverings were publicly acknowledged and much more carefully scrutinized by the media of the times.
## Appendix A

### Previous Occupations of Fire Department Members

(443 Members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinner</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Moulder</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Maker</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Driver</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilermaker</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorman</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholsterer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass Finisher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonecutter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxmaker</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckster</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperhanger</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lineman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironworker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brushmaker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarmaker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Maker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collarmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf Builder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Refiner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamfitter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnessmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brakeman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunkmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enameler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smelter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrotyper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass Finisher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Sampler</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilder</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevedore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Orderly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Spinner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversmith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyancer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearcutter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Dealer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patternmaker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

**Ethnicity of 1904 Baltimore Fire Department**

**All Members (443)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officers (78)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>22.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fire Insurance Salvage Corps (23 members)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

**1904 Immigration to Baltimore**

Statement of the total number of aliens admitted (exclusive of transits) at the Port of Baltimore for the year ending December 31, 1904, distributed according to the countries whence they came.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria-Hungary</td>
<td>17,922</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>5,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France, including Corsica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Empire</td>
<td>4,252</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy, including Sicily and Sardinia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumania</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Empire and Finland</td>
<td>16,340</td>
<td>11,688</td>
<td>4,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servia, Bulgaria and Montenegro</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain, including Canary and Balearic Isl.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey in Europe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Europe</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,866</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,839</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,027</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey in Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Asia</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,914</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,877</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,037</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: At this time, there was a large influx of immigrants from Poland to Baltimore. This is not reflected here because Poland was a conquered nation, having been divided up by the Russian, German and Austro-Hungarian Empires. Likewise, the immigrants from Turkey may be Greek or other ethnicities, having left parts of the Ottoman Empire for America.
## Appendix D

### Comparison of 1904 Annual Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Department Salaries</th>
<th>Non-Fire Department Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Commissioner</td>
<td>Iron Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td>Electrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Alarm Superintendent</td>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. Of Machinery</td>
<td>City Market Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireboat Pilot</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineman</td>
<td>Clothing Cutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Engineman</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Co. Captain</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostler</td>
<td>Cigarmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladderman/Pipeman</td>
<td>Laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireboat Stoker</td>
<td>Market Cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationer</td>
<td>Teamster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute*</td>
<td>Iron Moulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillerman</td>
<td>Painter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Directory of City Employees, (Baltimore: J.W.Bond Co); Maryland Bureau of Statistics and Information, Charles J. Fox, Chief, 13th Annual Report (Baltimore: Kohn & Pollock, 1905), 118–121, 132–133; Board of Fire Commissioners, 21st Annual Report, (Baltimore: Wm. C. Dulany Co., City Printers, 1905), 33

*Substitutes were part-time workers, and they were paid for the hours they worked based on the annual salary.
Appendix E

B.F.D. Members Level of Experience

Years of Experience

All Members (443)
- Mean - 8.92
- Median - 8.01
- Mode - 1

Officers (78)
- Mean - 15.46
- Median - 13
- Mode - 9
Goliath, 1893–1913. The Baltimore Fire Department bought this horse in July 1899 and assigned him to engine company #15, then headquartered at 308 West Lombard Street. On February 7, 1904, the company was among the first responders to a reported fire at the John E. Hurst Company on German Street (now Redwood Street) between Hopkins Place and Liberty Street. As Goliath’s team galloped north on Liberty Street, pulling a Hale Water Tower and a crew of firemen, an explosion ripped through the Hurst building. The horse veered away from the flames and in doing so drove the team and its crew clear of the falling wall. Goliath quickly became the most famous animal in Maryland. Seared by flames on his right side, he spent three months in the department’s horse hospital before returning to his unit. Burn scars on his neck and right hindquarter are visible in this photograph. The Baltimore City Council, by special act, gave him a lifetime position with the fire department, sparing him the fate of other fire horses that went out as workhorses in other city departments or were sold or destroyed at the end of their firefighting service. This civic hero was the most popular attraction at parades and fairs for the next nine years. Goliath remained at the Lombard Street firehouse until his death in 1913. (MC3825C, Baltimore City Life Collection, Maryland Historical Society) For more on the 1904 fire see Peter B. Petersen, The Great Baltimore Fire (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 2004.)
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Hook & Ladder Company 10, Lafayette Ave. and Stricker St., 1899. The city built this firehouse in 1895 and replaced it in 1967 with the building shown below. (Subject Vertical File, Maryland Historical Society.)

Third Battalion, Engine Company 8, Truck Company 10, Medic 15, Battalion Chief 3, 2016. Located at 1503 W. LaFayette Avenue, Truck 10 is known as "The Wicked Stick of the West" and Engine 8 as "Westside Thunder." (Courtesy Lt. Matthew Saylol, Truck Company 10, Baltimore City Fire Department.)
Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, born the youngest son of eleven children in an often poor South Baltimore family, was one of the most significant and most colorful political figures in Maryland history. He was arguably the most important Maryland Republican of the twentieth century: the last GOP mayor of Baltimore, and the only Republican governor in state history to win re-election. Additionally, McKeldin was one of just four men, and the only Republican, to be elected both mayor of Baltimore and governor of Maryland.

In a state historically dominated by the Democratic Party, McKeldin gained electoral success, both city and statewide, through a coalition of traditionally Republican voters (upper income and Protestant) and disaffected Democrats, alienated after contentious primaries. Within that bipartisan coalition, McKeldin had a core constituency of African American and Jewish voters, groups that trended Democratic in McKeldin’s time and who also admired his advocacy of civil rights and his support of the state of Israel.

At no time was McKeldin’s political star brighter, nor that of Maryland Republicans, than in 1952. After serving as mayor of Baltimore from 1943 to 1947 and two unsuccessful gubernatorial runs in 1942 and 1946, McKeldin, capitalizing on voter anger over the sales tax, won election as governor in 1950 over incumbent Democrat William Preston Lane Jr. by the largest vote margin in Maryland history. State voters, in addition to electing McKeldin, had ousted long-time Democratic U.S. Senator Millard E. Tydings, replacing him with John Marshall Butler, a more conservative Republican than McKeldin, and elected half of Maryland’s six U.S. House seats for the GOP. Therefore, in 1952, McKeldin, elected decisively two years earlier in a Democratic state, and being the only governor south of the Mason-Dixon Line, sought to have a visible and important role in the upcoming GOP presidential nomination contest.

Nationally, Republicans were hopeful of regaining the White House for the first time in twenty years. They sought to take advantage of President Harry S. Truman’s
unpopularity, his conduct of the Korean conflict, and allegations of corruption in the administration — including gifts of mink coats to officials’ wives, and Communist subversion within the American government.

The GOP, however, was a divided party in 1952. The Republicans were split into an Eastern moderate and internationalist wing, and a Midwest/Rocky Mountain West conservative and isolationist wing. The party had nominated Eastern wing candidates
Wendell L. Willkie in 1940 and Thomas E. Dewey in 1944 and 1948, while electing more conservative “Main Street” Republicans to Congress. Entering 1952, the presumed front-runner was Ohio Senator Robert A. Taft, son of the former president, known as “Mr. Republican” who represented the Midwest/West wing of the GOP.

For his part, McKeldin’s views were representative of the Eastern moderate and internationalist wing of the party, including acceptance of FDR’s New Deal, and supporting a bipartisan foreign policy of collective security and containment of the Soviet Union. The Eastern group was alarmed by the prospect of Taft, who wanted to significantly roll back the New Deal and was a containment critic (particularly on Korea), winning the Republican nomination and leading the GOP to a sixth straight presidential election defeat in 1952.

During 1951, McKeldin began commenting on national Republican politics. He distanced himself at this point from the growing Dwight D. Eisenhower for president movement being organized by representatives of the GOP’s Eastern wing, particularly Governor Thomas E. Dewey of New York, with whom McKeldin had a close political relationship. The governor believed a military man should not be president. “When he’s through being a soldier,” McKeldin said, “He ought to come home and retire, not go into politics.”

Senator Taft, who by mid-1951 was gearing up his presidential candidacy, sought commitments from state delegations to head off a possible Draft Eisenhower movement. Importantly, Taft controlled the majority of state representatives on the Republican National Committee, including Maryland’s national committeeman, businessman Jacob France, who was part of the state’s GOP “old guard” and with whom McKeldin was at odds.

As part of evaluating his chances in various states, Taft kept apprised of the Maryland political situation. In a “Memo for the Record,” in May, the senator wrote that he had conversations with Baltimore Sun columnist Frank Kent (whose conservative bent made him a useful source for the Ohioan), who told him that McKeldin “was practically the whole works (in Maryland) at the present time because of the manner in which he had gotten himself elected without the assistance of the old crowd.” Taft concluded that “obviously, we have to get to McKeldrin (sic) or lose the delegation.”

In July, Taft came to Maryland and addressed a crowd of 2,000 in Annapolis, the state capital. Later, after feasting on hot dogs together, McKeldin and the senator appeared to have formed a mutual admiration society – the governor saying the rally showed “a great amount of feeling in this state for Taft.” When asked about his preference for president, McKeldin said “I am undecided – but I could easily be for Taft.” When asked about his host, the senator lauded McKeldin as “one of the outstanding governors elected by the Republicans in recent years.”

In late summer 1951, McKeldin revealed his intended strategy for the upcoming Republican nomination process. The governor spoke about a “favorite son” candidacy that he could carry all the way to the GOP national convention. He said “using
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the name of a favorite son” would keep the Maryland delegation “fluid and free for maneuver at the convention” and was preferable to committing to a particular candidate. After discussing his favorite son strategy, the governor added that he “leans toward Governor (Thomas) Dewey’s leadership.”

The governor’s self-promotion was chided the next day by the Sun, which pointed out that McKeldin was elected “to be a governor and not a favorite son candidate for the presidency,” adding that in their “charitable estimate,” he had been a “mediocre governor.” McKeldin responded to the criticism by comparing an interview of him by the Baltimore press to “being taken in on a ‘friendly’ card game by strangers,” or “being lured into a dark alley . . . to be hit over the head with a blackjack.” He added that seven months was insufficient time for anyone to assess his performance in office.

McKeldin’s uncommitted stance on a presidential preference (by early 1952 he had stopped commenting on military men’s qualifications for president) was considered politically practical. While Maryland had only twenty-four delegates, those two dozen votes could emerge in a close ballot as huge bargaining chips for whichever candidate was nearest the nomination. McKeldin might then exact some reward from the likely winner, a nominating speech, a cabinet post or ambassadorship, perhaps even the vice presidency. Therefore, for the time being, McKeldin’s position about favoring a candidate was to have none, keeping open the option of being a “favorite son” candidate, and building up his prospects within the national Republican Party.

Although McKeldin turned down an offer from Taft partisans to speak on national radio in San Francisco at the Republican National Committee meeting, the governor did accept an invitation to speak at the February 12 Lincoln Day dinner in New York City, sponsored by the pro-Dewey National Republican Club of New York. Speculation was that Dewey would never have approved the McKeldin invitation without assurances that the two governors had similar views on the GOP presidential campaign. Importantly, it gave McKeldin the opportunity to deliver a high profile speech in the heart of “Eastern Establishment” Republicanism.

On February 12, the governor arrived in New York City in late morning, where he had lunch with former president Herbert Hoover, and paid a courtesy call on General Douglas MacArthur, both residents of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, site of the evening’s GOP gala. No specific details were revealed about McKeldin’s visits with the two prominent Taft-leaning supporters.

That evening at the dinner, McKeldin, speaking before a packed ballroom of 1,000 guests and a national radio audience, launched into a denunciation of the Truman administration, highlighting the alleged gifts given to administration official’s wives: “This is the last year of the ‘Mink Dynasty’ in Washington. The plundering potentates of the Potomac and the pusillanimous parasites of the palace guard are having their last ride on the merry-go-round of privilege and pelf.”

An observer described the governor’s voice as “booming to a surf-like roar, then died in a whisper; speeded to a freight train pace, then slowed to a tantalizing drawl.”
At one moment, he spoke “with a Scottish brogue, at another in a Southern accent.” McKeldin’s “verbal symphony,” as Sun reporter Russell Baker described it, included such rhetorical flourishes as “the corrupting disease of ‘Trumatic Fever;” “spreading pre-election concentrate of chlorophyll over the awful mess of the administration;” and what would become McKeldin’s favorite campaign catch phrase: “Fear Deal.”

Reaction to the “Mink Dynasty” speech was favorable in local and national GOP circles. The New York Herald Tribune, voice of Eastern Republicanism, gave page one coverage to McKeldin’s speech, printing the text in full. Some Republicans said McKeldin’s oratorical prowess would “lead in all probability” to delivering an important speech at the Chicago convention.

Over the next month in the Republican presidential contest, Eisenhower, still an unannounced candidate, defeated Taft in the New Hampshire primary and finished a strong second in Minnesota to former governor Harold Stassen (considered a stalking horse for Ike). These favorable results moved the general toward a “point of no return” as far as openly declaring his candidacy for the GOP nomination.

Meanwhile, some Maryland Republicans wanted to promote McKeldin’s interests further, saying that the governor could be a “dark horse” presidential candidate if Eisenhower and Taft were deadlocked. A surprise rally and dinner for 125 persons was held at the Governor’s Mansion in Annapolis in June 1951, organized by M. William Adelson, McKeldin’s “law associate” and chief political advisor. The governor was presented a gold watch and chain while guests waved placards and signs proclaiming “We Want McKeldin for President,” and “Teddy’s White House Express.” In March 1952, a group calling itself the “McKeldin for President Committee” mailed information packets about the governor to GOP leaders in several states. The packets contained a letter, pamphlet (designed with a black and gold border) with the governor’s photo on the cover, describing him as a “lawyer of integrity, a statesman of stature, and an orator of eloquence.”

Despite these efforts to promote the governor’s presidential prospects, McKeldin himself remained committed to his favorite-son strategy. For the plan to work, however, the governor needed majority control of the state convention delegates. Such control of the party machinery was uncertain as a serious challenge to McKeldin’s power as head of the Maryland GOP was already under way. In early March, H. Grady Gore, a U.S. Senate candidate — opposing Congressman J. Glenn Beall of Allegany County, who was backed by McKeldin — announced he was fielding a slate of convention delegates to challenge the governor in the May 4 primary. The anti-McKeldin faction was supported by, among others, Senator John Marshall Butler.

The selection process for state GOP convention delegates created considerable apathy on the part of the Republican rank and file. According to a close observer and participant, “the criteria for endorsement by a county, district, or city ward committee, was loyalty to McKeldin.” In addition, secret meetings received no publicity, as “in many cases, agreements on candidacies were arranged over the telephone.”
The anti-McKeldin forces saw through the gubernatorial strategy, however, and they filed a full slate of delegates throughout the state. As a result, the McKeldin organization scrambled to place their delegates alphabetically on the top lines of the ballot as required by law. As the filing deadline approached, the anti-McKeldin faction accused gubernatorial loyalists of “using the power of the governor’s office to deny employment to reputable and life-long Republicans.”

Ohio Senator Robert A. Taft, son of former president William Howard Taft, represented the Midwest/West wing of the GOP. (Library of Congress.)
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As a result of his early primary successes, Eisenhower, prodded by his “team” of advisors (Dewey, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, and others), wrote to GOP governors including McKeldin. In the letter to McKeldin dated March 26, Eisenhower explained his reasons for seeking the presidency, which involved a sense of “clear duty,” not ambition or desire to be involved in politics. The general also praised the “character and standing of individuals who have publicly or privately given their active or tacit approval to the idea [of Eisenhower running for president]”—something McKeldin had not openly done.

Replying to Eisenhower on the 31st, McKeldin wrote, “it has pleased me to speak highly of you, and I expect to continue to do so . . . with the utmost sincerity.” The governor told Eisenhower that “sentiment for your nomination and election to the presidency has been developing rapidly in Maryland. Many of our Democratic citizens as well as those of our Republican registered minority stand ready to vote for you in November.” Concluding his letter, McKeldin said his trips into the “so-called ‘Solid [Democratic] South’” convinced him that Eisenhower would have “an excellent chance of cracking the one-party tradition in that section of the country.”

Coincidentally, at about the same time as the Eisenhower-McKeldin correspondence, the Israeli government invited the governor to visit in April. An admirer, booster, and fundraiser for Israel, McKeldin had never visited the young nation. The visit to Israel was part of a larger trip by the governor to Britain, France, and Italy, where in Rome he hoped to have an audience with Pope Pius XII.

When Dewey read about McKeldin’s trip, he contacted the governor and asked whether he wanted to visit Eisenhower while in Paris. McKeldin said yes, and Dewey contacted the general. The governor revealed his intentions to meet Eisenhower the day before leaving the United States. “I think every governor ought to have the opportunity to talk with him,” McKeldin said. “He is the spokesman of our foreign policy in Europe. Of course,” he added with a wink, “politics will probably come into the conversation, too.”

Taft, sensing McKeldin’s public drift toward Eisenhower, sought to meet with him, especially after the governor told reporters that the senator could not win in November, as his foreign policy views were “out of step with today’s realities.” Urgently, Taft contacted the governor on March 30, asking to see him, even at McKeldin’s Baltimore home; when that failed, the senator called just before McKeldin left for Paris, and in the governor’s words, “asked me not to be swept off my feet” by Eisenhower.

McKeldin arrived in Paris on April 6, and was driven directly to Eisenhower’s suburban villa at Maines-la-Coquette for lunch. Speaking to reporters afterward, McKeldin said he and Eisenhower did not discuss the general’s plans to return to the United States, “but I get the feeling he intends to do something promptly [and] without delay.” He again stated that Maryland’s convention delegates “will be pledged to me as a favorite son presidential candidate and vote for me on the first ballot,” and he added with a laugh “if I don’t get nominated on the first ballot, we will decide
whom the delegation will vote for. I always follow the leadership of Governor Dewey and Dewey, as you know, is backing Eisenhower.”

The state’s primary election on May 5 brought a record turnout for Republicans as eighty percent of registered Maryland GOP voters went to the polls. The McKeldin organization won nearly eight in ten delegates selected for the state convention, assuring the governor voting control, albeit with a small, but vocal anti-McKeldin, pro-Taft minority. Helping McKeldin was Beall’s comfortable (21,000 vote) margin in the U.S. Senate primary.

Taft continued to press McKeldin for his support, and wrote the governor on May 13, informing him of a speech he was to deliver before the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce (an organization McKeldin helped found twenty years earlier). He said, “I would like very much to talk politics with you that day, either before the meeting or after. I would be glad to have your judgment as to whether I should try to talk with any of the other Republican leaders in Baltimore or throughout the state.” A few days later, Alice Roosevelt Longworth, T.R.’s daughter and a prominent Taft supporter, invoking her father, said, “it is my hope that you . . . who have borne with such great distinction my father’s name, will also be on Bob’s side.”

On May 19, Taft came to Baltimore and spoke at the Lord Baltimore Hotel. Afterward, Taft and McKeldin met in private and briefly discussed political matters. The governor asked Taft why he came to him rather than Butler, his Senate colleague. Taft replied that McKeldin was “more practical as a politician, and could work out things better” than Butler, whom the Ohioan, despite their philosophical agreement on issues, held in low regard.

Maryland Republicans held their convention May 24 to choose the twenty-four person-state delegation and decide on a presidential candidate to support on the first ballot in Chicago. The atmosphere surrounding the state convention, according to an observer, looked like a “Taft pep-rally” as throngs of women sporting Taft headgear crowded the corridors and leaned over the balconies, chanting, “We want Taft.” Eisenhower supporters remained conspicuously absent during most of the day’s proceedings.

After morning caucuses to select delegates, the convention came to order in the early afternoon, and McKeldin delivered the keynote address. Dressed in a suit with pearl blue tie, which showed a map of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, and wearing his trademark Black-Eyed Susan lapel pin, the governor set forth the “official” position on party unity: “Let us have a delegation in Chicago that will be keen enough and free enough to keep Maryland in a strategic position to promote a maximum of party harmony and to move effectively, at the right moment, to help in the selection of a candidate who shall become president of the United States.”

Meeting immediately after the state convention, the twenty-four delegates selected McKeldin chairman of the group and also elected him Maryland’s national committeeman. Senator Butler was not on the delegate list before the state con-
vention, and only through McKeldin’s intervention was a place found for him, as a congressional district delegate. The governor’s gesture was thought to be a move to promote GOP harmony, despite a later account claiming McKeldin “fought behind the scenes” to keep Butler off the delegation. The senator, despite McKeldin’s apparent intervention, continued to publicly claim Taft’s strong support among the delegation, claiming at least thirteen or fourteen “sure” votes for the Ohioan after
the first ballot. The governor, informed of Butler’s remarks, shrugged his shoulders and exclaimed, “What is he talking about? Why he wouldn’t even have been picked as a delegate unless I had insisted.”

When Herbert Brownell of the Eisenhower campaign contacted McKeldin, relaying the general’s “desire to meet the delegates,” the governor wrote to each of Maryland’s twenty-four member convention delegation, saying that “it seems desirable for us to avail ourselves of every opportunity to review the situation with any or all the candidates.” On June 11, twenty-one of twenty-four delegates led by McKeldin traveled to New York by train to meet Eisenhower, who while commander of NATO, was on leave from the presidency of Columbia University.

Arriving in New York at Morningside Heights, the Maryland delegation was escorted to the second floor reception room of the university president’s residence. When Eisenhower entered the room, McKeldin, never missing a chance to be Maryland’s biggest ambassador and salesman, stepped up quickly and pinned a black-eyed susan on the general’s jacket lapel. Eisenhower asked if that was a sunflower. “No,” McKeldin replied. Eisenhower grinned, then said, “well, its kin to a sunflower [the state flower of Kansas, where Ike grew up] so you’ll have to work for me.”

As the meeting ended outside the residence, McKeldin said to Eisenhower, “Mr. President [sic], when you get that nomination,” expressing perhaps his real presidential preference, “we want you to make sure to come to Baltimore and make a speech for us in the Fifth Regiment Armory.” “I’ll be glad to,” the general replied, “because I like Baltimore . . . because I like oysters from the famous Chesapeake Bay.” Without missing a beat, the governor said, “Man, I’ve got one,” and pulled from his jacket pocket an oyster shell wrapped in cellophane he carried “just to advertise Maryland oysters.” McKeldin presented the oyster shell, without the cellophane, inscribed “Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland,” to Eisenhower, who began laughing as did everyone else present.

Taft, meanwhile, remained hopeful that shifts in loyalty toward him would continue with the Maryland delegation. He wrote a friend ten days after the state convention, and said it was “hard to appraise the net result of the Maryland convention, although we feel we have nine for (myself) and about five more who probably will be for me, but may not resist pressure from the governor.”

Arrangements were made for a June 16 Taft visit to Baltimore without consulting McKeldin, who reportedly was upset, both because he was not notified, and because of the timing, the governor was scheduled to be on a West Coast trip. Tensions between the GOP factions increased when McKeldin loyalists threatened to boycott Taft’s appearance. The visit was moved back to the 23rd, and McKeldin sent a telegram from the West Coast urging his allies to attend, since he would be back in Maryland by then.

While out West, McKeldin’s pro-Eisenhower statements drew press comment, with aides back in Annapolis scrambling to clarify or correct the governor’s con-
When asked about releasing the twenty-four delegates pledged to him as a favorite son, McKeldin replied, “I’ve got a kind of a feeling we might make it on the first ballot.” Pressed by a reporter on whether this meant he was for the general, McKeldin said, “it is understood in Maryland that I favor Eisenhower.” Then he gave a booming laugh and refused to comment further. Asked about being a candidate for vice president, McKeldin ran “a big hand” over his chin and leaned forward. “Consider it?” he exclaimed. “Of course I’d consider it. Who wouldn’t consider being vice president? Matter of fact, one of the possible candidates asked me if I’d consider the nomination for vice president”— although no evidence exists of any offer to McKeldin at this point.23

Taft came to Baltimore June 23 in a last-ditch effort to sway delegates or perhaps even McKeldin himself to his side at the convention. After a closed-door meeting and dinner, the governor spoke to reporters while Taft stood off to the side. McKeldin said, “the understanding in Maryland is that I’m for Eisenhower. I’m not committed, but that understanding is correct.” When hearing McKeldin’s comment, Taft threw back his head and laughed, but said nothing. Later, when the governor said the Ohioan would make a “great president,” Taft chuckled and said, “I don’t count on his support, but I am not sure he wouldn’t give it.”

An associate close to the governor recalled that on this occasion, Taft offered him the vice presidency. When the offer was extended at the governor’s Baltimore office, McKeldin replied with hyperbole, “Senator, I have great respect for you, but I cannot do that because I am partially responsible and somewhat influential in having Eisenhower run. I feel like I would be doing something that I shouldn’t do under the circumstances – abandoning my own candidate.”24

In the weeks leading up to the Republican National Convention in Chicago, the focus of both the Eisenhower and Taft forces centered on disputed delegations from several Southern states, including Texas, Georgia, and Louisiana. At the National Governors’ Conference in Houston, the pro-Eisenhower governors, lead by Dewey and New Hampshire’s Sherman Adams, sent a telegram to Republican National Chairman Guy Gabrielson (a Taft supporter) dubbed the “Houston Manifesto,” signed by all the GOP governors present, including three pro-Taft chief executives and candidate Earl Warren of California.

McKeldin, however, was not present. At the last minute, he decided not to attend the conference “in view of the polio epidemic. I am greatly concerned about the possibility, however remote, of bringing the germs back to my two young children and the state.” Instead, McKeldin sent his aide Albert Quinn (also the father of two) to Houston, and spent the weekend on the Chesapeake Bay. When informed about the governors’ statement, McKeldin sent word to Quinn that he would support the “Houston Manifesto.”25

Twenty-four delegates, family members, and Republican supporters departed on the afternoon of July 5 from Baltimore’s Mount Royal Station for Chicago and the
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national convention. Rather than having a loud and boisterous crowd whooping it up for the GOP and favorite son McKeldin at the station, the delegates, a reporter noted, acted like “members of a social club starting out on a group vacation,” standing quietly, chatting, wandering about, or following the governor around.

McKeldin himself, was, as usual, ebullient and the center of attention. He rushed over to a group of young autograph seekers and gave each a signed photograph of himself, produced from a collection in his pocket; posed for a photograph with an Eisenhower delegate, who wore a dress decorated with a hand-painted black-eyed susan; and presented the train’s crew with ashtrays decorated with ceramic elephants. The engineer invited the governor, who accepted, to share the throttle with him between Baltimore and Washington.26

The Marylanders arrived in Chicago at 9:30 AM the next morning and were greeted by a crowd of “I Like Ike” revelers who stumbled through the words of “Maryland, My Maryland.” Later, at a news conference, McKeldin, sporting a Chesapeake Bay map tie revealed, and aides confirmed, that Taft “intermediaries” offered him a choice of three sub-cabinet level positions: Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force (but no mention was made of Taft’s vice presidential offer). Advisors described it as a “flat offer . . . ostensibly made with Taft’s knowledge.” Asked whether Eisenhower’s camp had extended any offer, McKeldin replied, “No. They know better than that.” Later, when Taft was asked about the alleged offers to the governor, he replied that “the report is untrue. There are no deals and no offers have been made by me or anybody on my behalf.”27

The Eisenhower managers met Sunday with selected state delegations, and it is likely that the final decision was made then to choose McKeldin to give the nominating speech for the general. Syndicated columnist Drew Pearson reported that the Eisenhower forces did not “decide until 4:30 (Sunday afternoon) that they wanted McKeldin.” Herbert Brownell, writing years later, said, “I arranged for him [McKeldin] to deliver the speech placing Eisenhower’s name in nomination.”28

McKeldin, however, had been on the mind of Ike’s campaign strategists for some time. Lodge, for example, told RNC chairman Gabrielson that McKeldin “was a good speaker who would make a fine speech, helpful to the Republican Party.” Others around the Eisenhower managers said later the decision to tap McKeldin for some role at the convention was “automatic,” since he shared the Eastern Republicans’ domestic moderation, foreign policy internationalism, and anti-communism. And certainly the governor controlled, at least in theory, Maryland’s twenty-four convention delegates, a number potentially crucial in a close ballot.29

When the decision was made to extend the speech offer to McKeldin, Brownell called Eisenhower’s suite requesting an appointment for the governor to see the general that evening. When told no time was available, Eisenhower was retiring for the night after a busy day of meetings with state delegations, Brownell was insistent. “Let’s find some time,” he demanded of the general’s aides, and an appointment was
set for after 11:00 PM. “McKeldin will be there,” Brownell said. The New Yorker then telephoned McKeldin at the Hilton Hotel between 11 and 11:15 PM and said to the governor, “Ted, the general wants to see you.” When McKeldin asked why, Brownell simply repeated that the general “wants to see you.”

McKeldin hung up the phone, got dressed, and went to Eisenhower’s headquarters at the Blackstone Hotel. When the governor arrived at the general’s suite, Brownell was already there. According to Drew Pearson, the general had just gone to bed when he was awakened, told about the hastily planned meeting with McKeldin, and then dressed to meet with the governor. McKeldin and Eisenhower chatted for about a half-hour, the governor later said, “about a lot of nothing.” Finally, after he “hemmed and hawed,” in McKeldin’s words, Eisenhower said, “I’m embarrassed . . . I don’t know how to ask you this.” Then the general “kind of fumbled and stumbled and hesitated,” and said, “would you consider nominating me for president?”

McKeldin replied, with a straight face: “Well, I tell you, General, I’m supposed to be nominated for president myself, I’m a favorite-son candidate, but I guess you have to make sacrifices in things like this.” He paused, unable to keep a straight face, broke into a broad grin, and then laughed. So did Eisenhower. “General,” McKeldin said, “it would be a great honor for me to nominate you.”

Eisenhower also asked the governor to delay announcing the speech publicly until later Monday morning so he could inform his entire campaign organization. McKeldin realized later, that when Eisenhower asked him to delay the announcement, the general had “become very political; almost overnight . . . a very smart thing for him to do.”

The meeting with Eisenhower finished, McKeldin left the hotel, where he encountered Charles Whiteford, the Baltimore Sun's political reporter. “What did you see him about?” Whiteford inquired. “He wants me to nominate him,” McKeldin replied. “Seriously,” Whiteford said, unconvinced, “what did you talk to him about?” McKeldin repeated that Eisenhower wanted him to give the nominating speech. Not persuaded, Whiteford said, “You know that isn’t so.” McKeldin, frustrated, replied, “Forget about it, then.” Sensing the truth, the reporter said, “Really – is it so?” The governor, now a little irritated, said, “What’s wrong with that? You know I’m the governor of Maryland.” Whiteford replied “It’s a little . . . a small state.” McKeldin said flatly, “Well, that’s what he asked me.”

Later, after McKeldin returned to the Hilton, Whiteford found him, and said he told his editor, Neil Swanson, about the visit to Eisenhower. “Come on McKeldin,” Whiteford said. “Swanson doesn’t believe it. Will you come down and tell him? McKeldin agreed to, and went to see Swanson, convincing him that the story was true. He may have also asked the Sun editor to hold off reporting the story – acceding to Eisenhower’s request – which first appeared in Monday afternoon’s Evening Sun.

Needing immediate help on his speech, McKeldin tried to contact Simon Sobeloff and Al Quinn. Sobeloff was in New York and took the next available flight to
Chicago. Finding Quinn proved more difficult. After visiting his mother and picking up his children in North Carolina, Quinn was heading back to Baltimore when state trooper Ed Mettee, his driver, realized he left his hat back at the house. When arriving back, Quinn’s mother rushed out, saying, “The governor just called . . . and he wants you in Chicago right away . . . Eisenhower wants him to give the nominating speech.” Within hours, the entire McKeldin speechwriting brain trust: Quinn, Sobeloff, Adelson, and Mildred Momberger, the governor’s personal secretary, were in Chicago drafting the most important speech of McKeldin’s career.

Although McKeldin’s inner circle, along with Whiteford and Swanson of the *Sun* knew of the speech, the state’s delegates did not. McKeldin scheduled a meeting of the delegation late Monday morning before the convention opened, but would say nothing about the speech until word came from Eisenhower. When the governor met with the delegation, he expressed pride in being Maryland’s favorite-son candidate, and urged the delegates to “stick together and keep the peace among ourselves” by going along with him on “the first few ballots.” The meeting adjourned without consensus on a presidential preference after the first ballot.

Shortly after noon, after the delegate caucus, McKeldin received a phone call from Eisenhower. The general again asked McKeldin whether he still wanted to
nominate him. The governor replied, yes, he certainly did; then Eisenhower crisply said, “Okay, get going. You’re on the team.”

McKeldin got off the telephone, and a few minutes later, he bounded out of the elevator into the hotel lobby, happily announcing, “I’m going to nominate Ike, I’m going to nominate him,” and did a little dance. Then speaking briefly to reporters, McKeldin announced the release of Maryland’s delegation from their obligation to him on the first ballot, but expected a “majority” of the delegates to vote for Eisenhower.

McKeldin’s favorite-son strategy had worked. He had held Maryland’s twenty-four delegates, however tenuously, until Eisenhower (his preferred candidate all along) offered him a prized assignment, a nominating speech at the national convention. And McKeldin, who valued oratory as much as any weapon in the politician’s arsenal, was determined to deliver his speech of a lifetime.

When the convention was called to order on July 8, the first item of business, adoption of the rules, became an opening test of strength between the two rival camps. Governor Arthur Langlie of Washington, an Eisenhower backer, introduced the Fair Play Amendment – which held that contested delegates should not vote on seating those challenged from other states. Then Congressman Clarence Brown of Ohio, a close Taft advisor, rushed to the podium and proposed an amendment to Fair Play, excluding seven Louisiana delegates pledged to Eisenhower. A contentious two-hour debate ensued, leading to the convention’s first roll-call vote, on the Brown Amendment.

The vote on Fair Play was the first test of McKeldin’s strength as head of the Maryland delegation. The Brown Amendment was defeated by the full convention, and by the Marylanders 9-15, a victory for Eisenhower — and McKeldin. Maryland’s vote was attributable in part to Deeley Nice, a gubernatorial loyalist, whose persuasive tactics were denounced as “arm twisting.” Nice reportedly pressured two delegates on the convention floor prior to the vote, and eventually secured the votes of eleven of twelve state job-holding delegates.

After McKeldin announced Maryland’s vote on the Brown Amendment, General William C. Purnell, a Taft delegate, tried to secure the microphone and have the delegation polled for the record individually, but he arrived too late. He promised to call for an individual roll call on all future votes. Butler, incensed over the vote and tactics, said McKeldin “was wickedly putting the screws on the Maryland delegation – I never saw such high-handed bludgeoning in my life.” The Evening Sun facetiously suggested “maybe Mr. McKeldin has cast a spell on them, ‘Svengali-like’ to cause them to pipe up for Eisenhower against their will.”

McKeldin spent most of Tuesday working on his nomination speech. The speechwriting team of Sobeloff, Quinn, Adelson, and Momberger, had started Monday afternoon, and they worked until 3 AM Tuesday in Adelson’s nineteenth floor room at the Hilton, then stopped and rested until 8 AM when preparation continued. The
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group penciled the first ideas on paper then sentences were rewritten and revised again. As the speech took form, the drafts were typed by Momberger, and those pages revised in pencil.

The speech’s content reflected “logical arguments” of Sobeloff, and the “polished literary style” of Quinn. But McKeldin himself added the “special flourishes, the individual touches,” recalled Baltimore News-Post columnist Louis Azrael. The Eisenhower managers left it up to the governor to write a “McKeldin-style” speech, but wanted to review the final draft.

Late on Tuesday, the speech was finished and sent to Lodge, Dewey’s press secretary James Hagerty, and Governor Sherman Adams of New Hampshire, Eisenhower’s convention floor manager. On Wednesday morning, July 9, McKeldin was summoned to the general’s headquarters, and went, accompanied by Sobeloff, Quinn, and Adelson. After arriving, Lodge told the group, “it’s [the speech] all right. We made only one correction. We took out the phrase where you said Eisenhower came from ‘Bible-reading parents.’” McKeldin protested, “why take that out – that’s factual.” “I know,” Lodge replied, “but I come from Massachusetts. Catholics don’t read the Bible the way we (Protestants) read it and they might not like that phrase.” McKeldin got his way, however, and “devout, Bible-reading parents” remained in the speech.

The Wednesday evening session was a decisive moment at the convention. The Credentials Committee report on seating the contested Georgia and Texas delegations came to the floor for debate and vote. After presentation of the minority report, the convention voted 607-531 to seat Georgia’s Eisenhower-backed slate, and then the general’s Texas contingent was conceded by acclamation.

Although the Maryland delegation voted 15-9 to seat the pro-Eisenhower Southerners, McKeldin lost four delegates who had supported him on Fair Play. Taft supporters carried out their threat to poll the delegation individually, which sent the governor in search of recalcitrant delegates. The governor walked over to L.S. “Ted” Ray and put an arm around the Montgomery County delegate’s shoulders. “Well, my brother. You’ve got an appointment from me and you’re doing a good job. But you’ve gone against me twice now. I hope you won’t do it three times [by voting for Taft].”

Early Thursday morning, McKeldin, confident of an Eisenhower first-ballot victory, took the weary Maryland delegation to see the general. Looking “fresher and more rested” than the Marylanders, Eisenhower warmly greeted the delegates, many of whom looked “shaky” after the previous evening’s grueling session, which lasted until 2 AM. Eisenhower thanked them for their support and posed for pictures with McKeldin along with the general’s grandchildren David and Susan. McKeldin’s hope that the meeting would help win back some pro-Taft delegates was dashed because of a feeling among several of those delegates that the governor neglected them for two days while writing his speech.

Thursday was the big day for McKeldin as he was to nominate Eisenhower that evening. The governor spent most of the day in his room rehearsing the speech.
After dinner, dressed and shaven, McKeldin, was driven to the Amphitheater. When he arrived, associates and Eisenhower advisors were aghast to see him sporting a small bandage on his lower chin. Unconcerned, McKeldin brushed away questions with a smile, explaining, “I nicked myself while shaving. The bandage will be off by the time the television starts,” as indeed it was. Then with the speech in his pocket, he walked to a holding area behind the speaker’s platform, ready for his moment in the spotlight.40

McKeldin stepped to the podium, notes in hand, ready to read from a prepared text, declining the use of a teleprompter-type device, saying that speaking from the text, permitted “freedom of action,” allowing him to move his head freely. The governor spoke; he opened with a Biblical verse, 2 Chronicles 7:14, the same passage he swore his oath upon when inaugurated governor: “If my people which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then I will hear from heaven and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.”

Speaking in measured phrases and enunciating his words carefully, McKeldin spoke of “grave threats” facing the nation. Never before, the governor said, “has government waste been . . . so extreme, corruption so callous, and high level dishonesty so disdainful of ordinary decency.” Furthermore, America never had “matched arms and wits with a ruthless enemy who has advanced so far toward . . . [a] godless goal of world conquest and enslavement of all mankind.”

These threats, McKeldin explained, resulted from “long, continued domination by one party . . . [and] deeply entrenched.” The governor urged the delegates to make 1952 a “year of decision . . . (and) redeem our nation from the evils of one party [Democratic rule],” the last statement bringing the first of many speech-stopping rounds of applause.

Quickening the pace and delivery of his speech, McKeldin, his voice with a tinge of Scottish brogue, said some, a hint of Southern accent said others, still a trace of “Baltimorese” (said Marylanders in attendance) sounded the call of urgency throughout the hall. Comparing the nominee with Washington and Lincoln, McKeldin declared that Eisenhower’s entire career “as a soldier, statesman, and administrator” prepared him “uniquely for the greatest office in the realm of our people’s sovereignty – the presidency of the United States.”

McKeldin emphasized Eisenhower’s “unwavering integrity that causes his very nature to rebel against the extravagance, corruption, and downright dishonesty of the Truman ‘Mink Dynasty.’” Furthermore, McKeldin declared, he is a “strong man – the Hercules to sweep the stench and stigma from the Augean stables of the Washington administration.” The delegates, momentarily confused over McKeldin’s words, paused before bursting into loud applause.

McKeldin affirmed confidently that Eisenhower led all rivals among Republicans, independents, and new voters by “three to one,” – prompting boos and catcalls from
Taft supporters – and especially “disillusioned Democrats . . . and they are legion.” The only Southern Republican governor declared Eisenhower is “the man who can break the ‘solid South,’ and our party may need some of those electoral votes to win.”

Eisenhower, McKeldin said, was “admired by all the people of America . . . and so loved and trusted by the fighting men under his command;” that when told of his impending visit, “the happy word went around that ‘Ike is coming!’” Buoyed by the growing crescendo of applause from the delegates, McKeldin, his voice raised to a near-yell, announced: “Ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans, let me tell you that Ike is Coming!! He is coming through for another victory, a glorious victory for the Republican Party in November and a happy relief for the sorely tried American people on Inauguration Day.”

“It is no detraction,” thundered McKeldin, “to say of this man in our generation . . . (what was) said of the immortal Washington: ‘He is first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen!’” Then, with a final flourish, McKeldin proclaimed: “It is with great pride that I place before this convention for President of the United States the name of Dwight David Eisenhower!!”

Meanwhile back at his hotel, Eisenhower, awake after a two-hour nap, witnessed the outpouring of enthusiasm and support for him on the convention floor by way of television, but unbeknownst to McKeldin, still at the podium acknowledging the applause — the general slept through the governor’s entire nomination speech.

Just eight hours after the nomination speeches concluded, the delegates returned at 11:30 AM to select a presidential candidate. McKeldin, who slept only two hours between adjournment at 3 AM and reconvening in the morning – was visibly angry over the Taft votes from Maryland, especially from the delegates with gubernatorial appointments, and was still annoyed when officially announcing Maryland’s tally of sixteen votes for Eisenhower and eight for Taft. When Eisenhower’s vote total neared the winning 604 mark, the persuasive tactics of McKeldin loyalists paid off as four Maryland delegates previously announced for Taft signaled to the governor by sign language that they wanted to switch their votes to the general. Ray, the only McKeldin-appointee to oppose him on every vote, later claimed he was also ready to switch to Ike, but could not get the governor’s attention. McKeldin denied it, saying that Ray was asked to go along with the majority, but refused.

With the general only about twenty votes from victory, McKeldin leaped to his feet, grabbed the Maryland standard and furiously started waving and shouting in an attempt to gain the floor, in order to have his delegation put Eisenhower over the top. Other delegates, noticing the moving Maryland standard, started yelling, “Let’s hear from Maryland,” and chanted a chorus of “Maryland, My Maryland.” Congressman Joseph Martin of Massachusetts, the convention chairman, turned toward the Marylanders, but instead spotted the waving Minnesota standard; he recognized Minnesotans and their switched votes from favorite son Harold Stassen put Eisenhower’s delegate total past the 604 needed for victory.
Denied the prize of putting Eisenhower over the top in delegates, but determined to be heard, McKeldin grabbed Maryland’s microphone, and called for a unanimous nomination, yelling, “It’s our convention!” provoking Chairman Martin to bang his gavel, ruling the governor out of order. Undeterred, McKeldin stood on a chair, waved Maryland’s standard and shouted, “This is the day of jubilo!” to paraphrase words from an African American spiritual, then let out a “Maryland-accented” rebel yell.44

Now with the general nominated, the only question left for the convention, or rather by the Eisenhower managers, was the selection of a vice presidential running mate. The Maryland delegation heard that Eisenhower’s advisors wanted “someone well-acquainted with Washington, D.C., at home in the Capitol cloakrooms and in the various agencies and departmental offices,” requirements that would have disqualified McKeldin.45

Many accounts have been written on the selection of Richard M. Nixon as Eisenhower’s running mate, although few if any have mentioned McKeldin. Was McKeldin seriously considered by Eisenhower’s managers for the vice presidency, and was he involved in the selection process for a running mate?

While dining the evening before his nomination, Eisenhower gave Brownell a list of acceptable candidates, including Nixon, Senator William Knowland of California, Lodge, Congressman Charles Halleck of Indiana, and Governors Arthur Langlie of Washington and Dan Thornton of Colorado — but not McKeldin.

There were obvious drawbacks to a McKeldin candidacy. They included geography, he was governor of an Eastern state, and Eisenhower, although raised in Kansas, was identified with New York and the GOP leadership there; electoral vote strength, Maryland had only nine electoral votes; political philosophy, McKeldin was identified with the moderate, internationalist wing of the Republican Party, as was General Eisenhower.

All speculation about McKeldin aside, the truth was that the decision to select Nixon was all but finalized as early as the spring, by Dewey, who queried the senator at a New York Republican Party dinner, and by Lodge, who broached the topic to the Californian in the U.S. Senate chamber. But the fiction of selecting Eisenhower’s running mate went ahead as scheduled at the convention. The “selection” conference was held shortly after the general’s nomination became official in Brownell’s eleventh-floor hotel suite. Approximately thirty to forty people were in attendance, including most key Eisenhower leaders.

Was McKeldin there? Other than a brief remark to a reporter a month later, explaining that “we were in conference for two hours thrashing it out,” and comments later in life, McKeldin was silent on the matter. The oral and written records are divided on the governor’s presence. Brownell, in his memoirs, and Maxwell Rabb, a Lodge associate and Eisenhower campaign aide, were certain he was present, as was the St Louis Post-Dispatch, which quoted Brownell in an extensive article on the meeting two months later. Yet, years later, Dewey could not recall McKeldin at
the meeting, nor could Mrs. Momberger, who would have likely known about it, unless the hasty convening of the group prevented the governor from informing her.

If McKeldin attended the meeting, he would not have been an active candidate for vice president. Brownell, who still had Ike’s list of names in his pocket, announced that “anyone who wished to be a candidate should leave the room,” and no one did. Discussion of names followed, with everyone from Taft to Senators William Knowland of California, and Everett Dirksen of Illinois.

McKeldin would only say, years later, that “four of us were under consideration: Nixon, Taft, Driscoll, and myself,” and added: “Yes, Nixon and I were the chief ones.” This account by McKeldin is at variance with Brownell’s account of the meeting and the ground rules among the participants. If McKeldin was under consideration, he would not have been present. McKeldin’s version thus does not withstand scrutiny.

After a number of names were met with silence, Dewey looked around and said, “What about Dick Nixon?” and outlined the Californian’s advantages to the ticket. Brownell quickly called for a “show of hands,” and every hand went up in the room for Nixon. Then the group cheered its decision and the meeting ended.46

Had McKeldin been present, he would likely have favored Nixon. But he had reservations. The governor believed Eisenhower needed someone “political” to advise him as vice president. Nixon, McKeldin thought, was “not strong enough” for the job (or not as strong as himself), and his association with Wisconsin’s Communist-hunting Senator Joseph McCarthy was “troublesome.”

In retrospect, it seems clear enough that McKeldin, despite accounts to the contrary, including his own, was never seriously considered for the vice presidency by Eisenhower. The general himself told the governor later that he “wanted a younger man . . . a man from a big state . . . a man from the Senate,” and Nixon, who was thirty-nine-years-old, came from California, the nation’s then-second most populous state, and was in his first term in the Senate, fulfilled all three requirements.47

With the convention over, as the train carrying the Marylanders rolled east across the Ohio Valley, Baltimore News-Post columnist Louis Azrael walked into the observation car and sat down next to McKeldin, who was looking out at the passing landscape. After a few moments, McKeldin began pondering that “it was a pity that Taft lost, because as a Republican, I appreciate the work (Taft) has done over many years, while a new man – Eisenhower – who has never fought the party’s battles should come in and brush a man like Taft aside.”

Turning to Azrael, McKeldin said, “I don’t know much about Eisenhower’s political philosophy, but I’m glad he, not Taft was nominated. Taft doesn’t have a feeling for the common people. Maybe Ike’s that way, too.” The governor leaned over and said, “the fact is that although I’ve been a Republican all my life, I should have been a Democrat. My deepest feelings are closer to the Democrats than to the Republicans.” That night, Azrael was awakened in his sleeping berth by Al Quinn. “Ted is worried about what he said to you. He sent me to tell you he was talking
entirely personally. He says, ‘please don’t publish it,’’ and Azrael did not until after McKeldin’s death.48

Refreshed from his first full night’s sleep in ten days, McKeldin returned to Maryland, greeted like a conquering hero. It was early Sunday morning, but hundreds of admirers packed the Mount Royal Station terminal, cheering, shouting, and singing, and held up signs honoring the governor, such as “Our Boy Teddy,” “Our Favorite Son,” and “Maryland’s Own McKeldin.”

As the governor stepped from the train, well-wishers surged around him, wanting to shake his hand, throw their arms around his shoulders, and pound him on the back. Several women kissed McKeldin on the cheek, one middle-aged woman exclaiming “Oh you’re wonderful.” Wading through the corridor of people, McKeldin heard comments such as “Thank you for our next president,” and “A job well done! We’re proud of you.” In McKeldin’s brief extemporaneous remarks, he spoke about Eisenhower, saying, “I hope we brought back the right candidate. I think we did. If anyone can preserve the peace and keep our sons alive, this man can.”49

Back in Annapolis, after eating a late breakfast while reading a stack of congratulatory letters and telegrams and attending church, McKeldin held an afternoon press briefing. The governor pronounced the Maryland GOP unified, in spite of divisions apparent at the convention, and forgave the state-appointee delegates who defied him in Chicago. But as McKeldin said in a letter several days later to a GOP state senator, he was clearly disappointed that “we were not able on the first ballot to do a better job with our own people.”50

When asked whether he would be a part of the new administration in Washington if the Republicans won in November, McKeldin grinned and said he would “prefer to be governor . . . . Besides, there is a great deal of work to be done yet, from the grass-roots up, and I feel I can be of greater help to the party in my present capacity.” In truth, however, McKeldin did not have the power or desire to create a GOP “machine” in Maryland.51

Although McKeldin played an important role, his part in the fall campaign was undefined by Eisenhower’s managers. He was, however, quite willing to share his own views on GOP prospects with Republican Party leaders, including the general himself. In a long letter to Sherman Adams, now Ike’s campaign chief of staff, McKeldin promoted a Maryland appearance for the general, and said the Maryland GOP would focus on the “deviation of the Fair Dealers from the ways of the true Democratic Party” in their opposition to states rights, and expansion of federal power, as in the reauthorization of the Federal Employment Practices Commission (FEPC), and support for federal aid to education. “Those who favor such proposals,” McKeldin wrote, “are strictly New Dealers and we can’t hope to get their votes anyhow.” On foreign policy, the governor said the “harder the attack on communism, the better . . . (since) we definitely won’t get the votes of communist sympathizers.”52

McKeldin’s fervent belief that the GOP could crack the “solid South” was made
emphatic in a letter to Eisenhower. He wrote, “I sincerely hope that there will be no substantial altering of your determination to seek the electoral votes of Southern states [sentence underlined in letter by Eisenhower staff].” McKeldin predicted that “we are going to bring a number of Southern states into your column . . . when I say ‘we,’ I mean prominent Democrats with whom I am in contact, as well as Republicans.”

A month after the convention, Eisenhower finally wrote McKeldin a letter of appreciation for the nominating speech. Blaming the delay on the “press of meetings and trips” since the convention, the general thanked McKeldin for “his leadership” and the “inspiring address of nomination you made on my behalf,” adding that “you may be sure that as long as I live, I shall recall your words many times and shall be heartened by your confidence in me” — not mentioning, of course, that he slept through the governor’s speech. Eisenhower reminded McKeldin that the Republican Party was “engaged in a patriotic, civic crusade,” and that the governor would be “far forward in the vanguard,” since his “record in city and state service constitutes a shining example of . . . effectiveness . . . deep convictions, and high ability.”

While McKeldin offered himself to the Eisenhower/Nixon ticket in whatever capacity they wanted, he was never asked to do anything specific beyond agreeing to two assignments. One, to deliver a televised address later in the campaign, and two, as McKeldin originally asked in his June meeting with Eisenhower, hosting the general on a one-day tour of Maryland.

In retrospect, it was McKeldin’s gift of oratory and his ability to deliver most of Maryland’s delegates that Eisenhower’s advisors wanted from him. As Sherman Adams recalled, “Ted McKeldin was a showman. I think he added something to the convention . . . (but) had comparatively little influence. As a person who was as strong for Eisenhower as he was, was not without effect on his own delegation. How far that permeated the floor . . . I should think (it) was rather limited. His personality was his chief attribute rather than any solid leadership.”

Still, McKeldin endorsed the self-described “crusade,” and gave speeches in support of the general during the fall campaign. The governor traveled about the country, especially in the South, emphasizing the genuine opportunity Republicans had of breaking that “solid” Democratic region. In addition, he attacked the Democratic nominee for president, his fellow governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois. In one speech, McKeldin called Stevenson’s court deposition on behalf of Alger Hiss, the alleged spy who was convicted of perjury for lying to Congress, “an act of stupidity.”

In a strange coincidence, before Eisenhower and the GOP were rocked by allegation of a “secret” Nixon campaign fund, McKeldin was beset with a similar “fund” controversy in Maryland. At a dinner for one hundred “old friends” of McKeldin’s, $7,000 was raised and turned over to the governor, who said he would use it “as I see fit.” After denying that the “old friends” were “seekers of political favors,” and joking that “some (of the money) might be used . . . to elect Eisenhower!” McKeldin returned the $7,000, and despite calls for a legislative investigation, the matter faded away.
On the evening of September 23, McKeldin was scheduled to give a nationally televised address on ABC entitled “Cleaning Up the Mess in Washington.” However, several hours before the telecast, Robert Humphreys, Eisenhower’s public relations aide, called McKeldin, asking him to be on “standby” at the ABC studios in Washington, D.C., for Nixon was now scheduled to speak in the same hour. As events unfolded, Nixon went on TV, giving what became known as the “Checkers” speech, followed by a taped talk by Eisenhower, and thus, McKeldin’s televised address was preempted.58

McKeldin’s only public appearance with Eisenhower occurred on September 25, when the general came to Maryland for a day-long whirlwind tour of the state, which featured a trip through Washington and Frederick Counties, lunch with Ike in his private railroad car, and a motorcade through downtown Baltimore to a packed Fifth Regiment Armory where the governor called for “a broom to sweep the Communists and corruptionists out of our national government.”59

After Eisenhower’s election, McKeldin, despite unfounded rumors and his own typical coyness, was not under consideration for any position in the new Republican administration, even after a meeting with the president-elect in late November when the governor, with a smile, said to reporters, “I don’t want to be in the position of declining something that has not been offered to me.”60

For Theodore McKeldin, who already achieved a good deal of success in local and state politics, including being elected mayor and winning election as governor, 1952 was his opportunity to garner national attention for himself and Maryland. Although the vice presidential nomination eluded him, his “favorite son” candidacy and especially the nominating speech for Dwight Eisenhower at the Republican National Convention would be the pinnacle of his political career.

McKeldin had fewer brushes with the national limelight afterward, excepting his public denunciation of Governor Orval Faubus of Arkansas after the Little Rock crisis in 1957, and his open rejection of Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater, the 1964 GOP presidential nominee, and his “endorsement” of President Lyndon B. Johnson that year. The governor built on his political career, beyond his brief but important role in 1952, through two gubernatorial terms and a “Last Hurrah”-style final term as Baltimore’s mayor in the 1960s, to achieve lasting recognition as one of Maryland’s foremost political leaders of the twentieth century.
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Mayor Theodore McKeldin lighting the Shot Tower on the evening of the big parade for the Baltimore Orioles winning the second straight game of the 1966 World Series. (PP286.194, Maryland Historical Society.)
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Unidentified woman, “Lovingly Yours, Hazel,” Clowes Studio Martinsburg, West Virginia. (PP317.40, Maryland Historical Society.)
“Lovingly Yours, Hazel”: The Waldon Collection (c. 1860s–1944)

DEBORAH L. HARNER

LAST SUMMER, the Maryland Historical Society library received an anonymous donation of sixty-six beautiful photographs taken c. 1860s–1944. This newly created Waldon Photograph Collection (PP 317), named for one of the identified subjects, is now accessible to the public but does not offer much information about the individuals who sat for these portraits. Several have a handwritten name or the imprint of the studio and its address, but lack the personal details that create life narratives. Only one studio is Maryland-related and there is no information indicating whether there is any connection between some or all of the sitters. If you have any information, please email library staff at specialcollections@mdhs.org so we can continue to tell their stories to future generations. The following photographs are just a sample of this intriguing collection.

This collection is a stunning example of the ever-changing technology of photography. Tintypes of the 1850s and 1860s were popular among Civil War soldiers who had their pictures taken in uniform. Some exchanged them with their loved ones on the home front and carried them as keepsakes. The tintype quickly evolved into the carte de visite, a paper photograph made from a glass negative and mounted on cardboard. After the war, the cabinet card became popular, creating larger formats and allowing the photographer to erase or soften flaws such as wrinkles, or misplaced hairs. During the 1880s, a new photograph paper, the gelatin silver print, further changed photography standards, eliminating the practice of attaching images to cardboard.

In the 1920s photo postcards became popular. Flexible roll film replaced glass plates, new postal regulations, and advances in the process allowed people to send postcards. Photo albums featured black pages for gluing photos or placing them in die cut slots with identifying information recorded in white ink. The demand for professional photography dropped as everyday people created their own memory-making images, making studio portraits such as these all the more important for the stories they hold and sometimes tell.
Sgt. Albert B. Clarkson, a Buffalo Soldier, served with the elite African American cavalry corps stationed in Fort Huachaca, Arizona circa WWI. Congress created the all African American 9th and 10th cavalry and four infantry troops in 1866 with the Army Organization Act. In 1871, the Comanche gave the 10th cavalry the nickname “Buffalo Soldiers” due to their intense fighting skills during the Indian Wars. Fort Huachaca was originally built in 1877 as an outpost to guard the Arizona border and became the home base for Buffalo Soldiers from 1913 through 1933. (PP317.18, Maryland Historical Society.)

On the back of the photo, signed “To Miss Azalia S. Mackey, from Q.M. Sgt. Albert B. Clarkson, Troop “F” 10th cav. U.S. Army, Ft. Huachuca, Arizona” c. 1918 (PP317.18, Maryland Historical Society.)
Miss Azalia Mackey, featured in this photo postcard, was the recipient of Sgt. Clarkson’s affections. Hoover Studios were located in Carlisle and Newville, Pennsylvania. Verso: “Taken December 14, 1911. Age 16 Compliments of Rachael E. Humphreys” The photos of Sgt. Clarkson and Miss Mackey are the only photos in the collection that have any documented connections.

(PP317.19, Maryland Historical Society.)
Clara Janney, a photo postcard.
(PP317.05, Maryland Historical Society.)
Frank Huddle, a photo postcard.
(PP317.06, Maryland Historical Society.)
Albert Stevens.
(PP317.09, Maryland Historical Society.)

(PP317.10, Maryland Historical Society.)
ABOVE: Five images of one unidentified woman in various poses, Verso: De Tartas 4th & Ocean Avenue, Asbury Park, New Jersey. (PP317.34, Maryland Historical Society.)

RIGHT: Unidentified woman, Washington, Pennsylvania. (PP31732, Maryland Historical Society.)
Unidentified woman, Levit (?), 4447 State Street, Chicago, Illinois. (PP31739, Maryland Historical Society.)
Unidentified woman, Fowler Studios, 238 North 8th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (PP317.42, Maryland Historical Society.)
(PP31750, Maryland Historical Society.)
Unidentified child, Volga Studio, “O.E. Garner” is written on the front of the photograph.

(PP31753, Maryland Historical Society.)
Unidentified child in pram, a photo postcard.
(PP317.44, Maryland Historical Society.)
Unidentified child with fur muff, Taylors, 411 North 6th St., Reading Pennsylvania. (PP317.51, Maryland Historical Society.)
Four unidentified men, W. L. Price Photographic Studios, 723 Seventh Street N.W., Washington D.C.  
(PP317.62, Maryland Historical Society.)
Unidentified man, B. A. Blakemore Studio, Main Street, Staunton, Virginia. (PP317.64, Maryland Historical Society.)
Unidentified man.
(PP317.65, Maryland Historical Society.)
Unidentified man, Meyer, 1309 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
(PP317.66, Maryland Historical Society.)
Ann and James Truman left England for Maryland in the 1660s. They were both staunch Nonconformists and part of their reason for leaving may have been so that they could experience religious freedom. In the seventeenth century, England was riven with religious differences, divisions, and intolerances. Worship according to the rites of the Church of England was compulsory, and people who failed to comply were looked upon with suspicion and could be imprisoned. England had been a Catholic country until the Reformation in the early sixteenth century, when King Henry VIII broke away from the Pope and the Catholic Church. Henry and his wife, Queen Catherine of Aragon, had failed to produce a male heir, prompting him to divorce her and marry again to try and produce a male heir. The Pope refused to agree and King Henry declared himself “Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England.” In the later sixteenth century, Independent congregations began meeting in secret and, if discovered, faced persecution. In 1620, a group of Nonconformists, later known as the Pilgrim Fathers, set sail in the Mayflower for the New World in a bid to escape persecution. Many more people subsequently fled to North America in search of religious freedom.

England remained troubled by religious unrest, which in 1642 culminated in the Civil War. Royalists supporting King Charles I fought against Parliamentarians or Puritans, religious Independents who supported Oliver Cromwell, and the conflict tore some families and communities apart. In 1660, Charles II became king, restoring the monarchy, but freedom of religion remained elusive. The ‘Great Ejection’ followed in 1662, when the Puritan ministers who had enjoyed relative freedom during the Civil War were replaced by Anglican clergy. In 1672 Charles attempted to extend religious choice, but the Declaration of Indulgence of that year failed. Parliament ultimately passed the Act of Toleration in 1689 when William and Mary acceded to

Ruth Crook lives in Grantham, Lincolnshire, England, and has published eight books on local history and contributes articles or chapters to other local history and genealogical publications. She also writes a weekly local history column for the Grantham Journal.
the throne. It allowed freedom of worship to Nonconformists who had pledged oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy and rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation. This act allowed Congregationalists and Baptists freedom to worship in their own buildings.

**James and Ann Truman**

Research on Arthur Storer (1645–1687) led to work on James and Ann Truman, Arthur’s half-sister and brother-in-law. The first piece of information was in a reference book published by the Carnegie Institute of Washington in 1908. The work documented a hitherto unknown letter, written by Ann and James Truman, sent from Maryland back to England in 1671 and describing the harsh existence in the Chesapeake colony. The letter was not among the collections of the British Library, the National Archives, the archives of the Cambridge colleges, or the Bodleian Library in Oxford. Ann and James Truman had written to their cousin Matthew Sylvester, an Independent Minister, so there was a chance that it had been kept in Dr. Williams’s Library in London, repository for the archives of the Independent and Congregational churches. As the letter was not catalogued individually, the initial search was unsuccessful. The archivist said that it would be “a near impossible task” to find it. I discovered that Richard Baxter, a famous Protestant Divine, served as
Matthew Sylvester’s secretary from 1687. The Baxter collection is among the holdings in Dr. Williams’s Library, where the letter was eventually located. It is unusual in that it is written by a woman, gives family and personal details, and information about trade in early Maryland.¹

The letter, dated April 8, 1671, is from Ann (Storer) and James Truman at the Patuxent River, Maryland, to their cousin Matthew Sylvester, in Cotgrave, Nottinghamshire, at the house belonging to Mr. White. John White was a Presbyterian and Sylvester worked for him as a domestic chaplain. Ann, a prolific letter writer, wrote the letter that she and her husband signed, numbered 92 on the back. The numbering is in Ann’s handwriting and in the same coloured ink, so it was not added later when the letter was catalogued. It is a rare piece that only survives because it is part of the Richard Baxter Collection. All of Ann’s other correspondence appears to have been lost. Interestingly, the house in Cotgrave, now a Post Office, still belongs to the White family. Ann’s brother Arthur’s letters to Sir Isaac Newton and Humphrey Babington also still exist, in important collections.

Ann Storer was born in Wysall, Nottinghamshire, in 1640, to Edward and Marie (Widmerpoole) Storer, her mother dying shortly after her birth. Her father then married Katherine Babington in Nottingham in the following year. Together they had three children, the elder two Edward, born in 1642, and Katherine in 1643, both at Bunny, Nottinghamshire, in the home of Katherine’s aunt and uncle, who were staunch Royalists. The third, Arthur, was born in 1645, shortly after their father died, in Buckminster, Leicestershire, the family home of the Puritan Storer family. Katherine became a widow with four very young children. In 1647 she married an apothecary, William Clarke, a widower with three young children, and went to live in Grantham, Lincolnshire, above his apothecary shop on the High Street. Together William and Katherine had three more children, Joseph, Martha, and John, making a total of ten between them. William was very prominent in the town and twice served as Alderman during the English Civil War. A staunch Puritan, he was not afraid to voice his opinions with vigor to whoever challenged them. He was also imprisoned for his views and had to answer before Parliament. As a justice of the peace, he also conducted Puritan marriages in Grantham and the neighbouring Vale of Belvoir during the Interregnum. William educated his sons and stepsons at the local grammar school, and his daughters and stepdaughters were taught to read and write. All the children learned apothecary and alchemy skills, as they watched their father and mother make preparations and tinctures and care for sick people in their home.²

Collateral Ties

In 1655, a twelve-year-old boy from the village of Woolsthorpe by Colsterworth, eight miles south of Grantham, moved into the attic room of the house, so that he
could attend the local grammar school, which had been in existence since at least 1327. His name was Isaac Newton. It must have been quite different for the young Isaac, who had spent most of his life in a rural village and now lodged in a bustling town household on the main road between London and York. Ann Storer was nearly three years older than Isaac, but he became friends with her younger sister Katherine, and also made doll’s furniture for the younger girls. Ann's brothers Edward and Arthur attended the grammar school with Isaac but, as the normal starting age at the school was eight, Isaac was some way behind them in his studies. Even Arthur, who was more than two years younger, was ahead of him in class. Tension and frustration grew within the household, and Isaac later admitted that he had been peevish over bread and butter and had stolen cherry cobs from Edward Storer. After school one day, Isaac fought with a boy, thought to be Arthur Storer, and rubbed his nose along the adjacent church wall. Later, in his list of sins, Isaac wrote that he regretted beating Arthur Storer. As an inventor, Isaac often sped along the house corridors in homemade carts. He made kites, windmills and lanterns, water clocks and even drew on his bedroom walls. The Clarkes must have been exceptionally tolerant hosts. Arthur Storer and Isaac Newton became lifelong friends, and when Arthur moved to Maryland they corresponded regularly.

Living in the nearby Vale of Belvoir in the village of Muston, Leicestershire, was widower James Truman, a physician, and his sister Elizabeth. James had been born in Sutton-in-Ashfield, Nottinghamshire in 1621, to Henry and Elizabeth Truman. He had five brothers and two sisters, while two other siblings had died in infancy. The children were baptised in the local Church of England parish church, since it was against the law at that time to be baptised as an Independent. Sutton-in-Ashfield was a center of Nonconformity, and an Independent, later Congregational, church was formed there in 1651, in secret, the fifth oldest in the country. A significant number of Independents also lived in nearby Mansfield. The family had previously lived at Gedling, Nottinghamshire, also an area prominent in Nonconformity, where the Greenfield family, who also went to live in Maryland, originated. Several families travelled to Maryland from Gedling and some of the later births there were also recorded in the Gedling parish records as having taken place in Maryland.

Two of James’s brothers, Thomas and Nathaniel, and sister Marie, had already moved to Maryland. Thomas was living there by March 1651, when he witnessed a legal statement by Kathryne Roper, widow of Captain William Roper, and her new husband Thomas Sprigg. Thomas Truman was a member of Lord Baltimore's army, and fought at the Battle of Severn in 1655. Of the twenty-seven known troops in the proprietor’s army, sixteen were Protestant, or of unknown religion, and eleven were Catholic. Thomas, one of the Protestant soldiers, was captured by the Puritan government and his lands confiscated. Fighting for Lord Baltimore was not as unlikely as it might at first seem. In England during the English Civil War, family and friendship was sometimes more important than support for the King or Parliament, although
there was bitter division within some families. We have seen how Ann and Arthur’s parents lived both with Katherine’s Royalist aunt and uncle and then Edward’s Puritan parents. Also during the Interregnum, when William Clarke was Alderman, and after the Great Ejection, when Katherine (Babington Storer) Clarke’s brother, Rev. Humphrey Babington, was ejected from his position at Cambridge University for being a Royalist, Puritan William gave him a position as vicar of Grantham for six months. An Independent, later Congregational, church was not, however, established in Grantham until 1819.  

Because of Thomas Truman’s service with Baltimore in 1658, he was rewarded with 1,000 acres of land, named “His Lordship’s Favor.” He also owned 600 acres of land patented in the 1650s, titled Trent Neck. By 1681 he represented St. Mary’s County in the Maryland General Assembly. Nathaniel owned Truman Hills, a tobacco plantation. In 1657 Thomas purchased Indian Creek, a plantation of 700 acres on the south side of the Patuxent River, where it bends to the east to Chesapeake Bay, for his brother James. James must have been making plans to travel to Maryland before he married Ann.  

Ann Storer and James Truman married sometime before 1659. Their first daughter, Elizabeth, was baptised at Muston in 1660, but died later that year. Other children followed in quick succession, Martha in 1662, Mary in 1663, Ann in 1664, and Elizabeth in 1666, shortly before they set sail for Maryland. Elizabeth, too young to travel, was left behind in England, possibly as referred to in their letter, under the care of Bishop Sanderson. “I pray you present our due respects & serviss to frs. [friends] at Mansfeild, to coz. Sanderson’s, I am glad my deare babe is with soe good a nurse.” Ann’s brother Arthur Storer also arrived in Maryland at about the same time, but it is unclear whether or not they travelled together. Nathaniel Truman travelled back to England early in 1668, as evidenced in the record of a court case brought by Thomas Sprigg in October 1677. He was suing Thomas and Nathaniel to recover expenses that he had incurred in clearing, building and cultivating crops for four years on some of their land, which Thomas Truman had previously agreed to sell to him. The brothers then evicted Sprigg and leased the land to James Nuthall.  

Ann’s letter offers a rare insight into life in seventeenth-century Maryland. She clearly missed her family in England and says in her letter “it being one of our greatest happyness to know our english fr [friends] are well, & though we can not see the faces yet Pt [that] we may read the lines of each other.” She calls Maryland “this darke corner of the world.” This comment may have had religious connotations, but she was probably referring to the largely untamed frontier land. She was clearly very homesick and eager to hear about family and friends back home. She tells the letter’s recipient that their daughter Ann (Nanny) and one of their servants had died in the previous year, and that during the summer they had “had an ague & fevor wch held us about a week or fortnight.” In January that year she had given birth to a son “who lived but 10 dayes.” The colonists underwent a “seasoning” ordeal, as their bodies
Ann and James Truman to Matthew Silvester, April 8, 1671. (Baxter Correspondence, Volume IV, ff.24–25, Dr. Williams’s Library, London. Copyright Dr. Williams’s Library.)
acclimatised to their new diet and habitat. Their food consisted mainly of corn, beans and squash, which would have been almost unknown to them in Europe. Many immigrants complained of “agues and fevers” or “great sickness and much weakness.” The marshes around Maryland were also ideal breeding grounds for mosquitos, and malaria became rife, as well as epidemics of dysentery that frequently decimated the early colonial population.

Infant mortality was high, since an estimated twenty-five percent of the children born alive died during their first year, and forty to fifty-five percent of those did not live to majority. Those who did reach adulthood lived on average up to ten years longer than immigrants. This was almost certainly due to immunities to local diseases that they had developed in childhood. Women who survived the dangers of childbirth usually outlived their husbands by a ratio of two to one.

The Trumans also traded with the Indians and purchased skins to send back to their friends and family in England: “we had got noe skins this year, the indians dress none till summer, good buck-skins are usually worth 6s 8d & doe-skins about 3s 4d.” The average farm laborer in England in 1650 earned approximately 9d a day, so a buck's skin would equate to a week and a half’s work. Ann also refers to religious persecution in England and says “I am sorry to hear that wickedness is set up by law to the persecution of soe many good people.”

James Truman died during the following year and was buried on Trent Neck, his brother's land. Ann, left alone with her children, soon married Robert Skinner, another settler with three children, and together they had three more offspring, Clarke, William, and Adderton Skinner.

Ann’s brother, Arthur Storer, is now recognised as being the first known astronomer in North America. He measured the stars, planetary motion and comets, and corresponded with Isaac Newton about his findings. He travelled back to England for a while in 1678 and stayed with his uncle Humphrey Babington in Boothby Pagnell, near Grantham. From the levity of his letter in October that year, he seemed excited to be returning to Maryland. No doubt Ann was equally excited to see him on his return and share family news with him, perhaps even news of her youngest daughter Elizabeth. It is often assumed that once people emigrated to the New World, they never again visited their homeland, but within this one extended family at least two people did so.

Arthur lived with Ann and her family but, after a fall from a horse in 1680, he was not well enough to travel far. He continued to observe the comet of 1682 from Indian Creek on the opposite bank of the Patuxent from that on which his earlier measurements had been taken, and recorded his findings. He observed in a letter to Newton that he must be “one of the first that took notice thereof in Maryland.” Edward Storer, their brother, wrote to Arthur, describing and measuring the comet from Buckminster, where he worked as a physician. Arthur Storer’s measurements were extremely accurate and Isaac Newton honoured him in his book *Principia.*
Robert Skinner died in December 1686, leaving Ann a widow once more. His will was witnessed and sworn by her brother Arthur on December 15. Arthur also died less than a month later and may have been buried on Ann's land, now part of Prince Frederick, as surmised in some publications. Ann was once again alone with several underage children. Robert hinted that Ann was still very homesick, appointing guardians of his children in Maryland, in the event that Ann was absent. This may have been in case of death, but perhaps she was also thinking of returning home and seeing the daughter she left behind as an infant. The family was clearly very wealthy, and from Robert's will we know that the family had several servants and owned several slaves.¹²

Nathaniel and Thomas Truman both died without living children, Nathaniel in 1677 and Thomas in 1685, and their extensive plantations were left to Ann and James’s three living daughters, Martha, Mary, and Elizabeth; the latter had remained in England. All three young women consequently became very wealthy, owning vast tracts of land and tobacco plantations. In 1697, Elizabeth and her apothecary husband Charles Greene conveyed the inheritance to Thomas Greenfield, Martha’s husband. Ann died in 1714 and at her death had been a widow for over twenty-five years. Despite being homesick she had stayed to raise her children. All were educated and had professions, a credit to a truly remarkable woman.

Grantham Civic Society intends to honour the life of one of Lincolnshire and Maryland's most famous sons. A blue commemorative plaque to Arthur Storer is to be unveiled on the grammar school building that he attended with his lifelong friend Isaac Newton.

Transcript of Ann and James Truman’s letter:

To his much esteemed friend mr Matthew Silvester at mr Whites of Codgrave these present / From petuxunt river Maryland Aprill 8th 1671

Good Coz:

It was noe small pleasure to us to hear of your health & welfare it being one of our greatest happyness to know our english fr [friends] are well, & though we can not see the faces yet Þt [that] we may read the lines of each other: We have cause to bless God & thank you Þt [that] (unworthy) we are upon your heart & in your prayers, I hope we have fared better therefore: & oh Þt [that] we may be enabled by our bountifull landlord to pay to him the due rent of praise and fruitfullness, & not forget him who is soe mindefull of us. Hee is pleasd to visit us with various
providences, our deare Nanny dyed june i9th & one of our servants a litle before, the rest of us (through mercy) seasoned (as thay call it) well, most of us in the sumer (3 months of wch was hot) had an ague & fevor wch held us about a week or fortnight, but have had our healths this winter. I was delivered of a son jan. 16th who lived but 10 dayes, (blessed be God) we are all well at this time. I was sorry to heare of the loss wch Coz H: had, & though hir greif might cause hir to fall into travell about the time hir husband died, I wish there be noe scandall, (I would willingly be informed concerning it) I hope shee diservs it not. I shall be glad to hear that you are married to hir you mentioned, who I think is a vertuous branch of very Godly parents. I am sorry to hear that wickedness is set up by law to the persecution of soe many good people, but glad to know that those that suffer for Christ shall never be loosers by him, for though thay may be destitute and afflicted yet not forsaken, & though we have cause to sympathize with you in your troubles yet if God would thereby transplant you into this darke corner of the world we should have reason to rejoyce. Pray present our service to Mr White & his Lady & tell him we had got noe skins this year, the indians dress none till summer, good buck-skins are usually worth 6s 8d & doe-skins about 3s 4d. I pray you present our due respects & serviss to frs. [friends] at Mansfeild, to coz. Sanderson’s, I am glad my deare babe is with soe good a nurse. if you have optunity, pray present our hearty love to mr Vaughan & mr James & their famelys. we should be glad to hear thay are well.

Deare Coz. the Lord be with you we are your affectionate and obliged fr: [friend]
Jams: Truman  Ann Truman

my maid bess presents her serviss to you

Address side of letter. (Baxter Correspondence, Volume IV, ff.24–25, Dr. Williams's Library, London.)
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Bacon’s Rebellion continues to loom large in seventeenth-century Chesa-
apeake history, having been the topic of a recent monograph which also de-
tailed the attention given it by Marylanders. As Governor Thomas Notley
and his Council saw it, Maryland’s unrest, for example the Affair of the Clifts, was
fomented by the same people in the same cause as Virginia’s armed rebellion. In
December 1676 commerce in arms, ammunition, foodstuffs, or other merchan-
dise by Marylanders with Virginia was banned under the penalties appropriate
for those aiding and abetting war against the Sovereign. Maryland’s interest is
reflected by a number of references to the rebellion in its colonial archives. It is
fair to assume that accounts of Bacon’s death in late 1676 were avidly attended to
by Marylanders, and it is the (written) accounts of Bacon death that are the topic
of this contribution.¹

Englishmen of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, including educated
Marylanders and Virginians, would have understood any texts or accounts of Ba-
con’s death referring to the “lousy disease,” the “infamous and exemplary” death of
the title above, quite differently than do contemporary historians and their readers,
who have lost the original meaning. Those texts are both a classical allusion with
implications concerning morality, and reference to a real but obscure and extinct
disease. The texts do not refer to the human body louse of modern medicine, and
the texts are not empirical evidence of a role of the human body louse (Pediculus
corporis) in Bacon’s demise.

Interpreting the texts regarding the “lousy disease” necessarily requires refer-
ence to literature in the history of medicine, more precisely in the history of medical
entomology. The same is true for any review of likely causes of Bacon’s death. This
contribution attempts first to explicate the historical and scientific meanings and
implications of the “lousy disease,” and then to review the evidence regarding Bacon’s
actual cause(s) of death. The original texts are first reviewed, then the views of con-
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temporary historians considered, followed by a similar account from mid-seventeenth century England, and a medico-historical account of the “lousy disease.” Finally, an analysis of the limited textual evidence regarding Bacon’s likely cause of death is presented, relying primarily on literature from the history of medicine regarding diseases in the colonial South.

**Historical Texts Referring to Bacon’s “Lousy Disease”**

The most detailed text describing the death of Nathaniel Bacon is that by Sir William Berkeley in his “A History of Our Miseries,” dated February 2, 1677. It was written hurriedly for Henry Coventry, a secretary of state to Charles II, to give Berkeley’s account of the background and events of Bacon’s Rebellion. Investigating commissioners from England had arrived only on January 29, and Berkeley wished to get his own version of events to London quickly. Berkeley’s letter was first published in the United States by Washburn in the twentieth century. The recent definitive version of the text is that of Billings, which follows:

I no sooner quitted the Towne but Bacon entered it burned five houses of mine and twenty of other Gentlemen and they say a very commodious Church he set fire too with his owne sacreligious hands. But within three weekes after the Justice and Judgement of God overtooke him. His usual oath was which he swore at least a Thousand times a day was God damme my Blood and god so infected his blood that it bred Lice in incredible number so that for twenty dayes he never washt his shirts but burned them. To this God added the Bloody flux and an honest minister wrote this Epitaph on him:
Bacon Dead I am sorry at my hart
That Lice and flux should take the hangmans part.

Billings does not explicate this text in his notes.²

The commissioners recently sent from England concurred with the minister’s epitaph in their 1677 “True Narrative of the Rise, Progresse, and Cessation of the Late Rebellion in Virginia,” which reads:

Hee lay sick at one Mr. Pates in Gloster County of the Bloody Flux, and (as Mr. Pate himself affirms) accompanied with a Lousey Disease; so that the swarmes of Vermyn that bred in his Body he could not destroy but by throwing his shirts into the Fire as often as he shifted himself.³

Note that in both these quotations a stylistic transition from the factual to the mythic appears. In the first, the burning of five houses of Berkeley’s and twenty of other gentlemen is simply stated, but then there is a transition to a general “they say a very commodious Church” and later “an honest minister” at odds with the specificity preceding in the narrative. Church and minister are unnamed. In the second citation the “Lousey Disease” is taken to require the affirmation of Mr. Pate, while the “Bloody Flux” as stated requires no affirmation.⁴

An anonymous 1723 account of Bacon’s Rebellion in Dixon & Purdie’s Virginia Gazette relates the observation concerning the “lousy disease,” without the author appearing convinced. The text reads:

It was thought by some persons that he died of a disease called by physicians phthiriasis, or the lousy disease, and indeed the act of attainder passed in the year 1680 declares that he died an infamous and exemplary death; but the report of the commissioners, which I shall soon have occasion to mention, says ex(?) that he died of the bloody flux.⁵

The 1680 act of pardon (not of attainder, that was in February 1677) noted in the above 1723 account is interesting not just for what it says, “until it pleased the Allmightly to send him the said Bacon an infamous and exemplary death* . . .” but also for its origin, as the act was drafted in and brought from England “under the great seal of England” by the new governor, Lord Culpeper, and was passed by the assembly unanimously as presented to them.⁶

Another participant in suppressing the rebellion, one who had arrived in November 1676 as commander of the heavily armed merchant ship the Concord, Captain Thomas Grantham, published his memoirs in 1716; in these he wrote:
And therefore, tho’ some of those who animated the Faction were put to Death; and Bacon died of the Lousy Evil; yet others, who submitted themselves, were receiv’d into Favour and Protection.\textsuperscript{7}

The positive references to the “lousy disease” originate from persons associated with the Crown, or in immediate contact with its emissaries. The presumably Virginian author of the Virginia Gazette article appears ambivalent.\textsuperscript{8}

There are accounts of Bacon’s Rebellion which do not mention the “lousy disease.” These include the narrative of Thomas Mathew, a Virginian, an anonymous narrative written probably by John Cotton, a Virginian, and the account of Samuel Wiseman, who arrived in Virginia with the three royal commissioners only in 1677.\textsuperscript{9}

Virginians had forgotten the “lousy disease” in the context of Bacon’s Rebellion, certainly by 1823. The evidence is in Hening’s collection of “all the laws of Virginia.” This is the footnote referenced by the asterisk included in the citation above of the 1680 act of pardon:

What was that \textit{infamous} and \textit{exemplary} death of which mention is made in this act? Historians, without giving any circumstantial detail, represent Bacon’s death as proceeding from a cold, and excessive fatigue, in the arduous duties which he had to perform.\textsuperscript{10}

Since Washburn’s publication of Berkeley’s “History of Our Miseries,” however, the “lousy disease” has been steadily noted by modern historians, who often refer to Berkeley’s text on the lousy disease, but, while mostly reserving judgment, have not recognized the original meaning of the text. Daniel Richter, for example, in Before the Revolution cites first from Charles Andrews’ Narratives of the Insurrections and then from Berkeley’s earlier text above referring to the lousy disease without elaboration, except to conclude (reasonably) that Bacon’s “Bloody Flux” was “probably dysentery.”\textsuperscript{11}

Among histories of the rebellion, Wilcomb E. Washburn’s The Governor and the Rebel, 1951, used these same sources, Berkeley, and Narratives of the Insurrections. Washburn does not further attempt to interpret the citations noting the “lousy disease.”\textsuperscript{12} Brent Tarter’s 2011 convincing account in the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography of the underlying causes of Bacon’s Rebellion refers to Berkeley’s “Lice and flux” only as Berkeley’s disgusted response to Bacon’s swearing, a part of a larger discussion of the contemptuous attitudes of Berkeley and his allies regarding the social characteristics of Bacon’s supporters. Tarter does not discuss Bacon’s underlying causes of death.\textsuperscript{13}

James D. Rice in his recent book grappled with these texts, tentatively concluding that the cause of death may have been louse-borne typhus, a conclusion, however, based on the assumption that the lice were human body lice. His hypothesis will be evaluated in a later section of this article.\textsuperscript{14}
A 1643 English Ascription of the Lousy Disease, and a Review of Its Literature

Another who was accused of succumbing to “lousy disease” was parliamentarian and prominent royal critic John Pym (1584–1643) who authored “A 1643 English Ascription of the Lousy Disease, and a Review of Its Literature.” Parliament appointed him the “Master of Ordnance,” that is, of the arms stored in the Tower, in November 1643 during the English Civil War. Pym died a month later. One historian claims Pym to have been “the most popular man in England until his untimely death,” and stated further that “The royalists, quite naturally, utterly despised John Pym.” The monarchists “delighted to spread the rumor that he had been carried off by the foul disease of Herod.” The “foul disease of Herod” refers to phthiriasis, the lousy disease or morbus pedicularis.  

In the case of Pym, who died of a tumor, the accusation that he suffered from the lousy disease, as well as a suspicion of poisoning, led to the nearly immediate publication of what we would call today an autopsy report. That document stated:

For the skinne of his bodie, it was without so much as any roughnes, scarr or scab; neither was there any breach either of the scarfe or true skin, much lesse any Phthiriasis or lousie disease, as was reported. And as for that suggestion of his being poisoned, there appeared to the Physitians no signe thereof upon the view of his body; neither wasthere any exorbitant symptome (while he lived) either in his animall, vitall or naturall parts.

“Scarfe,” the first half of the compound “scarf·skin,” means epidermis or cuticle; the “true skin” refers to the dermis. In the case of Bacon, similarly suffering according to an accusation by royalists, from the lousy disease, and there being perhaps also some suspicion of poisoning, no such defense has been offered previously.  

This legendary and bizarre (but also real) disease has most recently been reviewed by the physician and medical historian Jan Bondeson who begins the chapter “The Riddle of the Lousy Disease” in his A Cabinet of Medical Curiosities:

Of all the legendary and fantastic diseases of ancient times, phthiriasis, or the lousy disease, was the most intriguing and bizarre. In the corrupted humors of those who suffered from the disease, lice were believed to be spontaneously engendered, and tumors full of these insects, but devoid of pus, rose on the skin. When such a louse tumor burst or was incised, a stream of insects swarmed out. The flesh of the sufferer was slowly eaten away and transubstantiated into lice, and he perished miserably in this ‘most horrible of diseases.’ Phthiriasis was firmly believed to be a divine punishment for tyrants, desecrators, and enemies of religion.
From this description the significance of lack of roughness or breach of the scarfskin (epidermis) or true skin (dermis) in Pym’s autopsy report is evident.17

The literature on phthiriasis both literary and medical has been reviewed by Bondeson, and prior to him by Busvine, which is fortunate since nearly all the literature is difficult to access by reason of language and/or age. Hoeppli has added useful information from the Chinese literature. All three of these authors agree there was an actual disease, not observed in modern times, resulting from a rare infection of humans, most likely by parasitic mites of the genus *Harpyrynchus,* generally parasites of birds, within whose skin they form lesions similar to those described in humans. Bondeson in his review of medical case reports notes that most cases were reported in Germany, Scandinavia, and France: there were only a few reliable British cases, and not a single American one.18

In evaluating Berkeley’s account of Bacon’s death, two features of the literature on phthiriasis are relevant: the depth of the historical accounts, many apocryphal, and the similarity of the account of Bacon’s morbid state to the early descriptions, themselves often exaggerated. The abbreviated sketch of the classical literature following relies upon the above cited reviews of Bondeson and Busvine. The disease was reported in antiquity, Aristotle having described the condition, and Plutarch having written a chronicle of the condition. The most famous description, that of Sulla, is worth citing for the similarity to the description of Bacon:

   …his whole body became one mass of lice (*corpus in pediculos totum versum*); and though many persons were employed day and night removing the lice, yet they were unable to destroy as many as were produced, so that his clothes, bath, furniture, wash hand basins and food were full of them. And though he bathed frequently, every day and washed and rubbed his body, yet this was of no avail.

Herod the Great was also claimed as a victim of the disease. Both in early Christian times and in the Middle Ages there are numerous accounts of persons smitten with the disease, and the British medieval chronicles are no exception. A number of actual medical accounts were published in the 1700s and the 1800s, but no human case has been encountered in modern times.19

The real disease was not necessarily fatal, and the following early modern English case reported by Heberden may represent the more common clinical occurrence in the age of Pym and Bacon:

1762. AUG 23. I wasthis day informed by Sir Edward Wilmot, that he had seen a man who was afflicted with the morbus pedicularis. Small tumors were dispersed over the skin, in which there was a very perceptible motion, and a violent itching. Upon being opened with a needle, they were found to contain insects in every respect resembling common lice, excepting that they were whiter. Sir Edward Wilmot ordered a wash, consisting of four ounces of spirits of wine,
four ounces of rectified oil of turpentine, and six drams of camphor. The day following he told me all the insects had been killed on being touched with this liquor, and that all the itching had immediately ceased.

As Bondeson notes, the lethality of the condition had been exaggerated: 22 of 42 reasonably reliable cases were cured.20 This brief account of the literature on phthiriasis should leave little doubt that Bacon’s lousiness should be considered a royalist political slander, and also that any lice referred to are not the common body louse. That the Baconites did not see themselves as rebelling against royal authority is not evidence that the Crown did not so perceive it; in fact the Crown was likely to perceive the rebellion in the context of the seventeenth-century conflict between Parliamentarians and Crown. It is only logically possible that this is the only case of actual phthiriasis ever described in North America, unfortunately, since that would be a most scientifically interesting outcome.

Bacon might or might not have carried body lice (*Pediculus corporis*) or the related head or pubic lice: the cited texts carry no relevant information. Nor would body lice be relevant to interpreting the texts above. Seventeenth-century Virginia households of all social classes possessed laundry equipment and often laundry rooms, and the laundering practices were such as to eliminate or strongly reduce body louse burdens. It is unlikely that if Bacon was brought “lousy” into Mr. Pate’s house that he would have been permitted to remain obviously so, and some burden of body lice would not have been a significant risk factor for mortality.21

**Bacon’s Actual Likely Cause of Death**

There is a distinction between an “underlying” and an “immediate” cause of death. For example, dysentery may be the immediate cause of death while amebiasis (infection with the amoeba *Entamoeba histolytica*) is the underlying cause. There may also be contributing causes. Evaluating these in the instance of Nathaniel Bacon means relying on very scanty evidence, the four brief accounts contained in Charles Andrews’ *Narratives of the Insurrections 1675–1690* and in *Samuel Wiseman’s Book of Record*.22

Thomas Mathew’s account states simply that “Mr. Bacon now returns from his last Expediccion Sick of a Flux,…” and adds shortly after “nor had he one dry day in all his Marches to and fro in the Forrest.” He adds “in a While Bacon dyes. . . .” Thus Bacon was able to travel when first sick, and was sick before arriving at his place of death. There is no mention of general sickness among Bacon’s men. In the account *The History of Bacon’s and Ingram’s Rebellion, 1676*, the author states “Bacon haveing for som time bin beseiged by sickness, and now not able to hould out any longer, all his strength, and provissions being spent, surrendred up that Fort he was no longer able to keepe, into the hands of that grim and all conquering Captaine, Death.” The author adds later “that he subjected him selfe to all those inconveniences that,
singly, might bring a Man of a more Robust frame to his last hom.” Here not only is a considerable duration of illness stated, but limits to the robustness of Bacon’s constitution are noted. Again, there is no mention of other illness among Bacon’s men. Popular verse included in this account suggests poisoning, but this eventuality will be considered separately below. A third account, that of the Royal Commissioners, was cited in the introductory portion of this paper. They added “Hee dyed much dissatisfied in minde inquiring ever and anon after the arrival of the Friggats and Forces from England, and asking if his Guards were strong about the House.” Except for noting Bacon’s mental agitation in extremis, this additional sentence does not add useful information. The last account, that from Samuel Wiseman, is suggestive: “... a languishing Enemy, that had for a weeks space lay exposed to much more hardship, want, and inaccommodation than themselves, for this very service was supposed to bee the death of Bacon, who contracted the disease whereof hee dyed by lying in a very wett season in the Trenches before the Towne.” There appears to have been potentially eleven nights between 7 September when he caused “a Trench worke to be cast up composed of felled trees, earth and bush” and 18 September. The text does not definitely indicate that Bacon’s first symptoms appeared during this period, but it seems likely. If one assumes a lack of sanitary discipline and a buildup of flies during this interval, conditions for the spread of bacterial agents of dysentery would exist. Very wet environmental conditions are again described, and again there is no mention of general illness in the ranks of Bacon’s men.23

One may summarize these observations as follows. There is no positive statement of a general epidemic of illness or dysentery among Bacon’s men (although this is not conclusive evidence). Bacon’s illness may have initiated in mid-September, but was not terminal until late October, and that he was capable of some campaigning during the earlier stage of his illness. Both the time in the trenches before Jamestown and in his expedition were noted as being very wet. Bacon’s lack of robust constitution and his strenuous exertions are noted. Bacon died on October 26, 1676, two years after he arrived in Jamestown, and was still in the period of “seasoning,” during which the great killers were intermittent fevers or agues (i.e., malaria), or the bloody flux (i.e., dysentery).24

Protracted dysentery was the likely immediate cause of Bacon’s death. Multiple sources cited above attest to this. The underlying cause of death, however, must remain uncertain. Dysentery, bloody diarrhea, is a symptom which can result from infection by a number of agents, bacterial and protozoan. John Duffy summarizes accounts of dysentery in colonial America, particularly the South and concludes that accurate diagnoses are often impossible, although it was likely that some of the virulent outbreaks may have been typhoid or some form of cholera. However in his discussion of typhoid Duffy notes that it appeared not to be extensive in seventeenth-century colonial America. Given that, and the lack of suggestion of a general epidemic among Bacon’s men, typhoid appears somewhat unlikely to be the
underlying cause. Further, one cannot assume that dysentery refers just to typhoid or amebiasis. In the Civil War, when typhoid fever was recognized as a distinct entity, one recent author ascribes the diarrhea and dysentery primarily to *Shigella* and certain *Salmonella*, and offers a summary of the importance of those conditions under mid-nineteenth century military conditions. A classic review of bacillary dysentery in the pre-antibiotic era suggests it was a much more likely cause of “bloody flux” than was amoebic dysentery.\textsuperscript{25}

A possible role of malaria, the other great killer of immigrant colonists in the South, is worth discussing. Malaria’s connection with swampy, low-lying land was widely recognized in colonial America. The wetness of Bacon’s recent campaign territory was noted in the accounts above. Duffy and Childs, both writers of reviews on malaria in the South, consider seventeenth-century Virginia was relatively free of the disease and reject the notion. More recent literature gives further weight to the conclusion that there was significant risk of malaria mid-century and that by the end of the century the more malignant *falciparum* malaria entered the colony, supplementing the earlier *Plasmodium vivax* and *malariae*.\textsuperscript{26}

Malaria, particularly *falciparum* malaria can be associated with diarrhea. Nevertheless, as a textbook sign or symptom it was considered uncommon. In Civil War medicine the concept of “Typhomalaria” gained prominence. No reference has been identified which specifically deals with the joint occurrence of malaria and the several other potential causes of diarrhea and dysentery in the hyperendemic situation of the Low Country in colonial America. That Bacon’s dysentery was aggravated by malaria is a possibility.\textsuperscript{27} Lastly, there is Rice’s typhus hypothesis:

> At some moment during the fall, perhaps while huddling in a crowded, damp trench before Jamestown, Nathaniel Bacon began scratching at the body lice crawling under his clothing and feeding on his blood. Soon such “Swarmes of Vermine . . . bred in his body” that he had to burn his clothing every time he changed. At least one of the lice had previously fed upon the blood of someone carrying the bacterium *Rickettsia prowazekii*, which then bred in the louse’s gut until Bacon scratched the louse’s bite, crushing the host and grinding its infected feces into the small wound it had made in his flesh. A week or two later Bacon fell ill with a crushing headache and other flu-like symptoms and was bedridden in the Gloucester County home of Major Thomas Pate with a full-blown case of typhus. To this was added a “bloody flux” that turned his bowels inside out. By mid-October Bacon was delirious, “very much dissatisfied in mind, enquiring over and anon after the arrival of the frigatts and forces” that he expected soon from England. Even a visit from the Reverend Wading, released from his imprisonment in the controversy over Bacon’s oath, gave the general no relief. Nathaniel Bacon died on October 26, 1676, a day recorded by Captain Morris as one of “raney misty weather.”
Rice clarifies that the “diagnosis is conjecture, but typhus is easily the best fit for the symptoms described in contemporary accounts of his death,” a hypothesis that may come naturally to historians as there is a large literature on typhus and history, especially on typhus and deaths in massed armies, and in the trenches.28

But there are arguments against typhus as the agent of death beyond the fact that the lice as described on Bacon were not the human body louse. Samuel Wiseman’s Book of Record does refer to the trenches before Jamestown. However, Bacon’s force was small; a maximum of eleven days in trenches is not quite sustained trench warfare; and September in Virginia is not quite a continental European winter. And it should be noted that epidemic typhus is not consistent with an absence of an epidemic among Bacon’s men.

Bacon was entrenched for a week before Jamestown, September 7–18, 1676 and the incubation period of typhus is one to two weeks, commonly twelve days. Onset is marked by headache, chills, prostration, fever, and general pains. “Toxemia is usually pronounced, and the disease terminates by rapid defervescence after about two weeks of fever.” Note that diarrhea is not mentioned as a symptom. A death on October 26, after infection eight to eighteen days earlier would be uncommonly slow. And the intense symptoms at onset would probably be inconsistent with Bacon’s activity during an “Expedicion Sick of a Flux.”29

A recent detailed review by a medical historian suggests that typhus in 1600s Virginia was unlikely. Although typhus in North America has occurred on occasion, primarily among and restricted to communities of very recent immigrants, it appears never to have established itself widely north of Mexico. In particular, despite the apparently congenial circumstances of Civil War encampments and prison camps, there were no major typhus outbreaks at the time. The reported cases are believed to have been largely misdiagnosed typhoid (the two diseases had only recently been distinguished), or possibly isolated cases spread from recrudescence (Brill-Zinsser disease) among immigrant soldiers. The author also notes that “Typhus tends to cause constipation, not diarrhea – a key point in the differential diagnosis.”30

Perhaps to end on a lighter note, the question as to whether Bacon was poisoned should be raised. It appears the only relevant texts are in (claimed) popular verses, which, if nothing else, may portray the emotions of the times. In “Bacon’s Epitaph, made by his Man” we find the lines:

If’t be a sin to thinke Deathe brib’d can bee / Wee must be guilty; say twas brib-ery / Guided the fatall shaft. Verginias foes, / To whom for secrit crimes just vengance owes Disarved plagues, dreding their just disart / Corrupted Death by Parasscellcian art / Him to destroy.

These seem to clearly imply suspicions of poisoning in the minds of Bacon’s followers, some among the followers of John Pym in the above account, a routine
conspiracy theory of the times. Bacon’s enemies are seen as not at all distressed by the accusation, as suggested by the following lines in Upon the Death of G. B., “Then how can it be counted for a sin / Though Death (nay though my selfe) had bribed bin, / To guide the fatall shaft? We honour all / That lends a hand unto a T[r]ators fall.”

In truth both of these verses are believed to have been written by John Cotton himself. It should be noted, however, that some Virginians in later years considered the possibility of assassination. In a footnote to the 1677 Act of Attainder, Hening states: “The death of Bacon has never been satisfactorily accounted for. The total absence of any circumstantial detail of that event, especially in a character so conspicuous, has given rise to a conjecture that he, and Cheesman and Hunt, two of the principals who seem to have shared the same fate, fell by the hands of some assassin employed by the government.” Absent more convincing accounts, this writer would dismiss the possibilities of poisoning and assassination.31

Conclusions and Directions for Further Research

The findings above can be summarized simply and briefly. Nathaniel Bacon’s lousy disease, or phthiriasis, was a classic slander against unpopular enemies from antiquity to seventeenth century Great Britain, and had specifically been used by British royalists in the 1600s against enemies. On the other hand, there is no account of classic phthiriasis, now believed caused by parasitic mites of birds rather than human body lice, in North America, so one must conclude that the description of Bacon’s death was political slander rather than a medical description.

As to Bacon’s actual cause of death, typhus is extremely unlikely, while the “bloody flux” or dysentery, probably bacillary, appears reasonable given the commonness of this condition in early colonial America, particularly during the “seasoning period.” The odds are against the underlying cause being typhoid. Malaria could have contributed to susceptibility. But the reader is reminded that there are no hard medical data, and the reality is ultimately unknowable at this time.

As to further research, any historical account of a case of phthiriasis found in North or South American texts should certainly be called to scientific attention. For a historian of medicine, another look at the concept of typho-malaria, accessing worldwide literature from areas where both malaria and bacillary dysenteries were or are endemic, might be productive (although undoubtedly tedious in the extreme).

The role of human ectoparasites (lice, fleas, scabies) and micropredators (mosquitoes, midges and black flies, and biting flies such as the Tabanidae) in the environmental history and human biology of colonialists and Native Americans deserves closer study.32
Notes

The author would like to thank the very helpful reference and rare book librarians who assisted in identifying and obtaining bibliographic items: Ann Repetto, Philip Skroska, Elisabeth Brander (Washington University in St. Louis), Susan Mallioux (University of Missouri, St. Louis), Glenda Insua (University of Illinois at Chicago), and William C. Luebke (The Library of Virginia).

4. See notes 2 and 3 above.
5. “Remainder of the Account of Bacon’s Rebellion, in the year 1676 . . .” in Alexander Purdie and John Dixon’s *Virginia Gazette*, February 23, 1769. (As quoted, the report of the Commissioners did however note the presence of the lousey disease.)
8. See note 5.
10. See note 6.
16. *A Narrative of the Disease and Death of that Noble Gentleman John Pym Esquire, Late a Member of the Honourable House of Commons, Attested under the hands of his Physicians,*
Maryland Historical Magazine


23. See note 22.


Cirillo nicely summarizes the development of this concept from the time of the Civil War until its demise in the late 1800s, and certainly by the time of the Spanish-American war. The concept had its origins in Southern medicine before the Civil War, however. This literature is large and obscure, and the reader is referred to the reviews of Dale C. Smith, who did consider that “a malarially impaired patient should suffer more rather than less than an otherwise healthy patient from the attack of typhoid fever,” however uncommon the joint occurrence of the two diseases was in the late 1800s in the eastern United States. Typhoid fever occurring in military camps was seen often as complicated by malarial and/or scorbutic phenomena.
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“underbelly”: from the Deepest Corners of the Maryland Historical Society Library

THE LIBRARY’S BI-MONTHLY BLOG, “underbelly,” is among the society’s most popular online features. Launched in September 2012 staff, historians and research fellows contribute articles inspired by treasures found in the rich and textured collections of manuscripts, photographs, prints, books, and ephemera in the library’s collections. As of March 2, 2017 there are 182 posts on the website, some of which will be featured here in coming issues. The following piece on Port Covington is particularly relevant. In January 2016, athletic apparel company Under Armour CEO Kevin Plank, in an agreement with the city of Baltimore, announced plans to move the company’s headquarters to the historic property, a tremendous investment in the city and its residents. Special Projects Archivist Lara Westwood researched and wrote this history of the old port in June 2016. For access to the full archive, visit www.mdhs.org and follow the “blogs” link on the home page.

Port Covington: Baltimore’s Junction with the World

LARA WESTWOOD

PORT COVINGTON long served South Baltimore as an industrial hub of the city. Sharing a peninsula with Locust Point and Fort McHenry, the port was for many years the Western Maryland Railway’s “junction with the world.” It is most remembered as a bustling port, filled with ships and trains ready to send freight across the world, but Port Covington’s story has many other chapters.

Lara Westwood is the Special Projects Archivist of the H. Furlong Baldwin Library at the Maryland Historical Society.
The land that would become Port Covington remained mostly unclaimed and unsettled as Baltimore grew in its earliest years. The first colonial settlers quickly carved out tracts north and east of the port in the Inner Harbor area and as far south as Whetstone Point in the late seventeenth century. Expansion into the port area took much longer, even as Baltimore Town incorporated other early settlements, such as Jonestown and Fell’s Point, during the eighteenth century.

The first notable use of the land did not come until 1813 when a fort was built to provide support for Fort McHenry during the War of 1812. City officials, sensing Baltimore’s vulnerability to a British attack, requested reinforcement from the War Department to fortify the city’s defenses, because Fort McHenry could not repulse the enemy alone. Colonel Decius Wadsworth, Chief of Ordinance and noted engineer and inventor, designed the wedge-shaped fort to prevent the British from outflanking the forces at Fort McHenry via the Ferry Bar Channel. Several other small forts and batteries, including Fort Babcock and Fort Look-Out, were built at this time along the harbor to bolster defenses. The new fort, sometimes called the Patapsco Battery or Fort Wadsworth, held a magazine, troop barracks, and a guardhouse. After Brigadier General Leonard Covington was mortally wounded at the Battle of Crysler’s Field in November, 1813, the fort was renamed Fort Covington to honor the fallen Maryland native. Construction was completed by December, 1813 and would soon see action.
By September, 1814 the war was at Baltimore’s door. The British had burned Washington, D.C., destroying the White House and the Capitol Building the month before, and turned their sights on the valuable port city. On September 12, American and British armies clashed on land at North Point and Hampstead Hill. The following day, the British warships began firing on Fort McHenry, and the assault lasted for twenty-five long hours. Fort Covington had been equipped with about ten mounted 18-pounder long guns and was manned by a small garrison under the command of Captain William H. Addison. The forces at Fort Covington and the other small redoubts provided crossfire to help drive back the enemy ships and prevent them from landing. Fort McHenry withstood the bombardment, and the British were forced to retreat. Maryland lawyer Francis Scott Key, sequestered in the harbor on British ship, was so inspired by the sight of the American flag flying over Fort McHenry amidst the fray wrote a poem entitled “Defence of Fort M’Henry,” which would later become the national anthem. The Battle of Baltimore proved a turning point for the Americans, and the war was over by February of 1815. After the war’s end, a small detachment remained at the fort until the 1830’s.

As Baltimore expanded its borders, the fort and surrounding land became more integrated into the city and served as the southernmost border of the city until 1919. An 1822 map of city by Thomas Poppleton showed that roads had been planned for
the land surrounding the fort all the way down to the tip of Ferry Bar, the furthest reaches of the Port Covington peninsula. By the 1850’s, the fort’s buildings were dilapidated, and the City Council debated new uses for the area, including a public square or a new powder magazine. Eventually, the fort was torn down to make way for commercial uses. A steam mill and distillery were built near the old fort site, along with a wharf owned by O. Smith. A ferry also operated off of Ferry Bar and carried people to and from Anne Arundel County until a bridge extended Light Street across the water.

The Winans brothers, Thomas deKay and William Louis, also purchased over 100 acres along the waterfront on the peninsula in the late 1850’s to establish an industrial community. The sons of famed inventor Ross Winans, whose innovations in railroad technology spurred the industry, envisioned building locomotive manufacturing plant and shipyard on the site, surrounded by employee housing. Their father had dreamed up a new type of steamship called a cigar boat for its cylindrical shape with pointed ends, and his sons hoped to manufacture the ship on a large scale at their new shipyard. The new design had too many problems, and the cigar boat never caught on commercially. With failure of the ship came the end of the Winans’ community. The Winans walked away from the project after building a few piers and a cottage, which was used as an office, but held on to the land. The property was later used as a brickyard and a trash dump, but the cottage stood until 1913 when it burned down.

*A busy port. Western Maryland Railway, Port Covington, no date.* (Blakeslee Lane, Subject Vertical File, Maryland Historical Society.)
The Winans Cottage, before it was lost to fire, served as the clubhouse for the L’Hirondelle Rowing Club, Undine Boat Club, and others similar clubs over the years and represented the growing entertainment use of Ferry Bar and Port Covington. Several resorts and public beaches cropped up along the waterfront and became a popular place for Baltimoreans to escape the long, hot summer days. In the early 1890’s, new trolley lines began bringing the urbanites from all over the city to such destinations as George Kahl’s Ferry Bar Resort. Yacht and boat clubs also lined the coast. In a 1951 article for the *Baltimore Sun*, Benjamin A. Hooper recalled pleasant Sundays spent with his family at George Kahl’s Ferry Bar Resort when he would fish from the balcony and his parents would dance and have drinks. The resort notoriously flouted Baltimore’s prohibition of alcohol sales on Sunday with a pavilion 30 yards offshore and just outside city limits. Hooper described a lovely scene: “As you sat fishing—and as your parents sat drinking beer—you could see the scull races that began at the Arundel Boat Club….You could see sailboats…and the rowboats and canoes that carried young fellows in their boater hats and their girls, who carried parasols. (1)”

The surrounding area remained remarkably rural before the Western Maryland Railway turned Port Covington into a lively port and railroad terminal. George F. Obrecht, Jr., in another *Baltimore Sun* article, remembered playing in the fields that abutted the railroad tracks on Port Covington as late as 1911. In the winter, he and his friends would skate on the ponds that dotted the landscape and fish there in the summer. Pasture land still existed along South Charles, Light, and Hanover Streets, and after swimming at Winans Beach at Ferry Bar, Obrecht and his pals would milk the cows there. (2)
The Western Maryland Railway had long wanted to connect its ever expanding railroad network with the Baltimore harbor and found Port Covington to be the perfect location. A railroad terminal there would serve as their “junction with the world” and allow the railway to grow its shipping networks and tap into the global market. In 1883, the company formed Western Maryland Tidewater Railroad Company, which allowed for the construction of a tidewater line, but the project stalled for almost twenty years. Construction of the connecting lines from Walbrook Junction, then outside of the city, down to Port Covington was completed in 1902, and the new railroad terminal was finished in 1904.

The terminal changed the area’s landscape dramatically. It covered over 95 acres and the land had to be molded into usable space. According to a history of the Western Maryland Railway, “About 100,000 cubic yards of dirt were removed to level the area; some 500,000 cubic yards of mud and sand were dredged in digging channels and anchorages. (3)” The original structure included 75 miles of track, two piers, one for coal and another for freight, a 600-foot bulkhead, and a transfer bridge for moving railcars. On the facility’s first day of operations on September 24, 1904, three freight cars were loaded with canned goods to be sent south and west. As the railroad continued to lay track across the state, the terminal’s business grew and the facilities with it. The biggest boost came once connections were made with West Virginia and Pittsburgh train lines. Expansion was necessary, and in 1913, the
Railway purchased 90 acres from the Winans family. The grain elevator was built on the new land, and the new development signaled the end of Ferry Bar’s resort era. The railroad’s locomotive repair shops were also transferred to Port Covington from Hagerstown and Elkin, which brought hundreds of jobs to the city. By 1929, the terminal could store over 100,000 tons of freight, and the docks could accommodate seven ocean vessels.

Upkeep on the terminal proved costly, and new technology forced renovations. The city assisted with some of the repairs and funded new infrastructure, but the Western Maryland Railway footed much of the bill. In 1950, the company laid out a twelve million dollar plan to modernize the piers and incorporate the growing trucking industry. However, these updates and renovations did not keep the Port Covington railroad terminal in business. In 1973, the Western Maryland Railway was absorbed into the Chessie System, a holding company of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway and Baltimore & Ohio Railroad companies, which eventually became CSX Transportation. Marine operations at the port ceased in the 1970’s, and the railway soon followed.

The end of the railroad era opened Port Covington to new possibilities and new chapters. Many plans have been proposed for the area since the 1980’s when CSX began selling off the land. In 1985, it was in contention to be the home to a brand

*Boathouses for the Arundel and Ariel Boat Clubs. Arundel Boat Club, Ferry Bar, Md., 1912* (Subject Vertical file, Maryland Historical Society.)
new stadium to replace Memorial Stadium, but Camden Yards was chosen instead. Later, the *Baltimore Sun* opened a new printing plant. Other maritime industries have also moved into the area, but no large scale redevelopment has been successful to date. Currently, Maryland native Kevin Plank is working to build a new home base for his sportswear company, Under Armour, and mixed-use neighborhood on Port Covington.

Sources and Further Reading:

*There is some debate in the scholarship as to whether Colonel Decius Wadsworth or Captain Samuel Babcock of the Corps of Engineers designed the fort. Both were involved with the building of the new fortifications in Baltimore and had forts named for them.*

(1) Hooper, Benjamin A. “I Remember When...Ferry Bar Was a Thriving Resort.” *Baltimore Sun*, January 4, 1951.
(2) Obrecht, George F., Jr. “I Remember When...Ferry Bar Was a Bathing Beach.” *Baltimore Sun*, August 8, 1948.
Passano-O’Neill File.
Recollections of Baltimore

ROBERT GILMOR

The interest which the members of this Society, present at the last meeting, seemed to take in the extemporaneous and imperfect account I then gave in explanation of an interesting document presented by one of them, and the desire expressed that I would commit it to paper to be read at our next meeting, and afterwards preserved as a record of some of the changes in the face of our city, for the benefit of younger as well as future members, have been felt by me as obligatory, but unaccustomed as I am to make such public communications, I must throw Myself upon their indulgence for any errors, omissions and other imperfections in this, made in compliance with their wishes.

The document alluded to, and presented by a descendant of one of the subscribers, is a subscription list signed in 1781 by a number of the most respectable citizens, to raise a sum of money sufficient to effect the levelling and extension of Calvert street by underpinning and under arching the venerable old Court house, which occupied nearly the breadth of the street and at the same time stood on a hill, sixty or a hundred feet above the level of the basin at the County wharf, at the foot of the street, and about 30 or 40 feet above the pavement where the Battle Monument in Monument Square occupying its site, now stands. This was successfully effected by Leonard Harbaugh, an enterprising architect of Baltimore, who was afterwards employed on the public buildings erected at Washington.

Though I was too young to know anything of this subscription list, I was old
enough to notice the general aspect of the then Baltimore Town and especially the old Court house, with the pillory on one side, and the jail higher up, where the Granite record office now stands to the west. In the rear of the Court house there was a steep descent to Jones’ Falls, which then flowed in a semicircle round the foot of the hills to the west of it, from about where the water company’s mill is, to its present channel not far from the German church on Gay and Holliday streets. This hill was so high that the powder magazine was built at the foot of it about the southeast corner of Lexington street and the square, with a small wharf in front to which the boats of the shipping came for their powder during the war. The water here was deep and once a man was drowned there. I have dived from it often, as I learned to swim in the Falls close by, about the place now occupied by Mr. Meredith’s house, the first from the corner of the square in North Calvert street. The low flat enclosed by it was called Steiger’s Meadow. On the heights above the course of the Falls were the old Dutch church, old St. Paul’s (a wooden structure, the belfry of which remained a long while after the church was pulled down and may perhaps be remembered by some here), then came the Roman Catholic Chapel (lately pulled down to make place for Calvert Hall), the old jail and Court house. Some idea of the height of the range may be formed by noticing the elevation of the ground on which the First Presbyterian church is built, and which was partly reduced when the old church was removed.

The old Court house finally was taken down when the new Court house at the
corner of Lexington Street and the square was built. Some gentlemen who had built
good houses on the square, fearing that its site might be occupied by some disagree-
able and offensive building, memorialized the legislature to grant authority to raise
$100,000 for the purpose of erecting a monument on the spot to the memory of
Washington. This was the origin of the Washington Monument. The legislature
granted the prayer of the memorialists, and twenty-three gentlemen were appointed
managers to carry their object into effect, six alone of whom are now living. In conse-
quence, however, of apprehensions being entertained that the lofty column adopted
by the managers might be dangerous to the neighboring buildings, the individual
now addressing you was authorized to negotiate with Colonel John Eager Howard,
at that time engaged in laying out his park with a view to a division of it among
his children, and succeeded in obtaining a square of 200 feet at the intersection of
Charles and Monument streets, both of which for a short distance were widened
into avenues, and a circle of about 100 feet in diameter allotted for the site of the
monument in the centre of which now stands an ornamental apex to the City and
is seen in the approach to it from every direction. The avenues, or places as they are
styled, are susceptible of embellishment by shrubbery, etc., leaving at the same time
broad carriageways on each side.

I might be permitted to stop here after having satisfied the request of the Society,
but as there are few now living who recollect the phases of our once small town but
now large and wealthy City, the third in size and commerce in the United States, and
most of the old enough to remember them have neglected to record the changes
which have taken place, I will take leave, even at the risk of being charged with the
garrulity natural to old men, to mention a few for the information of the younger
members of the Historical Society. In doing this, there will be much irregularity; it
would in fact be impossible to note them otherwise, and I trust I shall be excused
for the want of connection in the account, derived from the very nature of the
reminiscences.

I came to Baltimore a child of 4 years old, where my father, at the instigation of
a friend, afterwards his partner in trade, induced him to remove from Dorchester
County on the Eastern shore as a field unworthy of his enterprise, to Baltimore
Town, then a small village. This was Mr. Thomas Russell, whose widow died only
three years ago. We arrived in December 1778 and landed at Fell's Point, at that time
the residence of the principal shipping merchants as well as long after. A friend and
correspondent of my father’s made us lodge with him for a couple of days till he
could get the house in town, which had been taken for him, ready for the recep-
tion of his family. Young as I then was, I never can forget the sparse situation of the
houses at the Point and the cornfields and trees, especially between that place and
the town. On the common above the causeway, where now stands Trinity church,
was afterwards built the Theatre of Hallam and Henry, in which Wignall, Marshall
and his wife and Mr. and Mrs. Morris made their first appearance. The waters of the
basin then flowed up to the causeway, and around by Peter’s Brewery (now Clagett’s) on the banks behind which I have shot many a snipe and blackbird as well as on the marsh which lay between the embouchure of Jones’ Falls and the centre market at Water street. The road from that side of the Falls to Water street at Frederick street, was so often overflowed as to require two or three bridges to cross the streams made by the tide. At the foot of Gay street, within 50 yards of Lombard street, the waters of the basin +rippled on a sandy shore, and there was little interruption to the shore from thence round by the commencement of Commerce street the foot of South at Lombard street, and on to Light street southerly by the City Spring in Charles street to Christopher Hughes’ property at the head of the basin. As a boy I have crabbed with a forked stick the whole way. Even in 1782 when my father sailed for Havre, he embarked his family in a boat in a little dock which came up to Exchange place, within 30 feet of the house I now live in, on the back of which were two old warehouses built by Philip Rogers, which belonged to me, and were pulled down in making the improvements in Water (now Lombard street) on the ground where Mr. Bathurst’s warehouse now stands.  

At the southeast corner of Gay and Water streets, where the Custom house warehouse now is, was an old two story house (as most of the houses in Baltimore were at an early period) occupied by Mr. John Smith, the grandfather of our worthy President, who settled in Baltimore in 1759 according to Griffith; on the opposite northeast corner of Water street still stands an old house, used as a Magistrate’s Office, which was the Custom House when General Otho Holland Williams was Collector. He owned I believe and built all the neighboring houses in Water and Gay streets, at the northeast corner of the same streets where is now the Custom House, was the residence of John Sterett, and a few doors above in Gay street that of his father Mr. James Sterett, and still farther on at the southwest corner of Gay and Second streets was the residence of Mr. Robert Purviance, in which once quartered Count Dillon and other officers of the French Army when in Baltimore.  

There were few other than wooden houses as far as street and down Market to Frederick street. But on the northeast corner of Market and Gay streets still exists an old two story brick house with the date 1786 on the front, the corner of which is D. Mackenzie’s Apothecary shop. This was occupied by the father of our present Treasurer who I believe was born in it, at least his older brother Mr. S. Donaldson was, for I recollect playing in the house with an older brother, long since dead, who mentioned his birth as having occurred the night before. This property belongs to the Patterson family, and has undergone no change of consequence. Market street (now Baltimore) was called from the market house being on it. It extended up from Gay street, where the Watch house and alarm bell formed one end. The assembly room was once the market, and I well recollect my parents going there to a ball. The country people with carts lined both sides of north Gay street, while others occupied the sidewalks in Market street. Some of the ruins are still to be seen in the
neighboring houses. Market street was not then paved, for I well recollect seeing a drummer of the army, when it marched through Baltimore to the South about 1781, nearly swamped in a deep mud hole opposite the corner of North street, and was with his pony extricated with difficulty.

But let us return to the lower part of Gay street and notice the changes which have taken place in that neighborhood. The house lately occupied by Jamart as a hotel, adjoining my residence, was the only one on that side of Water street (now Lombard) for some distance. It was built by Mr. Wm. Spear, the maternal grandfather of our President. The old locust tree which still remains, near my house, formed one of the gate posts to his garden within my recollection. Opposite to Mr. Spear’s was the property of the Sterett family, a brewery built by Mr. James Sterett, who came here in 1762 or 1763. It was twice burned, and rebuilt. It continued to be in a ruinous state till the square from Gay to Second street was purchased by a company and the present Exchange Buildings erected on it. There were no houses on that side of Water street to South and even to Calvert, with one or two exceptions at the corner of Lovely lane, and its corner in Calvert street. I have crossed fences to reach the latter, on the ground occupied now by Mr. Patterson’s property.

At the corner of Exchange alley stood an old house, which with many others of newer construction have been removed to make room for the widening of Lombard street to form the square called Exchange Place. At the southeast corner of Commerce street was the distillery of Mr. Samuel Purviance, who came to Baltimore in 1763. On the opposite corner of Commerce street was a row of warehouses, built on the bank of the basin, from the lower stories of which next the water tobacco was rolled into scows lying within a few yards at the shores. The old Exchange was built here, when the ground was made which now forms Commerce street. In these warehouses were quartered a part of the French Army on its way to Virginia, and the boys were accustomed to obtain cartridges from the soldiers for the purpose of making squibs.

There were some other old houses further on. That especially at the corner of Water and South streets, formerly occupied by the Baltimore Insurance Co., and once the residence of Mr. Daniel Bowly, who built the wharf called after him, which led to the filling up of that part of South street, was to connect it with the town at the west corner of Bank (or Mercer) street is still to be seen the remains of an old two story brick house with a hipped roof, which was once the principal inn of the town and where I have even myself dined with my father and a company of other gentlemen, when a youth. It is now rented for a slop shop. Farther on in Bank street are also the remains of a large yellow wooden house, formerly the residence of Mr. Harry Dorsey Gough, then the richest inhabitant. It is now a tavern. On the south side of Bank street, the name of which is significant, are still some old homes, whose lower back stories were on the shore of the basin, which was afterwards the continuation, of Water street. Beyond Light street on the heights overlooking the basin were here and there old wooden houses, and a row of one-story hipped-roof houses, forming
the lower part of Charles street, which were built by the French refugees from Nova Scotia in the war of 1756 and was long known by the name of French town. There are but two or three of these houses now remaining. One is on the west side of the street near the corner of Lombard street. It formerly had a large shady garden attached to it, where the boys were accustomed to go on Saturday afternoons to eat cakes and drink mead.

After the paving of Market street the improvements made in it by pulling down old buildings and erecting better were so rapid that I can scarcely recollect the former. There is one at the southeast corner of Calvert street, now a lottery office, and one at the corner opposite, formerly a druggist's; between Light street and the alley below it is a large three story (formerly two story) house, which was occupied by Mr. Wm. Hammond, one of the early citizens. The entrance to it was by a high flight of steps to a spacious hall, with a broad old fashioned staircase. The lower part of the house is now converted into shops. At the corner of Light street are still old houses, the west one and its neighbours the property of Colo. Rogers' descendants. The old family mansion, which stood back from the street, with a lawn before it and a railing, gave way a few years ago to the force of improvements, and the range of three story houses, called Colonnade Row, with some others, occupies the place.

At the corner of Charles street on the West side is still the three story brick house belonging to the Hudson family, now occupied as a paper-hanging store. It was one of the best finished houses in the town. From thence to Congress Hall, which extends from the southwest corner of Sharp to the southeast corner of Liberty, I do not recollect any houses.

It always appeared to me a considerable distance without buildings, and from thence westwardly and northwardly, on the rising ground over which Howard, Eutaw and Paca streets run, there was a forest of trees back of which was the race course. In Howard street, the house at the southwest corner of Saratoga street, formerly occupied by Wm. Taylor and Ebenezer Finlay as a flour store, was the only brick house within my recollection. A little to the west of Green street, near Franklin, was the Lux estate, called Chatsworth, a beautiful residence about half a mile from town. It has since been cut up into lots, and laid out in streets, and can scarcely now be recognized; yet in 1790, the late William Cooke was in treaty with George Lux for the purchase of it at £5 or $13.33 per acre. A part of the old house is still visible near the Reister's Town Road, and some of the old locust trees which formed the grand alley in the garden, yet remain in the rear of Mr. Jeremiah Hoffman's house in Franklin street.

To the north or northwest of this was the old Almshouse, only lately pulled down. Back of it I recollect seeing a review of the French Army, when on its way to York. The first St. Paul's church which stood on the Hill west of Jones' falls, was of wood, and when a brick one to replace it was built, it was on part of the church yard back of the houses in Lexington street opposite to Mr. Lorman's, and had its entrance from Lexington street, and the old church turned into a school house, where I received
part of my early education. It was afterwards pulled down to make way for the present structure, which when completed caused the removal of the second church.

The heights back of St. Paul’s and the Roman Chapels on which the Cathedral stands, was covered with fine trees, forming part of the Park of the Belvidere estate. On the summit of this hill in front of the trees the citizens were accustomed to repair and show themselves whenever an alarm of British barges in the river was given, with a view to intimidate by numbers and apparent preparation for defense. I have witnessed such parades more than once.

The Park was the favorite resort of the young people, and the scene of several duels. Mr. David Sterett was shot there by Hatfield, about where Mr. Owings Hoffman’s house stands at the corner of Charles and Madison streets.¹¹

The east side of the Falls, called old town till very lately, was first built. The widow of Mr. John Moale told my father than she recollected when all the west side was in Cornfields, and that there was but one brick house there. In North street, not far from where stood old Christ church, is still to be seen one of the oldest houses in the city. It stands back a little from the street, and extends to the Falls.

In Baltimore street extended, nearly opposite the second Presbyterian church was the first Theatre built in Baltimore and of brick. Some of the ruins were visible within a few years. The first play I ever saw was there, being carried by my father when about six years old. Wall’s Company performed. This was succeeded by the one between the town and Point before mentioned, and that by a wooden one which preceded the present Holliday street theatre.

There are no doubt many other remains of our ancient town to shew the changes and improvements which have made it what it now is; sufficient, however, has been mentioned to give some idea of them, and to induce the present generation, and especially the members of our Society, to note down all those which occur within their own recollection from time to time.

By so doing a mass of information will in the course of a few years be accumulated to aid materially in the history of our thriving city, and facilitate future enquiries.

NOTES

2. 26 North Calvert Street.
3. On Saratoga Street, west of Charles.
4. Northwest corner of Fayette and North Streets.
5. Trinity Street near High.
6. 57 West Lombard Street.
7. John Spear Smith.
8. Two Counts Dillon, of the Regiment Dillon, were with Rochambeau America in 1781. This one here referred to was probably Count Arthur de Dillon (1750–1794), Colonel of the regiment. The de Dillon [1750–1794], See Balch, The French in America, Vol. 2, page 102.
10. This building is described in this magazine, volume 5, page 118, as “Kaminsky’s Tavern,” there erroneously written “Cummins Key’s.”
11. See this magazine, vol. 6, p. 79, for an account of this duel. [ed. note: *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 6 (1912): 79–85.].

Plan of the City and Environs of Baltimore. Warner & Hanna (Charles Varle), 1801. (Baltimore City Life Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

*Charles P. Varle, a French expatriate from Santo Domingo, settled in Maryland in 1798. A trained engineer, local publishers Warner & Hanna hired him to prepare this early view of Baltimore. This view depicts the city Gilmore wrote of in his “Recollections of Baltimore.” Buildings noted in the key on the bottom right include: St. Mary’s Seminary, Methodist, Catholic, Lutheran, and Episcopal churches, the Baltimore Bank, the Merchant’s Exchange, the Custom House, the jail, theatres, markets, and the Observatory on Federal Hill. The New Assembly Room & Library is pictured on the top right.*
Letter from Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826) to Mssrs. Robert Gilmor & Co, May 1, 1791. The future president asked Gilmor’s company to send recently arrived olive trees to Charleston, South Carolina by the “first vessel,” addressed to Monsieurs Brailsford and Morris who would “introduce the culture of the olive trees” to the United States. (MS.3198 B1, Gift of Elizabeth Gilmor Wills and Gavin Gilmor, Maryland Historical Society.)
Robert Gilmore Jr. (1774–1848), merchant, ship owner, and importer amassed a stunning collection of art, rare books and papers, coins, and antiquities. He supported European and American artists and their works, among them Francis Guy, Gilbert Stuart, and Thomas Sully. (Mezzotint, 1830–1835, after a painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence, Medium Prints, Maryland Historical Society.)
Tuesday morning.

My dear Sir,

I am much obliged to you for the flask of Mocha and two bottles of Burgundy sent yesterday. The latter I have not yet tasted. The sherry we drank of yesterday was so much pleased with its flavor that I have requested W. Wilson to send some more for me. I have tried Burgundy in this country of a high flavor, it is a delicate wine and does not bear a sea voyage. When I have tasted the Burgundy, I will let you know my opinion of it.

Although I had not the satisfaction of finding you at home, I had the pleasure of Mrs. Gilmore's company while I stayed. Your picture is a striking likeness and a fine piece of painting. "Animals' speaking?" Mr. Thompson has done equal justice to Mr. Gilmore, not from your displeasure. If failure it must be difficult indeed to do justice to the original and to copy Colonel's countenance."

Yours most truly,

Ch. Carroll of Carrollton.
Left, Charles Carroll of Carrollton (1737–1832) to Robert Gilmor, undated, thanking him for the “flask of Aleatice and two bottles of Burgundy delivered yesterday.” Above, Secretary of State Henry Clay (1777–1852) wrote from the nation’s capital introducing a friend who will be visiting Baltimore. (MS.3198, Gift of Elizabeth Gilmor Wills and Gavin Gilmor, Maryland Historical Society.)
Book Reviews


In New Directions in Slavery Studies, editors Jeff Forret and Christine E. Sears bring together the work of twelve contributors to illustrate the current trends in the study of slavery, whose scholarship has proliferated since the 1970s. Few have successfully undertaken the enormous task of synthesizing the ever-expanding scholarship of slavery studies, some of the most notable—such as Peter Kolchin’s American Slavery, 1619-1877 and Mark M. Smith’s Debating Slavery: Economy and Society in the Antebellum American South, being published in the mid- to late-1990s. It is in this context that New Directions in Slavery Studies becomes even more important with regards to its contributions to the field. The edited collection is divided into three parts, each addressing the discipline’s major themes—commodity, community, and comparison—and suggesting new paths of future inquiry. While a review of each essay is impossible, I want to demonstrate the overview of each section and highlight one article from each that might of interest to both general readership and those with a particular interest in the region of Maryland or the Chesapeake at-large.

The first set of essays addresses the variety of means by which the institution of slavery reduced human beings to property and how this objectification of human bodies allowed masters to commodify them in both the domestic and transatlantic slave trade. Bonnie Martin’s essay “Silver Buckles and Slaves: Borrowing, Lending, and the Commodification of Slaves in Virginia Communities” demonstrates how central slaves were to the borrowing and lending practices of Virginia slaveholders. Martin reviewed more than 3,600 transcripts and abstracts of seventeenth and eighteenth century courthouse records from across the state and compiled data from nearly 6,000 credit transactions and debt contracts from six sample Virginia counties. Through her research, she successfully illustrates how free Virginians “experimented with legal debt decorum and human collateral in order to maintain social harmony in community networks of credit…[revealing] a shift from personal promises to pay to more formal mortgage contracts supported by collateral.” (p. 31) In this way, slaves of the Chesapeake were subject to the same legal rules applied to the selling of land, livestock, etc., commodifying them for the financial security of their owners. Although her research is on Virginia, specifically, parallels can be drawn to the commodification of slaves in Maryland given not only the physical proximity of the two states, but also in the similarity of the slave systems throughout the Chesapeake region.

The essays of part two examine the creation of slave communities, a conception that emerged out of the revisionist scholarship of the 1970s and has become a
hotly debated topic among slavery scholars. In Kathleen M. Hilliard’s “Bonds Burst Asunder: The Transformation of the Internal Economy in Confederate Richmond,” Hilliard demonstrates how the rising fortunes of African Americans in the context of war-torn Richmond during the Civil War illustrated how “day-to-day economic transactions came to resemble the shaded world of illicit economic exchange long exploited by enslaved people—and their masters—throughout the South.” (p. 131) As black and white economic fortunes converged, white anxiety about not only their material standing, but also their political power, falling below that of rising slaves escalated and exposed the inadequacies of the new southern nation. Although Hilliard's focus is on Richmond, the effects felt in the weeks and months after the fall of the Confederacy were widely felt in a rippling effect. Whether in Maryland or in Virginia, South Carolina or Georgia, the “economic, social, and political bonds of the internal economy so carefully tended in mastery's heyday had final burst asunder.” (p. 145)

The final set of essays bring together research and scholarship on comparative slavery, contrasting the “peculiar institution” of American slavery with similar, and in many ways less restrictive practices in places such as Brazil, North Africa, and Cuba. One essay that will be of particular interest to Marylanders is Mariana Dantas’ “Slave Women and Urban Labor in the Eighteenth Century Atlantic World.” In this groundbreaking scholarship that seeks to shift the male-centered portrayal of western slavery “with one in which slave women's labor and agency is acknowledged as equally relevant to the economic and social development of the New World,” Dantas provides a comparative analysis of slave women in Baltimore, Maryland and Sabará, a municipality in the state of Minas Gerais, Brazil. By examining the manumission practices in both towns, Dantas highlights how female slaves in Sabará were able to use their labor as a pathway to freedom—accessing the commodification of their labor in a way that they could apply to emancipation. This contrasts starkly with enslaved women in Baltimore who faced factors, such as strict gender division that emerged as a direct result of industrial production, which prohibited or prevented them from accessing paid jobs (like their Baltimore male counterparts could) or the ability to “leverage their work” to obtain their freedom. (p. 180)

This work expands our knowledge of the history of slavery by introducing both the academic and the general reader to the current state of the field and to new methods of investigation—such as microhistorical investigations of merchant voyages, tracing emigration patterns, or examining insurance and lending records. By dividing the scholarship into three sections, highlighting the discipline's major themes—commodification, community, and comparison—and suggesting new paths of future inquiry, this edited collection successfully provides a critical overview of the field that encompasses a diversity of geographic, temporal, and social landscapes in a clear, accessible way.

Jamie L.H. Goodall
Stevenson University

Schlotterbeck’s work is a broad examination of the everyday lived experiences of the various people-groups who found their home in the colonial South. Particularly ambitious is the scope of this work—the author presents a sweeping view of the Chesapeake, the Lowcountry, the backcountry, Spanish Florida, French Louisiana and interior Native American communities. While Schlotterbeck gives some attention to the period prior to contact, the vast majority of the work examines the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In short, it is a broad synthesis of existing literature on everyday life to which the author contributes his own conclusions.

The work is divided into 10 chapters organized topically with the exception of the first chapter. Chapter 1, titled “New Societies,” examines “the historical context of daily life in the colonial South [and] comprises a series of snapshots starting in 1500, just before Native American contact with Europeans, then every 50 years up to 1750” (1). The next three chapters examine labor, families and possessions, respectively. “Labor” argues that work aided in the creation of southern identities. It “created intersecting divisions of class, race, and gender peculiar to the colonial south” (81). “Families” argues that “colonial settlements survived only because Indian, European, and African men and women continued life by creating new kinds of families. They drew on their particular cultural traditions about organizing family life and faced radically different opportunities and constraints that shaped the array of choices individuals made” (129). “Possessions” claims that consumer goods helped to create both connections among colonials and to the mother country, while at the same time spoke of the distance between these same groups. Colonists were quick to adopt English displays of wealth, yet it was not a unilateral adoption. They did so with respect to regional realities, and the various culture groups within those regions. Thus new world realities shaped the display of opulence. Moreover, conspicuous consumption helped to fuel the southern economy, and united people to England.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 examine food, leisure and bodies, respectively. “Food” contends that “well before 1770, distinctive southern cuisines had emerged from two centuries of colonial encounters between Native Americans, Europeans, and Africans with important Caribbean influences” (202). Southern dishes developed from who was in the social mix and to what they had access. “Leisure” encompassed both the pastimes in which southerners engaged and the time to do them. Much like work, the expression of leisure divided given the particularities of class, race and gender thus contributing to the emerging Southern identities. “Bodies” argues that notions of the body became justification for enslavement. Adornments of the body were a way to display wealth, class and privilege—and similarly used to express justification for the lower orders’ unfavorable place at the bottom of the social hierarchy.
The next two chapters examine beliefs and disorder. “Beliefs” contends that by “1770 transatlantic religions and pan-ethnic faiths made colonial Southerners more divided in religious beliefs and practices than ever, yet had also laid foundations for southern evangelical religion” (324). In the end “shared beliefs and worship styles lessened class but not caste divisions. By 1800, religious freedom and voluntary congregations toppled church establishments’ hierarchical order, but evangelical egalitarianism waned and endorsed a racial hierarchy of dominant whites, enslaved blacks, and dispossessed natives” (325). Unlike the other chapters, “Disorder” is constructed around 15 imaginary newspaper articles that “exemplify the disorder of everyday life and negotiations over autonomy, economic opportunities, gender roles, collective rights, religion and freedom. Arranged chronologically, they include state violence …disorderly servants, slaves, women and settlers; and uprisings by Indians… Omitted are conflicts and deviant behavior that are part of every human society” (332).

The concluding chapter, “Identities”, interprets the origins of southern distinctiveness as arising from daily life. Schlotterbeck presents a compelling portrait of a “colonial South [that] developed before there could be self-conscious southerners. Religion, ethnicity, language, province, and, above all, attachments to places—building new homes in a new and changing land—defined southerners’ identities before the American Revolution. Almost every marker of future southern distinctiveness arose from the colonial South’s ethnic and racial diversity and geographic variety. Dynamic tensions arose from paired opposite traits that in the ninetenth century became hallmarks of southern identity” (383). Thus it is this bifurcation to which Schlotterbeck points as the essence of southern identity—emerging in everyday life during the colonial period.

Schlotterbeck’s interpretations are well-grounded and work in tandem to show the dichotomy of the tensions in the south—the same factor pushing a community apart, such as stratifying it along class and gender lines, helped create a unique patchwork of cohesiveness. In other words, diverse identities comprise southern identity. Overall, the work is detailed, commanding considerable breadth, yet accessible. And, the comparisons made between the emerging southern regions make it a robust addition to courses such as those on Colonial America or the South. Clearly written with complex ideas, this is a really smart work benefitting any student of Maryland’s early history. Schlotterbeck both explores how Maryland differed from its neighboring Southern colonies and suggest how these differences contributed in the creation of a distinct southern identity of which Maryland continues to be a part.

Amanda Miracle
Emporia State University

In *Ireland in the Virginia Seas*, Audrey Horning takes on a challenging undertaking in comparing the British plantations in Ireland to the settlement of the Chesapeake and Albemarle regions of North America. She seeks to address the long-standing debate over whether English plantation schemes in Ireland can and should be viewed as precursors to English colonization of the Americas. Horning builds upon David Beers Quinn’s and Nicholas Canny’s studies of English colonial attitudes and the native populations impacted by their ambitious schemes. Horning’s contribution to these earlier works is that she, as a historical archaeologist, utilizes documentary sources and material culture to paint a more detailed portrait of these endeavors. Archaeology allows her to delve more deeply into the lives, not only the plantation leaders, but of local populations and migrants drawn into these colonial experiments.

In Ireland, Horning’s study spans the late sixteenth-century settlement schemes of men such as Sir Thomas Smith, Ralph Lane, and the Earl of Essex in Munster as well as the creation of the Ulster plantation through the period of the 1641 Rebellion. In the Americas, she begins with sixteenth century interactions between Europeans and Native Americans, especially the failed Roanoke colony, and then explores the Jamestown settlement through the mid-seventeenth century. On both sides of the sea, she re-approaches the assimilation/acculturation/hybridization models of colonization and cultural interaction and shows, through architecture, economics, religion, and warfare, that native and migrant populations dynamically influenced each other. Horning challenges the presumption of hegemonic English cultural domination as not only inaccurate, but woefully simplistic. While this insight is not new, her use of historical archaeology to explore the use, re-use, and transformation of native dwellings, the role of religion and language, the presence of native and European manufactured household goods, trading systems, and warfare presents a dynamic understanding of these complex relationships.

Two chapters address sixteenth-century interactions in the Irish Munster plantations and the Chesapeake/Albemarle regions. Horning examines ill-formed English attempts to colonize, endeavors that reveal a poor understanding of the goals and processes of colonization, not to mention the willingness of native populations to tolerate an English presence. Horning does make the important point that English embroilment with the Irish and Native Americans did not begin when late 16th century colonizers arrived, but spanned decades, if not centuries, of European exploration, contact, and economic interaction. Colonization schemes were more complex and challenging, however, designed to make wealthy men wealthier, but also to assert an English presence in both regions as a foil to European competitors such as the Spanish and French.
The third and fourth chapters move into the 17th century schemes in Ulster and Jamestown that persisted, but could not be deemed unbridled successes. Arthur Chichester and Thomas Phillips envisioned what the Irish colonization schemes should look like— English control over vast tracts of land, establishing towns as manufacturing and trading centers, and the re-purposing of Irish church and manorial lands and buildings as symbols of English control. They intended to populate these plantations with English migrants, but they never achieved this to any significant extent. Instead they became dependent on Irish tenants, and lowland Scots, whose loyalty was weak at best. Rather than driving out Gaelic leaders, they found Irish willing to work within the parameters of English law to maintain their position. While this goal did not necessarily work out well for Irish leaders such as O’Cahan, the inability of the English to eliminate Gaelic leadership inevitably led to ongoing conflict.

In Jamestown, involving some of the same investors who had dabbled in Ireland, poor planning, weak leadership, and ongoing violence between native and immigrant populations hampered the colony’s growth. The violence ultimately resulted in royal oversight, as private investors were incapable of managing, and keeping alive, the immigrants. While Jamestown ultimately flourished with the discovery of tobacco as a profitable commodity, it was a slow and torturous process to build a sustainable population and to find a way to co-exist with Powhatan and other Algonquin tribes. That this colony ultimately came to be dominated by European (and African) settlers owes as much to the great distance required to abandon this undertaking as it does to the effective management on the part of the colonial investors and/or the crown.

This study fleshes out many details arising from Horning’s archaeological research. But the book can be frustrating because it feels as though she is attempting to combine apples and oranges into a structured landscape, something that is impossible given the enormous difference between the Irish and Native American populations and their understanding of the English. Similarities exist, absolutely, but it is very difficult to compare Powhatan’s management of English encroachment with the willingness of the Irish to work within their shared understanding of English law. Similarly, the failure of the English to make colonization of Ireland appealing to their own population, and the ease with which those attempts could be abandoned, cannot really be compared to the death rates and enormous challenges of abandoning the Chesapeake settlements and returning to England. While Horning seeks to address the issue of the “other,” this comparison also feels awkward. Perhaps the strongest link between these two endeavors is that many of the leaders and colonization goals arise from a relatively small group of wealthy English leaders. This study shows, however, that their vision and management on both sides of the sea was highly flawed.

Alexa Silver

*Delaware State University*
Imagine you are enslaved, and you make the difficult and dangerous decision to run. You leave most or all your family and friends behind. Or maybe members of your family were sold off, and you were next. You encounter unfamiliar roads and rivers; with a combination of luck and cunning, you reach a free state. You encounter strangers. They might ignore you, or they might betray you. With luck, they will offer you food and helpful information. With luck and cunning, you will evade prowling slave catchers and kidnappers. With luck, you will connect with a network of secretly seditious men and women opposed to fugitive slave laws who will assist you in reaching safety.

Scott Mingus’s book, The Ground Swallowed Them Up: Slavery and the Underground Railroad in York, Pa., is a welcomed addition to a larger work in progress—a renewed effort among historians to develop a better understanding of the Underground Railroad (UGRR) and its related history. Mingus’s compilation of narratives about freedom seekers, those who assisted them, and those who pursued them is assembled from a wealth of primary and secondary sources. The book centers on one county, but offers more than local history. Many of the episodes extend beyond the boundaries of York County, and relevant connections to surrounding areas are made, as freedom seekers stayed on the move and networks extended well beyond any one county. The chronological arrangement of material is framed by important national and regional events related to the conflict over slavery, fugitive slaves, slave catching, and kidnapping.

For readers interested in this topic, many of the stories are absorbing. Some stories portray the cunning and courage of freedom seekers, and the network of agents, black and white. Other stories portray hostility, betrayal, brutality, and greed from slave catchers, kidnappers, and citizens who sided with them. For historians, the book is a useful collection of stories and sketches of agents gathered from multiple sources.

For those interested in Maryland history, any detailed history of freedom seekers and the Underground Railroad in Pennsylvania counties bordering Maryland will include Maryland history, and this book, with references to Maryland on nearly every page, does not disappoint. The conflict between Maryland and Pennsylvania over fugitive slaves, slave catching, and kidnapping is an ongoing theme. Slaveholders, slave catchers, and kidnappers mentioned are often Marylanders. Many of the freedom seekers entering Pennsylvania fled from Maryland, their stories of freedom, or capture, culminating north of the Mason-Dixon Line.

Collecting and recounting a comprehensive, straightforward record of Underground Railroad related stories that touch on York County is a lengthy undertaking.
This overview occasionally sacrifices a further explanation of some underlying issues. Varying levels of verification characterize nineteenth and early twentieth century accounts. Some are solidly documented and others require closer scrutiny and fact checking. Mingus frequently used qualified statements to express caution with some of the material.

Piecing together a comprehensive national history of an activity in which secrecy was imperative creates a challenge for historians. Assisting freedom seekers, especially after passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, was a dangerous activity that could result in imprisonment and heavy fines, and possibly retaliatory violence. The risk discouraged the keeping of written records that could expose the whereabouts of freedom seekers, and reveal hiding places and other agents in the network. In the nineteenth century, and the early decades of the twentieth, many stories about the Underground Railroad were collected and over the years generally accepted at face value. Our understanding of the Underground Railroad, however, has been clouded by myths, legends, speculations, folklore, puffery, and an oversight in the role of African Americans in securing their own freedom and the freedom of others. After Larry Gara criticized the distorted perception of the UGRR in The Liberty Line: The Legend of the Underground Railroad (Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1961), historians began taking a closer look at this important chapter in American history. Scholarship since Gara’s assessment has constructed a more accurate, though still incomplete, picture. The need for a fuller perspective has spurred increased attention to regional and local episodes. Each county history of the UGRR, each local story, either verified or a trigger for a deeper investigation, add useful pieces to form a composite of the Underground Railroad and related topics. Mingus’s The Ground Swallowed Them Up makes a valuable contribution to that effort.

Milt Diggins
Independent Scholar

_The Limits of Tyranny: Archaeological Perspectives on the Struggle against New World Slavery._ Edited By James A. Delle. (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2015. 268 Pages. Illustrations, bibliography, notes, index. Cloth, $84.95.)

_The Limits of Tyranny: Archaeological Perspectives on the Struggle against New World Slavery_ (2015) explores links between historical archaeology and the study of slave resistance through three broad analytical categories: physical resistance, moral struggle, and marronage. Taking a general queue from Frederick Douglass regarding the limitations on tyranny created through persistent opposition, the edition locates an expanding area for slave studies in nine diverse and scholastically ranging chapters. Offering essentially Marxist readings of forms of resistance, this publication
Maryland Historical Magazine rarely provides innovative theoretical analyses, proposing instead a public history presentation with hopes of changing social memory about the levels of resistance to slavery within North America and the Caribbean.

The publication follows in the path of archaeological analyses of power and space within slave studies that include works by Clifton Ellis, Lydia Marshall, Theresa Singleton, Akinwumi Ogundiran, Alexandra Chan, John Chenoweth, Leland Ferguson, James Deetz, and earlier work from many authors included within the collection. Often uneven, the edition blurs lines between archaeology, in the material sense of digging in the ground, and historical archaeology in the Foucauldian sense of excavating patterns of power and knowledge. Some chapters expose direct links between how material archaeology can offer new ways to interpret slave resistance, while other chapters rarely discuss such physical substances and instead explore historiographical questions along already well-trodden scholarly paths. The edition is separated into three sections that follow a general editorial introduction. Each segment is also introduced through a concise and often poetic editorial outline.

The first section looks upon direct forms of physical resistance to slavery in North America and the Caribbean. In chapter one, Delle studies the Christiana Riot of 1851 through the lens of historical memory related to material culture of the revolt, exemplified through a single gunflint found during a public archaeology project in 2007-2008. Delle asserts the importance of counter-hegemonic social memory of the Christiana, Pennsylvania resistance for the continued remembrance of the bureaucratic horrors of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. Holly Norton's following chapter, despite being misplaced by a typographical error within the table of contents, uses broad theories of the contingent event to analyze a slave revolt on the Danish island of St. Jan in 1733. The chapter explores how maps were used as instruments of power in the wake of the rebellion as plantation owners on nearby St. Croix shifted focus from exterior mercantilist concerns with foreign invasion to interior concerns with capitalist management of labor. Chapter three, from Samantha Bardoe, analyzes the many editions of Samuel Martin's An Essay on Plantership to show how slave resistance on Antigua, including the murder of Martin's father in 1701, showed the younger Martin that forms of spatialized paternalism would better increase production on his plantations.

Section two shifts heavily upon North America of the nineteenth century to study the abolitionist movement through diverse forms of material culture. Linda Ziegenbein pursues the life of David Ruggles, an often forgotten abolitionist, through newspaper discourse about his radical egalitarian beliefs. Herein, Ruggles is analyzed through broad readings of the Underground Railroad through Weberian and Foucauldian ideas of social power to assert the individual within structures of inequality and resistance. In chapter five, Delle and Mary Ann Levine offer the model piece for the objectives of the collected edition. The authors search the historic sites around Thaddeus Stevens’ home in Pennsylvania to argue that Stevens and his confidant,
Lydia Hamilton Smith, were active within the Underground Railroad. Linking archaeology to public memory, the authors offer striking evidence of a cistern on the property that connects the egalitarian Congressman with the project of freedom's railway. Chapter six, from Douglas V. Armstrong, defines a similar public project, through excavations at Harriet Tubman's estate. This chapter hopes to broaden terminology related to the site to assert that Tubman's home in Auburn, New York was a farmstead rather than a singular household. Expanding this denotation can advance how Tubman continued her work against injustice through creating a home for the elderly, and attempting to establish a school for African American girls.

The final section focuses on maroonage in a rather introductory manner. All the chapters in this section explore the difficulty of archaeological research regarding a population that was predominantly hiding from discovery. Though an engaging premise, the section lacks much novelty. Chapter seven, from Daniel Sayers, offers a well-illustrated, consistently engaging, and in-depth analysis of archaeological evidence of long trajectories of possible maroonage in the Great Dismal Swamp. A more uneven chapter follows from Uzi Baram, who studies maroonage in the Angola region of Florida's Gulf Coast through the theories of Sherry Ortner, the history of the Seminole Wars, and the tactic of “falling back.” Chapter nine, from Cheryl White, does little to tie up the edition, while spending much wind critiquing studies of African retention and creolization.

The three chapters including work from Delle and Armstrong make *Limits of Tyranny* an interesting and attractive edition. Other highlights include the chapters by Sayers, Norton, and Bardoe. Often, the rest of the edition encounters difficulty finding space between the goals of public historical archaeology and the theoretical engagement with slave studies that is often touched upon, but rarely explored through novel interpretation. The reader is therefore left with a disjointed edition, which still offers significant highlights that portray links between archaeology and social memory that can enter the public sphere as activist history.

Andrew Kettler

*University of South Carolina*


If you like the narcissistic personalities in *House of Cards*, the political intrigue in *Game of Thrones*, or the personal lives of the ruling elite in *Downton Abbey*, then you will probably enjoy reading Rachel Shelden's behind the scenes look the political and social lives of congressmen on the eve of the Civil War. The legislation and events of the era are well known; and provide subjects for the book's chapters:
the Wilmot Proviso, the Mexican-American War, the Compromise of 1850, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the “Bleeding Summer,” the Lecompton Constitution, and the “Secession Winter.” In all the scholarship on these events, Shelden claims to be the first to investigate the question about how these legislators’ personal relationships affected the passage or defeat of the era’s landmark legislation. She invites the reader, as Alabama Senator William King once said, “Behind the curtain where great men relaxed” to construct her thesis (81). She argues, “[The] social and cultural life [in Washington, D.C.] was a critical part of the way that politicians engaged with the sectional and ideological struggles of the antebellum era” (2). Those interested in Maryland legislators can find several supporting characters throughout the book including Thomas Ligon (Democrat), James A. Pearce (Whig, Opposition, then Democrat), Thomas Pratt (Whig) [known in DC as the “King of Poker”], John P. Kennedy (Whig), Henry Winter Davis (American Party), James Morrison Harris (American), and Reverdy Johnson (pre-war Whig), although none of these men play major roles in the narrative.

Shelden combed through manuscripts of former congressmen in archives across the country to gather evidence of the multi-faceted, male social relationships of the nation’s lawmakers. The picture she paints is one where politicians, irrespective of party or section, worshipped, boarded, dined, fraternized, gambled, and drank (sometimes to excess) together. Antebellum Congress was an environment that fostered personal friendships across section and party, like Abraham Lincoln of Illinois and Alexander Stephens of Georgia, or Whig William Seward and Democrat Jefferson Davis. Shelden correctly points out that much, if not more, political deal making took place outside of the halls of Congress as it did upon Capitol Hill.

The monograph, which is based upon the author’s Ph.D. dissertation, wrestles with and tries to counter the long-standing interpretation of antebellum federal politicians as the “blundering generation” whose uncompromising rhetoric, posturing, and lack of bi-partisanship leadership led to a war that cost the country well over half a million lives. Shelden critically evaluates the oft-cited Congressional Globe as a historical source, and concludes that many of the partisan speeches delivered on the House and Senate floors were “buncombe,” or speeches given for the benefit of the representative’s constituencies (36–38, 202). Certainly, this was often the case. Lincoln’s famous “Spot Resolution” is a good example of this since few people in Washington seemed to notice the freshman Congressman’s speech, but that did not stop Lincoln from circulating the resolution to newspapers in Illinois (43).

Shelden has a point about Congressional speeches being “buncombe.” However, it seems difficult to maintain that position in the context of Rep. Preston Brooks caning Sen. Charles Sumner in 1856 in response to a perceived slight from one of Sumner’s senate speeches. From her research, Shelden determined that the “caning of Sumner” had more of a polarizing effect outside of Washington than within the Capitol. She drew this conclusion because “congressional relations quickly returned
to normal,” Congressmen ceased writing about the incident within a few months, and in-context Washington was what one Congressman described as “the most immoral and corrupt place in the Union” where duels and violence were commonplace (124-25). Shelden may well be right based upon the evidence she examined, but the reaction of Congressmen that she describes seems psychologically unnatural for persons witnessing or experiencing violent trauma.

Yet, that statement might be in fact true of her cast of characters, many of whom seem narcissistic. In her last chapter, Shelden writes about the Southern Congressmen resigning their seats. Contemporaries described these men as “ill from distress of mind,” “very sad about it,” and rueing the impending decrease in the quality of Washington’s social life (168). Jefferson Davis wrote, “Civil war has only horror for me . . . but whatever circumstances demand shall be met as a duty” (168). One would think that if the Civil War was such a horror for him, he would have worked harder in his duty as a senator to work with his friends from the North and across the aisle to find a peaceful resolution, rather than assume leadership of the Confederacy. While Shelden masterfully assembles great evidence, her final chapter in some ways betrays her thesis, because in the end the “Washington brotherhood” was impotent, insular, and indeed a “blundering generation,” who absconded from leadership at the most crucial moment in the nation’s history.

S Chandler Lighty

Indiana State Library
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