At 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.

Martha Frick Symington Sanger is an eleventh-generation descendant of pioneer William Hambleton and a great-granddaughter of Henry Clay Frick. She is the author of *Henry Clay Frick: An Intimate Portrait*, *The Henry Clay Frick Houses*, and *Helen Clay Frick: Bittersweet Heiress*. 
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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**Cover:** Frederick Douglass: Bicentennial Birthday.

*Maryland born Frederick Douglass (1818–1895) remains among the most respected and honored abolitionists, authors, and equal rights advocates of the nineteenth century. In his first autobiography, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass (1845), he wrote “I have no accurate knowledge of my age, never having seen any authentic record containing it.” He knew nothing of his father and was separated from his mother “... when I was but an infant, [a] common custom, in the part of Maryland from which I ran away, to part children from their mothers at a very early age. I do not recollect ever seeing my mother by the light of day, she would lie down with me, and get me to sleep, but long before I waked she was gone.” Douglass eventually chose February 14 as the date of his birth but could not confirm the year as 1817 or 1818. In 1896, the year after his death, researchers confirmed 1818 as the year of his birth, noted in a Talbot County farm ledger. (Frederick Douglass, *The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass, Written by Himself* [Hartford Conn.: Park Publishing Company, 1884].)*
Etching of Supreme Court Justice Gabriel Duvall, aged 70, showing the straight lip line often associated with tooth loss. (Albert Rosenthal, 1822. The Collection of The Supreme Court of the United States).
The Search for a Justice: Gabriel Duvall of Maryland

DOUGLAS W. OWSLEY AND SANDRA S. SCHLACHTMEYER

He was known to General Washington and was befriended by General Lafayette. He was an early and enthusiastic supporter of Thomas Jefferson and maintained his prominence to be appointed by James Madison to the Supreme Court. His life of influence was clearly worth commemorating with an appropriate marker or memorial, if only his grave site could be found.

Gabriel Duvall spent most of his ninety-two years (1752–1844) in the public eye but in death has proved elusive. Of the 102 justices who have died since the Supreme Court was established, Duvall is the only one who does not have a known grave site. He served twenty-three years as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the young United States after serving terms as both a Maryland and a national Representative. Despite his renown, his funeral is undocumented and his grave location is uncertain. He asked to be buried in the family cemetery, but there is no marker or headstone for him there — or anywhere else.¹

As arguably the most illustrious of their large and prominent Maryland-based family, the many Duvall descendants wanted to honor Gabriel. David Duvall, president of the descendants group in 1986, acknowledged, “The society has wanted to find Gabriel for more than 30 years.” If the grave could be found, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission agreed to save it from the destruction from a local road encroaching on the ancestral cemetery. The commission, as operators of a museum on land that was his property, planned to rebury Duvall on the site. Everyone involved eagerly shared the same goal to find his burial among the many unmarked graves.²

In 1986, the Society of Mareen Duvall Descendants, named for the immigrant who established the family, received permission to excavate the section of the ancestral cemetery that held Gabriel Duvall’s immediate family and to remove remains to the Justice’s property. Proclaiming success, the society held a press conference featuring a skull and set of bones assigned to the Justice. But, analyses of artifacts from the grave as well as comparative osteological information on nineteenth-century Americans suggest that the search for the Justice may not be concluded. Years of effort, to reclaim the ancestral cemetery and to reconstruct events of the time, have brought dissent on whether the Justice has been found.³

Douglas W. Owsley, Ph.D., is a Curator and the Division Head and Sandra Schlachtmeyer is a Research Specialist for Physical Anthropology at the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of Natural History in Washington, D.C.
Gabriel Duvall’s Early Public Years

Justice Gabriel Duvall is the best known of a very large family that his great-grandfather, a French Huguenot who emigrated from Scotland, established in the seventeenth century. Over time, family members adopted various spellings of the name, Duval and DuVal among them, but Gabriel always used the straightforward, single-word, double L version.

Gabriel, the sixth of ten children, was born and grew up on his father’s 150 acre plantation in rural Prince George’s County, Maryland but left early for nearby Annapolis and at nineteen was the Clerk of the General Court at that provincial capital. Not only did he study law under John Hall, Esquire, who practiced in the General Court, but Gabriel also took an active part in the area’s movements toward independence. During the Revolutionary War he served in Annapolis as muster master and commissary of stores for Maryland’s militia. When provincial governance switched to the Maryland Convention in 1775, Gabriel was chosen as its clerk and also as Clerk of the Council of Safety, its executive arm. From then on, Gabriel Duvall was never without a public office, either city, state, or national.4

Along with his public positions, Gabriel maintained a private law practice after admittance to Maryland’s bar in 1778. With his specialty in the area of wills and estates, he regularly sold property and goods to satisfy creditors or to fulfill legacy terms and, after the Revolution, in 1781, he became part of the Commission for the Sale of Confiscated British Property. The next year, he was elected to the Maryland State Executive Council where he served (1782–1786) until elected to the Maryland House of Delegates in 1787. He served there until 1793 but at the same time was a prosecutor in the Mayor’s Court of Annapolis (1781–1784) as well as Recorder in Annapolis (1788–1801). In addition, he and four others were selected to represent Maryland at the 1787 Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, but all declined the appointment.5

Gabriel may have had a personal reason for staying in Maryland then: he married Mary Frances Bryce on July 24, 1787. The couple lived in Annapolis but may have spent time at his family’s rural home which Gabriel owned by 1785. Their son, Edmund Bryce, was born in January 1790, but Mary died that March at age 29. The newborn son was sent to live on the plantation in Prince George’s County with his grandparents, in the same 28-foot by 24-foot frame house in which Gabriel grew up.6

Gabriel Duvall’s National Public Years

After Mary’s death, Gabriel remained in Annapolis, still a delegate to the Maryland House, to maintain his law practice. His influential leadership led to his unopposed election, in 1794, to the House of Representatives in the Third Congress of the United States. He rented rooms in Philadelphia, the new nation’s capital, where he met and married his landlady’s daughter, Jane Gibbon, in May 1795.
The couple stayed in Philadelphia through Gabriel’s term in the Fourth Congress, then moved to Annapolis when he became a judge of the General Court of Maryland. In public esteem, this was the state’s principal court, dealing with areas of his expertise: debts, land titles, estates, and common law criminal offenses. During this time, Gabriel joined the national political scene in 1796 as an elector for Thomas Jefferson, using his oratory and pamphleteering to aid the democratic cause. Even though Jefferson lost, Gabriel outpolled opposition elector Charles Carroll, of the locally influential Carroll family, by 500 votes in a district that included Baltimore City, Annapolis, and Anne Arundel County. In 1800, when Jefferson won, Gabriel was “as prolific with the pen as he was tireless on the speaker’s platform.” As a Jefferson elector once again, Gabriel took all but 440 of the nearly 2,000 votes cast in Baltimore, another indication of his continued effectiveness.7

By this time, the city of Washington, D.C. was built up sufficiently for Congress to hold its first session in the nation’s new capital. Midway through Jefferson’s first term (1802), Gabriel accepted appointment as Comptroller of the National Treasury, a post he continued when James Madison was elected president in 1809. Gabriel and Jane moved to Washington and, in joining the Washington social circles, Jane Duvall often played cards with First Lady Dolley Madison. “The round of teas, outings, visits, balls and other functions brought them into constant contact with many prominent figures, the builders and formulators of the young government. Cards left by callers bore such recognizable names as Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Stephen Decatur, William Wirt, Roger Brooke Taney, and Martin Van Buren.” Jane cemented in social circles the stature Gabriel attained in political circles.8

Gabriel’s son, Edmund, may have visited his father’s Washington home from time to time and Jane’s mother, Mary Gibbon, came from Philadelphia to live with her daughter and son-in-law around 1804. When Mary Gibbon died in 1810, she was buried in a section of the ancestral cemetery established for Gabriel’s family, even though Gabriel and Jane were not living on the plantation at the time.

In 1811, when Gabriel was sixty years old, President James Madison appointed him as the seventeenth Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. The seven Court members were also required to hear cases in Circuit Courts, which meant that Gabriel, assigned Maryland and Delaware, traveled to Baltimore and New Castle every year after the Supreme Court adjourned for the season.

The following year, Gabriel resumed construction on a two-story Federal-style red brick home on the land that he had expanded into a plantation of more than 600 acres sitting along the Annapolis Road between Annapolis, Bladensburg, and Washington. After the British burned Washington’s public buildings in 1814, Gabriel and Jane moved permanently to the plantation in Prince Georges County, and by 1816 he called his home Marietta. By the mid-nineteenth century the acreage was devoted to tobacco as a cash crop, but Gabriel was also known as a breeder of race horses, in the company of other breeders such as Supreme Court Chief Justice John
Marshall, Thomas Jefferson, Virginia Congressman John Randolph, and French General Lafayette.\(^9\)

Gabriel sat for all the Supreme Court’s sessions and was included in the political and social Washington events of the day, among them the ceremonies honoring Lafayette’s return to Washington in 1824 as a celebrated hero of the Revolution. The festivities included a weapon salute, causing Gabriel’s startled horses to bolt and hit a tree. The runaway carriage shattered, leaving the seventy-four-year-old justice unconscious with an arm broken in two places. A concerned Lafayette called on the recovering Duvall a few days after the accident. There are no reports of disability from the accident.\(^10\)

During these years, Gabriel’s son Edmund married Augusta McCausland in 1818 and built a home on the Duvall plantation, where there were now three: the original mansion where Gabriel’s unmarried sisters Sarah and Delilah lived; Gabriel’s home; and Edmund’s. Edmund tried establishing a law practice in Baltimore, changed the spelling of his name to DuVal, and became prominent in local Maryland politics, but by 1829 required medical intervention to address mental and physical health issues. His father wrote, “... his disease was too deeply seated to admit to remedy. For several of the last years of his life, he had labored under severe and heavy affliction.” Edmund traveled to Philadelphia for treatment hoping to “be restored to sanity and health” but
came home only somewhat improved. He returned to Philadelphia for additional treatment in January 1831, but died there within weeks. His body was sent to the plantation and buried in the family cemetery on February 11, 1831. His children, Marcus (age 7), Edmund Bryce (5), and Mary Frances (3), were joined by Gabriella Augusta, born in July. Augusta seemingly never fully recovered from that birth, her ninth pregnancy in thirteen years, and she died a year later, in October 1832. In her will she named Gabriel guardian of the two boys and her sister guardian of the two girls. However, her brother-in-law refused to take the baby who then stayed with her brothers at their grandfather’s home. Gabriel added a two-story section to the back of Marietta for them, giving the house its T shape. 

All this while, Gabriel, now in his eighties, continued as a Supreme Court associate justice, not speaking often and writing only those decisions directly in his areas of expertise. John Marshall, Chief Justice for all of Gabriel’s term, consulted at length with all of the justices but authored most of the decisions himself. Gabriel’s increasing deafness made it harder for him to engage in the formal arguments, but his contributions to decisions continued to be valued. He was reluctant to retire because he feared someone less committed to the Constitution would be appointed to his place. 

---

Argyle, 1836. Published for the New York Spirit of the Times Newspaper, Bred by Colonel Edmund B. Duvall of Maryland in 1830, the Property of Don Pierce, M. Butler and Company, S.C., Engraved after 1875 by Robert Hinshelwood, after a painting by Edward Troye. (Courtesy, Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 1955.2093.)
Gabriel continued to run his plantation and to maintain his interest in horse racing and breeding. The celebrated thoroughbred, Argyle, winner of races from Maryland to Georgia, was foaled in 1830 at Marietta under Edmund’s ownership. The horse won multiple purses worth thousands of dollars in a day for new owners in South Carolina and Georgia. Just as Argyle was ending his racing career in 1840, Gabriel asked the editor of American Turf Register for a portrait of the valuable horse. Gabriel contributed many articles and letters to the American Turf Register and Sporting Magazine and in 1833 he made, at the editor’s suggestion, sixteen minor corrections to the “American Race Turf Register, Sportsman’s Herald, and General Stud Book.” The editor commented about Gabriel, “to whom readers of this magazine are much indebted for valuable information, and who is ever ready to communicate in the most obliging manner, his knowledge of races and racehorses of the olden times. His memory runs back farther, and embraces more minute details, and with greater fidelity, than that of any other person. Its tenacity is almost incredible.”

After a short illness in spring of 1834, Jane Gibbon Duvall died at age seventy-seven, asking to be buried near her mother in the family cemetery. A previous governor of Maryland was among her pallbearers indicating that the Justice was still well regarded and active in political circles. The next year, 1835, Gabriel resigned from the Supreme Court, after being assured that President Andrew Jackson would replace him with his fellow Marylander, compatriot, Roger Brooke Taney.

Gabriel continued caring for his grandchildren and paying for the boys’ educations at various area schools. In 1840, he drafted a will that carefully divided his large plantation between the two boys, paid the educations of all four grandchildren, and divided more than fourteen thousand dollars in cash among the four. Ever precise, he later added codicils apportioning recently purchased land to the two boys and withholding Edmund’s bequest until he turned twenty-one.

When Gabriel died at his home on March 6, 1844, the Maryland District Court adjourned immediately and resolved to wear mourning badges for the remainder of the session to honor their colleague and former chief justice. The resolution also noted that Gabriel was “distinguished for impartiality as a judge, integrity as a man, and usefulness as a citizen.” The United States Supreme Court also adjourned on hearing the news and pledged to wear mourning badges, declaring “... few having brought to the judicial function sounder learning, applied with sounder judgment to the practical administration of justice, with a pure and unmixed love of justice for its own sake, with conduct and manners at once benignant, firm, and dignified, the genuine result of inbred dignity, firmness, and independence of soul.” Justice Joseph Storey, who was sworn in with Gabriel, recalled “his firm integrity and independence, and his sound judgement, so eloquently and truly stated at the bar.”

Despite Gabriel’s renown and the high regard in which he was held, there is no record of his funeral or his grave site other than the request in his will that his body be “decently buried in the old family burial ground.”
The Duvall Family Cemetery

The plantation cemetery lies about a half-mile from Marietta, a ten-minute walk for Gabriel and his grandchildren to visit their parents’ graves. More significantly, the cemetery was only 200 feet (half a football field) from the “old mansion” where both Gabriel and his son Edmund grew up and where Gabriel’s two unmarried sisters lived. Some accounts refer to the cemetery as “Wigwam,” a name Marcus DuVal gave the property when he inherited it. The graves in the cemetery may have had markers originally, but only three remain in the southern section and none remain in the older, northern section.

Without a tombstone or marker for his grave, the home Gabriel built on the plantation served as his personal memorial. Locally, he is remembered in the DuVal High School in Lanham, Maryland and in the Duvall Wing of the courthouse in Upper Marlboro, Maryland. In downtown Baltimore, his legal acumen is recognized in the Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr. Courthouse. Half a century after his death, a committee of Judges of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City included him in a group of twenty-four influential lawyers whose names are inscribed on the circular frieze of the sixth floor courtroom. But eventually, his name and his family’s cemetery faded from memory. Suburbs filled the rural land, newly created residential streets and widened highways encroached on the cemetery, and the unattended burial grounds, long neglected and overgrown, became targets for vandals and mischief makers.¹⁸

In 1983, William Thompson, a Maryland member of the Society of Mareen Duvall Descendants, knew the group’s interest in finding the justice’s grave and introduced Richard Muzzrole to the Marietta property and to the society. Although not a formally trained archaeologist, he had been hired to help with an archaeological dig of an iron furnace and learned on the job. Fascinated by this experience, he then joined the excavation of a famous glass factory in Frederick, Maryland and, three years later, in 1965, the then-curator of ceramics at the Smithsonian Institution sent him to conduct rescue archaeology in nearby Alexandria, Virginia. Described as “an archaeological aide with the Smithsonian,” Muzzrole helped with excavating that city’s tavern-square block. The volume of ceramics and glass recovered on the main street there was so large that Muzzrole enlisted local citizens as volunteers to help. In 1971, when the Smithsonian withdrew financial support for the project, a group of citizens pooled their resources to continue to pay Muzzrole’s salary. His work was so valued that, without a college or high school diploma, he became Alexandria’s City Archaeologist, a post he held until 1975.¹⁹

After several years working on other archaeological projects, notably the cellar at Gunston Hall near Alexandria and with Ivor Noël Hume of Colonial Williamsburg, Muzzrole wrote to David Duvall, then president of the Duvall Society, and to John M. Walton, Jr., then Coordinator of the History Division of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, to suggest four separate exploratory proposals involving buildings and paths around Marietta house. His proposals were all very similar
to archaeological work performed throughout his career yet the group hired him to investigate the family cemetery. Walton gave him a “copy of the history my office prepared on Marietta” that contained details of Gabriel’s life and his final will. Then, with his friend Bill Thompson, Muzzrole began “searching for the grave of Judge Duvall.”

In 1984, when the investigation began, the cemetery was hardly distinguishable from surrounding scrub. Muzzrole reported the area was covered by a “profusion of honeysuckle, wild rose vines and grape vines, as well as poison ivy” growing into branches of young walnut, sassafras, and locust trees. Muzzrole began with an extensive probing of the soil of the cemetery area, determining by the presence of cedar stumps and post holes that the entire cemetery — northern section, southern section, extension — measured 75 feet north/south, and 31 feet east/west with its western border closest to the old mansion. In 1990, Muzzrole created many reports but none mention tombstones or markers in the ancestral family section to the north. No records reveal who is buried in the cemetery, but a six-foot-tall obelisk marker provided a convenient demarcation between the northern, assumed to be older, and the southern section.

Muzzrole’s search for the Justice concentrated on the southern section of the ancestral burial ground where the obelisk, an upright tablet stone, and a horizontal slab marker helped establish boundaries of the land containing Gabriel’s immediate family. That space, 22 feet east/west and 25 feet north/south, was enclosed on three sides by a split rail fence with a line of cedar trees on the east and west inside the fence. Gabriel, as the plantation’s owner, probably determined the size of the new section, and, as the family’s head, determined placement of the graves within the cemetery. For convenience in referring to the graves in this section, Muzzrole first assigned numbers and eventually associated the spaces with individuals. It is helpful, however, to look at the graves in the order they were excavated.

Graves 4 and 5, closest to the western and northern borders, closest to the old mansion and to the ancestors, seemed the likeliest candidates for the earliest graves.

R. J. Muzzrole, “Working drawing” of the Gabriel Duvall family section of the ancestral cemetery, 1986 (digitized by Kate D. Sherwood, Smithsonian Institution.)
Muzzrole calculated available space for new graves in the first row from Grave 4 to the fence line, accepting that Graves 4 and 5 existed before Graves 2 and 3. Graves 4 and 5 were unmarked and unexcavated. The earliest marked burial in this new section, Grave 2, was not a Duvall, but Gabriel's mother-in-law, Mary Gibbon. She was buried at an edge of what may have looked like an untouched, open space. In a grave set back from both the south and west rail fence lines, she was far from the Duvall ancestors.
and yet part of the family. It is possible that her daughter, Jane Duvall, supervised her mother’s burial in a brick vault and designed her memorial, a full-length table-style slab reading: “Mrs. Mary Gibbon a native of Philadelphia O.D. 8 Aug. 1810 Age 80.” After Muzzrole fully removed the tipped-off cracked slab and exposed the brick in 1986, he did not excavate further.\

The next marked burial in the cemetery, Grave 10, took place twenty years later, a funeral that must have been very hard on the Justice. This gravesite for his only child, Edmund Bryce, who died in 1831 at age forty, was set so far away from the west fence line that it looks to be in a second row. However, it is also on the north side, as near to the ancestral Duvalls as possible. The inscription on the base supporting the obelisk, most likely composed by his wife, reads: “Erected to the memory of Col. Edmund B. Duval only son of Judge Duvall who departed this life on the 5th of Feb. 1831 in the 42nd year of his age. Regretted by all who knew him.” Augusta planned this tomb without telling Gabriel that she intended to be buried in it, too. In an undated letter to Gabriel she revealed:

... when Mr. Colman put up the monument... he built under it two arches in one of which repose my dear Edmund’s remains, and the other is left vacant for mine... I believe you have never been made aware of this circumstance, which was necessary to the gratification of my wish to be laid beside my husband, in which due care has been taken that his grave shall not be disturbed.”

It is likely that her wish to be buried next to Edmund was followed when Augusta died the next year in October 1832 at age thirty-eight, but there is no inscription for her on the tomb. This tomb has not been excavated.

An incised tablet marker found next to the obelisk, near Grave 9, commemorates the lives of two of Edmunds and Augusta’s children, Mary Frances and Gabriel, who died young in 1825. Exploration of Grave 6 revealed skull fragments of an infant near the surface along with hand-wrought coffin nails, all suggesting that unmarked and unexcavated graves 6, 7, and 8 hold the couple’s three other children who died at birth or shortly thereafter.

When Gabriel’s wife died a year and a half after Augusta, she left a request to be buried near her mother and Gabriel wrote in his Journal, “Her remains were interred on the 18th in the family burying ground, alongside the tomb of her mother.” Grave 3 was assigned to Jane Gibbon Duvall though no marker was found. As Muzzrole removed the overlying soil, he could see that the grave shaft was unusually wide. The grave measured 46 inches, almost double the usual width of a grave, leading him to conclude that Jane and Gabriel, husband and wife, were buried side by side:

To give an idea of just how certain we were that Judge Duvall was resting on the right side of Jane in the same grave, we took elaborate measures to document that fact in full color photographs. In one photograph, we laid a range pole
down the center of the grave, with a sign on each side, giving their respective names and dates.”

Yet Muzzrole’s excavation of the grave shaft showed that it carefully stepped down to a modest width of 21 inches at its bottom and contained the remnants of only one set of remains. Jane’s coffin had been covered by boards, yet not even her skull was preserved. Only six small facial bones and one small brass clothing hook were recovered in 1986. Traces of thigh and pieces of hip were recovered in a re-excaation by volunteer and “amateur archaeologist from Bowie” Guy Barron in 1989. Significantly, no teeth were found even though teeth, because of their composition, preserve better than bone. This may indicate that, given her age, Jane had lost all of her teeth. Artifacts from a coffin reported to be mahogany are thirteen cut nails, one wrought nail, and one small wood screw.

Mitigating the disappointment at not finding Gabriel’s grave, Grave 1 had been located in late 1985. This grave, however, is on a slight angle compared to the straight east/west orientation of the other graves. It is outside the borders of the cemetery but close to the presumed entrance, and is about seven feet from the grave of Gabriel’s second wife. When that grave was opened the following year it contained what was described as an “outer casket” but was more likely a shipping crate, and an inner mahogany coffin. The fairly complete skeleton featured a skull that showed a nearly complete dental arcade full of copper-stained teeth. Numerous corroded artifacts were recovered from the

Excavation of Grave 1 revealing a skull, various pieces of coffin hardware and three glass pieces from a large coffin viewing plate. (Marietta House Museum.)
grave, including elaborate coffin handles and the lugs that attached them to the coffin, a large glass viewing plate, decorative tacks with copper thread, multiple nails, and buttons. To Muzzrole, the decorative coffin hardware and expensive glass plate suggested the coffin belonged to someone of wealth and status, someone such as Gabriel Duvall. Muzzrole, in doing research, read the 1851 obituary of an archbishop whose body “is in an air-tight inner coffin . . . a glass being over the face . . .” and decided, “So, what was good for the Arch Bishop [sic] was also good for Judge Duvall.” Muzzrole’s 1990 report on Grave 1 further argued:

the space between grave #4 and the south fence line was 14 feet 10 inches, leaving enough room for three graves, spaced about one foot between graves. If Judge Duvall had laid out Mrs. Gibbon’s plot 1 ½ feet further to the south, and his wife Jane’s one foot closer to her mother’s tomb, there would have been enough room for him, with about 13 inches between graves. As it turned out, the Judge gave up his own space to his mother-in-law. . . . In 1834, when his wife died, Judge Duvall laid out her grave 22 inches from her mother’s tomb, and 23 inches from grave #4. When Judge Duvall died on March 6, 1844 at Marietta, he was ninety-three-years-old, and living with his ninety-four-year-old sister Sarah, with one or two people to take care of their needs. At that time, it is doubtful that the Judge was aware that not enough space was available next to his wife Jane. Because the funeral arrangements had to be made by friends and relatives from outside of Marietta, they could not be expected to know where the grave plot was located, especially, since it was ten years, since the last family burial [sic] took place . . . the decision by the people in charge to bury Judge Duvall just outside the fence line, I believe was based on . . . closeness to Jane and his family, rather than just arbitrarily picking a spot for convenience.”

Muzzrole also proposed that Gabriel’s sister Sarah, who died shortly after Gabriel, was buried in Grave A, which is inside the cemetery borders and strongly aligned east/west.

Another excavation, on the far north side of the larger cemetery area exposed the full skeleton of a horse that may have belonged to the Justice. The extraordinary effort required to bury the whole horse, not just the head, heart and hooves as often done, suggested that this horse was, in some way, special. Perhaps it was a race horse or a favorite riding horse. In either case it was undoubtedly special to the Duvalls.

**Has Justice Duvall Been Found? Majority Opinion and Dissent**

In 1986, after the excavators determined the boundaries of the Justice’s cemetery section and some grave locations were established, Muzzrole assigned names of family members to the various graves. But, in fact, only three graves can be positively associated with family members. No DNA analyses to prove relationships have been done on any of
the remains. The tall obelisk at the north carried the name of Gabriel’s son, Edmund. Another stone, “Sacred to the memory of Mary Francis Duvall who died 16 June 1825 aged 4 years & 11 months; also Gabriel Duvall who died 14 June 1825 aged 2 years & 4 months,” is the marker for two of Edmund’s children. In addition to those, a large slab stone identified in-law Mary Gibbon’s grave on the south side. Near Mary’s grave, is the almost certain grave of Gabriel’s second wife, Jane. A gravestone carved with “Jane Gibbon Duvall” but no date reportedly existed in 1955 but was gone when Muzzrole began excavations and heard local stories of vandals breaking up grave markers. Yet he was “never able to find even a crumb from any marble, granite, or sandstone marker.”

**Majority Opinion**

For identity confirmation, the Duvall Society brought the remains found in Grave 1, thought to represent Gabriel Duvall, to the Anthropology Department of the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of Natural History. The results, as relayed by David Duvall in 1987:

> were supportive, yet inconclusive. The initial examination had revealed no evidence of a break in the left arm bones; much of the right arm was missing. But the remodeling of a broken bone after 20 years could have hidden the break. . . . Facial restructuring of the skull, however, when compared to several artists’ likenesses of the Judge were found positively compatible. On the other hand . . . the bones could have been those of a somewhat younger man. . . . The usual signs of some arthritis in the spine of a 91 year old [sic] man were inconspicuous. The fact that the teeth were in good condition was questionable, yet . . . not that unusual. . . . The funeral trappings and chronology of burials . . . seem to offer the best evidence to substantiate his identity at this point.”

The relative youthfulness of these bones was seemingly corroborated by Gabriel’s contemporaries who wrote: “. . . he has until lately enjoyed remarkable health for a man of his years. In his occasional visits to this city [Washington] and Baltimore within the last few years, he exhibited an erectness of port and vigor of step which might have been envied by much younger men.” *The Western Law Journal* noted “He enjoyed fine health in his old age.”

David Duvall concluded, “Although the meager physical evidence may allow that the bones belong to Gabriel, we can’t be sure. . . . It seems apparent for now that more clues must be found before it is determined in just which grave these bones will take their final rest beneath the walnut grove at Marietta.” However, Muzzrole, the grave’s excavator, was “99 percent sure this is Gabriel. But I leave open that little bit of doubt.” Majority opinion, formed by Muzzrole’s arguments, was further persuaded by the anthropology report and the remains in Grave 1 were considered those of Justice Gabriel Duvall.
With Gabriel found, Muzzrole assigned the two graves in the northwest corner closest to the ancestral cemetery, graves 4 and 5, to Gabriel’s father, who died in 1801, and mother, who died in 1794, without giving any evidence to support that conclusion. To everyone’s surprise, Richard Muzzrole left the cemetery project in September 1986, leaving Guy Barron to continue the work. In September 1987, the Society of Mareen Duvall Descendants celebrated the bicentennial of the Constitutional Convention (that Duvall had declined to attend) and reinterred the occupant of Grave 1 on the grounds of Marietta with a tombstone commemorating Justice Gabriel Duvall.35

**Dissenting Opinion**

As Justice Duvall would acknowledge, the information that frames every decision, when viewed slightly differently, can result in a dissenting opinion. In fact, much of Muzzrole’s rationale for determining Gabriel’s grave could have been refuted at the time by information in the thoroughly researched document, “Marietta: A Historic Structures Report.”

In 1989, Donald K. Creveling, then director of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, History Division, expressed strong reservations about the decision to reinter Gabriel’s family’s remains and about the general conduct of the archaeological excavations. He noted, “basic archaeological information was not recorded during his (Muzzrole’s) excavations. . . . Had the excavations proceeded in a more professional manner much more historical and archaeological information could have been obtained by these excavations.” He was also “concerned about what will become of the other twenty odd burials. In my opinion, archaeologically and historically they are just as significant as the Duvall burials. Though they may not be central figures of the Duvall family, they are nonetheless historic burials.”

Creveling’s immediate concern was “several open burial excavations, an exposed brick burial vault, and numerous open trenches and piles of back dirt. . . . The present condition of the cemetery is accelerating the deterioration of the site by erosion . . . and is damaging the brick vault.” As a result, in 1994, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission History Division Archaeology Program completed excavation and exhumation on the tomb of Mary Gibbon, Gabriel Duvall’s mother-in-law. Mortar in the brick vault had moderated the soil acidity while the large stone slab over the grave had reduced soil moisture to help preserve the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teeth and Arcade</th>
<th>Number of Teeth Present</th>
<th>Number of Carious Teeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incisors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillae</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillae</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premolars</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillae</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molars</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxillae</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>471</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary Gibbon’s edentulous skull illustrates the tooth loss common to those older than 60 in the nineteenth century.
(Chip Clark, Smithsonian Institution.)

bones. Her incomplete remains lay in a supine position with the head at the east. Her left arm was along her body; her right upper arm was also along the body but with the lower arm on top of the upper, bringing the hand to her shoulder. The toothless skull was in good condition.\textsuperscript{36}

In 2003 the remains of this eighty-year-old woman were sent to the Anthropology Department of the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of Natural History where the author assessed the bones. The skeleton, in poor condition with friable bones, was aged at seventy-plus years based on degenerative changes such as porosity of the joint surfaces and moderate-to-severe arthritic changes, including extensive wearing of joints. The long bones are extremely light in weight and osteoporotic. Dentition had been lost in life and the supporting bone has resorbed, indicating that tooth loss occurred a significant time prior to death.

Table 1. Dental Pathology in Nineteenth-Century American Whites Aged Sixty Years and Older (n=65).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carious Teeth (Percent)</th>
<th>Number of Sockets</th>
<th>Number of Teeth Lost Antemortem</th>
<th>Teeth Lost Antemortem (Percent)</th>
<th>Number of Alveolar Abscesses</th>
<th>Alveolar Abscesses (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though Mary Gibbon died thirty years before Gabriel, any subsequent changes in his lifestyle or diet would not have been so significant as to result in a skeleton that looked substantially different at a similar age. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, with access to sugar and carbohydrates, and an absence of good dental hygiene, most could expect to lose multiple teeth by age sixty.\textsuperscript{37}

Information on dental health during the nineteenth century is primarily anecdotal. However, skeletal biologists at the Smithsonian Institution are collecting comprehensive osteological data for historic period human remains from Maryland and Virginia that capture the incidence of tooth loss and decay. While the sample of skeletal remains from the nineteenth century is small, it reinforces general observations that American white men and women aged sixty years and older would have lost more than half of their teeth (Table 1). The average loss for molars (79 percent) and premolars (57 percent) would have made chewing difficult. The average loss for incisors was 67 percent, making biting a challenge. Data indicate that, of remaining teeth, the many carious (32 percent) and/or abscessing (7 percent) would have been a source of pain.

Based on those statistics, derived from nineteenth-century Americans examined as part of archaeological investigations, eighty-year-old Mary Gibbon’s toothless skull is representative of her time. The absence of teeth in the grave of Jane Duvall indicates

---

**Figure 6.** David Duvall, then president of the Society of Mareen Duvall Descendants, packing for transport the skull showing a nearly complete set of teeth that was excavated from Grave 1. (Marietta House Museum.)
that she too, at age seventy-seven probably experienced extreme tooth loss. In contrast, the skull from Grave 1, showing an almost full set of both upper and lower teeth, is unlikely to be that of ninety-two-year-old Gabriel Duvall.

Similarly, arthritis and osteoporosis were expected ailments of nineteenth-century individuals older than sixty. Muzzrole attributed the notable lack of arthritic changes in the skeleton from Grave 1 to Gabriel’s non-physical lifestyle as a lawyer and plantation owner. Yet, the most common means of transportation for a man in that time period was riding a horse and Gabriel was no exception. “After his retirement from office, Judge Duval was accustomed to ride on horseback from his residence, twelve miles (and return home the same day), to witness a race on the National Course.” This physical activity, along with aging, should have produced arthritic changes in the vertebrae. Mary Gibbon, who did not ride horses as often as Gabriel, showed moderate arthritis and bone-on-bone rubbing throughout her spine. 38

In addition, the coffin hardware from Grave 1 can be dated. Coffin embellishments such as handles, glass viewing plates, and decorative screws became widely available after 1850. Burials in 1840 rarely had hardware beyond hinges and nails. The coffin handles from Grave 1 are known as swing bail handles of a type that were used after 1860 and are identical in shape to handles in the 1880 catalogues of three coffin companies. “Based on the available information for white metal swing bail handles with silver-colored plating, it

Representative artifacts recovered from Grave 1. The two coffin handles with their decorative attachment lugs, three pieces of preserved mahogany coffin wood, decorative cap lifters and three copper alloy coffin studs all date from after 1860. The four-hole buttons became commonly available after 1840. (Chip Clark, Smithsonian Institution.)
appears that these items would not be present in an 1844 burial. It is far more likely that these handles would be found in a post-1860 context, and, since the handles from Grave 1 are identical in shape and border design to a handle found in the 1880 Zanesville Coffin Company, the 1881 Columbus Coffin Company, and the 1884 Chicago Coffin Company catalogues, the combined coffin handle dates suggest a later date for this burial.”

A broken glass viewing plate was also recovered from Grave 1. These plates, inserted in the coffin lid, allowed family and friends a last look at their loved one. Viewing plates coincided with the increased decoration on coffins. “Glass plates first appear in the 1867 Crane, Breed & Company catalogue and appear in various forms in the 1882 Columbus Coffin Company catalogue, the 1882 Stein Manufacturing Company catalogue, and the 1892 National Casket Company catalogue. The occurrence of the glass viewing plate is consistent with the dates derived from the swing bail handles and other recovered coffin hardware, and supports a mid- to late-nineteenth century date for this burial.”

The coffin artifacts suggest a burial in the 1870s or 1880s. The condition of the skeleton suggests a man in his fifties. Neither supports Grave 1 as the grave of Gabriel Duvall, who died in 1844 at ninety-two.

The Middle-Aged Man in Grave 1

Judging by the slight off-kilter placement of Grave 1, much of the burial ground may have been overgrown, making the edges and grave alignments uncertain at the time of this burial. Yet, it seems reasonable to assume that the man in the grave either asked to be buried in the ancestral graveyard or was buried there by his relatives. Tracing the ownership of the land helps focus the possibilities on members of the Duvall family.

When Gabriel died, he left Marietta house and grounds to his second grandson, Edmund. To Marcus, his first grandson, he left the original mansion and grounds including the family cemetery. Both grandsons suffered economic hardship during and after the Civil War, but Edmund seemed to recover better than Marcus. Jailed in 1864 for protesting paying taxes, his property was sold to satisfy creditors. Edmund bought the 380 acres plus all of Marcus’ personal effects that were also sold to pay taxes. Two months later, Edmund leased the house to Marcus “during his natural life” for the sum of one cent and the future payment of the taxes. Marcus failed to pay the taxes and the property was sold by court order with Marcus as the highest bidder. By this time, the private problems of the brothers became public through charges by Edmund that Marcus was destroying the land and charges by Marcus that Edmund would “disinherit and turn homeless on the World, his only brother!” Marcus recovered the land but, in 1868, it was again sold by court order. After Marcus died in Fairfax, Virginia in 1873 at age forty-nine, the couple who bought the land deeded it to Edmund. He died just four years later, at age fifty-three and is buried alongside some of his children in his lot in Holy Trinity Church Yard near Marietta. Marcus’ burial site is unknown, suggesting that he is most likely the man buried in Grave 1.41
Almost thirty years passed between Gabriel’s death and that of Marcus. Marcus may or may not have lived on the property that he held and lost several times, but as he felt strongly about retaining it, he may have asked to be buried in the cemetery, just 200 feet from the old mansion. Through the years of war and hardship, it is very probable that the cemetery was neglected and became overgrown. Still, Edmund and nearby relatives likely remembered enough about it to place Marcus’ grave close to other family members and yet outside the fence line to be sure not to disturb existing graves. Grave 1 seems to be the last burial and available evidence suggests that these remains represent Marcus DuVal.

**Continuing the Search for the Justice**

Various aspects of Gabriel’s life and circumstances argue against his being the occupant of Grave 1. As a young man, Gabriel was in charge of details: musterman, commissary of stores, and secretary to various committees. In his law practice he concentrated on the details of death: wills and estates. He surely was familiar with the confusion death can cause among survivors and would have intended to reduce that for his family.

In Gabriel’s section of the cemetery, graves were not dug one after the other, row by row, in the order of death. Instead, Gabriel established a carefully considered rank order to the cemetery that placed Duvalls together. Within this order, his second wife selected her own grave site and his daughter-in-law selected hers. It is possible that Gabriel selected his grave site when his first wife died in 1790. Although the couple lived in Annapolis at the time and maintained a pew there at St. Anne’s Episcopal Church, there is no notice of Mary Duvall’s funeral or burial in the church records. The first, original, St. Anne’s Church was razed in 1775 and, because of the Revolutionary War, was not completely rebuilt until 1792. Burial in the churchyard, while not impossible during construction, may have been difficult. In the three months between their son’s birth and Mary’s death, the couple decided to have the child raised by his grandparents and may also have decided to bury Mary at the cemetery of the ancestral Duvall’s where her son and husband could visit her grave regularly. It is worth considering that Mary’s grave may be either Grave 4 or 5 in the first row, close to the ancestral family and close to the original mansion.\(^{42}\)

At Mary’s death, Gabriel wrote to his father, “But so great was my affection for her, and I had so uniformly experienced the goodness of her heart, that were she now living and single and I had my choice of all the world, I would prefer her.” Such a man may have decided to be buried next to the wife who died giving him an heir. His regard for Mary may have continued through his second marriage since he named his new house “Marietta” long after he wed Jane. Perhaps Grave 4 or 5 in the first row may be his.\(^ {43}\)

Gabriel was obviously in charge of deciding where burials were placed: his mother-in-law as far from the ancestral family as possible; his son next to his ancestors and, more importantly, just below the probable grave of his mother. When Gabriel’s second
wife died, he placed her somewhat centrally, next to both her mother, as she requested, and next to the space he may have reserved for himself.

As the cemetery held everyone essential in his life — his son and wife and children, his own second wife and her mother, and perhaps his first wife or his parents — it is very unlikely that Gabriel would have allowed the area to become overgrown with weeds and vines in his lifetime. When he died, his four mourning grandchildren were young adults who were well provided for in his will. Three of them lived in his house and his sister Sarah, to whom he left lifetime residency in the original mansion, was

The Memorial Garden at Marietta House Museum, Glenn Dale, Maryland, including close-up views of modern markers. Under a grove of tall trees on the western edge of the knoll on which Marietta House is built, six tombstones stand in a row. This Memorial Garden was created in 2003 to offer a place to reflect on Gabriel Duvall’s life and the contribution he made to the young nation. The tablet stone on the far right commemorates two of Gabriel’s grandchildren and was removed from the ancestral cemetery. The grandchildren were not exhumed and reburied here. The tall obelisk, moved from the cemetery, was the original monument over the double crypt constructed for Gabriel’s son, Edmund, and his daughter-in-law, Augusta. Neither has been exhumed and reburied here. The large, flat table stone, moved from the cemetery, marked the grave of Mary Gibbon, Gabriel’s mother-in-law. While her remains have been excavated and reinterred in this grove, they are not under this stone. Third from the left is a new tablet stone for Gabriel’s second wife, Jane Gibbon Duvall. During the exhumation of Mary Gibbon, the name at the top of the report pages was given as Jane Gibbon and the mistake went uncorrected by the various people who read the report. Decades later, when the remains of Mary Gibbon were returned by the Smithsonian, they were received at Marietta as those of Jane Gibbon Duvall. It is possible that Jane Duvall’s scant remains, recovered by Muzzrole in 1986 and Barron in 1993 but never professionally examined, were carefully stored at Marietta until 2003 and then buried under this stone together with the more substantial remains of her mother. Under the new tablet stone for Gabriel (second from left) is buried, very probably, his grandson Marcus DuVal. The smallest stone, newly created for Judge Duvall’s horse, recognizes the substantial contribution Gabriel made to the highly valued breeding and racing of thoroughbreds in Prince George’s County. A complete horse skeleton was found near the ancestral cemetery, the skull is under this stone.

(Kate D. Sherwood, Smithsonian Institution.)
also there to mourn him. Most likely, they all would have known where he wished to be buried and would have had every reason to do as he requested.

It is even possible that Gabriel Duvall, despite his prominence, did not want a permanent marker over his grave. There seem not to have been permanent markers over the graves in the ancestral cemetery and neither grave in the first row seems to have had a permanent marker. In the second row, Mrs. Gibbon had a large stone probably devised by her daughter. Jane Gibbon Duvall, buried by Gabriel, may have had a stone with her name but no dates. Edmund Duvall had a very large burial vault with an obelisk for a marker devised by his wife, but despite her request to be buried with Edmund, Gabriel did not add her name and dates to the marker.

If there was no tombstone for Justice Duvall, it was not because there was no money. Gabriel left a very handsome estate. It was not because no one remained to honor him. His sister, three grandchildren and many households of Duvalls lived in the area. “Perhaps the judge designed no grave marker or monument for himself, a gesture of modesty or self-effacement that was not uncommon in the humble and trusting expectations of popular religion in his time. Perhaps a simple wooden marker was once placed upon his grave — if so, it has long since disappeared.”

44
In the end, the graves of Justice Duvall and his first wife remain unknown and unmarked. Now, because their tombstones were removed to the grounds of Marietta, the graves of the Justice’s son and daughter-in-law and their two children are also unmarked, perhaps as Gabriel Duvall wished them to be. Although finding the precise gravesite of this exceptionally influential man would bring a sense of completion, it may be enough to think that United States Supreme Court Associate Justice Gabriel Duvall lies among his family near his home and law office, his significant contributions to a new nation recognized and remembered through his stone in the Memorial Garden at Marietta House.

We thank Susan Wolfe, Museum Manager (retired) of the Marietta House Museum, who provided information on the Duvall family and archaeological work conducted by R. Muzzrole in the Wigwam Cemetery. Barrett L. McKown of the Society of Mareen Duvall Descendants provided documents from Society files. Historical and genealogical research was conducted at Marietta House Museum, Glenn Dale, Maryland, and the Maryland State Archives Hall of Records, Annapolis. Malcolm Richardson assisted with historical research. Excavation of the burial vault of Mrs. Mary Gibbon was conducted under the supervision of Donald Creveling, M-NCPPC, with field assistance provided by Dana Kollmann. Creveling requested examination of Mrs. Gibbons remains and arranged loan of M-NCPPC curated artifacts recovered by R. Muzzrole from Grave 1. Kollmann aided examination of the Gibbon skeleton. Table 1 was prepared by Kathryn G. Barca. John P. Connolly, National Sporting Library & Museum in Middleburg, Virginia researched the racing history and lineage of the thoroughbred horse Argyle. Historical archaeologist Laurie Burgess, National Museum of Natural History, analyzed the artifacts recovered with these burials.
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Children roller skating in Model Cities Area E, December 12, 1973. President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society programs included antipoverty initiatives such as the Model Cities Agency that created neighborhood resource centers. Area E, shown here, includes Sandtown-Winchester. (Robert Breck Chapman Collection, Special Collections, Langsdale Library, University of Baltimore, hereinafter RBC Collection, UBA.)
Neighborhood Matters: What Baltimore Learned from the War on Poverty

AIDEN JAMES FAUST

In 1983, Baltimore teenagers interviewed Mayor William Donald Schaefer for a public access television show called “Street Scenes,” produced by the municipal antipoverty program, the Urban Services Agency. In the seven-and-one-half minute interview, the mayor addressed a variety of issues related to youth programs, leadership development, and his own path into local politics. When asked what advice he would give to a teenager with mayoral aspirations, Schaefer emphasized the importance of retaining a focus on people and neighborhoods, “Strong emphasis on neighborhoods, because that’s the strength of the city of Baltimore, in the neighborhoods.” The mayor’s advice underscores a grassroots urban wisdom that emerged, in part, from the Great Society programs and the solutions to poverty that they offered the city. In the quarter century between the “Street Scenes” interview and the present, this wisdom came to be overshadowed by a neoliberal development logic focused on the city’s business core at the expense of non-elite neighborhoods. Why did this neighborhood-based vision of local politics matter in the War on Poverty, and how did the Great Society shape municipal government’s response to the needs of the city’s poorest residents?

The War on Poverty was a complex federal mandate launched by President Lyndon B. Johnson during his 1964 State of the Union address. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 established the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), which coordinated antipoverty efforts that included the creation of Medicare and Medicaid, the food stamp program, employment programs (Job Corp, VISTA, and federal work-study), and education programs (Head Start, Title I), among others. President Johnson’s vision of a Great Society was advanced by the 89th US Congress, which pushed through close to 200 bills that addressed virtually every aspect of American life, including civil rights, education, health, poverty, the arts, the environment, housing, and immigration.

This study considers the extent to which the Great Society led to changes in Baltimore’s municipal governance in the 1970s. Although the most progressive aspects of the early programs in the city’s War on Poverty were suppressed through federal policy decisions, what emerged in Baltimore by 1974 was a decentralized municipal service model that operated at the neighborhood level and provided human services in response

Aiden Faust is the Head of Special Collections at the University of Baltimore. His recent work on local archival history is forthcoming from Rutgers University Press in Baltimore Revisited: Rethinking and Remaking an American City. This essay won the 2015 Joseph L. Arnold Prize for Outstanding Writing on Baltimore’s History.
to citizen demand. The neighborhood-based delivery of human services through a new department known as the Urban Services Agency was a primary take-away from the local War on Poverty. Urban Services met the needs of citizens for services such as health programs for seniors, breakfast programs for youth, public preschool programs, supplemental public education in music and art, library and information services, job training programs — all through neighborhood centers known as “little city halls.”

When Mayor Schmoke eliminated the agency in 1993 due to systematic restructuring of local government, its functions were folded into fourteen neighborhood “hubs.” Although these hubs mimicked the decentralized nature of the former Urban Services centers and the Mayor’s Stations created under Mayor Schaefer, the new hubs functioned solely as information conduits, referring citizens to services available through the City Housing Department. The transfer of direct service provision out of the city’s neighborhoods coincided with a larger shift to consolidate municipal resources and management in the downtown business core, effectively neglecting the needs of residents at the level in which they lived and operated — the neighborhood.

During the active planning and implementation years of the Model Cities Program, early scholarly activity was most apparent in political science dissertations and the Journal of the American Institute of Planners. Early community case studies focused on Pittsburgh, Oakland, Detroit, and Seattle. Much of this literature explored the “software” in the War on Poverty, activities generally associated with health and human services, recreation and cultural programs, and a general orientation toward directing resources to programs that focus on people. This emphasis on people included political organizing, citizen participation, and promoting programs that met the health and wellness needs of vulnerable populations like mothers, children, and elders. In this model, communities were made of people.

Software, however, was difficult for resource allocators to quantify, and it also opened the Great Society doors to grassroots activists desirous of radical social and economic change. Teaching poor people to mobilize to change local government was an inherent threat to the existing power structure, and was immediately suppressed by machine Democrats and Nixon Republicans in the late 1960s and 1970s. “Hardware” replaced software, focusing on investment in traditional urban renewal demolition and construction projects. Model Cities began to reflect HUD’s emphasis under Nixon on bricks and mortar projects—an emphasis that would only continue through federal funding of the Empowerment Zones with Hope VI funds through the first decade of the twenty-first century.

The trajectory of scholarly attention to this program includes a singularly useful work on African American participation on the Community Action Program in five major cites that analyzed data from over 300 field interviews. Their analysis of varying levels of participation in each city took into consideration the power of the political machine in each locale, the general political climate and race relations of each city, and the role of labor unions or other political organizing forces. This early empirical study
paid particular attention to factors in American political life, including machine and reform politics, which affected black participation in the Great Society during the 1960s. These early scholarly studies were supplemented by a number of firsthand accounts by administration officials, some published at the time, and others recently released.4

Early examples had limited scholarly value and were poorly received in academic circles. More recent personal accounts have been published as edited interview transcripts from the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library’s oral history program, telling the Great Society story from the perspectives of federal policy analysts and White House appointees. It is here that the standard declension narrative of the War on Poverty, including the emotional arc from initial optimism to disillusionment, is created. By the mid-1970s, academics largely deemed Model Cities a failure and subsequently ignored the effort for much of the next two decades, the negative analysis tied to an explicitly political and policy-oriented analysis of the War on Poverty. Common among these critics was a reliance on quantitative, statistical analyses. Such studies overlooked or avoided the people-focused cultural aspects of the program that would have benefitted from qualitative measures of assessment.5

The Conservative ascendance of the 1980s and 1990s is marked by a noticeable scarcity of literature on the Model Cities Program as planners and public policy scholars no longer found the concept relevant. The overarching conservative ethos of this period discouraged public and scholarly discourse on the Great Society, seen by many as the last bastion of American liberalism. Since the 1990s, and especially since the turn of the twenty-first century, there has been a renewed interest in the legacy of this program, particularly in terms of citizen participation and neighborhood-focused studies. Although local studies present mixed opinions about the War on Poverty, this new wave of writing has introduced important factors such as the relationship between the Great Society and the rise of the Black Power movement, policy innovations, and the advances of black politicians as a result of the antipoverty programs.

Other themes include participatory democracy, community control, and the role of women and community activists in the Great Society. The attempt by a new generation of scholars, particularly women and scholars of color, to reconsider the legacy of the War on Poverty from grassroots perspectives represents an important shift toward understanding a federal program that was implemented locally across the country. The War on Poverty was forced to abandon community organizing, but persisted in demonstrating the value of citizen representation and neighborhood-based services in Baltimore’s poorest communities. Although the achievements in Baltimore consistently involved compromise and constraint, the local effort resulted in the creation of a municipal antipoverty agency that operated for another two decades. The city’s advocates integrated its governance structure into municipal government.6

This study considers the organizational history of Baltimore’s antipoverty programs from the earliest federal demonstration program to the municipal successor agency, which relied heavily on federal block grants to continue its operations. By adding the
city as a case study to the existing War on Poverty literature, the legacy demonstrates that despite challenges related to citizen participation, community organizing, white resistance, and political obstacles from the City Council, these Great Society programs had an enduring impact on municipal governance through the creation of the Urban Services Agency. Baltimore’s black leaders (and white leaders dedicated to citizen participation) worked within the constraints of local politics to apply lessons learned from the Great Society, including the inclusion of poor residents on advisory bodies and the creation and maintenance of almost two-dozen neighborhood centers. This work examines the development of three distinct but related antipoverty programs in Baltimore—the Community Action Agency (CAA), the Model Cities Agency (MCA), and the Urban Services Agency (USA)—over a thirty-year period, from 1967 through 1996.

**Succession Programming: From CAA to Model Cities**

I share the strong feelings within our Model Cities community that meaningful citizen participation is, and should continue to be, an essential element of the entire Model Cities program. However, without adequate community organization and technical assistance services, this kind of meaningful citizen participation cannot exist.

—Mayor Thomas D’Alesandro III
In December 1967, when it became clear that Parren Mitchell, the head of Baltimore’s Community Action Agency (CAA), intended to resign his post, Mayor Thomas D’Alesandro III unabashedly begged him to stay. Brother of NAACP lobbyist Clarence M. Mitchell Jr. and brother-in-law of the first female African American lawyer to practice in Maryland, Juanita Jackson Mitchell, Mitchell was a member of the state’s leading civil rights family. A seasoned activist in his own right, he had fought and won a legal battle to attend the graduate school for sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park in 1950, becoming the first African American student admitted. In his attempts to retain Mitchell with the Community Action Agency, D’Alesandro emphasized his support for the antipoverty agency, stating, “It is my fervent hope that you will remain in this position and continue to play an important role in the crusade to bring a vital segment of our community into the mainstream of national life.”

This recognition of poor, inner city African Americans as “a vital segment” of America and the desire to create opportunities for economic mobility and social integration characterized the Mayor’s progressive approach to the War on Poverty. This view, however, was not necessarily shared by the majority of Baltimore’s City Council or the United States Congress. They saw community activists as troublemakers and sought to suppress social change through the marginalization of activists as “militants.” The attempt to downplay community organizing through the transition from the Community Action Program to the Model Cities Program represented a watering down of the Great

*Children playing on the hood of a Volkswagen Beetle on West 24th Street. From left to right: B.J., Ruthie Thomas, Sissie Scott, Kimberly, 1969. (Model Urban Neighborhood Demonstration Collection, Special Collections, Langsdale Library, University of Baltimore, hereinafter MUND Collection, UBA.)*
Society’s mission. What played out on both local and national levels was a struggle to control the terms of the debate and the solutions the Great Society programs offered. This section explores the political and economic factors that shaped Baltimore’s Great Society programs and how those programs evolved into the Urban Services Agency in 1974. As the municipal entity formed through the merger of the Community Action Agency and Model Cities, Urban Services was the legacy of Baltimore’s War on Poverty. The trajectories of its parent agencies illustrate the enormous constraints these programs operated under — from political infighting to abject racism to federal mandates to insufficient resources to growing wariness from residents and community leaders. Slowing down national succession planning efforts, Baltimore’s CAA and MCA operated simultaneously — one slow to die, the other slow to develop — and carried core elements of their programs into a new agency that would persist within the local political landscape for another two decades. Citizen representation and neighborhood centers were two primary take-aways from the local War on Poverty that positively impacted municipal service delivery to low-income residents well into the era of New Federalism. Although community organization was largely dismantled, citizen participation remained an active component of Baltimore’s antipoverty programs and persisted into the municipal successor, the Urban Services Agency, through the 1980s.

Understanding the impact of the Urban Service Agency lies in the development of its parent organizations. The War on Poverty in Baltimore encompassed more than just the Model Urban Neighborhood Demonstration project. The latter half of the 1960s was a period of local activity for both the Community Action Agency and the Model Cities Agency. While CAA was created in 1965 as the central coordinating organization for the city’s antipoverty programs, its emphasis on community organizing and its support within the African American community made it less politically palatable to the Baltimore City Council. Once federal planning agencies shifted focus to the Model Cities program, many black leaders withdrew in protest. Baltimore’s Mayor D’Alesandro was an important figure in the local fight to retain community organizing and community participation in both the CAA and MCA programs. D’Alesandro’s advocacy for citizen participation stands in stark contrast to his mayoral counterparts across the country, including those in Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles, who often resented the Great Society programs for the power and resources they diverted from city halls. Despite D’Alesandro’s best efforts to maintain the early vision of the Great Society, the shift in federal policy and corresponding resources under the Nixon Administration handed control over to local and state governments and ultimately ended the programs. Although eclipsed by national politics, CAA’s groundwork in community organizing and the network of neighborhood community centers laid the foundation for long-term municipal programming in Baltimore.9

The Community Action Agency received OEO funding through MD CAP Grant #207 in February 1965. On June 13, 1965 the Baltimore Sun announced, “War on Poverty Launched Here.” The story ran with a large photo of two women, one black and one
white, talking in a doorway. In the photo, the white woman speaking and holding a large handbag is identified as Miss Linda Raichlen, a social worker from the University of Maryland. The black woman, identified as Mrs. Hazel Brown, is shown listening and holding a broom. The article also identifies the original geographic area of the city served by the Community Action Agency — a corridor known as the Gay Street slum area, which would become the locus of Baltimore’s civil uprisings in the aftermath of Martin Luther King’s assassination three years later.10

Although the local papers painted a picture of benevolent middle class reformers, the federal mandate to encourage “maximum feasible participation” of the poor created a space for poor black Baltimoreans to shape the project. Early on, activists associated with the Antipoverty Action Agency Committee (APAC) criticized the Community Action Program’s board for failing to include the poor. Preschool centers, reading programs, youth job programs, neighborhood-based library services, and preventative healthcare for pregnant women were among the initial programs launched in Baltimore. Many of these programs were offered through CAA’s growing network of neighborhood centers, which sought to offer residents assistance in close proximity to where they lived.11

The Community Action Program also faced serious challenges from elected leaders on the Baltimore City Council, who resented the agency’s autonomy and considered “people power” a threat to their authority and the power of party politics locally. By December 1965, city councilmen accused CAA of poor management and political
bias in hiring. Director Parren Mitchell defended all 114 employees hired to date, providing proof that the staff was a mix of candidates from civil service lists, leaders of neighborhood Youth Corps programs, and mayoral appointments. Unable to defund the program, the Council pressed for greater control of funds through the municipal Board of Estimates. Among the programs most vexing to city council members was a free legal services program for low-income residents.12

Criticism and political pressure also came from national sources. In 1966 a controversy erupted regarding a report, authored by a staff member from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity and published in the Afro-American newspaper. The report characterized Baltimore’s CAA as slow to get off the ground, lacking the ability to mobilize the poor, and relying on “traditional welfare techniques.” Funding problems also hampered the War on Poverty locally. Congressional restrictions in November prevented Baltimore’s CAA from expanding its programs during a period marked by increasing unrest.13

These financial constraints, coupled with the political shift away from Community Action as the primary antipoverty coordinating organization, prompted Parren Mitchell to resign as the head of Baltimore’s CAA on June 25, 1968.14 When a WMAR-TV reporter asked why he was resigning, Mitchell gave a three-part, ninety-second response that summarized his CAA experience:

There were three major areas of concern that prompted me—no, really forced me—to resign. The first is the continuing inadequate funding of antipoverty programs, both at the city level and at the federal level. Each time this happens, it forces me to raise the question again and again, “Do we really have a commitment in this country to combat poverty?” And I have serious doubts about it. The second major concern was that I assumed to combat poverty—to wage a war against poverty—we would be free from the bureaucratic process. It’s gotten worse. We labor under bureaucracy at the city and state and federal level.

But most pressing of all Mitchell’s stated concerns was the movement away from CAA as the central coordinating agency for antipoverty efforts. He flatly rejected the succession program model that was being planned nationally and implemented locally. Members of the city’s Community Action Commission would follow suit. A week later, on July 2, all thirteen members resigned in protest over what they felt was an abdication on the part of the mayor in fulfilling his promises to the agency. Their collective resignation announcement describes the challenges they faced: “[W]e have been forced to witness a steady reduction in the effectiveness of the program — its philosophy and funds — by vested interests, political machines and outright bigots. Federal OEO cuts in budgets, constant crisis situations concerning viable programs, make it impossible to plan effectively and sustain the people’s faith in the program.” In the Commission’s view, the Baltimore CAA was “a sham and a mockery, which raises people’s hopes and
then dashes them senselessly.” They also believed that Democrats were using the CAA “as a political tool for patronage” for African Americans.15

Mayor D’Alesandro responded quickly, working to meet the demands of members of the Community Action Commission and imploring them to stay on. By July 18, the group released a press statement announcing, “[W]e are happy to report today that a number of items of agreement have been reached. We feel they will enable the program to achieve its original purposes.” Paramount among those agreements was the necessity of a new director with a “background of proven sensitivity to the needs of poor people.” At the mayor’s request, all thirteen members returned to their positions. The political stage, however, was set for a showdown between the mayor, black activists, and city council regarding the next leader of Baltimore’s Community Action Agency. That showdown would center on Walter P. Carter.16

Walter Percival Carter was a social worker and civil rights activist who led Baltimore’s chapter of the Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), organized voter registration drives and freedom rides, served as Maryland’s coordinator for the 1963 March on Washington, and was involved with protests to desegregate employment at Baltimore Gas and Electric, Gwynn Oak amusement park, and Howard Johnson hotels. In February 1968, the mayor offered him a position as the chief community organizer for Model Cities. In August of the same year, acting on the recommendation of the Community Action Commission, Mayor D’Alesandro nominated Carter to become Mitchell’s successor as the head of CAA. Of the nomination, the mayor said, “I am convinced that he and I are on the same wave length when it comes to the importance of community organization work, and the need for the work of the CAA and the Model Cities Agency to be closely coordinated.”17

Throughout his political career, D’Alesandro had maintained positive relations with Baltimore’s black community. As city council president, he praised CORE’s activism and role. Once elected mayor, D’Alesandro appointed more African Americans to municipal positions than any of his predecessors and his efforts were particularly apparent in the local War on Poverty. The mayor’s advocacy for community organizing, Walter Carter, and the Community Action Agency demonstrated his commitment to growing the ranks of the local Democratic voter’s base by securing the confidence of as wide a cross-section of black voters as possible.18

A majority of the white elected officials in Baltimore’s City Council, however, did not support the War on Poverty. Unlike the mayor, who sought to build a voter base from the city’s growing black population during a period of accelerating white flight, council members looked to represent the interests of their existing constituents, largely working class whites in ethnic enclaves throughout the city. White Baltimoreans negatively viewed the War on Poverty as programs that benefitted only blacks, and their elected representatives did the same. By a vote of 8 to 10, the council rejected Carter’s appointment as the head of CAA. The Afro-American analyzed these events succinctly: “[T]he vote was a manifestation of revenge against Mr. D’Alesandro, and a blatant exercise in
rank racism.” The us-versus-them politics of race in Baltimore’s Democratic Party was abundantly clear in the local press. The Sun ran a lengthy article by Robert Erlandson speculating on why the council opposed the mayor’s nominee, characterizing the mayor as having “a propensity for militant Negroes.” Councilman William Myers of the 6th district complained, “[I]t’s about time he started appointing some of our people to some of these jobs.” In case this statement left any room for speculation, Myers clarified, “I mean white people.”

When it became clear that the council’s opinion would not be swayed, the response from black leaders was swift and unequivocal. Twelve members of the Community Action Commission resigned in protest over Carter’s rejection. Walter Lively, Parren Mitchell, and Homer Favor of the Baltimore Urban Coalition also resigned from their posts and Lively identified the council’s unwillingness to let black citizens choose their own leaders as the root of the problem.

The political struggle between white control and black control of CAA and Model Cities was not unique to Baltimore. Nationally, this power struggle played out with mixed results. Detroit was a comparable American city whose mayor pursued CAA funding early on and sought to work with the city’s sizable black community to implement Great Society programs locally. Despite limitations such as civil service regulations and the political interests of the mayor, Detroit is a national example of a large city where African Americans successfully influenced the antipoverty programs. In Chicago, by comparison, Daley machine control largely suppressed citizen participation in its implementation of the antipoverty programs. Philadelphia represents a more intermediate example, where representatives of the poor were included in the programs, and the city’s African American community had a clear role in shaping the process, but established political machines reduced the antipoverty programs to a patronage mechanism.

By December 1968, when the city council approved the appointment of Frank J. Ellis as the new head of the CAA, it was clear that community interests would take a back seat to the interest of local politicians. Although Walter Carter’s focus on community organizing represented the interests of the black community, Frank Ellis’ bureaucratic emphasis appeased both local city council members and federal program administrators. The Baltimore Sun ran a story on his “fiscal and administrative efficiency.” Within months of becoming the director of CAA, Ellis made the unilateral decision to shut down four of the program’s neighborhood centers. Meanwhile, Carter returned to his position as the chief community organizer for Model Cities and in a January 1969 letter to the board described his efforts, “[W]e have been attempting over a period of several months to develop sound, cooperative working relationships between the neighborhood development component of the Community Action Agency and the community organization section of the Model Cities Agency.”

Walter Carter’s work on resolving organizing efforts between the two agencies would be short-lived, however. By April 27, 1969, the papers reported his resignation. Earlier in the month the Baltimore News American quoted his frustration with a federal policy
shift away from allowing private organizations and neighborhood groups to operate under contract with Model Cities. “They (the Nixon Administration) prefer to give this program to white Democrats in City Halls than to give it to black people,” he stated.23
The process of dismantling the War on Poverty during Richard Nixon’s presidency would lead to the eradication of the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1974. During his first term in office, however, strategists advised the president to move cautiously against the programs. According to Nicholas Lemann, Nixon appeared initially supportive of Model Cities, while biding his time for re-election. He assigned trusted advisors to key posts in the antipoverty programs. Donald Rumsfeld, who would go on to serve as Secretary of Defense under both Gerald Ford and George W. Bush, resigned from Congress in 1969 to serve as the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under Richard Nixon. Nicknamed “the undertaker” by those who considered him a threat to OEO and its programs, Rumsfeld originally voted against the Office of Economic Opportunity’s creation in Congress in 1964. Nixon’s favored aide, Rumsfeld’s tenure at OEO, from 1969–1970, was characterized by reorganization of the agency and the creation of new programs at the expense of existing ones.

Federal policymakers weakened the impact of OEO in favor of HUD’s Model Cities program, leaving the role of community organizing in the antipoverty programs at stake. Mayor D’Alesandro tried to simultaneously accept the federal mandate while keeping the confidence of black voters through his ongoing support of Community Action, a tactic that resulted in simultaneous, rather than successive, programs. Model Cities got off to a decidedly shaky start prompting a HUD regional review concerned over lack of state involvement. “It was explained by the City that the State made no effort to support the model cities program. . . . This is of course a serious deficiency in the planning process.”
Mayor D’Alesandro campaigned vigorously for the program, trying to assure residents and community leaders that decision-making authority rested with them, even if the program had an almost nonexistent community-organizing component. “I believe that the people who live in the Model Cities area know better than anyone what the needs and desires of poor people are. And I want every public official and
all segments of the community to realize this as well as I do, and to join me in doing something about it.”

Despite these reassurances, many remained deeply skeptical. Civil rights champion Juanita Jackson Mitchell submitted her resignation from the Model Cities Board in May 1968. Her letter to the mayor provides a few subtle clues when it refers to her ongoing interest in Model Cities “as Congress intended it,” and when she asserts the critical importance of “self-determination of the people.” Although Mitchell helped start the Model Cities Policy Steering Board, concerns over lack of community control prompted her to resign from it early on. The board consisted of thirty people total. Of those, eighteen were community representatives elected from six community councils. An additional three were at-large representatives elected by the community representatives. One representative was selected by the city council president and the mayor chose the final eight. This Policy Steering Board would be an ongoing arena of struggle over authority and control of the city’s Model Cities program.

In December 1968, D’Alesandro met at Baltimore’s CORE headquarters on Gay Street to discuss control of the Model Cities Program. He spoke for ninety minutes with at least twenty civil rights activists and community leaders, including Margaret McCarty of Rescuers from Poverty, Walter Lively of Baltimore’s Urban Coalition, and Walter Carter himself. The group demanded greater community control of the program, including representation of the poor on the governing board. Although the meeting reportedly resolved tensions between grassroots black leaders and the mayor’s office, the struggle to define roles and goals would continue through the duration of the program.

Baltimore’s fledgling Model Cities program was further destabilized by changes in leadership and federal policy shifts. Director Robert Ewing announced his departure on the first day of 1969, going on to become the general manager of an Inner Harbor redevelopment project and leadership was quickly assigned to William G. Sykes. The frustration over a federal policy shift that spring that excluded private organizations and neighborhood groups as partners eligible for contracts, as voiced by Walter Carter to the press, was but one of the serious challenges facing the program. Simultaneously, Mayor D’Alesandro grappled with OEO Director, Donald Rumsfeld, over the withholding of funds for two core programs in Baltimore’s Model Cities plan. All federal funds for the technical assistance and community organizing program, known as CO-1, and the community councils, known as CO-2, had been repeatedly delayed. Washington Green Jr., who took over the chief community organizer role after Carter’s departure, reported:

During the past three months the c.o. [community organizing] staff on several occasions expressed to me their concern about the state of the entire Model Cities Program and the way things seemed to have reached a point of stagnation. They were concerned about the fact that the council participation had sharply declined and though the decline had slowed, it still continued. They were also concerned about the fact that they were finding it increas-
ingly difficult to talk to residents about involving themselves in a program that on paper held out promise for change but in actuality had shown no positive results because of numerous delays. People just were not listening. By October 1969, D’Alesandro’s written correspondence with federal officials duly notes Baltimore residents’ growing skepticism of the antipoverty programs and the lack of commitment to community participation and adequate funding by all levels of government. In no uncertain terms, he reminded Floyd Hyde, Assistant Secretary of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, “I have made a commitment to have citizen participation as an integral part of these programs and I intend to stick by it. The Federal agencies have made a similar commitment and we expect you to live up to your part of the bargain.”

D’Alesandro’s persistence with HUD paid off. On December 17, 1969, the top story in the Inner City Watch, a newsletter produced by Model Cities’ community organizers, reported, “Our Mayor has kept his word” and “Santa Claus arrived a week early this year. In his pack was $386,350 in funding for the six Model Cities Community Councils.” Mayor D’Alesandro’s commitment to community organizing, both through the councils and the CAA, persisted through the end of his term as mayor. His support allowed both agencies to continue developing their programmatic agendas, despite relentless political pressure and accusations of misconduct.

Federal pressures on Baltimore included an unequivocal mandate from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to develop Model Cities more quickly. In a memo widely circulated to all staff, the policy steering board, and the mayor, William Sykes discussed HUD’s unhappiness with developments in Baltimore. “They stated very clearly that unless we begin to operationalize at a faster pace, we will not receive the full amount of Federal funding for which we are technically eligible for the second year.”

Indeed, HUD’s scathing critique targeted weaknesses in staffing and personnel. Control over staffing was part of a growing internal power struggle between Sykes and the Policy Steering Board. When confronted with the concerns, D’Alesandro sided with Sykes, advising the chairman of the board, “Full responsibility for staffing (and the staff) of the Model Cities Agency must be placed with the Executive Director, subject only to the approval of the Board of Estimates as is required of all city employees.” Sykes’ struggles with the board continued through the following year, during which time he petitioned the Baltimore City Board of Estimates to turn “full responsibility and authority for the administration of the program” over to the program’s staff.

The Office of Economic Opportunity applied additional pressure to Baltimore’s Community Action Agency during the same period, “We are concerned with our inability to obtain from the CAA adequate audits. To date we have never received a complete audit for any of the agency’s program years.” Late financial reporting and “unending discussions” were further vexations to OEO, prompting Acting Deputy Regional Director, Richard Bowman, to chastise the mayor’s office. “As you know, we
and HUD have been concerned for over a year with the possible duplication of effort by the two local agencies.” Bowman’s correspondence called for merging the policy steering boards and community organizing efforts in CAA and Model Cities, effectively eliminating two of CAA’s strongest and most citizen-oriented components.35

Under these increasing pressures to merge Baltimore’s antipoverty programs, Lenwood M. Ivey assumed leadership of CAA. A graduate of Howard University, Ivey worked as a social work supervisor prior to joining the fledgling program in 1965 and initially served as the chief of neighborhood operations in East Baltimore. In February 1969, he gained appointment as one of the associate directors and later the same year was named acting executive director of the agency during a political scandal. The previous director of the program, Frank Ellis, was indicted on a series of criminal charges related to mismanagement of emergency funds and given a two-year prison term.36

Through their communications with the city, regional and national officials from the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Housing and Urban Development clearly articulated the federal vision of succession programming — one antipoverty program (MCA) replacing the other (CAA). But Baltimore’s dual programs continued to operate simultaneously through December 1971, the end of D’Alesandro’s term in office. The city’s Community Action Agency continued to operate, albeit on borrowed time, and Model Cities continued to struggle to establish clear lines of authority and implement its major programs. The job of merging the two agencies would fall to William Donald Schaefer, D’Alesandro’s successor and the former city council president who had assisted the campaign to block Walter Carter’s nomination as head of CAA three years earlier.37
The first meeting of the joint CAA-MCA Planning Unit took place March 14, 1972, and within two months the committee produced a preliminary report with recommendations to the mayor on the merger, among them expansion of the program’s target area and the development of a single citizen participation mechanism. By September, Schaefer released his own statement on the proposed merger, in which he stated “it would not be appropriate to merge the two agencies at this time.” Schaefer’s rationale included uncertainty over federal funding, reticence to create administrative issues related to a merger, evidence of increased cooperation, and decreasing duplication of services between the two programs. And “most importantly the fact that after initial growing pains, the two agencies have developed into efficient operations which serve as effective arms of the city government in the delivery of services to residents of their target areas.”

The Nixon administration’s soft approach towards the War on Poverty programs evaporated overnight after the November 1972 election. According to Lemann, “Once Nixon had been re-elected, there was no longer any need to outfox his critics by keeping the old poverty programs that they had expected him to gut.” Within days of starting his second term in office, Nixon directed top officials to begin the process of dismantling the Great Society programs. Taking their cue from the feds, and despite Mayor Schaefer’s stated reticence to merge the programs, plans for a successor agency were underway locally by 1973. Suggestions on a list of potential agency titles clearly indicate the mayor’s desire to situate the successor program within his immediate purview: Mayor’s Office of Community Affairs; Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Development; and Mayor’s Office of Community Development. Among the questions raised by MCA Director William Sykes were sources of funding after federal monies expired, the status of staff as mayoral appointments or civil servants, and the fate of citizen advisory bodies (CAA’s Community Action Commission and MCA’s Councils). The most pressing concern was one of funding. Federal funds were set to expire December 31, 1973 for the Community Action Agency and June 30, 1974 for the Model Cities Agency.

As advisors close to the mayor weighed in on the merger, some expressed a clear critique of the existing programs. Robert C. Embry, Jr., director of the city’s Department of Housing and Community Development, advised, “We should not assume that the agencies should continue to exist just because they have existed . . . neither agency is charged with the delivery of a specific service.” Embry addressed the racial politics of the existing antipoverty programs directly, suggesting a significant geographical expansion of services to pacify racist white residents:

Whether intended or not, these programs are seen by both whites and blacks as being designated to help black people. While the years of neglect of our black citizens justify the creation of special programs to deal with their problems, the apparent monopoly by blacks had to lead to the eventual hostility toward these programs by the white majority, and their eventual termination. This is
now happening. Consideration should be given to extending any new program
to a larger area, if not city wide [sic].

Mark Joseph, a city development coordinator, suggested a course of action that em-
phasized mayoral power and deemphasized citizen participation, particularly over
the distribution of financial resources. Joseph also encouraged Schaefer “for as long
as possible continue the neighborhood centers,” referring to the network of service
centers embedded in residential neighborhoods. Started by CAA and also adopted
by MCA, the centers provided a wide range of personal, social, and community
development services to residents of Baltimore’s poorest areas. Services included
youth recreation programs, health and wellness programs, senior citizen programs,
employment assistance programs, legal services, and referrals to other, more special-
ized services within city government.

Even as City Hall looked to gain administrative control over resources and strategic
direction within the new antipoverty agency, core elements of CAA and Model Cities
programs were selected for retention in the successor agency, including citizen participa-
tion and neighborhood centers. Community organizing, which held radical potential
to challenge existing political and economic power structures, was largely abandoned,
but using citizen representation on advisory boards to identify poor residents’ needs
and create programs designed to meet those needs allowed the city to reform its mecha-
nisms for governance. Rather than permitting residents to use federal funding to create
independent agencies that could leverage city government, the antipoverty programs
offered a narrower and more reformist opportunity to teach local government to be
more responsive to the needs of entire communities of underrepresented residents.

In order to implement this reformist agenda, the city needed capable coordinators
and planners to incorporate aspects of CAA and Model Cities into municipal govern-
ment. Mayor Schaefer looked to Lenwood Ivey, whose service in CAA spanned the
program’s eight-year existence, to play such a role. Schaefer wrote to the OEO in Sep-
tember 1973 announcing Lenwood Ivey’s appointment as director of Model Cities, in
addition to his existing duties as director of CAA, effective September 1, 1973. It would
be Ivey’s job to merge the two agencies after their federal funding expired. In June 1974,
the Baltimore City Council and Mayor Schaefer passed and signed Ordinance #697,
approving the merger of the Baltimore Community Action Agency and Model Cities
Agency and creating the Urban Services Agency.

The Rise and Fall of the Urban Services Agency, 1974–1993

On June 30, 1974, Reverend Vernon Dobson, an influential black minister and pastor of
Union Baptist Church, appeared in a WBAL-TV editorial that criticized the merger of
CAA and Model Cities. Dobson stated, “I’ve continually opposed the merger of CAA
and Model Cities because I felt it was politically motivated and that it would decrease
the viability of poor people. And now that the merger has happened, I’m convinced that I was right.” He accused the agency of eliminating citizen participation and allowing politicians to run the program. The pastor concluded his op-ed with the statement, “[P]oliticians historically don’t seek to empower people who [are] powerless, but they use powerless people to get and keep their power.”

The following week, Lenwood Ivey of the Urban Services Agency taped his WBAL-TV rebuttal to Reverend Dobson regarding the terms of the CAA/Model Cities merger. Ivey claimed citizen participation was built into the new Urban Services Agency through ten elected representatives from the Model Cities neighborhoods. Ivey continued, “Under this Administration, the poverty agency has had one guiding principle: To give those we serve every opportunity to participate in the decisions affecting their lives.”

This public exchange between two prominent black leaders illustrates the ongoing struggles for citizen participation in Baltimore’s antipoverty programs, even after the Great Society programs had formally ceased to exist. In Baltimore, the Urban Services Agency (USA) was the municipal legacy of Baltimore’s War on Poverty. Under the direction of Lenwood Ivey — first named head of CAA, then MCA, then USA — Urban Services would operate a network of neighborhood service centers that remained connected to the citizens it served through geographic proximity. The determination of Baltimore’s black leaders to retain core elements of the Great Society infused subsequent programs with a community focus, reminiscent of the original antipoverty programs. Ultimately, local and federal administrators largely phased out community organizing, and citizen participation took a back seat to service provision as Urban Services was gradually transformed by the political mechanisms that shape municipal agencies within city government. Local leaders such as Lenwood Ivey did what they could to maintain as much of the Great Society vision as possible, decades after the elimination of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Local War on Poverty programs taught city government how to better respond to low-income citizens’ needs at the neighborhood level, reflected in the endurance of the Urban Services Agency through the advent of New Federalism. Examining the nineteen-year lifespan of Urban Services, from 1974 through 1993, defines the impact the War on Poverty had in Baltimore.

At the time of its inception, the Baltimore Urban Services Agency inherited twenty-three neighborhood centers from its predecessor antipoverty agencies. These centers were distributed across the city, with higher concentrations in East and West Baltimore, where the poorest neighborhoods were (and still are) concentrated. The centers occupied repurposed churches, storefronts, libraries, public baths, or (in the case of Dunbar) associated with an existing public high school. These diverse settings served as multipurpose centers for many programs and classes for children, teens, senior citizens, young mothers, the homeless, and families in crisis. Food pantries, yoga classes, poetry readings, dance performances, legal assistance, home heating assistance, library services, and many more programmatic offerings coexisted in these spaces. The Urban Services headquarters was located at 11 East Mount Royal Avenue, across the
Jones Falls Expressway from Penn Station. From this location in Baltimore’s midtown, the USA office maintained geographic proximity to neighborhood centers to the east and west, as well as City Hall.45

From its very inception, Urban Services administrators were carefully instructed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on how to select Great Society programs for continued funding. Even though USA became a municipal agency within the city government, the majority of the department’s budget remained federal. In 1975, 20 percent of the USA budget was allocated from the city, while 80 percent came from the Community Services Administration (the successor agency to the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity), the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and HUD. In accordance with HUD’s mandate, city-sponsored projects deemed successful were transferred to the corresponding municipal agency. Projects deemed unsuccessful were terminated and those that did not map to existing municipal agencies but deemed eligible for retention were slated for federal funding under the new Community Development Block Grant program. The fate of the antipoverty programs varied according to this plan. The Neighborhood Sanitation, Preventive Dentistry, and Iron-Enriched Milk programs were turned over to the two agencies for General Funds. The Lighted House Manpower and Institutional Training projects were turned over to the Mayor’s Office of Manpower Resources for funding. A total of fifteen programs were terminated and the remaining fourteen programs and six community councils, which could not be picked up by other agencies because there was no appropriate municipal corollary, were retained for the Community Development Block Grant program.46

Unidentified children eating lunch in a classroom, October 17, 1973. (RBC Collection, UBA.)
Regular interim reports continued to be submitted to HUD, detailing the ongoing efforts to merge programs previously run by Model Cities and Community Action. Early USA program priorities included community services, health, education, crime and juvenile delinquency, recreation, employment, housing, and environmental protection. The neighborhood centers served as the primary delivery mechanism for these programs. Under CAA, the Neighborhood Development Program operated twenty-two community centers that remained cornerstones of the Urban Services Agency and stand as a primary example of an important lesson that Baltimore learned during the War on Poverty. These satellite centers provided a mix of direct services and referral services to poor residents in the neighborhoods where they lived. Services included housing weatherization and emergency energy assistance; health projects such as CPR training; senior citizens’ social and recreational programs and transportation services; youth educational and summer lunch programs; and neighborhood cleanups.47

In addition to CAA’s neighborhood centers, Model Cities also maintained six residentially based satellite centers, known as Community Councils. The six councils operated as independent contractors with MCA, and as a result, had independent identities and staff. They were also seen as centers of black political activity, particularly in East Baltimore, and therefore eyed with concern by city councilmen and the local media. In 1976, Lenwood Ivey’s decision to eliminate the councils and transfer eligible staff into the municipal Civil Service system was a controversial and decidedly unpopular decision with residents and staff. Tim Conway, Chair of Foresight Community Council, Inc., voiced his complaints to the mayor’s office. His correspondence to Joan Bereska, Administrative Assistant to the Mayor, stated:

Joan, I think that there are some strong political motivations involved in the decision effecting the Councils. I feel it is morally wrong as well as depriving the citizens of the service that the six (6) Councils have been providing for the last 6½ years because of some person or persons having personal grudges against some of us within the Councils. I am asking you, as the Mayor’s Administrative Assistant to intervene and to try to put a stop to such a person or persons from doing to the council personnel what is about to happen.”48

The Community Councils had operated as independent, third party contractors under Model Cities and also functioned as the sites of citizen engagement and participation in the program. Consequently, their dismantling had symbolic power and real world implications. Neighborhood-based community and political organizing that was previously conducted out of the Community Councils was seen as undesirable in the new municipal agency. Their community governing boards were replaced with advisory councils, weakening the power of residents in the decision making process, prompting swift reaction. Stanley Santos, a longtime East Baltimore neighborhood leader, resigned in protest as Chairman of Community Council A. Residents penned an open letter
to the mayor, voicing concerns over the changes, chiefly how Lenwood Ivey handled moving existing staff into Civil Service jobs. Lack of college degrees among existing Urban Services staff disqualified some for applying to take the Civil Service test for the positions they already held. Although they had been assured that those standards and qualifications would only be applied to new staff, existing personnel felt deceived and angered by the lack of accommodations within the Civil Service rules. The letter also accused Ivey of being intent upon purging “former Model Cities personnel.”

Mayor Schaefer’s response to these concerns was addressed in writing to all twenty-seven community members, including five men and twenty-two women, twenty-four of whom resided in the 21217 zip code of the city’s central west side. Schaefer explained that the mandate to convert Urban Services staff into the Civil Service system came directly from federal administrators at HUD. This response did not address the community’s concerns about educational qualifications for existing staff. Despite community objections to ingesting these workers into the Civil Service, the Urban Services Agency continued its development as an official arm of local government. Of the eighty total Council staffers, seventy-one took the exam, sixty passed, and fifty gained Civil Service positions. All six former Councils were then converted into Urban Services Agency neighborhood centers.

For the duration of the 1970s, the local media was seemingly intent upon reporting financial mismanagement or controversy around accusations of financial mismanagement. This drive to tarnish the reputation of the antipoverty programs served to reaffirm and strengthen white rejection of the Great Society programs as benefitting only blacks — financial wrongdoing could be used as socially acceptable rationale for

*A young girl sits on a woman’s lap while talking with a medical care provider at the Model Cities Iron Fortified Milk Program Clinic, August 14, 1973.* (RBC Collection, UBA.)
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curtailing black political power. Indeed, a constant cloud of scrutiny seemed to hover around the Urban Services and its use of public monies. Late in 1974, the Baltimore News American reported that two former employees of the Model Cities youth athletics program, Operation Champ, pled guilty to criminal charges for stealing almost $14,000 through a check-cashing scheme. A year and a half later, the News American printed a series of articles and editorials on the program’s audits. The reports claimed that “unauthorized or unappropriate [sic] spending practices” in the Community Councils led to their discontinuation.51

Throughout these investigations and audits, Mayor Schaefer publicly supported Ivey’s leadership and his confidence in the director as an adept administrator was generally reflected in the media as well. Ivey was able to distance himself from the financial practices of previous programs by playing the role of reformer. But it was only a matter of time before the press found errors in the workings of the Urban Services Agency. By early 1977, the Sun published a story on an employee accused of embezzlement, prompting an audit of the entire agency. Six months later, the paper reported the theft of $1,100 with the headline, “City Audit Confirms Misuse of Job Funds.” A similar article about the misuse of funds from a winter home heating fuel program in 1980 reported that six Urban Service Agency employees were suspended and four were terminated. These instances of theft or fraud in USA’s nineteen years of operation appear as isolated instances, rather than widespread graft.52

Strikingly, the media largely ignored all other activities associated with Urban Services, except for a few social events advertised or briefly noted in the Afro-American. The Sun and the News American slanted reporting continued to damage Urban Services...
public image and tether it to the tarnished legacy of the War on Poverty programs that had been so unpopular with Baltimore’s white residents. The agency produced some of its own media representation through a public access television program called “Street Scenes,” that aired on WBFF in Baltimore during the late 1970s and early 1980s. These images depict teenagers employed in a USA odd jobs program, black ballerinas training through the Cultural Arts Program, and senior citizens participating in a USA community choir, among other slice-of-life segments. Produced by Urban Services under the direction of Rachel Wohl, “Street Scenes” employed many USA teens in the program’s filming, acting, and interviews. This grassroots footage stands in stark contrast to mainstream newspaper coverage of the politics of the program from City Hall.53

From its very inception, funding and staff cuts were a way of life for the Urban Services Agency. Financially dependent on federal monies, those monies contracted radically over time, particularly during Ronald Reagan’s two terms as president. State and local funds could not adequately supplement federal funds, ultimately forcing the agency to lay off staff, close neighborhood centers, and reduce its overall services. Reagan’s well-known antipathy toward social programs created significant financial challenges for the USA and its ongoing antipoverty efforts in Baltimore.54

In 1975, the city received almost thirty-one million dollars through HUD’s Community Development Block Grant Program. Of that sum, over eight million dollars was dedicated to the Urban Services Agency, provided it coordinate services with Department of Housing and Community Development. USA funding actually came from all levels of government — local, state, and national. In an environment of shrinking resources, the agency had to limit its priorities and objectives. In fiscal year 1976, USA put forth seven functional areas for prioritization — the top three of which were community services, health, and education. By the very next year, those priorities shifted to education, health, and public safety. The removal of community services from agency-wide priorities is a striking move away from the community-focused rhetoric of the former Great Society programs. This did not mean that USA was taking services out of the neighborhoods — in fact, neighborhood-based day care, library services, transportation, and health screening programs expanded in FY77. However, it was the agency’s mechanism for designing programs based on residents’ expressed needs that was deemphasized. The process of becoming a municipal agency involved setting priorities and designing programs without the input of residents.55

Further cutbacks from federal sources continued through the 1970s. In 1978, Lenwood Ivey reported that USA’s Block Grant funding faced a $338,000 cut effective April 1, 1979. He proposed narrowing the gap by closing two of the six former Model Cities neighborhood centers on North Avenue and eliminating Block Grant funding for Legal Aid and Direct Search for Talent.56 The Legal Aid program was the primary objection of city councilmen thirteen years earlier, at the very start of the War on Poverty in Baltimore. What was it about providing poor residents with pro bono legal assistance that was so unpopular with politicians?
The Direct Search for Talent was a popular and successful program that sought to identify individual black youth who demonstrated leadership potential and to cultivate their skills for upward mobility into the middle class. Although this leadership model has been criticized by scholars who (rightly) point out the abandonment of the democratic ideals of the Great Society in favor of an individualistic approach to cultivate the Talented Tenth, the program was nonetheless a core element of Urban Services’ predecessor programs and represented a curious choice for elimination.\(^{57}\)

In the middle of these cutbacks, USA announced its physical relocation from its three-story office at 11 E. Mount Royal Avenue to a nine-story building at 227 St. Paul Place. At that time, in 1980, an expected 250 USA employees would work in the new building. This move shifted the agency’s headquarters out of a mixed-use midtown area and into the central downtown business core, in close proximity to City Hall. What is suspect about this move is the justification for a tripling of rental office space, most likely at steeper business district prices.\(^{58}\)

Although USA staff expressed continued frustration with Ivey’s leadership, Mayor Schaefer maintained a friendly and supportive relationship. Although his opinions about Urban Services are noticeably absent from the records, his strong relationship with the director are evident. When staff anonymously wrote to the mayor during a period of budget cuts he told Ivey, “I am pleased at the action you have taken to tighten control over the Urban Services Agency. I concur in the things that you have implemented. However, I seriously doubt if that well deserved ‘nice man label’ evaporates. You, fortunately, are a nice guy.” Ivey, in turn continued to meet Schaefer’s expectations in terms of “developing plans for maximum operations with less funding.”\(^{59}\)

Less funding was indeed the name of the game. By July 1981, President Reagan’s antipathy toward social programs meant major cuts to the Community Services Administration and the Community Block Grant Program. Ivey, in turn, proposed a re-organization of Urban Services that included eliminating the conservation program from Self-Help Housing; closing of all Cultural Arts centers except Gallery 409, Dunbar, and Cherry Hill; eliminating the Library Services program with Enoch Pratt Free Library; eliminating all Project Champ youth athletics projects except the street program; withdrawing Legal Aid’s federal funding; closing the Community Residence Center; and directing more municipal monies to the SAGA senior citizen program that had lost a third of its federal Title XX funding.\(^{60}\)

In a “Proposed Plan for Revision of the Urban Services Agency,” Ivey laid out the reality for 1981: “Recognizing the plan to fold CSA [Community Services Agency] funds into a block grant and the impact the loss of funds (Block Grant and CSA) will have on the city, we are submitting a proposal for the city’s consideration that would continue the Urban Services Agency as a social services support agency.” This proposed shift would eliminate all but the highest performing neighborhood centers. Ivey also suggested that certain administrative expertise developed within
Urban Services, including evaluation, management, neighborhood services, planning, research, public information, and fiscal management, be used to assist other city agencies. Instead, what transpired was the immediate lay-off of 24 existing USA staff, from modestly skilled workers to professional staff to management. Among the employees terminated were the director of fiscal management, the chief of neighborhood operations, a neighborhood center director, two senior management analysts, an accounting supervisor, an executive assistant, a youth counselor, and thirteen day care social workers, day care clerks, and utility aides. Many of the administrative functions Ivey had pointed to as unique to Urban Services were, in fact, the exact positions eliminated in the 1981 reorganization.61

Political pressure in the mid-1980s forced Maryland Senator Clarence Blount to resign as chair of the Urban Services Commission, which operated as the board of the Urban Services Agency. Blount’s resignation came after the Baltimore Evening Sun ran a series of investigative articles critical of USA and its board. The senator claimed the media’s accusations were minor points about board terms and that “City agencies [had] been targeted by the news media.” Although the Urban Services Commission was set up to consist of one third elected officials, one third business people, and one third community representatives, he described the board as three-quarters community members. Like Parren Mitchell, he was one of several black politicians whose political careers had roots in Baltimore’s War on Poverty. A former Dunbar High School principal, Blount served as the chair of the Community Action Commission in 1968 before being elected to the Maryland State Senate in 1971. Senator Blount’s resignation from the USA board in 1985 further signaled the agency’s break with its past and the increasing distance from its predecessor programs in the War on Poverty.62

At the time Blount stepped down, Lenwood Ivey had terminated 200 of his staff in the previous three years. Cutbacks to HUD’s Community Development Block Grant and Community Services Block Grant programs had reduced the Urban Services Agency’s annual budget by 1.3 million dollars by 1986. In response, Ivey proposed merging neighborhood centers, terminating under-performing staff, not filling vacancies, and using existing staff to cover additional projects. The Sun reported that Community Development Block Grant funds withheld from Urban Services forced the layoff of twenty-one staff, the elimination of five vacant positions, the consolidation of three day care centers, and the closure of two neighborhood centers. Ivey told reporters he had to cut half a million dollars from the current year’s budget, and those cuts had to come from departments funded with federal Block Grant monies. As the transition to a municipal agency depended on federal funds to cover services and programs not traditionally designed as part of local government, the department most affected by the dramatic loss of federal funds was the Neighborhood Services department.63

In 1986, when the people of Maryland elected William Donald Schaefer governor, City Council President Clarence “Du” Burns served the remainder of his mayoral term. Although Burns became the city’s first black mayor, in the eyes of many residents he
represented continuity with the Schaefer administration and the Democratic political machine on Baltimore’s working class eastside. The following year Kurt L. Schmoke defeated him in the mayoral primary and served as the city’s first elected black mayor. Schmoke, a hometown football star from City College high school, had graduated from Harvard and Yale and won a prestigious Rhodes scholarship. During Mayor Schmoke’s tenure, the structure of city government would be reorganized, the size of the municipal workforce would contract, and programs associated with Schaefer and his political allies would face elimination.64

Soon after taking office, Mayor Schmoke began systematically analyzing the workings of city agencies, looking for ways to make local government more efficient and effective. Programs that provided “software” were notoriously difficult to quantify and assess. All programs were increasingly pushed to measure their “impact” in order to justify continuation. Urban Services, with its roots in 1960s big government, caught the mayor’s attention. Close by his side was Kalman “Buzzy” Hettleman, a City Hall insider whose advisory role to Baltimore’s mayors on the Great Society programs date back to 1969. A Baltimore native and graduate of University of Maryland School of Law, Hettleman served as the assistant to the director of the National Office of Economic Opportunity Legal Services before taking a series of positions in local and state government between 1967 and 1983, including: administrative assistant to the mayor, director of the Baltimore Department of Social Services, and secretary of the State of Maryland’s Human Resources. Even after his official state biography trails off, Hettleman still clearly had a close advisory role in City Hall. He communicated with Mayor Schmoke at length regarding the state of the Urban Services Agency in the late 1980s. In April 1988, Hettleman delivered an extensive review of the Urban Services Agency to Mayor Schmoke. In his estimation, “I think that Len [Ivey] is overwhelmed by all of the history and the baggage of the agency, but, even more basically, he simply does not seem to be a creative program developer or manager.” In addition to this critique of Ivey’s leadership, Hettleman laid out a variety of options for the mayor, including leaving it intact, “spinning off” individual programs to other municipal agencies, or making the USA neighborhood centers part of a network of social service casework centers. Hettleman recommended a formal review of USA’s functions, to be conducted by a black leader, and introduced the idea of the neighborhood centers playing a “virtually indistinguishable role” from another neighborhood-based initiative known as the Mayor’s Stations. Five years later, Schmoke chose to merge these two programs, as Hettleman suggested.65

Mayor Schmoke met to discuss USA’s organization and policies with Senator Nathan Irby, the new chairman of the Urban Services Commission. Out of that meeting, it was decided that the mayor would support a plan to reorganize Urban Services or call for a new leader to replace Lenwood Ivey and stated that he supported the agency. That support, however, hinged on changes that would make it more effective by reviewing the wide-ranging programs and operations within every neighborhood center
to carefully assess overall performance and identify underperforming areas. Programs deemed successful might be transferred to other agencies and ineffective or outdated services might be eliminated. In April 1989, Schmoke suggested transferring the Cultural Arts Program, as well as parts of the weatherization program, and eliminating the transportation program entirely. Other programs he identified for potential transfer were Sanitation, SAGA, AFRAM, Project Survival, Youth Development, CHIP and Eviction. Central to his vision of the restructured Urban Services was the neighborhood centers. The mayor continued to regard merging services with the Mayor’s Stations as a potential way to strengthen the overall functioning of the neighborhood centers.66

Although Senator Irby assured Schmoke that the Urban Services Commission would conduct their own evaluation of USA’s programs, the senator requested additional time to conduct an assessment. Once again, Hettleman intervened, interjecting, “Beside the ‘B.S.’ nature of this ‘process,’ the danger is that the Commission will be overly protective and make it more difficult for you to spin-off programs (including Cultural Arts and Weatherization). To avoid this you may have to take a stronger stand on your ‘wishes’ on the range of programs.” The mayor, in fact, had already taken a strong stand on his wishes. The month before, in March 1989, Mayor Schmoke asked Lenwood Ivey to step down as Director of the Urban Services Agency, a position he’d held for eighteen years.67

Public criticism of the Urban Services Agency continued in the press, declared “a pacification program” and “an ill-defined and ill-performing bureaucracy which has pretended to serve the needs of the city’s poor but has seldom delivered creditably.” The condemnation of Urban Services was part of a broader project of shrinking local government services and privatizing many former municipal functions. Schmoke wanted to reduce the range of services USA offered and allow federal community development block grant funds to support the operation of recreation centers. After the announcement of a five-cent reduction in Baltimore homeowners’ property tax rate, Mayor Schmoke expressed the reality of lowering “expectations of what city services the city will provide,” among them closing fire stations and recreation centers, privatizing the popular Afro-American festival, AFRAM, and reorganizing Urban Services. In order to assist and search for private funds to support the program’s work, Mayor Schmoke re-hired Lenwood Ivey as a private consultant, just four days after his retirement as a municipal employee.68

The departure of key longtime black leaders of the antipoverty program, Clarence Blount and Lenwood Ivey, still did not quell the local media’s criticisms of the agency. When the city council approved Lloyd Mitchner as the new director in 1990, the Sun characterized the agency as part of the municipal patronage system. If USA was, in fact, seen as a throwback to political patronage under the Schaefer administration, it is unsurprising that the mayor looked to make a decisive political break with the past. Some journalists, however, criticized Schmoke’s decisions. Investigative journalist Daniel Berger accused the mayor of “cutting the meat, saving the fat” by eliminating
core services. The mayor’s ongoing review process for restructuring city government actively considered eliminating funds for art and cultural programs, merging planning and housing agencies, merging Urban Services with Parks and Recreation, merging Transportation and Public Works, and forming a General Services Administration.69

For the antipoverty agency, this culture of reorganization culminated in the spring of 1993, when the Baltimore Sun announced that Urban Services would cease to exist as an independent agency within municipal government. A newly created Department of Housing and Community Development would incorporate the programs previously run by USA and merge them with the services of a parallel legacy program, the Mayor’s Stations. At the time of its elimination, the agency had an annual budget of twenty-seven million dollars, only 2.9 million of which came from the city’s coffers. The restructuring of municipal government in Baltimore between 1987 and 1993 reduced the municipal workforce by 14 percent, from 29,000 to 25,000 employees.70
An addendum to the Urban Services Agency story came in 1996, when Mayor Schmoke announced the overhaul of fourteen neighborhood centers that replaced USA’s centers and the Mayor’s Stations. These new centers had operated for three years on an annual 5.2 million dollar budget, functioning primarily as referral services to other city agencies. Schmoke publicly admitted that the reorganization had proven ineffective, and that the new centers had “failed to meet their mission of providing basic city services.” The decision to revert to direct service provision at on-site neighborhood centers represented a return to the concept behind the neighborhood centers that emerged decades earlier. The mission of the centers that developed out of the Great Society was not reflected in other municipal programs. The realization of Urban Services’ value came too late to salvage the neighborhood-based direct service delivery mechanism that had emerged from the hard-fought battles of Baltimore’s War on Poverty.  

As an institutional history, this essay was primarily concerned with changes to the programmatic structures developed to help local government better respond to the needs of poor residents and how the War on Poverty changed local politics. From the mid-1960s through the mid-1990s, the city’s top elected officials were forced to grapple with the demands of the poor who participated in resident councils and citizen advisory boards and helped create antipoverty programs with federal funds. What emerged from the local Great Society programs was a decentralized municipal service model that operated at the point of need — the neighborhood. Abandoning this model also closed recreation centers, multipurpose facilities, firehouses, and branch libraries. Today, residents of the city’s hardscrabble rowhouse communities continue to articulate the necessity of these programs and demand a return to municipal services at the neighborhood level.

There is still more work to be done to bring the organizational history of Baltimore’s War on Poverty together with corresponding cultural, social, and political histories. What roles did activists and women play, and did the shortcomings of the Great Society radicalize the city’s black youth? To what extent does the Black Power movement overlap with or diverge from the War on Poverty locally? Did the federal Empowerment Zones program in Baltimore during the 1990s and early 2000s draw from the lessons of CAA, Model Cities, and Urban Services? How should these antipoverty programs be evaluated, in light of the city’s 2015 civil uprisings following the death of Freddie Gray in police custody? The relationship between protest and policy is ripe for further scholarly consideration, and Baltimore provides rich archival sources for future case studies.
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George (1887–1964) and Lillie Blizzard (1903–1960) with their children, Mildred, Carl, Dorothy (front), and Nellie, Kempton, Maryland, 1939. (LC-USF34, Library of Congress.)
The Blizzard Family of Kempton, Maryland: Faces from a Depression-era Coal Mining Town

JOE MANNING

“I agree that we were a poor family, but I don’t see how we could’ve been that bad off. We were living on a small farm outside of Kempton then. We didn’t have anybody helping us, but we were getting by with what we had.” Dorothy Blizzard Slaubaugh (pictured left), youngest daughter of George and Lillie Blizzard

Farm Security Administration (FSA) photographer John Vachon (1914–1975) took these pictures of the Blizzard family in May 1939, capturing that moment in their lives on nitrate film negatives. This particular shot portrays parents and children with great dignity and respect, at ease and comfortable. Mr. Blizzard leans slightly toward the camera. Mrs. Blizzard, with delightfully unruly hair, smiles warmly. The children, who strongly resemble their mother, are beautiful, and the parents look genuinely proud of them. The viewer cares about this family at first glance and wants to know more.¹

Joe Manning is an author and historian. He grew up in Maryland and currently lives in Florence, Massachusetts. For additional interviews and photographs of the Blizzard family, visit the website, https://morningsonmaplestreet.com/old-photo-project/old-photos-gallery.

¹ Joe Manning is an author and historian. He grew up in Maryland and currently lives in Florence, Massachusetts. For additional interviews and photographs of the Blizzard family, visit the website, https://morningsonmaplestreet.com/old-photo-project/old-photos-gallery.
In 2012, the author selected the George Blizzard family and in several months was able to track down some of the children’s living descendants, and Dorothy, the only surviving child in the pictures. What emerged after many interviews was a long and richly rewarding story, complete with dozens of family interviews and photos, all of which may be viewed seen on the author’s website.

The Farm Security Administration and Its Photographers

On March 9, 1933, newly inaugurated president, Franklin D. Roosevelt, called a special session of Congress for the purpose of drafting legislation to aid the country’s unemployed in the wake of the 1929 stock market crash. Approximately 25 percent of the working population lost their jobs, a staggering number that affected most American families. The president believed that “direct recruiting by the Government itself” was the most efficient way to create new jobs. Over the next several months he proposed, and Congress passed, a series of important bills known as the New Deal that created programs to relocate struggling urban and rural families to federal government planned communities. Consequently, Congress created the Resettlement Administration (RA). The Information Division of the RA and its successors, the Farm Security Administration and the Office of War Information, were headed mostly by Roy E. Stryker. The former Columbia University economics instructor employed young photographers such as Walker Evans, Dorothea Lange, Russell Lee, Ben Shahn, Jack Delano, and John Vachon, all of whom had stellar careers. The project began in 1935, its mission to document loans made to individual farmers by the Resettlement Administration,
and the construction of planned suburban communities. Several years later, the focus switched to the lives of sharecroppers in the South, migratory agricultural workers in the Midwestern and Western states, and finally to recording rural and urban conditions throughout the United States, as well as mobilization efforts for World War II. The project ended in 1945.

The following is from a 1964 interview with John Vachon. Richard Doud of the Smithsonian conducted the interview which is housed at the Library of Congress.

Doud: Do you remember, I’m sure you do, your first major assignment as a photographer, and how you went about getting ready for it, what you did to prepare yourself for it?

Vachon: One which only lasted about three days, maybe less, two days, I think, and I don’t remember what led up to it, but it was just one in which I happened to get some pictures which I have always liked quite a bit. It was to go to a coal town in West Virginia (it was in Maryland) called Kempton, which had been where the mine had (temporarily) closed. You know, it was one of those poverty stories, and I went with a guy named Harold Bellew (Ballou), who was an information adviser or something. I can’t recall what connection, you know, how this fit in with Farm Security or Resettlement, what they were considering doing for these people, but we spent two or three days in that town, photographing families, and housing, and children. I can’t recall any preparation, except that I think that I was probably, more than any other photographer who ever worked there, imitative, because I had been so exposed to all these other photographers, and particularly Walker Evans, who had a great influence on me. I went around looking for Walker Evans’ pictures.

Vachon was about to celebrate his twenty-fifth birthday when he was dispatched by the Farm Security Administration to Kempton in May 1939. He took 128 photographs there, twenty of the Blizzard family, some untitled and/or unpublished. His simple, straightforward and moving portraits of life in this remote mining village are
regarded as some of the finest work he produced in his illustrious career. Born in 1914, in St. Paul, Minnesota, and graduating from St. Thomas College in 1934, he enrolled in graduate school at Catholic University, and then took a job with the Resettlement Administration, a federal agency that soon became the Farm Security Administration. The job consisted of copying captions onto the backs of agency photographs, primarily of migrant farmers and poor families in the Appalachian region of the South. Two of the FSA staff photographers, Walker Evans and Dorothea Lange, later gained high regard for their work as American documentarians.

Vachon’s boss, Roy Stryker (1893–1975), was head of the Information Division, and creator of the agency’s photography project. In 1937, with Stryker’s encouragement, Vachon borrowed a camera and took some pictures in the Washington, D.C. area. A year later, impressed with the pictures, Stryker offered him a job as a staff photographer and he remained with them until 1943. Over 10,000 of his pictures for the FSA are archived at the Library of Congress. After serving briefly in World War II, he became a photographer for Standard Oil, and then worked many years for Life and Look magazines.

Davis Coal and Coke Company and Kempton, Maryland

The Davis Coal and Coke Company began operations in 1914, situated a mile and a half downstream from the Fairfax Stone, where the first trickle of the great Potomac River begins. Kempton straddled the border of Maryland and West Virginia. The mine and the surrounding village of Kempton were located in Maryland, but the post office and
company-owned store were on the West Virginia side. The company built the mine and houses on a hillside above the Potomac, clearing a strip of ground three-quarters of a mile long and several hundred feet wide. Most of the residents lived in single-family houses, with four to six rooms, an outdoor toilet, and a small lot with ground for a lawn in front and a small garden in back. An arcade named the Opera House stood next to the company store and housed a lunchroom, bowling alleys, pool tables, dance floor, and auditorium. Two years later the company suffered a devastating explosion in a mine shaft that killed more than a dozen workers. The streets remained unpaved, and by 1918 Kempton held 106 houses and a population of 850. In the 1930s workers organized the first union that was not affiliated with the company and afterward would institute a thirty-day strike before the annual contract was renewed. Such a strike was in effect when Vachon visited in late spring 1939. Ironically, about one month before he arrived, the Davis Coal and Coke Company had shut down its operations in Boswell, Pennsylvania, only ninety miles north of Kempton, throwing 170 persons out of work and leaving the community of 2,000 residents without a single industry.²

Eleven years later, the company closed its operations in Kempton. The Daily Mail (Hagerstown, Maryland) published an article about it on April 21, 1950. The following is quoted from that article.

Western Maryland’s mine industry is slowly being squeezed out of operation, coal men familiar with the area fear. Spokesmen said that underscoring the continuing trend to lower production and greater miners’ unemployment was the closing of Maryland’s largest mine. The Davis Coal and Coke Company shut down its No. 42 mine at Kempton, Garrett County, on Saturday. The 1,200-ton-a-day operation was mechanized and employed about 250 diggers. Equipment is being dismantled now and shipped away. Garrett County Commissioners confronted with a bad jobless situation, promptly moved to have the county declared a federal disaster area. Kempton’s only store, which employed seven people, also closed Saturday.

Coal men believe the mine slump is far more than just a seasonal depression due to present market conditions. They attribute it to a competitive disadvantage of Western Maryland coal, a low volatile grade, and they see no prospect for sufficient demand to make it profitable again. Production costs at Kempton, a Davis spokesman explained, were “way out of line” with the type of coal produced.

**George and Lillie Blizzard**

George David Blizzard was born in Grant County, West Virginia, on September 7, 1887. He married Nanna Bowser, probably in 1910. They had one child, Daisy, who was born in 1911. The marriage ended in divorce and on May 2, 1926, George married Lillie V. Sims, in Mineral County, West Virginia. He was thirty-eight and she was twenty-two, a na-
The couple had nine children, one of whom, Edward, died in 1930 at the age of six months. According to one family member, however, they had several others that were stillborn or lived only a few days. In the 1930 census, the family was listed as living in Garrett County, Maryland, in an area called Ryan’s Glade, about fifteen miles north of Kempton. George was working in an unspecified coal mine. They moved to a farm in the Kempton area shortly after. When the family was photographed in 1939, they were living on a farm near Kempton, not in the mine village. In the 1940 census, the family was listed as living in the mine village of Kempton, Maryland, at 31A Toney Street. All of the eight children living with them were attending school, except for the youngest three, all under the age of six. The census noted that George left school after the third grade, and wife Lillie left school after the sixth grade.

Lillie passed away on November 27, 1960, at the age of fifty-seven, and George died three years later, December 17, 1964, at the age of seventy-seven, survived by eight children, thirty-six grandchildren, and ten great-grandchildren. Many were living in Gorman, West Virginia, about fifteen miles from Kempton, including Dorothy Slaubaugh, the only surviving child shown in the photographs and one of her daughters and several grandchildren. One other Blizzard child is still living, Mary, but for health reasons, she was unavailable for an interview. She did not appear in any of the photographs.
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Dorothy Blizzard (playing "dress-up"), 1939. (LC-USF34, Library of Congress.)
“I first saw some of the pictures of me and my family in a book (Where the Potomac Begins). My oldest sister was very upset with them. There was one picture of me that I did not like. The kids were putting on these old coats and stuff, and I had put on shoes that didn’t match. We were just playing. We wouldn’t have dressed like that normally. I agree that we were a poor family, but I don’t see how we could’ve been that bad off. We were living on a small farm outside of Kempton then. We didn’t have anybody helping us, but we were getting by with what we had. During the Depression, we got coupons to buy shoes, and to get sugar and things like that. My mother canned a lot of stuff. We butchered a lot of our meat and canned that, too.

I was born on January 1, 1936. When I was about four years old, we left the farm and moved into the coal mining town. There were some pretty good houses there, though they were old, and they all looked alike. I walked to school. Later, we went to school in Thomas, West Virginia, so we had to walk to the post office across the state line to get the bus, because we couldn’t take a bus from Maryland. We had a car, but someone else had to drive us, because neither of my parents could drive.

We lived there till I was about 13. Then we moved over to Gorman, Maryland, in what they called Table Rock. We bought a house there, a nice big house. We had an outdoor bathroom, and we had to carry our water from the spring, because we had no running water. We owned two horses, some pigs, and cows and chickens. Our main meat was served on Sunday. We never felt poor, but I felt like we didn’t have as much as some of the other people.

But we lost the house, because my father was on strike and couldn’t keep up with payments. He was getting some money from the union, but it wasn’t enough. A friend of ours owned a vacant house back off the road, which was a nice house, so we rented it for a while. That was in Gormania, West Virginia. My dad was still on strike. I don’t think he ever worked again in the mines after that. After he retired, he got a pension. I lived in Gormania until I grew up and got married to John Slaubaugh in 1953. He and I moved to Barberton, Ohio. I had a sister, Mildred, living there, and she told us they were hiring at Babcock and Wilcox, a big construction company. We lived there about two years. And then they started laying people off, so my husband had to find another job. We moved to Arlington, Virginia, where he got a construction job. He built houses and things like that. We had a total of fourteen children.

My father died in 1964. He had that disease in the lungs that miners get (pneumononiosis, commonly called ‘black lung disease’), but we never could prove it, because when he was very young, he accidently shot himself while he was hunting, and they could’ve blamed it on that. He died of a heart attack while he was being treated in the hospital. My mother had died four years before. My mother was a hard worker. She helped a lot on the farm. She was very pleasant to be around. My father was a very nice man. He was very understanding. We used to have a lot of fun together. My older sister Mary and I are the only children still living.”
Excerpts from author’s interview with Janine Shirley, one of Dorothy Blizzard’s fourteen children:

“My mother has a lot of faith in God. When we were growing up, we would all get together every evening, and she would read to us from the Bible. And then we would say a prayer and go to bed. She said that her parents made sure all of their children went to school, even if they had to walk in a snowstorm. My mother also believes strongly in education. All of us had to go to school, and had to do our lessons. She would help us with our schoolwork. She would answer any questions we had to the best of her ability. She was very intelligent. She didn’t finish high school, but she went back and got her GED.

She knew math very well. And she continued to learn as she helped each of us with our schoolwork. When all of us grew up, she loved children so much that she became a teacher’s aide in the schools. At least two of us children went to college. My parents have always been very close. They do everything together. Our whole family has always been very close. When I was growing up, practically every Sunday after church, we would go out to McDonald’s, and then to the park, where we played baseball. My mother loved to play and run the bases. She also loved to play Jacks and horseshoes.

I asked her once why she had so many children, and she told me it was because she never wanted to be alone. And now we children are grown and have our own families, most of us live in the same area, and we often have family reunions and get-togethers.

In those pictures the government took, I could see how much my mother and her siblings had to struggle to get by. But I believe that kind of a struggle can make you
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stronger as a person. You learn that the most important things in life are God, family, a place to live and enough to eat. My mother always says, ‘It doesn’t matter where you live, it’s what you make of your home.’ My mother is humble, just like her parents were. She doesn’t really understand how much of a positive effect she has had on us children. She has always been a strong, vibrant woman, with a lot of pride and a lot of faith. She continues to be loving, caring, and nurturing. She has the warmest hands. I can remember when I was growing up and had an ear infection, she would cup my ear in her hand, and it would sooth the pain.”

Carl Martin Blizzard, the oldest child photographed by Vachon, was born on January 21, 1929. He married Ruby Jordan and they had two children. Carl served in the Korean War, worked for many years for the Island Creek Coal Company, and was also an auctioneer. He died in Maryland on August 8, 2002 at the age of 73. Ruby died in 2011. Survivors included two children, four grandchildren, five great-grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. Excerpts from author interview with Carl’s son, William Blizzard.

“I saw the photos in Where the Potomac Begins. My father didn’t like the pictures. He didn’t want people to see how he lived when he was growing up. I bought a copy for him, but he shoved it into a bookcase in a place where you couldn’t see it. But I don’t have a problem with the pictures. A lot of people had to grow up like that back then.”

He didn’t get any further than the sixth grade. When he was young, he worked on a farm for about 25 cents a day, just so he could help his parents. He started working in the coal mines when he was eighteen. He talked a lot about helping his dad at the
mine. He said his father had to work really hard to keep his family fed. His mother used to cook supper on a coal stove. He told me about the death of his little brother Edward, who died when he was just a baby; and about his sister Agnes, who died at the age of 18, while he was stationed in Korea.

I found his Army papers, and the VA sent me all of his medals. One of his sisters told me that when he got home from Korea, he burned his uniform. He must have had some bad memories of the war. He worked thirty-nine years in the mines at the Island Creek Coal Company in Bayard, West Virginia. We lived in Terra Alta, which is about thirty-eight miles from Bayard. So he drove to work every day. He also worked as an auctioneer. He started doing that in 1966, but he continued to work at the mine. He liked to tinker around at home. After he retired from the mines, he built sheds and other outbuildings and sold them.

I graduated from high school, but I didn’t go to college. I helped my father for a while with the auctions. Later, I worked for WalMart for eighteen years. I worked in the pharmacy for part of the time. He (my father) told me he had rheumatoid arthritis as a kid, but I guess he got over that. He got hurt in the mines a few times. He had several heart attacks. The last one, in 2002, was massive and it took him. My mother died two years ago.

My first child was born with a club foot. My dad said that before he died, he wanted to see her walk. He did, just a couple of minutes before he passed. She was in the room, and he said to her, ‘Come over here,’ and she pulled herself up from the floor and walked over and got in his lap, and then she got back down. And then he said, ‘I’m going,’ and he died.”

Mildred Delores Blizzard was born on April 8, 1933. She married Earl Lipscomb and they had six children. They lived in Barberton, Ohio most of their lives. Earl died in 1998. Mildred died in Barberton, on December 31, 2002 at the age of 69. Survivors included six children, twelve grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. The following are excerpts from the author’s interview with Marjean Cool, Mildred’s daughter.

“When that book came out, my mother was very upset about the pictures, and so she didn’t buy it. She said, ‘They made my daddy look like he was a bum.’ If you knew my mom, and the way she felt about her dad, anything that might make him look bad would really offend her. I knew my grandfather had worked in the coal mines. And if you live in a coal mine town, and you go outside, you’re going to get really dirty. My grandmother and grandfather seemed to be okay with the way they and the kids looked. After all, they were letting the photographer take the pictures, so I don’t think they thought there was anything wrong with it. When I saw Grandma with her hair like that, at first I wondered why she didn’t comb her hair for the pictures. But her sisters all had a problem with their hair if the humidity was high. It would get frizzy. My mother had the same problem, and so do I, but we had gel to keep it down.
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Mildred Blizzard (1933–2002), 1939. (LC-USF34, Library of Congress.)
I was born in 1956, in Barberton. We lived in a project then. During that time, Dad was working off and on at B & W (Babcock & Wilcox). There were times when they would lay off people. My parents still owned a house in Kingwood, West Virginia, so Dad would go back there to work when he got laid off.

Barberton was a very small town, right next to Akron. I was the only girl. My three older brothers went to public school. When we moved from the projects to the house that my parents bought, there was a Catholic school right across the street. Walking to the public school from there was a little over a mile. That was fine for the boys, but Dad wanted me right across the street where it was convenient, even though we were not Catholic. After that, my two younger brothers also went to the Catholic school. When we got to the eighth grade, we all went to the public high school.

My mother told me that when she was a girl, her mother made her go into the kitchen and learn to make bread. She cried all the way through it because she thought she should be outside helping her dad in the yard. She was very close to her daddy. But she went ahead and learned, and when she made her first loaf of bread, her mother told her, ‘That was the best bread ever because your tears are in it.’ I remember my mom canning and all of that, so she learned to do what her mother taught her. She only got as far as the eighth grade.

I was only four years old when Grandma died, and only eight when Grandpa died. We would go there in the summer to visit. I remember that Grandma’s gray hair was so pretty. One time when we visited, Grandpa was going to the store, and he asked me if I liked bananas. I told him I did, and he came back with a huge basket of them. I remember Mom talking about one time when Grandpa had sent money to her. She knew he didn’t have much money. But he wanted Mom to buy something for all of us kids. So she used just part of it and sent back the rest.

My mother was very giving. Her little church was about ten or fifteen people. For Christmas, she would want to buy something little for everyone in the church. She dearly loved her grandchildren. They were her life, and she would do anything for them. When I had my first grandchild, she was on cloud nine.

In her later years, she got diabetes, and she had congestive heart failure. She died on New Year’s Eve of 2002. My father was thirteen years older than my mother, and he died in 1998. My mother loved gladiolas, so I planted some in the spring and took them to her grave. I miss my mom very much. There was never a time we would talk or visit that we didn’t tell each other, ‘I love you.’ She was that way with all her family.”

Nellie Mae Blizzard was born on August 11, 1934. She married Edward Dillsworth and they had two children, a son and a daughter. She died in Oakland, Maryland on July 16, 2011, at the age of seventy-six. Survivors included her husband and their two children. The following are excerpts from the author’s interview with Wayne Dillsworth, Nellie Blizzard’s son.
I thought it was kind of cool, seeing those pictures in the book, *Where the Potomac Begins*. I heard those stories for years. She never used the word ‘poor,’ she just said she didn’t have much, but that her father always seemed to find a way to take care of them. She said she was just like Loretta Lynn in *Coal Miner’s Daughter*. I think they would have been a little better off than people would think. I know that some of her siblings were very angry about the pictures in the book. One of her sisters consulted a lawyer about suing the author to get the pictures out of the book. But they didn’t bother my mother at all. She actually had a copy of it autographed by the author.

I was born in 1962. We were living in a rented house in Oakland (Maryland) then. They finally bought a house in Oakland, and my father still lives in it. He worked in the logging business. He retired from that about five years ago, and he drives a tractor-trailer now. He never stops working.

My mother didn’t finish high school, but she worked for a while until I was born. She was a good mother. She was a lot of fun sometimes, but if you did something
wrong, she’d straighten you out. She was kind of a homebody. She liked picnics and family reunions, and that kind of stuff.”

George David Blizzard Jr. was born on February 5, 1937. He married Helen Dillsworth, sister of Nellie Blizzard’s husband Edward and they had six children. He worked in construction most of his life. George died in Virginia on September 17, 2010 at the age of seventy-three. Helen died a year later. Survivors included seven children, twenty-one grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren. The following are excerpts from the author’s interview with David Blizzard, son of George Blizzard Jr.

“I was born in 1960. At that time, my parents were living with Grandma and Grandpa Blizzard, at their old home on Table Rock (Garrett County, Maryland). When I was two years old, we moved to northern Virginia. There was no work in Garrett County, except for the coal mines and logging. My father got a job in construction. He did a lot of concrete work and a lot of bridge work at first. He had dropped out of school in the sixth or seventh grade. But despite that, he was a heck of an architect.

I remember when I was a kid, he would bring home a set of plans, roll them out on the table, and by the next morning he would have it in his head how he was going to

George Blizzard Junior (1937–2010), 1939. (LC-USF34, Library of Congress.)
build whatever it was he was working on. Most of the work he did was for companies, but once in a while on weekends, Dad and his brother-in-law would go out and get work to build houses, from the ground up.

In his later years, he did asphalt work. A lot of it was put down by hand. I worked with him for a while when I was young. The company had an old flatbed, and we could haul about 10 tons at a time. I remember sometimes we’d work from early morning till 3:00 in the afternoon, and by that time, we had put 100 tons of asphalt down by hand. And then he would tell me to go get another load.

My parents married on March 4, 1959. I remember that, because my wife and I got married on March 4, 1979. We planned it that way, and my parents were very pleased. They started out in a rented house, and owned a couple of houses later. I was their first child.

I quit in the 10th grade. For the past eleven years, I’ve been managing a compost operation for Spotsylvania County. We take human waste from the wastewater treatment plant, mix it with mulch, and make the compost. It’s great for landscapers and gardeners. A few years ago, they changed the qualifications and wanted everyone to have a high school diploma or GED. So I went back in 2008 and got my diploma.

My father talked about how when he and his brothers and sisters were growing up, they didn’t receive much on Christmas. He could remember his father coming home with fruit baskets. He never complained about it. That’s one of the reasons my parents moved to Virginia, so we kids wouldn’t have to grow up the way he did.

My Aunt Dorothy told you that her father, my Grandfather Blizzard, was a very nice person to be around, and that he was very understanding. My father was like that, too. He would take me fishing when I was a kid, but I remember that he didn’t have much patience waiting for the fish to bite. I’m the same way. Picnics were the big thing. Many times, on the spur of the moment, he would say, ‘Let’s go get some KFC (Kentucky Fried Chicken) and have a picnic.’

He knew how to pinch a dollar. He knew how to save and not buy things he didn’t really need. I guess I’m not much like that. I grew up in a different world. But I picked up a lot of his work habits. He was never late for work. I’m the same way. My wife is always asking me, ‘How come you’re going to work so early?’

My father was in good health up to the last couple of years, and then he got a collapsed lung. He never smoked, so it was probably caused by the type of work he did. When you work in construction, especially when you’re handling concrete, you’re always breathing in some kind of dust. I was only four years old when Grandfather Blizzard died. But I remember getting out of the car when we would go visit him, and he would be standing on the front porch. He always had a pack of Teaberry gum in his pocket, and he made sure I got a stick of it. He passed away in the hospital in 1964. They were about to release him, and my dad went to pick him up and bring him to our house. Mom was cooking a big dinner to celebrate. Dad had him up and was putting on his shirt, and he suddenly died of a heart attack.”
Unidentified coal miner, Kempton, Maryland, 1939. (LC-USF34, Library of Congress.)
In May of 1939, John Vachon captured this beautiful image of a coal miner looking down at the town where he lives and works. Eleven years later, the mine would close for good. It has been seventy-five years since Vachon visited Kempton with his camera. It is no longer an official town, just a geographical location with only a handful of families living there.

“I think it’s great to be able to see those pictures of my dad and his brothers and sisters, and what things were like when they were young, you know, not having a thing, and to see where they ended up. They didn’t have much as kids, but the family was there and the love was there.” –David Blizzard, son of George Blizzard Jr.

NOTES

1. For the past nine years, I have been researching the lives of some of the families in many of the historic photographs taken by the Farm Security Administration and related federal agencies during the Great Depression and World War II. Almost 177,000 of them, with their original captions, appear on the website of the Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. In addition, I have been researching the lives of some of the children in the more than 5,000 photographs of child laborers taken from 1908 to 1924, by Lewis Hine, which are also in the library’s collection.

2. Gilbert Gude, Where the Potomac Begins (Santa Ana, California: Seven Locks Press, 1984); “Seventy-one miners were caught by an explosion at the Kempton mine of the Davis Coal and Coke company, on a spur of the Western Maryland railway, about two miles from Fairfax, W. Va. Twelve dead bodies have been recovered, five after several hours’ search. It was expected that one more body will be found, bringing the fatalities to thirteen. All but three or four men known to have been in the mine are now accounted for. The mine was not badly wrecked, according to mine officials. The explosion, it was stated, was probably caused by dust. Those not directly in range of the blast hurried to the main entries and started for the foot of the shaft in which the cages were still operating. There they were met by rescue parties from the surface and quickly hoisted. Other rescuers made their way into the mine and soon located several bodies. Later other miners who had been unable to reach the main lines of communication were found and brought out. The mine is in Garrett County, Md., and is practically new, with all modern machinery. It is a shaft mine, 430 feet deep with seven or eight miles of headings. The machinery of the mine was not damaged and the cages working expedited the rescue of the imprisoned men. The explosion occurred about 2000 feet from the shaft bottom. Falls of coal from the explosion delayed the rescue work. The mine is devoid of gas. The identification of the men taken out has not yet been established. Several are burned and badly maimed. The mine has a capacity of about 2,000 tons a day,” Tyrone Herald (Pennsylvania) on March 2, 1916. “Have you heard the news from Kempton? Splendid isn’t it? Something to be proud of, Kempton, the youngest town of Garrett County; Kempton, a mining town on the Western Maryland Railroad; Kempton, one of the patriotic towns of the county, the town that does things,” Oakland Mountain Democrat (Maryland), July 4, 1918.

3. Author unable to confirm.
Stanford University President David Starr Jordan shown at the U.S. Capitol with anti-war protesters, rallying against President Woodrow Wilson’s speech to Congress asking for a declaration of war, April 5, 1917. Four days earlier his pacifist speech at Baltimore’s Academy of Music ignited a riot. (Library of Congress.)
“Prominent Men Badly Beaten”: the Baltimore Pro-War Riot of 1917

CHARLES HOLDEN

The year 2017 marks the one hundredth anniversary of an event that shocked Baltimore’s “better citizens,” sparked a lively if brief debate over free speech and patriotism, and then quickly washed away in the tidal wave of World War I-fueled nationalism. On April 1, 1917, a Sunday, the streets of Baltimore buzzed with rumors that President Woodrow Wilson, fondly remembered from his days in the 1880s as a graduate student at Johns Hopkins University, would finally ask Congress for a formal declaration of war against Germany and its allies. That evening, however, at the city’s Academy of Music on North Howard Street, a packed house listened to David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University and a prominent pacifist leader, denounce the impending American entry into the war. Once the Academy hall was filled, a small contingent of police stood guard to prevent disruption from pro-war individuals seeking entry. As the meeting proceeded, the crowd outside grew in numbers and passions escalated. When the crowd reached an estimated 500 people, they approached the door, only to be told to move on by Marshal Robert Dudley Carter of the Baltimore Police Department. The crowd backed down Howard Street a short distance and then stopped as someone produced an American flag. At this point, “while the crowd was clamoring for admittance to the Academy,” Agnes W. Gill, the daughter of a wealthy businessman, climbed on top of a box and called for “three cheers” for President Wilson and for the nation. “This is a time when the country needs every man of you. This is no time for quibbling,” Gill shouted. As those gathered around roared their approval, she broke into song, leading them through the national anthem and the provocative “We’ll Hang John Brown to a Sour Apple Tree,” with “Davy” Jordan substituted for Brown. Their numbers grew rapidly — estimates range from 1,000 to 4,000 — and more American flags appeared. When a “corpulent individual” emerged from the Academy and “made some remark” about the pro-war crowd gathering in the street, “in a twinkling a dozen men had leaped on him.” The police had to form a “flying wedge” to free the man, who emerged “ashy pale and trembling all over.” Within minutes the scene had grown into what the Baltimore Sun cheered as “the greatest patriotic demonstration the city has seen since the Spanish-American War.”

Charles J. Holden is a Professor of History at St. Mary’s College of Maryland. He is currently finishing a co-authored book on Spiro Agnew and the rise of the “silent majority.”
Then this “patriotic demonstration” turned into a melee. The war advocates began marching back and forth in front of the Academy, waving their flags and singing songs proclaiming their patriotism. The Sun reported that the crowd also stood “howling, hissing, and shaking their fists at the police.” When C. Harry Reeves, Jr., who had recently served with Maryland’s Fifth Regiment on the Mexican border, asked if they would “follow the flag over the police into the hall and put an end to the meeting,”
the crowd roared its approval and surged toward the doors. Waves of protesters crashed against the thin police line as tempers rose on both sides. At the bottom of the steps in front of the Academy, a Captain Henry attempted to yank an American flag from Carter Osburn, Jr., who in the confusion of the moment, emerged as another one of the leaders of the rally. The sight of the Captain Henry and Osburn wrestling over the flag — “the first mistake made by the police,” The Sun opined — sent the protesters into a howling rage. As the Sun, reported, “That was enough. Fists went up in the air, the mob surged forward and the police, pushed back by an irresistible force, went back as if they were yanked with a rope. On and over them swept the crowd.” With Carter Osburn’s flag held high, the protesters stormed into the Academy hall, where David Starr Jordan was delivering his address. Both sides exchanged shouts as the protesters made their way toward the podium where they “shoved the flag in the face of Dr. Jordan.” Both sides hurled insults back and forth for several minutes while some in the stunned and frightened audience moved toward the door. Finally, fearing the worst, meeting organizers ushered Jordan out and the meeting was effectively ended.

The break-up of the pacifist meeting did not conclude the evening’s events, however. As the happy protesters spilled back into the street, two patrol wagons arrived carrying an estimated forty additional policemen. When Marshal Carter gave the order to clear the street, the police, now reinforced and “smarting under the humiliation of being swept off their feet,” charged into the crowd with clubs drawn. “’Thud’ and tattoo commenced,” The Sun reported, as the police beat the “young men unmercifully.” According to The Sun, the demonstrators offered no resistance, “but that seemed to make little difference.” Before this final act of the night’s drama concluded, police filled two “wagons” with protesters under arrest and one man, Douglas Ober, Jr., was knocked unconscious by a police baton. What began as a political clash over American foreign policy, escalated into an ugly episode of physical intimidation by a group of young men against law-abiding citizens, and then ended when the police, in turn, flexed their own muscle against the intimidators.

Riots are chaotic, complicated events and this one featured a volatile combination of issues that added to the confusion: free speech, law and order, local class relations, the meaning of nationalism and patriotism, war versus peace, loyalty versus accusations of treason. Not surprisingly, opinions on what exactly happened and what it all meant abounded. But in a short time, Baltimore’s elite, with the backing of The Sun, quickly forged a narrative of the event that used nationalism to excuse the behavior those who had rushed the police. After a few days of sharp debate that played out in the newspaper, the component parts of this narrative came together: the pacifists were asking for trouble, the police overreacted, and those of their own class, the “prominent men” who were “badly beaten,” had demonstrated an appropriate level of patriotism during these stressful times.

Baltimore has a long history of rioting, many of which occurred within diverse contexts and had varying causes at their core. In 1812, an Anti-Federalist crowd attacked
the newspaper office of the *Federal-Republican*, a paper opposed to the looming war with England. When the *Federal-Republican* had the gall to try and restart publication, mob violence spread beyond the newspaper office and engulfed much of the city as Anti-Federalists sought out anyone suspected of Federalist sympathies. The city, of course, home to the infamous Pratt Street Riot of April 1861 when pro-Confederate Baltimoreans attacked two Massachusetts regiments changing trains on their way to Washington, D.C. The great labor strike of 1877 began when workers for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in places such as Wheeling and Martinsburg walked off the job in response to wage cuts. Working class men and women in Baltimore, suffering under their own economic hardships, protested in solidarity when the call came for reinforcements to help put down the West Virginia strikes. Once again, angry Baltimoreans squared off with soldiers marching through the streets and once again a soldiers-citizens clash produced fatalities. In more recent times, in the aftermath of Martin Luther King’s assassination in 1968 and in reaction to the death of Freddie Gray while in police custody in April 2015, the city has witnessed widespread unrest and outrage over acts, and police behavior, seen as both senseless and unjust.³

It would be a stretch to say that what happened in front of the Academy of Music rises to the level of gravity of these other Baltimore riots. There were no fatalities and very few injuries. Property damage was slight, if at all. Plus it was all over within approximately an hour. But it does shine a light on how moments of intense nationalism can intersect with and inflame preexisting tensions. The outcome of this particular episode also shows how Baltimore’s powerful were able explain away the embarrassing revelation that they, too, could engage in mob-like behavior normally associated with the lower classes. They employed the language of nationalism to defend their own, closed down dissent, and reaffirmed a social order that left them on top. This event also presaged more ultra-nationalist actions against any remaining dissent once the United States had entered the war. Prominent historians have documented the extensive efforts to clamp down on free speech as the United States entered the war in 1917, yet others correctly pointed to the significance of the pro-war unrest in Baltimore that April, “Thus the tone was set . . . for the next twenty months.”⁴
In the early months of 1917, war fever was building in Baltimore, along with concerns that there might be an outbreak of some kind of unrest. In February, the Maryland National Guard’s Fifth Regiment returned from the U.S./Mexican border conflict to much praise and proclamation of civic pride. Anticipating that the entry of the U.S. into war might spark some form of disorder, Marshal Carter had asked to recruit an additional 240 police for “emergency duty” as well as permission to begin police training in “the handling of two machine guns.” When the new additions joined the force in March, Carter announced that he was now ready, “If war is declared and we have any riots or trouble in Baltimore I am ready to handle the situation.” Then, just to make sure, Carter officially asked Maryland Governor Emerson Harrington to “prevail upon the United States government” to “give or loan” the department two Gatling guns. These would be used, he explained, “only during riots.”

It is probably safe to say that when Marshal Carter congratulated himself for his preparations he had little expectation that the police force would be used against members of the city’s upper class. He would not have been alone in that. In perusing letters-to-the-editor in The Sun, it becomes clear that the arrest and the beating of the protest leaders, the “prominent men” referred to in the next day’s headlines, sent the biggest shock waves through their readers. Among the “two wagon loads” of people arrested, The Sun singled out six names as being the “prominent men” who were beaten and taken in: Carter G. Osburn, Jr., [Joseph Hall] Allison Muir, William Tipton, Douglas Ober, Jr., Leonard Ober, and Louis Merryman. Representatives of Baltimore’s elite responded immediately. The “citizen” delegation that met with the police department leadership shortly after the event included R. Lancaster Williams and William L. Marbury, two very prominent Baltimore city leaders.

The American upper-class of the early twentieth century championed the rule of law and order in the face of “mob” activity that seemed to stalk urbanizing America. The United States had experienced a wave of recent immigration since the turn of the century and the assumption among the upper classes was that immigrants tended to be “riot-prone.” Paul Gilje, the foremost historian of American rioting, notes in his definition of what constitutes a riot that they are “moments when people in the street,
le menu peuple (“the little people”) make themselves heard and reveal how they interact with others in society. Suddenly, in a luminescent moment, amid the shouting roar of the crowd, the ‘inarticulate’ become articulate.” Yet the Baltimore riot presents a puzzle: is a mob still a mob if led by the elite? Does this still constitute a riot when its leaders were not only articulate but were representative of the city’s leading families?7

If one looks at other parts of Gilje’s definition of a riot, however, then what happened in the streets of Baltimore that evening qualifies. “Riotous crowds do not act merely on impulse and are not fickle.” Indeed, shortly after the melee, The Sun accounts included information from the police indicating that the storming of the Academy was pre-planned. Reverend R. W. Hogue, one of the event’s organizers, suggested it was that night. In calling for the meeting to disband, he announced to the crowd, “The threat has been made good. The disturbers who said they would not permit the meeting to go on have succeeded.” In the aftermath, the Police Board revealed to the press that detectives were “gathering information which the Police Department believes will show that a number of those in the gathering premeditated [sic] trouble with the pacifists.”8

The board already had:

. . . the names of a number of men who planned, early last week, to go to the meeting and break it up. These men were overheard in two uptown hotels making arrangements to get their friends to attend the meeting and the general defense of the board will be that the disturbance was deliberately incited and that those who came there for that purpose deserved anything they got.9

If true, then it was no accident that those waving American flags in the street targeted the Academy of Music that night, having “seize[d] upon some object or objects that represent the forces that propelled them into the riot originally.”10

Despite the calculating aspect to the rioters’ targets and actions, there is, of course, still an element of the unexpected. Here again what happened that night in Baltimore fits Gilje’s definition. There is, he notes, “always a certain element of the irrational in any given tumult. Rioting was not a daily routine. Each participant in a riot knew that he was involved in an exceptional episode of his life. Emotions and passions surfaced; people got carried away with what they were doing.” The surfacing of these particular pro-war emotions makes sense when the events are placed in the context of the time, in this case when the political debate between the American right and the left prompted acts of physical conflict. “Right-wing violence intensified from 1917 to 1920 against the backdrop of the strident patriotism that accompanied America’s entry into war.” These years marked a time when “anyone who opposed the war, people of German heritage, and other ethnics might be the subject of attack.”11

Still, at the time, it is puzzling that these sons of the elite ended up beaten and under arrest. And it was unsettling that they had, after all, overpowered the living symbols of law and order, the police, in their desire to break up the meeting. This conundrum vexed The Sun at first. The paper began its analysis in the next day’s paper under the
title “A ‘Mob’ of Good Citizens.” Here one notices that The Sun chose to put the word “mob” in quotes, but not “good.” From the paper’s perspective, there was no question the protesters, and especially their leaders, were “good citizens.” But linking these good citizens with a “mob” required additional punctuation. The Sun noted that the crowd was of “mixed personnel” but led by “business men” and “representatives of many of the best-known families and institutions in the city.” The paper then drew up a list of names in the “front ranks,” that included two well-known and highly regarded professors from Johns Hopkins University, Robert W. Wood and John H. Latané. Wood was a pioneer in optics, Latané was a historian and author. His opposition to those inside the Academy arguing against the American involvement in the war took a more scholarly form in his 1918 book From Isolation to Leadership where he asserted, “The world still waits on America, and sooner or later we must recognize and assume the responsibilities of our position as a great world power.”

The Sun strove to defend the protest and criticize the police, without granting too much legitimacy to extralegal street politics. The Sun’s editor admitted his regrets that the “patriotic enthusiasm” of that night “found no other way to manifest itself” than by the disruption of the pacifist meeting. But the editor tried to explain away the protesters’ actions by first placing the blame on the pacifists. In doing so, the paper began to cinch together support for the American entry into the war with shutting down dissenting voices, all in the name of proper patriotism. Indeed, with the Baltimore melee, “the tone” was now “being set” for wartime nationalism. The paper pointed especially to “the insulting charge made by such men as Dr. Jordan that those who favor the protection of American life and property are promoting war in order to make money.” Given this, “it is not at all strange” that trouble ensued.

David Starr Jordan’s appearance in Baltimore that evening was co-sponsored by the American Union Against Militarism, The Emergency Peace Federation, and the Women’s Peace Party of Maryland. Indeed, his usual speech attacked the munitions industry as urging war in order to produce fantastic profits for their business concerns. Like a lot of progressive intellectuals aligned somewhere on the political left, Jordan also
criticized the complex financial dealings between U.S. bankers and bondholders and British and French companies for encouraging war to protect investments. But now *The Sun* and those who supported the protesters began to redefine this political position as being suspicious and perhaps treasonous. Storming the Academy and overpowering the police were “not unnatural” acts in these circumstances, where “public feeling” was “excited by the ill-advised propaganda” allegedly put forward by the pacifists. “Many of the pacifists are sincere,” the column continued, “but there is a growing suspicion that they form a cover for persons of pro-German sympathies, who are bent rather on protecting Germany than on protecting the United States.” (The meeting organizers, meanwhile, insisted that “not one word was uttered by any speaker that was in any way capable of being interpreted as unfavorable to the President, or to any branch of Government.” William Tappan, who served as chairman for the meeting, “made it very clear that he was not a pacifist and not pro-German.”)

*The Sun* then appropriated terms normally used to describe mob behavior and turned them on the police. “There seems to be no doubt,” the paper proclaimed, that the police “lost their heads.” The result, of course, was “disorder” that could have been prevented “without the extreme measures they employed.” Since the meeting had been advertised in advance, the paper argued that more police should have been on hand for crowd control. Therefore, the *Sun* concluded, once again using revealing punctuation, “The so-called ‘mob,’ it seems to us, is not so much to blame as the failure of police prevision.”

*The Sun*’s position, blaming the police and casting suspicions on the event itself, sparked a sharp rebuttal from some readers. Thomas B. Bond wrote to *The Sun*, “I cannot agree that overpowering the police and assaulting them was at all justifiable.” Cleverly invoking the elite values of social stability and class behavior, Bond noted that it was the police who, at first, sought to “restore order peaceably and gentlemanly.” Having failed, the police then “cracked some heads.” Bond added, “and should have cracked all that were engaged in mobocracy on that Sabbath evening, and bruised them so that they would remember the result of mobbing a lawful meeting and resisting peace officers.”

The author “Pro-Law and Order” reminded readers of the qualities expected of the city’s elite, “When so-called ladies and gentlemen forget their breeding and behave like common rioters, as they did on this occasion, they deserve the treatment they received, and I am glad the police did their duty and tried to disperse them.” Understanding one’s sense of duty and own good “breeding” worked in conjunction from the elite perspective of the early twentieth century. This had momentarily broken down, according to this writer, and the result was that these elite men and women had descended into the ranks of “common rioters.” Kudos therefore were due the police for remembering and acting on their “duty.”

Continuing to criticize the failure of the city’s elite on that night, another writer, Mary L. White, named names and expressed her sorrow at the listing of Dr. J. H. Mason Knox, Jr. as being among the protest leaders. James Henry Mason Knox, descended
from General Henry Knox, a Revolutionary War hero and the first Secretary of War, was a pillar of the local elite. With a Ph.D. from Yale and an M.D from Johns Hopkins, and additional medical studies in Berlin and Vienna, Knox was also active in several local charities and belonged to the city’s prestigious clubs. White lamented that “if war or prospective war has turned into a savage the Christian gentleman, as I know Dr. Knox from my acquaintance with him a few years back, then God pity the country.”

The next author, “Native Baltimorean,” despite heavy use of sarcasm, delivered a similar message as “Pro-Law and Order” and Mary L. White:

What a thrill of pride does a native Baltimorean feel...when he reads of this Baltimore mob led by men and women of high social position storming, to the accompaniment of profane language, a gathering composed of law-abiding citizens who were exercising their constitutional right to ‘peaceably assemble.’

In addition to having failed the standards for appropriate behavior and language for persons of “high social standing,” the writer pointed out that the protest leaders also failed to uphold elite standards of behavior along gender lines as well. Once inside the Academy hall, the protesters engaged in the “violent intimidation of ladies, some of them elderly and feeble.” The “fierce threats” against “unarmed and peaceable men” were similarly inexcusable. Finally, the author speculated on “how beautifully will our widespread fame for old-time Southern hospitality be enhanced by the courteous treatment accorded that distinguished ‘stranger within our gates,’ the president of Leland Stanford University! The protestors failed yet another test of appropriate behavior for the elite, the gracious reception of a guest.

These writers all revealed their belief that there existed a standard of behavior and decorum for the “better” citizens. The problem with the riot, as they saw it, was that the leaders of the demonstration abandoned their own class and behaved very badly on a number of levels. Predictably, confusion, violence and lawlessness reigned for the moment. Yet letters of this sort still carried a tone and provide glimpses of a faith that having taken a regrettable misstep, these members of the city’s elite would return to the standard.

Other writers used the riot to mock and attack the pretensions of the local elite altogether. J. R. L. Callanan compared “that cultured mob” that violated the rights of the pacifists to speak to German submarines that violated American shipping rights to the high seas. Concluding boldly, he proclaimed, “and I for one am ready to fight both.”

Similarly, the editor of the Baltimore Afro-American, no doubt accustomed to inconsistencies in the self-proclaimed local white elite’s behavior, made no distinction between the protestors’ behavior and their status or leadership. As residents of a border state, Marylanders have long contemplated their identity as southerner or northerner. The editor of the Afro-American played off of the state’s identity quandry to condemn the protesters and to make a pointed observation about the riot in the context of lynching
in the South. The paper noted that traditionally intolerance of difference was “regarded chiefly as a Southern virtue.” The North liked to believe it was “remarkably free” from “a mob spirit that violently carries everything in front of it, and has no respect for law and order.” But, the events of April 1 showed that premise to be false. Skillfully, the Afro-American writer linked the lawlessness of the Academy riot, regardless of who its leaders were, with life under segregation, where pretenses of harmony and order through hierarchy nearly always rang hollow. What had transpired in front of the Academy that night was an “out break of mob-rule . . . convincing enough that Maryland, our own state is blood kin to Georgia, Florida and other states where lynching is the usual mode of punishment.” The episode allowed the paper to draw more attention to the pressing horror of lynching common at this time:

It makes very little difference that the mob only prevented Dr. David Starr Jordan from speaking rather than snuffing the life out of some suspected criminal; it makes little difference that Dr. Jordan’s only offence against the mob was political rather than racial; the attitude towards law and decency behind their action points to the same thing in either case. The mob felt itself insulted and outraged, and with little regard for the Sabbath day, or for the rights and privileges of the pacifists, backed by police permission, to air their views, violently broke thru the thin cordon of opposing officers, broke thru the doors of the hall, and broke up the meeting.

The Afro-American then pointed out that there was one crucial difference, however: “In Georgia his [Jordan’s] life would have been in danger.”

For others, the pacifists’ right to assemble and speak was the essence of the American experience. “Pro-Law and Order,” referred to earlier, felt strongly about this point and defended the pacifists’ right to assemble and speak: “My authority is the Constitution of the United States.” This author continued with a preemptive strike against accusations of disloyalty by adding “I am not a German.” “Pro-Law and Order” was “shocked and mortified” by the “savagery and mob spirit” evident outside the Academy. The protesters’ blatant violation of the pacifists’ right to free speech had the potential to change the city’s reputation from the home of the national anthem to “the town of hoodlums and lawlessness.” For John Salmon of Baltimore the matter was simple. Echoing J. R. L. Callanan’s sentiments expressed above (Callanan compared “that cultured mob” to German submarines and declared himself “ready to fight both”), Salmon wrote, “The crowd who broke up the meeting Sunday night are the Prussianized crowd, and those of us who believe in free speech are the American crowd.” One of those persons in attendance at the Academy that night, Rev. Peter Ainslie, criticized the demonstrators in nationalistic terms: “freedom of speech is fundamental in the spirit and genius of American life. Trample that under foot and there will be no need of the Stars and Stripes for which this sacred symbol stands.” Similarly, Alexander Francis, who described himself as a “Theodore Roosevelt-Billy
Sundayite” and who thought the U.S. should “even now . . . have 1,000,000 men in the trenches,” defended the Academy event and Captain Henry’s struggle to take the American flag from Carter Osburn, Jr. “For what purpose was the flag being used on that occasion?” Francis asked. He continued: “The meeting was lawful; the audience was peaceful in personnel and discourse.” But instead, a “riotous mob conceived the idea of breaking up the meeting and were using the flag to inflame a riotous spirit, no doubt already inflamed by spirituous frumenti [i.e. alcohol]. Those using the flag for this purpose were dishonouring it.”23

Alexander Francis also raised a point that few other writers did: that on the night of the Academy event, the United States had not officially declared war against anybody yet. “We, as a nation,” he noted, “were at peace with the whole world.” Charles J. Carey made the same point, which formed the basis for an important distinction that kept the focus on free speech and not treason. In laying out his argument, Carey first went to great lengths to present his credentials as a “patriot” before getting to the gist of his letter. Carey described himself as “Intensely pro-Ally, with American ancestors early in 1700, with two children who have already taken steps to do their part in the war.” Therefore, he added, “I cannot be accused of being pro-German when making any remarks about the Academy of Music disturbance Sunday night, which was a disgrace to the city of Baltimore.” Carey went on to condemn the rioters, “their conception of freedom is equal to the Inquisition of the Middle Ages.” The critical point for him was that “the discussion of the proposed action,” that is, the war, was “still open.” Therefore, the pacifists should have had the full protection of the law. Carey’s and Francis’s remarks are poignant considering how once the U. S. entered the fighting, the government went to extraordinary lengths to establish a wide definition of seditious, and therefore illegal, speech through the Espionage and Sedition Acts of 1917 and 1918.24

Eugene W. Barnes’ letter was one of the only letters found in The Sun that offered a reading of the events from a distinctly working-class perspective. In Barnes’s opinion, World War I was, to borrow a popular left-wing phrase from the time, the capitalists’ war and the workers’ fight. The munitions industry, with the press as its organ, pushed the United States to enter under the guise of patriotism. Of the paper’s position in defending the rioters, Barnes wondered:

I am trying to mentally digest your editorial attempting to smooth over the ugly, un-American “mob” of patriotic (?) men of Baltimore city in breaking up a publicly advertised, orderly meeting of peaceful men and women . . . Was it really a patriotic outbreak?

Barnes next pointed out that several preparedness meetings had been held recently without incident. Why the difference, he wondered? Because, he answered, “selfish martial interests with an army of smug well-paid retainers and cheap pushers are behind them.” Barnes warned that an awareness of the economic stakes of those behind
the American preparedness movement was “filtering through to the ‘hewers of wood and drawers of water.’” Responding to the rioters’ and The Sun’s assertion that pacifism equaled treason, he added that “millions of us lower stratas are begin to resent such implication.” The accusations were “Cheap talk, not even ingenious.”

Not surprisingly, The Sun also ran several letters that applauded those who forced their way into the Academy. These letters reveal how this particular iteration of nationalism, one that brooked no dissent, was beginning to take shape. For these writers, free speech was beside the point because the pacifists, in their view, were traitors plain and simple. “Please give me the space,” T. M. Allen of Gaylord, Virginia wrote “to congratulate Baltimore, and especially the crowd that marched to the Academy last night and broke up the pacifists’ meeting.” Even though, as just discussed, on the night of the riot President Wilson had not yet asked congress for a declaration of war, Allen remained satisfied that “every man who takes an active part in any such meeting should be marked as a traitor.” Allen concluded, “Go to it, boys of Maryland, and rest assured that the boys of old Virginia will stand with you.” William Ellinger used the occasion to read back over anti-war activity since 1914 and reinterpret all of it as treason. The riot, he asserted,” was the logical outcome of open and covert treason, which has been rampant and blatant ever since Germany began her assault upon civilization.” The meeting was a “forum of treason” and the rioters’ attack represented the willingness to “execute the resolution of our country that treason disguised in the uniform of bastard pacifism shall no longer be tolerated.”

Anti-war protesters on the steps of Congress as President Woodrow Wilson asked a special joint session of Congress for a declaration of war against the German Empire, April 2, 1917. (Library of Congress.)
Similarly, Leo Knott rejoiced in the “spontaneous outburst of patriotism and genuine Americanism” represented by the attack on the Academy. Americanism in Knott’s understanding was explicitly gendered. The actions of the demonstrators, he noted, would warn those who come to our city to preach treason, and those in our midst who share their sentiments and sympathize with their treasonable utterances, to read the device on the escutcheon of our State taken from the coat of arms of Cecilius Calvert, the illustrious founder of the Province and the State of Maryland: “Fatti maschii, parole femine” (“Deeds are masculine, words feminine”).

In case the message was not yet clear, Knott continued, “We are not and never have been nor will be lily-livered or pussyfoots when ‘grim-visaged war’ confronts us. We do not talk much, write notes nor make speeches. It is not our trade . . . When Maryland strikes she strikes, and let the enemies of our country, foreign and those domiciled among us, pacifists and pro-Germans, stand from under.”

The fear and uncertainty unleashed by the Baltimore riot did not last long. The city’s elite hammered away through The Sun, defending the actions of the young men who were arrested. Perhaps more significantly, they also took steps to exact a degree of revenge on the Baltimore Police Department. The paper goes on to note that the six young men whose names The Sun listed had the charges reduced to disturbing the peace (from inciting a riot) and were released. As the young men came out of the police station they were greeted by a “crowd of several hundred persons” who “gave a great cheer, automobile horns were honked and the six were acclaimed as heroes. The release of these six came following a late night meeting of Marshal Carter and Captain Henry, the two commanding officers at the scene, General Lawrason Riggs, president of the Baltimore Police Board who was a prominent civil leader, as well attorney William Marbury and R. Lancaster Williams, a wealthy Baltimore businessman, who had been at the scene in front of the Academy of Music.

The Sun reported “universal criticism” of the Police department for the “brutality of the clubbing” but also for having allowed the anti-war event to be held in the first place. Despite the report of universal criticism, the complaints came specifically via a visit to police headquarters by a “delegation of citizens.” This delegation just so happened to include Gustavus Ober and Gustavus Ober, Jr., father and cousin of Douglas and Leonard Ober, both arrested in the melee in front of the Academy (Leonard had been “severely beaten,” the Sun reported). The delegation met with the Police Board and “demanded that the police authorities ‘go out and get the men who had used their clubs in an unwarranted manner.’” The Sun accused the board of holding a closed “star chamber” session and was put out that the board “refused to allow the newspaper men to hear the statements” especially since Gustavus Ober said he had no objection to
the press’s presence. At the conclusion of the meeting the delegation emerged with an announcement that a “complete investigation” of the police orders and actions for that night would be conducted.\textsuperscript{30}

By April 4, \textit{The Sun}, claiming again to speak for the entire city, reported that “Baltimore continued yesterday to resent, wherever citizens gathered, the action of the police Sunday evening when an indiscriminate clubbing affray followed the breaking up of a peace meeting.” By afternoon, the column continued, a rumor emerged that a “committee of citizens” was considering taking the matter up with Governor Harrington. \textit{The Sun} could not confirm the rumor, but did note that “several influential citizens admitted that it was under discussion.”\textsuperscript{31} William Marbury, in reference to Douglas Ober’s beating, accused the police of undermining the law and order they presumably were sworn to uphold: “Do you mean to tell me that three policemen in order to arrest a 133-pound man had to club him in that fashion? Policemen who act that way when turned loose are a menace to the safety of the city and we don’t propose to stand for it.”\textsuperscript{32}

Meanwhile Marbury, Williams, and the Obers, among others met to compose an open letter of condemnation of the police. The “petition,” drawn up by Marbury, demanded that the police leadership identify and punish those who had used their clubs. In line with \textit{The Sun’s} interpretation, it blamed both the police and the pacifists, while absolving those who overpowered the police and physically broke up the meeting: “It is just as much a crime for a policeman to use his club when there is no necessity for his doing so as it is a crime for him to fail to use it when it is necessary for him to do so in order to protect the persons or property of the community.” The “slightest relaxation of this rule would convert a policeman from a protector of the community into a serious menace to that community.” It was true that the disruption of the pacifists’ meeting “may have constituted a violation of the law.” And while they understood that “the fact that the speakers at that meeting were giving utterance to sentiments which were very abhorrent to most patriotic Americans,” this “constituted no legal excuse for persons not in authority to suppress them.”\textsuperscript{33}

As momentum toward a hearing investigating the police’s action that night began to build, Marshal Carter attempted to deflect some of the attention away from his men. Carter reported that “he would shoulder the entire responsibility for the charges made by the young men arrested.” But he also declared his belief that “the policemen were justified in dispelling the crowd,” leaving aside the important question of how the crowd was dispelled. Despite Carter’s careful concession, the article also indicates that for now the “prosecution” against the police would still be led by Marbury and Williams. Then, suddenly, the hearing to investigate the action of the police, set for April 10, was “postponed indefinitely.” State attorney general (and future governor) Albert Ritchie, serving as counsel for the Police Board, wrote that preparedness efforts, now that the U.S. was in the war, were taking up too much of his time to come to Baltimore to conduct the hearing.\textsuperscript{34}
Ritchie’s request to postpone the investigation indefinitely, and his explanation for why it needed to be postponed, marks a fitting conclusion to the story of what happened on Howard Street on the night of April 1, 1917. Simply put, the war took over. Back at the Academy of Music one week later, navy recruiters organized to induct new members. Thirty-two “red-blooded American youths raced down the aisles” to the
stage to be the first to sign up. With the call to come to the stage “pandemonium was let loose, and the 3,000 in the recruiting meeting — 3,000 packed and jammed in the big theatre — rose and stamped their feet, whistled, shouted, clapped their hands and cheered.” Shortly afterwards, a group of “28 of the 32” went back out to Howard Street where they proceeded to yell “slackers” at other young men walking by. The Baltimore Police Department also began to move in lockstep with the nationalism promoted by the city’s leaders. On April 15, The Sun reported that a local policeman John A. Muller was dismissed from the force for an “un-American utterance.” The April 16 edition of The Sun reported that a “number of Germans, in compliance with Marshal Carter’s alien enemy firearms order,” had turned in their weapons. And on April 17, Marshal Carter and his men dissolved an “anti-conscription” meeting scheduled to be held in Baltimore and sponsored again by the American Union Against Militarism. Carter cited the lack of a city-approved public talk permit. In early May, a letter to the editor made an astute observation. That after all the fuss of the first week or so after the riot, “nothing has been heard from Mr. Marbury or anyone else” regarding the melee or the investigation of the police. The writer was correct. The time, it seems, had passed to question the lawless actions of young, elite men bound for war or to question the forces of law and order.35
NOTES

1. It is likely that Baltimore’s civic leaders remembered Wilson more fondly than Wilson viewed his time at Johns Hopkins, however. See http://pages.jh.edu/jhumag/0907web/wilson.html (accessed August 24, 2016); On John Gill, see Henry Hall, America’s Successful Men of Affairs: The United States at Large (New York: New York Tribune, 1896), 341. Hall describes John Gill as “a leader in the financial and social life in Baltimore.” Gill was also a former Confederate soldier. He died in 1912; Agnes W. Gill had already begun her work supporting the war effort. In addition to frequently showing up in the “Society” section of The Sun, she was listed as one of “fifty society women” who had met to learn bandage-making through the Red Cross in February 1917. See “50 Learn Bandage Making,” The Baltimore Sun, February 13, 1917; the narrative of events here is drawn from the Sun’s headline articles from April 2, 1917. They include “‘Three Cheers for U.S.A.’ Cries Miss Agnes W. Gill” and “Pacifists’ Meeting Ends in Riot: Mob Breaks In; Police Use Clubs; Prominent Men Are Badly Beaten.”

2. C. Harry Reeves, Jr. managed the local Foss-Hughes automobile company. He resigned in 1917 to join the aviation corps. See Motor World Wholesale, 53 (November 28, 1917), 46; Carter G. Osburn, Jr. born in March, 1896, was also a member of a prominent Baltimore family. According to Hall’s 1912 history of Baltimore, Osburn’s father was “a prominent business man” and a vice president of the Farmers’ and Merchants’ National Bank of Baltimore,” Clayton Coleman Hall, Baltimore: Its History and Its People (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1912), 853; “Pacifists’ Meeting Ends in Riot,” The Sun, April 2, 1917.

3. Paul A. Gilje, Rioting in America (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996), 60–61, 118. Ten civilians were killed as a result of the 1877 clash.


6. Douglas Osburn, Jr. and Leonard Ober, William Dolley Tipton, and Allison Muir all served during World War I. Muir was drowned when the steamship Kansas City sank on September 5, 1917. See Maryland in the World War, 1917–1919: Military and Naval Service Records, volume II (Baltimore: Maryland War Records Commission, 1933): 1484, 1542, and 1561. In addition, Leonard Ober had already served in 1915 with the American Field Service on an ambulance unit. William Tipton went on to become a pilot of some renown and is reported to have shot down four German planes in World War I. For Leonard Ober see http://www.175wg.ang.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123188757 and
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Oysters in Half Shell. (Oil on canvas by Andrew John Henry Way, 1863, Maryland Historical Society Accession: 1964-3-30.)
“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, research fellows, and patrons contribute articles inspired by treasures found in the rich and textured collections of manuscripts, photographs, prints, books, and ephemera in the library’s holdings. As of this writing there are close to 200 posts on the website, some of which will be featured here in coming issues. Written in 2014, the work appears now as it is oyster season. This look back is also relevant due to current discussions on whether to continue funding conservation programs. For more Chesapeake Bay stories, and access to the full archive, visit www.mdhs.org and follow the “blogs” link on the home page.

Maryland on a Half Shell

LARA WESTWOOD

The waters of the Chesapeake Bay have long sustained life in Maryland, providing both industry and food. Cities and towns sprang up along the banks of its tributaries where quick access to the Atlantic Ocean allowed international trade to flourish and spurred the growth of Baltimore and Annapolis. Seafood was a staple in every Marylander’s diet from the earliest days of the colony—perch, sturgeon, catfish, oysters, and crabs supplemented settlers’ meals. The Bay’s bounty helped the colonists survive when the harvest failed to yield enough of the standard crops, like corn and wheat, to accommodate the rapid population growth. By the mid-nineteenth century, subsistence fishing grew into a fully-fledged industry and became a vital part of the economy.

These days, the blue crab is synonymous with the Maryland fishing industry, but that was not always the case. Fishermen annually pulled forty-eight million pounds of shad from the Chesapeake during the mid to late nineteenth century. Even with fin fish plentiful, the oyster reigned supreme in the Bay as a cash crop with thousands of men and women employed in harvesting and packing. But the industry also prompted highly contested regulation and fierce, sometimes violent, competition.

Lara Westwood is the Special Projects Archivist of the H. Furlong Baldwin Library at the Maryland Historical Society.
Early colonial settlers of the Chesapeake Bay region were astonished by the breadth of the oyster population and the fare’s popularity in England. Over-fishing, however, had left a severe shortage of the once abundant bivalve. The near perfect conditions in the Bay allowed oysters to thrive and grow to amazing proportions, some so large that they had to be cut up before they could be eaten. The shallow water was the right mix of fresh and salty and filled with nutrients. The filter feeding systems of the oysters kept the bay waters pristine and extraordinarily clear. The mollusks could cleanse the entire bay in just a week. The oyster reefs grew so high that they became a navigational challenge. Almost every tributary of the Bay boasted mature, natural oyster bars.

Despite the abundance, Marylanders did not initially profit from oyster harvesting. Oyster dredging occurred on a small scale, and fishermen provided product only to the immediate local market. Thus, the supply remained high. New England oystermen saw this as an opportunity. Northern oyster bars had rapidly become depleted because of over-harvesting, so the oystermen moved into the Chesapeake and began exporting Bay oysters north. In 1820, Maryland legislators realized the negative impact this could have on the local oyster beds and economy. Dredging was outlawed—only hand tonging was permitted—and oysters could only be transported out of state by Marylanders.

Rather than lose profit, the Yankees moved south to set up shop. One such enterprising businessman was Caleb Maltby. He moved to Baltimore from New Haven, Connecticut and set up the first oyster packing house in the city in 1834 or 1835. The new Baltimore and Ohio Railroad helped grow his business—allowing him to ship his canned oysters quickly and efficiently to New England. Other entrepreneurs saw Maltby’s success, and opened competing packing houses on the docks of Baltimore. Over ten thousand people were employed by the city’s 115 packing houses by 1869.

Locals also wanted their share of the wealth. The town of Crisfield in Somerset County was literally built on oysters. So many oysters were shucked there that the shells were used as the foundation to build new land. In 1854, massive deposits of oysters were found in the Tangier Sound, which is bounded by Tangier Island, Virginia and Smith Island, Maryland, and brought oystermen to the little town, then called Somers Cove. John W. Crisfield saw great opportunity for an oyster boomtown and ensured that the Eastern Shore Railroad would connect Somers Cove to the outside world in 1866. His plan was a success, and when the town incorporated in 1872 as a city, it was renamed Crisfield, which became the seafood capital of Eastern Shore, and arguably the United States.

Canning and the explosive growth of the railroad provided for oysters to be shipped across the country. The demand for Chesapeake Bay oysters hit an all-time high, and illegal dredging became epidemic. More restrictions and laws were imposed to curb poaching. Oystermen from all over the Northern East Coast dredged the Bay and sent their haul to New Haven, New York, Philadelphia, and even Baltimore to be packed and shipped. Confiscation and other heavy fines were imposed on those who were caught dredging, but the business was so lucrative that these punishments had little
Many African Americans found employment on oyster boats and in canning facilities. “Maryland, 'In the Mornin' by de Bright Light,' Negro Oystermen of Annapolis on their way to the Fishing-Ground in Chesapeake Bay.” (Frank Leslie’s Illustrated News, October 21, 1880, Medium Print Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

effect. Enforcement of the oyster laws, left to local sheriffs, was also rather lax as they did not have appropriate resources to patrol all 2,300 square miles of the Chesapeake. The sheriffs sometimes received support from local fishermen who believed that illegal oystering was an affront to their way of life. For example, a combined force of police and watermen captured the heavily armed Osiris in 1849 and arrested forty men.
These skirmishes between illegal dredgers and local sheriffs were all too common in Maryland waters. Maryland enacted stricter regulations requiring oystermen to be licensed and creating an official oyster season of September 1 to June 1. In an attempt to lighten the sheriffs’ burden, the crews of licensed fishing boats were deputized and had the power to arrest illegal oystermen and state lawmakers finally allotted real resources
Depiction of the Oyster Wars in Harper’s Weekly, March 1, 1884. (“The Oyster War in Chesapeake Bay,” Medium Print Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
forenforcement after the Civil War. Legislators approved the charter for a steamer to patrol the Bay for illegal oyster fishing in 1867, thus creating Maryland’s oyster police force, commonly called the Oyster Navy.

The Oyster Navy fought in a veritable oyster war from the end of the Civil War until the 1950s. Harvesting was notoriously hard work and oystermen worked in frigid conditions on the Bay during the legal season, leaving them prey to its conditions. Boats were always short men to work them, so unlawful captains frequently shanghaied crew members, often immigrants new to Baltimore who spoke little English. Illegal dredgers, known as oyster pirates for both their criminal work and rowdy behavior, took to the water well-armed and ready to fight off law enforcement. The newspapers ran weekly
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Baltimore oysterman Captain Martin Todd held membership in the Maryland and Virginia Oyster Exchange, a beneficial society founded to provide death benefits to members’ families. Maryland law required Todd, and all commercial oystermen, be licensed. (Todd Family Papers, MS 2284, Maryland Historical Society.)
stories describing violent clashes between fishermen and the police, competition for the best harvesting locations was fierce, and fellow oystermen often fought one another for control of the beds.
Despite legislation to protect the vital mollusk, over-fishing quickly destroyed the Chesapeake Bay’s oyster beds. The annual harvest dropped from fifteen million to less than ten million bushels from 1884 to 1890, prompting even more confrontations on the Bay. In the small town of Rock Point, Maryland, conservation commissioner Swepson Earle, reported “Three killings a week created no civic resentment, while many weeks during the oyster season marked the departure from this life of as many as five or six men.” The last known shot of the Oyster War was fired in 1959 when Maryland oyster police shot and killed Berkeley Muse for illegal dredging near Colonial Beach, Virginia.
Further restrictions placed on oyster harvesting included size requirements for oysters sold and formal leasing of oyster beds. Renting out the beds allowed for planting new oysters and limited the amount pulled from the area. From 1906 to 1912, a group from the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, led by Charles C. Yates, charted what was left of the oyster bars, providing an accurate picture of the state of oysters in the Chesapeake Bay. Yates’ maps are still in use today.

The fight to save the Bay’s oysters still rages today. Years of pollution and over-fishing virtually destroyed Maryland’s oyster industry, and very few oystermen now work the Chesapeake. Conservation efforts have led to a comeback, but the oyster population may never recover to the bountiful quantities that once defined the Bay.
Oyster Tongers near Bay Bridge, 1952.
(A. Aubrey Bodine, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, B997-1, Maryland Historical Society.)

Oyster dredging, December 1, 1953. (A. Aubrey Bodine, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, B998-4, Maryland Historical Society.)
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Mrs. Benjamin I. Cohen (Kitty Etting Cohen) to Zebulon Waters, Invitation to Fancy Dress Party, February 2, 1837. (Vertical File, Maryland Historical Society, Gift of Miss Eleanor Septima Cohen.)
Classics Corner

Several days after Benjamin and Kitty Cohen hosted their glamorous party, James Macon Nicholson (1807–1875) dutifully fulfilled his promise to send an account of the event to his mother at Wye House.1 Too ill to attend, Rebecca Lloyd Nicholson apparently longed for every detail, but her son found his memory “considerably at a loss.” Nicholson offered his mother little on the house beyond “you remember that everything about the house is rich and expensive, and if anything has been added . . . it was all in keeping with the rest.” The rugs had been rolled up for dancing and the “supper rooms” were on the second floor. Nor did he report on food and drink beyond “every delicacy” served on the finest china, cut glass, and silver and that the rooms were “brilliantly lighted by lamps which blazed from amidst bounties of flowers.” That abundance of fresh flowers, in an antebellum Baltimore January, grew in the greenhouses behind their home.2 Nicholson’s “meager description,” however, does allow a mid-winter peek inside one of Baltimore’s finest homes, at a costumed gathering of the city’s most prominent and influential residents, many with deep and notable roots. Some dressed in lavishly elegant costumes and others chose to pepper the occasion with legendary and humorous characters. Margaret Patterson dressed as a Circassian Princess “her dress in perfect keeping, of rich materials and beautiful jewels, & wore a crown covered with jewels” and her cousin Charlotte Patterson as an “Italian Peasant.” Yet among the most striking was Mr. Wethered as “Old Hagar,” and “young Dr. Butler as Mrs. Trollope,” both of whom “excited a great deal of merriment.” Rebecca Key Howard, however, drew the writer’s full attention:

What was she, you will ask, she was no Queen or Goddess, she represented no character in Shakespeare — neither was she attired in any costume as a princess. She was herself only and as herself dressed in some white material familiar to you ladies, but unknown to me. She paraded through those rooms, crowded with all the beauty of this city of beauties, the acknowledged Queen of the Night, not that she received more attention, but she elicited the most admiration.”3

Nicholson closed his letter with high tribute to Benjamin and Kitty Cohen, “charming host and hostess [whose presence] was felt and acknowledged everywhere . . . there was no effort visible, everything went on as if by magic.” Many stayed until the early hours of the morning.

My dear Mother,

When I wrote you a few days since, that I would give you some account of Mr. & Mrs. Cohen’s Fancy Ball, I thought I was making a promise which could be fulfilled without any difficulty. I supposed I could easily find out all the Characters personated, and would be able to remember, not only how they were supported, but to a certain extent in what garniture they were exhibited. Today, however, I find my memory considerably at a loss, and am afraid I shall be able to give you but a meagre description. As the Invitations desired, the Guests assembled as near 8 o’clock, as could have been expected. The three Rooms on the first floor were thrown open for the Reception of the Company, the Lady of the house receiving in the large Room on the right hand Side of the Hall as you enter. I need however say nothing to you of the appearance of the Rooms, as I do not know that the furniture was much altered from what you have seen it there. You remember that everything about the house is rich and expensive, and if anything has been added for this occasion, it was all in keeping with the rest.

The carpets were up in the two Rooms on the left-hand Side of the Hall for dancing and down everywhere else. In the Rooms on the right was a beautiful Divan covered with rich silk damask and the Recesses were filled with flowers most tastefully arranged, and Seats of various kinds were arranged around the walls. Refreshments were constantly passing about, borne by servants dressed in liveries suited to the occasion, served up in rich china and cut glass on Silver Waiters. The Rooms were all most brilliantly lighted by Lamps which blazed from amidst bunches of flowers. The Supper Rooms were on the Second Floor, over the large Drawing Room. The principal Table extended the length of the Room decorated with beautiful China, cut glass and Silver all filled with every delicacy to be thought of. In the large Recess stood a Second Table decorated in the same style and same Delicacies, as on the first Table. A Third Table was in another part of the Room on which solid Refreshments were served consisting of everything to please the most fastidious taste & served in the best style and in the greatest abundance as I am sure you well know.

But to return to the guests. There was at first but little space for Dancing, and until the Evening had somewhat advanced, even but little inclination. For the first hour or two, everybody seemed busily occupied, either in ascertaining “Who was Who,” or in admiring and examining the beautiful Dresses of the Ladies; for many of the gentlemen were in mask. The Rooms were crowded almost beyond example in our City, tho the Washingtonians would hardly call it a tight squeeze, but for Fancy Dresses, anything of
a “squeeze,” you know must be annoying as it prevents many rich, handsome Costumes being shown off to advantage. To tell you who was there, is no very hard task, for I might in general terms say everybody was there who is at all in the habit of attending parties.

First among your friends whom I met was Mrs. Caton, she looked as I have always seen her look before. I think I run no risk in saying she was in no Fancy Costume, but wore a handsome Black Velvet Dress and Ostrich feathers in her head Dress. She was leaning on the Arm of Mr. McTavish, who was arrayed in his rich Consular Uniform (as I understood) that was much admired. I only recollect that there was a great deal of Gold Lace on the front of his Coat. Mrs J. G. Davis was there, I think, as Mary Queen of Scots, wore a handsome Dress of Black Velvet, trimmed with Pearls, over White Satin Under Skirt and a tiara of rich Jewels on her head.

Mrs John Skinner was there as a Polish Lady and you may take it for granted, both of these Ladies had on rich and becoming Costumes, the latter wore a Purple Velvet Dress over White Satin Polish Cap and Feathers. Amethyst jewels, very handsome Costume.

Rebecca Key Howard was there. What was she, you will ask? She was no Queen or Goddess, she represented no Character in Shakespeare, neither was she attired in any Costume as a Princess, she was herself only and as herself dressed in some
White material familiar enough to you ladies, but unknown to me. She paraded through those Rooms, crowded with all the Beauty of this City of beauties, the acknowledged Queen of the Night, not that she received more attention, but she elicited most admiration.

The two Williamses were there looking like Angels, both of them, Mary however more so. They were dressed I believe in personation of some picture they had chosen as a Model, but I do not know who the picture represented, I only know they were beautifully dressed and wore beautiful jewels and if the Originals equaled the representations, I should like to have the picture hanging in our Parlors.7

Sophie Cooke also looked remarkably well, as the heroine in the “Bride of Abydos,” she wore a beautiful Turkish Dress, but I can give you no particulars. Sophie Coolve, Mary Williams and Margaret Patterson wore, I think, the prettiest Dresses in the Rooms and I doubt if my judgment was much from that of others present. Margaret Patterson was, I think she said, a Circassian Princess and her Dress was in perfect keeping, of rich materials and beautiful jewels & [she] wore a Crown Covered with jewels and she looked better than I ever Saw her. Her Cousin Charlotte Patterson was there, the daughter of Mrs. Joe Patterson and probably you know her, she wore a beautiful dress, as an Italian Peasant, I believe. Maria Stevenson was there as the “Bandit’s Bride,” a beautiful dress, and she looked so well.

Margaret Smith, the granddaughter of the old General, was looking remarkably well, and your humble Servant bored her for the greater part of the Evening with his Society. She is looking remarkably pretty this Winter and last night was not surpassed by many. She told me what she represented, and she wore a beautiful Turkish Costume of pink and white and a pink Turban with feathers, as a “Polish Lady” I think. I am not able to describe all these beautiful Costumes, or the Characters they intend to represent. I write only to while away some of your sick hours, tho I think by this time you have almost wholly recovered, tho I think by this time you have almost wholly recovered, tho I am able to give you the general appearance and general effect it is as much as I am able to do but I must continue to tell you of others there. Miss Skipwith from Virginia was also much admired in a beautiful Costume as a “Berneois Peasant” I believe, also there was Miss Anne Gordon of Virginia who appeared as “Sweet Anne Page” in a pink and white Costume and Pearl Ornaments. This last Lady is Said to be very wealthy, but independent of her wealth her appearance is very attractive, and her lovely manners make her most agreeable; but I am not personally acquainted with her.

Elizabeth Hall was also there, also as “Sweet Anne Page,” her appearance is always striking and the beautiful Velvet dress I believe it was which she wore last night was very becoming and became her very much.

Miss E. Travis was there as “Night,” she wore a rich Black dress Covered with Silver Stars. She is certainly a lovely woman, with perhaps the finest eyes (next to Julia Calvert’s) I ever saw. Her figure is not so good, the last party at which I saw her
she was probably the Belle of the Evening.

*Serena Barroll* was there as “Eowena,” she wore a beautiful Costume, Cherry Colored, and a Gold tiara covered with jewels. I think she has the finest figure perhaps in the City, and I heard many speak her praises.

*The Claphams* were there and looked remarkably well in beautiful Costumes, one I think probably from Lalla Rook.

*Miss Emma Meredith* was there as “Queen of the Fairies” beautifully dressed in perfect keeping with the Character. Many others were there, but I think I have gone through with most of the ladies that you know, or have heard of, and I must now mention at least a few of the gentlemen.

“Paul Pry” was there, represented by *Mr. B. Brent* a stranger (from Washington I think), who played his part well.

*Old Hagar* too was there. She made her appearance and really the resemblance was very striking and was personated by *Mr. Wethered* I am told.

*Young Dr. Butler* appeared as “Mrs. Trollope” and excited a great deal of merriment. Several strangers are here for the Winter, and they and the Beaux of the City were all very handsomely apparelled. *Mr. Campbell*, who accompanied Murray Lloyd to the Eastern Shore on the occasion of his Wedding, was there, and represented the “Corsair,” his dress was a costly one I understood but not a becoming one, he is a handsome man and probably the ladies thought him very handsome last night.

*Mr. Middleton* from South Carolina was there as an Indian Chief, and looking remarkably well, which was the general opinion which I concurred in.

*Theoderic Skinner* wore a handsome Dress as a “Polish Lancer” and I heard many say he looked remarkably handsome in it. His Brother Frederick Skinner likewise wore a handsome Costume as a Greek I was told, a very rich Costume.

*Joe* (Nicholson) and *E. A. Brown* went as Sailors.

*William Meredith* represented an “Indian Chief.”

*Dr. J. H. Thomas*, said to be Engaged to Miss Anne Gordon of Virginia, appeared as a “Kentucky Hunter” and not only played his part well but also looked well in that Costume.

*Mr. McHenry* and *Mr. Greenway* both represented French Counts, gentlemen of the “Olden times,” in handsome Costumes; they and many others wore masks.

We also had a “*Sugar Loaf*” who was *Mr. Cooke* and a “*Terrapin*” who was *Mr. Wm. H. Hoffman*, they created much amusement. I have not mentioned my own Character. I at first represented a Sailor and was in Mask, then changed my Dress and wore a Turkish Costume to represent “Old Nick,” as I heard myself called. I enjoyed this beautiful Ball as everyone did and regret you were not well enough to be present. I have named but few of the many present, there were many distinguished Strangers there and Officers of both the Navy and Army. The presence of the Charming Host and Hostess was felt and acknowledged everywhere. There was no effort visible, everything went on as if by Magic and it was not until the small hours in the
Morning the guests shook hands and said Good Night to Mr. and Mrs. Cohen after this most delightful evening.

Hoping my letter may find you improving, and almost well again. I am, my dear Mother, ever your affectionate son,


Since writing my letter a printed list giving many names of some I have not mentioned who were present at Mr. & Mrs B. I. Cohen’s Fancy Ball, Feb 2nd 1837, and I copy those I have not described and send you.

**Printed List**

Mrs E. F. Cohen wore a beautiful French Embroidered Dress and Pearl Ornaments.

Miss Graff was Dressed as a Swiss Peasant.

Mrs Robert Gilmor wore a handsome Ball Dress with rich and elegant Jewels.

Mrs Robert Gilmor Jr. went as “Medora” wearing a White Muslin Dress. No Ornaments, only her long, beautiful hair flowing down to her feet, over her neck, shoulders and back.

Miss Norman, A Spanish Page-Dress of Blue and White Satin, hat & Shoes to Suit.

Miss E. O’Donnell, Diana, Dress of White and Silver, with Silver bow and arrows.

Miss Sterrett, Swiss Peasant.

Miss Gill, Swiss Peasant.

Miss Donnell, Dutch Girl, very pretty Costume.

Miss Elizabeth Frick, Noviciate.

Mrs. T. Oldfield, A Houri (a nymph of paradise), beautiful Dress of Yellow and Gold.

Miss E. Wethered, Sultana, very rich Dress of Blue and Silver, Brocade, very handsome Costume.

Miss C. D. . . . e, Spanish Lady of Rank.

Miss Hodges, Noviciate, Dressed in White.

Miss Carroll, Very beautiful, Parisian Costume.

Mrs Pennington, “Queen Caroline,” Black Velvet Dress, Stomacher of magnificent Jewels, Tiara of Jewels, and White and Scarlet plumes.
Mrs P. Brune, Young Lady of the 15th Century, very rich Brocade Dress with pointed Stomacher, very high heels on her Shoes with Buckles, hair powdered and cushioned, Long Curls behind, antique fan, and beautiful Jewels.

Miss Agnes Gordon. Rebecca (from Ivanhoe), rich and handsome Costume and a profusion of Jewels.

Miss C. Nisbet, Greek Costume, very handsome Costume.

Miss A. Nisbet, As “Polly,” A Gold Crescent with small gold Bells as a head-dress, and all her Costume was appropriate and ornamented beautifully.

Miss L. Howard, a Circassian Dancing Girl.

Miss Margaret Hughes, As a French Peasant Girl.

Miss E. Gilmor, Polish Lady, Costume Cherry Colored trimmed with swans-down over an under-dress of Gold & White, hat to suit.

Miss Mary Smith as “Rebecca,” wore a beautiful Dress.

Mrs. Greenway, Italian Peasant Girl.

Miss C. Smith, Spanish Lady.

Mrs. B. Mayer, Queen Elizabeth with a ruff and long train of Satin, perfect Costume.

Miss Armstead, a Greek Girl.

Mrs. C. Tiernan, Turkish Lady, beautiful Dress of Silver and White, and fine Jewels.

Mrs. Somerville, a Highland Lady, Scotch Dress.

Mrs. Latrobe, a Highland Lady.

Miss Martha Gray, a Gipsy, Mantle and hat all in character.

Miss Dunbar, Highland Lady.

Miss Rebecca Rogers, Highland Lady.

Miss S. Hoffman, Turkish Costume, very handsome Dress.

Miss Barney, Polish Dress, very handsome.

Miss Winter, Normandy Peasant Girl.

Miss Magruder, Helen McGregor, full Highland Costume.

Miss Howard, “Flora McIvor,” very beautiful Costume.

Miss S. [. . . w], a Gipsy, handsome Dress.
Miss Clapham, a Scotch Lassie, attracted general admiration by the elegance and correctness of her attire.

Mrs. P. H. Davidge, a Highland Costume.

Miss Shubrick, Renée de Rieux, Countess de Chateau neuf.

Mrs. S. W. [D . . . n], a Brazilian Lady.

The Gentlemen, many of whom were in Mask as well as Costume.

M. P. [D . . . n], a Pedlar.

Mr. W. Donnell, Italian Nobleman.

Mr. W. Tiffany, Black Friar.

Mr. H. Tiffany, Count Almavivi.

Mr. P. Kennedy, Neapolitan Fisherman.

Mr. W. Meredith, an Indian Chief, in full Costume tomahawk in hand.

Mr. J. B. Williams, A Swiss Mountaineer.

Mr. G. Cooke, the “Sugar Loaf.”

Mr. W. Greenway, French Count of the Last Century.

Mr. R. Brent, “Paul Pry.”

Mr. L. Smith, Country Boy from Anaranold County & his Sweetheart “Miss” Phoebe, Cornstalk, his Sweetheart played these parts well and most amusing.

Dr. Tom Buckler, A Country Girl.

Mr. Swan, A Sailor.

Mr. Barroll, A Sailor.

Mr. W. Frick, Captain of the Water Witch.

Mr. J. M. Nicholson, A Sailor, then changed Costume and appeared as “Mephistophiles,” wore handsome Turkish Costume.

Mr. B. H. Latrobe, Costume of Last Century, handsome Dress.

Mr. S. O. Hoffman, Court Dress of France, handsome Costume.

Mr. E. [H. . . . n], An Irish Boy from Tipperary.

Mr. W. H. Hoffman, The “Terrapin.”
Mr. J. Carroll, Costume of last Century.
Mr. McHenry, an ancient Costume of France.
Mr. Graff, Tyrolean Peasant.
Mr. Ludlow, A Highland Chief.
S. Teackle Wallis, Mendicant Friar.
Mr. C. E. Barney, Don Juan.
Mr. Robert Gilmor jr., a Turkish Costume.
Frederick Skinner, A Greek Pirate, handsome Costume.
Theoderick Skinner, Polish Lancer, very handsome Dress.
M. Patterson, A Shepherd Boy.
Mr. F. H. Davidge, a Highland Chieftain.
Mr. B. Mayer, Earl of Rochester, handsome Dress.
Mr. Davis, wore a handsome Uniform.
Mr. G. W. Dobbin, Brazilian Guachi.
Mr. Savage, a Page.
Mr. Bordly, Courtier of the time of Charles II.
Mr. L. Washington, a Sailor.
Many of the Gentlemen wore Masks.

This list, including all those mentioned in Mr. J. M. Nicholson's Letter, do not include all the guests at this famous ball.\(^8\)

The Residence of Mr. and Mrs. B. I. Cohen some years later became the residence of Dr. Alexander Robinson, who married Miss Wirt, and his daughters Laura, now Mrs. Robert Atkinson; Angelica, now Mrs. Robert Gamble; Agnes, who married Carval Hall (both deceased), and his sons, William Wirt Robinson, Alexander Robinson, and George Robinson (all now deceased). But all this family of Dr. Robinson, from just before 1860, and after 1865, made this handsome house of Mr. and Mrs. B. I. Cohen, on North Charles and Saratoga streets, well known to the Maryland “Belles and Beaux” of those later dates, the children of many of those “Belles and Beaux” present at this celebrated fancy ball, February 2, 1837 and the beautiful entertainments given by Dr.
Robinson and his daughters and sons, though not “fancy balls,” were no less delightful entertainments, as many of the present day can testify, myself among them, from just before 1860 and after 1865.

Rebecca Lloyd Post Shippen
(Mrs. Edward Shippen)

NOTES

ELEANOR SEPTIMA COHEN (1858–1937) died one hundred years after her grandparents’ fancy dress party. She had devoted much of her time and support to both Jewish and non-sectarian charities, among them the Medical Department of the University of Maryland, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, and the Associated Jewish Charities. Her community memberships included the Maryland Historical Society, to whom she bequeathed family papers, miniatures, textiles, furniture, china, and silver — some of which may have graced the costumed festivities of that legendary ball in February 1837.

1. Copy of a letter written in 1837 by Mrs. Shippen’s father, James W. Nicholson to her grandmother describing “fancy party” given by Mr. and Mrs. B. Cohen, uncle and aunt of Mendes Cohen, president of the Maryland Historical Society. (Shippen Papers, MS 1415, Maryland Historical Society.)

2. The Cohen residence, located at what is today 230 North Charles Street, was demolished prior to 1908.

3. There is no known image of Rebecca Key Howard.

4. Benjamin Israel Cohen (1797–1845) and Kitty Etting Cohen (1788–1837) belonged to two of the city’s earliest and most influential families, both of which settled in Baltimore decades earlier and had long been prominent in the city’s financial and cultural life. One of the foremost bankers in the city, Benjamin Cohen was a member of the banking firm of Jacob I. Cohen Jr. and Brothers, and in 1838 helped form the first Baltimore Stock Board. He worked toward passage of the Jew Bill, urging members of Maryland’s House of Delegates to introduce and support legislation that extended the same civil privileges to Jewish persons as those allowed to members of other religious denominations. Benjamin Cohen, as exemplified in the story above, held a prominent role in the social life of Baltimore, played the violin, and enjoyed botany and horticulture. The Cohen and Etting family relationships began with Benjamin’s marriage to Kitty Etting, daughter of Solomon Etting and Rachel Gratz Etting. Facing the New World: Jewish Portraits and Decorative Arts in Colonial and Federal America from the Maryland Historical Society (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1998).

5. Letter from James M. Nicholson to his mother Rebecca Lloyd of “Wye House,” wife
of Judge J. H. Nicholson. The invitation cards, several of which are among the papers of Miss Eleanor S. Cohen, granddaughter of the host and hostess, bear on the face the words of the above caption, and on the reverse “The honor of company is solicited at 8 P. M. . . . Jan. 23d. 1837.”

6. Both Mr. and Mrs. Cohen were enthusiastic horticulturists and had large greenhouses in the rear of the residence supplied the flowers.

7. Mary and Elizabeth.

8. From another contemporaneous letter, published in pamphlet form shortly after the “party,” the above list has been corrected, and from it the following names are added: Madame Patterson-Bonaparte, Queen Caroline; Miss Virginia Williams, Quakeress; Miss A. Law, French Gardeneress; Miss Matilda Cohen, from Wales, Welsh peasant; Miss Mary Hall, Flora MacDonald: Miss Mary Cooke, Tyrolea peasant; Mrs. Flora Byrne, Young matron of 15th century; Mrs. Dr. Hall, Lady of last century; Mrs. Donaldson, Highland Lady.
When Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, hired the *Ark* to transport a small contingent of English colonists to Maryland in 1633, the ship was just three years old. It did not arrive until March of the following year, and when it docked at St. Clement’s Island, on the northern side of the Potomac, it arrived considerably lighter. A dozen of the 130 passengers developed a mortal fever and were buried at sea. Among the dead were two English Catholics who were setting out to found a colony where they might practice their religion free of harassment. This project lasted six decades before new penal laws were enacted, including the outlawing of mass and stripping away the rights of Catholics to vote or practice law.

The importance of this experiment in American religiosity was mixed up with economic and political maneuvering across the other English colonies and in Britain itself. The intrigues were fueled in part by animus directed squarely at the Catholic proprietors, the Lords Baltimore (Calvert family), and the Jesuits, a religious order considered by many to have a destabilizing effect throughout the realm. For their part, the Calverts’ routinely side-stepped the best efforts of their detractors. Expression of their loyalty to the English crown was the guarantee (and price) for freedom of religion. The long tenure of religious pluralism in the colony was an important precedent, but it was a most fragile state of affairs.

Now comes the most thorough examination of the rhetoric used to secure position and status, favor from and indictment of a monarchy that almost always stood on shaky ground. Antoinette Sutto’s closely argued monograph, which makes splendid use of English archival records, pays close attention to the function of rumor, letters, and the printed page in assessing the power and impotence of colonial government. Sutto, a former professor of colonial American history at the University of Mississippi, shows us an early rendering of “fake news.” The behavior of some Protestants on both sides of the Atlantic toward the Catholic-leaning kings, Charles I and II and the latter’s brother, James II, was driven in large measure by cunning and opportunism. The foil in their plans to unseat powerful Catholics was the ubiquitous allegation of popery, an infection so insidious that English law and civilization was thought to hang in the balance. The popular mind often lapped up this canard. Sutto bores down into the documentary evidence and carefully lays out the strategies used in rebuttal.

Much was at stake. In Maryland, threats of invasion from unfriendly native tribes, as well as possibility of corporate and violent takeovers from eager Virginians, made

---

*Book Reviews*

the role of authority crucial for the social order. Civil peace relied on strict observance of the king's charter. Individual loyalties to king and country were measured against the fealty shown to the proprietors of the charter, the Catholic Calverts, who routinely begged off swearing the mandated oath of allegiance, which placed the king at the head of the Church of England. For many, this was a contradiction that undercut the Calverts' leadership role. For Lord Baltimore, no matter the antipathy Marylanders may have had toward the religious minority, they were bound to uphold the royal charter.

For the most part, this influenced the region’s economic advancement. Early on, when a property dispute arose over who could control Kent Island off the northerly shore of the Chesapeake and a profitable trading post owned by a Virginian, the effort to neutralize claims to it centered around the power of the charter and thus the authority of the king. Any dissent from the whims of the proprietor could be taken as seditious. The Virginian acquiesced and Kent Island fell into Lord Baltimore's hands, an outcome that did little to ingratiate Calvert to the Virginia Council, who complained bitterly to the Privy Council in England.

No satisfaction came, and it stuck in the craw of those who were bested. Smear tactics and innuendo were the result, but even then, in order to stave off insurrection, negotiations with the Iroquois supplemented the proprietor’s ability to keep his enemies at bay. Sutto makes some interesting suggestions in the last part of her book that “ordinary settlers created a specifically American variety of anti-popery that combined a variety of provincial grievances into a terrifying whole.” A group of “Associators” who opposed Lord Baltimore struck fear in the hearts of the settlers, who worried they would be invaded by marauding Indians. They ultimately failed in toppling the regime by means of a “Catholic conspiracy,” but alliances in the 1630s had become radically weakened by the end of the 1680s. The Calvert's confessional politics could no longer be sustained, either in Maryland or in Britain. When in 1688 William of Orange strolled into London to depose James II, the Calverts’ legal claims to their authority ceased as well. It would take another generation before their charter was restored, and with it, the sanctioned return of religious pluralism to Maryland.

Patrick J. Hayes, Ph.D.,
Redemptorist Archives of the Baltimore Province
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
The late Harvard historian Arthur Schlesinger Sr., once famously identified anti-Catholicism “as the deepest bias in the history of the American people.” The documents assembled by Robert Emmett Curran in this valuable reader amply reveal the roots of that animus in Colonial America. Indeed, as his title indicates, one eighteenth-century public document from colonial Maryland labeled Catholics “a dangerous intestine enemy” . . . “manifestly prejudicial to the Protestant Interest.” To the Protestant majority in the British colonies, Catholics were a suspect internal minority whose allegiance to Pope allegedly trumped their loyalty to King. Curran contends that to be Catholic in British America “was a virtual declaration of being an enemy to English institutions and tradition.” But Curran’s sources also demonstrate the various ways colonial Catholics themselves sought to cope with their alien status and sometimes prospered in spite of it.

An emeritus professor of U. S. history at Georgetown University and a recognized expert in American Catholic Studies, Curran is ideally qualified to produce this much-needed reader. The compiled documents cover roughly two centuries, from the failed Gunpowder Plot of 1605, in which the Catholic Guy Fawkes conspired to blow up Parliament, to the 1791 ratification of the Bill of Rights, under which Roman Catholics shared the same religious and civil liberties at the federal level as their fellow citizens. While his sympathy clearly lies with his co-religionists, Curran is even-handed in the selection and presentation of the sources and avoids privileging the Catholic position at the expense of the Protestant. He skillfully organizes 120 documents into ten thematic chapters, or “parts.” Arranged chronologically, the documents in each part address as few as two or as many as nine different subjects. The editor provides historical context to each topical grouping of sources by a helpful introduction, complete with questions that will enhance the reader’s use in the classroom.

The range of the documents in Intestine Enemies is especially noteworthy. Demonstrating his familiarity with the archives of both church and state, Curran has gathered an impressive array of published and unpublished materials, many of which appear in print for the first time. He effectively mines sources from Catholic sites like the Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome and the Maryland Province Archives for the Society of Jesus. Curran is equally adept at tapping public documents and official correspondence from British repositories like the Public Record Office, the Board of Trade, and Colonial State Papers. Moreover, the editor draws upon not only ecclesiastical and governmental records, but also every-day sources like letters to the

1 As told to John Tracy Ellis, and quoted in Ellis, American Catholicism, The Chicago History of American Civilization. Edited by Daniel J. Boorstin (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956), 149.
editor, broadsides, and private letters. For example, famous public documents such as Maryland’s Act Concerning Religion of 1649 are present, but also personal testimony like the mid-eighteenth century correspondence of the Jesuit Joseph Mosley with his family back in Lincolnshire, England.

While seeking to be representative and inclusive in his selections, Curran yet acknowledges, “Virtually all the voices are those of English or Irish males.” (xix) Despite such lamentable limitations of most records from the seventeenth- and eighteenth-centuries, he contends that the assembled sources still offer “a valuable cross-view of the changing world that Catholics were a part of in British America.” (xix) A welcome feature in this regard is the attention he gives to lesser-known colonizing efforts in the seventeenth century, such as the failed Catholic colony of Avalon in Newfoundland and the settlements of Catholic indentured servants in the West Indies islands of Barbados, Montserrat, and Jamaica. That noted, the vast majority of the documents in this collection focus on events in the thirteen colonies of mainland British America, Maryland in particular. Lord Baltimore Cecil Calvert, a Catholic proprietor, founded Maryland in 1634 as a refuge for his co-religionists. Resented for their social and political prominence as well as their sectarian difference, the Catholic minority in Maryland suffered increased legal discrimination in the eighteenth century.

Taken as a whole, the documents in this reader offer evidence that, while suspicion of Roman Catholics was a constant in British America, its degree of intensity ebbed and flowed with military events (wars, alliances, treaties), demographic shifts (immigration), and political developments (changes in heads of government, imperially and locally). For example, while penal legislation against Catholics had a long tradition in Britain and its colonies, enforcement was often limited so long as Catholics remained private in their religious practice. In times of social stress or political turmoil, such as the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the episodic Wars for Empire between Britain and Catholic France, fears of the “Papist” presence spiked, and laws against Catholics were more strictly enforced. Ironically, the Franco-American alliance during the War for Independence reversed past loyalties, France’s strong support for the Patriot cause had the effect of making Catholics more acceptable to their Protestant neighbors.

This admirable volume fills a long-standing gap in the scholarly literature on Colonial America. Professor Curran has performed a true service in making this rich collection of sources available to scholars and students of the British Atlantic world. He has also achieved his stated goal to provide readers “the opportunity to have first hand access to this history rather than the derivative experience that narratives provide.” (xvii) As such, Intestine Enemies may be read either as a companion to Curran’s recent monograph Papist Devils: Catholics in British America, 1571-1783 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014) or as a stand-alone resource for research or the classroom.

Joseph G. Mannard
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Issues of American dependence upon foreign goods and manufacture regularly resurface in political debate, and periodic cries to “buy American” protest trade imbalances and the exportation of domestic jobs and industry. Currently, Chinese goods exemplify the issue, but readers of Zara Anishanslin’s book will gain fresh insight into patterns of both American consumption and protest. From the earliest colonial days, Americans have never been economically independent, in spite of the vast territory, resources, and available potential. Until the American Revolution, Britain supplied colonists’ every need and established trade policies and regulations to hamper independent American production, which, when tried, proved to be more expensive and difficult than buying British goods. Little has changed over two hundred years, except for the primary provider that feeds and fuels American consumer appetites.

Through the lens of a single silk dress, Anishanslin follows its production, purchase, and survival in the form of a 1746 portrait of Anne Shippen Willing (1710–1791) painted by Robert Feke (ca. 1707–1751). The surviving original pattern design, dated 1743, by Anna Maria Garthwaite (1688–1763) forms the first section of Anishanslin’s analysis. In her notes, Garthwaite recorded that Simon Julins (ca. 1686/8–1778), a master weaver of French Huguenot ancestry, commissioned the damask silk design. From these basic facts, Anishanslin brilliantly weaves the story of British and American colonial exchange on multiple levels, concurrently telling two intertwined national stories.

Anishanslin first examines Garthwaite’s home(s), family life, and educational opportunities that resulted in Garthwaite’s professional silk design career. Anishanslin places Garthwaite in her residence in the Spitalfields neighborhood of London, surrounded by other silk designers and weavers. She also examines broader family and neighborhood networks, further cementing Garthwaite’s place in a political and social spectrum. Garthwaite, not unexpectedly, represents a statistical minority as a professional woman, and Anishanslin carefully positions her within the context of other women in the Spitalfields silk industry. Flowers and other plants enjoyed significant popularity in fashionable silks; thus Anishanshin further takes into account the eighteenth century’s fascination with all things botanical, including the foundation of the Chelsea Physick Garden, the importation of printed floral textiles from India, and exotic plants from the American colonies.

Julins commissioned a design for a silk damask. Usually done in a single color, the reversible finished product simultaneously represented luxury and economy. Particularly fashionable in the colonies, damasks did not go out of vogue as quickly as other multi-colored floral designs, and they lent themselves readily to the common practice of restyling to update the gowns of which they were made. Julins understood his target
market very well. His position and profession as a master weaver was highly political: his Huguenot forebears fled persecution in the wake of Louis XIV’s decision to revoke the Edict of Nantes, which had mandated religious tolerance in France. When they resettled in England, the Huguenots established an industry that further stimulated English and French rivalry. The English government exploited the resulting possibilities, as Anishanslin carefully explains. On a broader level, the hunger for silk, combined with a fascination for the silk worm’s ability to spin such a desirable fiber, resulted in multiple attempts to establish colonial silk production. Trumpeted in terms that compared the colonies with China and the East, Anishanslin follows various American attempts to establish a fledgling silk industry. As demand far outstripped supply, Anishanslin’s research shows that, in partnership with its colonial landowners, Britain was attempting to free itself from its dependence on foreign silk suppliers.

Sadly, the unsurprising missing link in the production of Mrs. Charles Willing’s dress is the unknown dressmaker. Similarly, there is far less documentation about Willing than about her husband and other male relatives, but, as is the case with Garthwaite, Anishanslin carefully pieces together Willing’s place in colonial mercantile society and within her local context. As she did with Garthwaite, Anishanslin also examines Willing’s home, neighborhood, and social and political networks. Here, and in other instances in which Anishanslin considers colonial homes, the role of enslaved labor receives its due.

The final section explores the career of artist Robert Feke, again through the lens of his home, family, and social circle, which emphasized fostering the arts, libraries, and scholarship in the New England colonies. He painted a portrait of his wife in the guise of Samuel Richardson’s best-selling heroine, Pamela Andrews, demonstrating Feke’s interest in literature and its symbolism. Anishanslin studies other surviving Feke portraits and analyzes the influences of Milton’s Paradise Lost evident in these paintings.

The careers of Garthwaite, Julins, and Feke spanned the heyday of the Spitalfields silk industry. Only Willing lived to see the aftermath of both the American boycotts and Revolution. The combination of events and the shift to mass mechanical production spelled disaster for the weavers, who were the first victims of politics and economics of the Industrial Revolution. Anishanslin’s detailed analysis of one American silk dress illuminates the fact that the in-depth study of any colonial artifact is the analysis of two places on different sides of the Atlantic. She thus provides a model for the interpretation of Maryland’s colonial artifacts, and her methodology can form the basis for future research and even an exhibition. There is one negative aspect which is not a critique of her research and scholarship: color plates of the brilliant silk samples and colonial portraits would have greatly enhanced the publication.

Karin J. Bohleke
Fashion Archives & Museum of Shippensburg University

*Objects of Devotion: Religion in Early America*, by Peter Manseau is based on the National Museum of American History’s new exhibit, *Religion in America*, but is far more than an exhibit catalogue. Manseau succeeds admirably in his quest to put religious objects “into dialogue with one another,” helping readers explore religion in all its diversity as a fundamental part of early American life (vii). He challenges us to move beyond our notion of religious history as purely intellectual history into considerations of material culture and lived religion, making an argument for the importance of museums.

Framed by an introduction and conclusion, brief essays form the bulk of the book, each based on a photograph of an object or person. The book is organized regionally, with equal attention paid to New England, the Mid-Atlantic, and the South and a shorter final section, “beyond the borderlands,” and includes objects dating from 1610 to 1852. Uncluttered with footnotes or academic jargon, the essays seek to interpret each object from multiple perspectives, weaving it into a larger narrative of America’s evolving and contested religious identity. For example, Manseau uses Methodist itinerant Freeborn Garrettson’s saddlebags to discuss the religious origins of abolitionism and opposition to the American Revolution. Likewise, the essay on Stickball explains the ritual game played by the Cherokee and its role in tribal politics as well as the ways in which missionaries used Indian removal to increase Indian conversion rates.

A particular strength is the author’s comprehensive coverage of religious life: the “objects of devotion” include people, documents, writings, personal possessions, images of rituals, and portraits. The Winthrop Cup (a silver communion cup used in John Winthrop’s church) makes an appearance, but so does the Bilali Document (a rare American Muslim text) and the Yeung Wo Temple (founded by Chinese immigrants in 1852). While white Christian men dominate the coverage, approximately 40% of the essays relate directly to the experiences of women, non-white men, or religious minorities, although Native Americans primarily appear as objects of European Colonialism. While some objects are familiar and their historical significance clear, others represent the religious experiences of ordinary Americans.

The introduction, which is framed around the Iron Cross, made in England and brought to Maryland by the first Roman Catholic expedition to the English colonies, will be of particular interest to students of Maryland history, as will the eight objects and essays concerning Maryland. The portions of the book directly pertaining to Maryland history largely, but not exclusively, relate to the former colony’s Roman Catholic heritage, and include both the Carroll family tabernacle and Archbishop Carroll’s chalice and paten. While suitable for all those interested in religious history and the history of early America, this volume is indispensable for libraries, archives, and museums with related collections. Those seeking a beautifully illustrated, comprehensive, and
thoughtful exploration of the intersection of material culture, religion, and life in early America need look no further.

Elizabeth A. Georgian
The University of South Carolina Aiken

*Lion in the Bay: The British Invasion of the Chesapeake, 1813–1814.* By Stanley L. Quick with Chipp Reid. (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2015. 266 pages. Illustrations, Maps, Notes. Hardback, $32.95.)

Inspired by the discovery of what could have been War of 1812 era damage during renovation of his home on Fairlee Creek in Kent County, naval architect and engineer Stanley Quick began to research the British invasion of the Chesapeake during the summers of 1813 and 1814. After compiling an exhaustive record of Royal Navy ships assigned to the Chesapeake theater, their movements, and daily activities as recorded in logs, charts, and reports in the British National Archives, Quick concluded that his home, Carvill Hall, had likely been damaged during a British raid in 1814. Expanding the scope of his interest, the research eventually included all the naval actions, raids, and other incursions against towns and individual residences in the Chesapeake. *Lion in the Bay: The British Invasion of the Chesapeake, 1813–1814* is the result of that research, edited and with final chapters written by Chipp Reid after Quick’s death in 2009.

From the first appearance of Admiral Sir John Borlase Warren’s blockading squadron off the Virginia Capes in February 1813, through the final departure of *HMS Orlando* in March 1815, Quick’s thorough research and lively narrative details the ‘terror campaign’ waged by British land and sea forces, against the shipping, towns and villages of the Tidewater. Incorporating details from logbooks, journals, and the personal correspondence of officers, militia, sailors, and citizens of both sides, Quick offers a comprehensive view of the events and their impact on the residents of Maryland and Virginia. War of 1812 enthusiasts will appreciate the detail included in descriptions of familiar actions, as well as the less familiar incidents of smaller scale that had no less serious impact on those who suffered the loss of their homes or livelihood. Describing major conflicts, such as the Battle of Craney Island, the ‘Bladensburg Races,’ and the capture of Washington, Quick exposes interpersonal and organizational rivalries, missed opportunities, hubris, and outright incompetence that made survival of the nation questionable. He also reveals the flaws in British military leaders as well, with personal rivalries, conflicting goals, greed, and miscalculation that in effect helped weaken the strongest military force ever sent to these shores. Overall, *Lion in the Bay* offers an intriguing account of the Chesapeake Campaign of 1813–1814, supported by a wealth of information and personal accounts of the actions.

One major problem with this work is that it leaves you feeling that you’ve missed
something, as if you’ve dozed off during a good movie. One of the best features of this book is the way it incorporates details, and the individual stories and personal observations that help bring history to life. Unfortunately after Chapter 18: “The Bladensburg Races,” the narrative loses steam and the wealth of detail seems missing. One can only assume that this may be the point where the original researcher/author was not able to continue his work on this project. After an overview of the occupation and burning of Washington, the narrative skips to the Battle of Caulk’s Field; then Baltimore, Fort McHenry and the writing of the Star Spangled Banner, and the war is essentially over. Even the incident that may have prompted Quick’s initial research, the raid on the Waller Farm that preceded Caulk’s Field, is lightly treated. The editor’s inserted notes that the researcher compiled pages of notes and detail, but “the following is a condensed version”, leading one to wonder what a wealth of information, individual stories, and incidents have been glossed over. After the very detailed accounts of the action at Craney Island, Joshua Barney and the Chesapeake Flotilla, and the raids on the Patuxent River, the sparse treatment and lack of detail and consideration for the remaining months of the war, and most of 1815, are unfortunate. Certainly the tenor and belligerence of British actions changed after the focus of the war shifted toward New Orleans, but the raids, foraging for supplies, and sheer presence of British forces continued to plague residents of the Tidewater until the last ship departed. Those stories deserve to be told as well, to give us the full experience of the Lion in the Bay.

David MacDonald
Independent Scholar


_Mysterious Medicine_ is an anthology of brief works, mostly short stories, by Nathaniel Hawthorne and Edgar Allan Poe, two celebrated literary figures in nineteenth century America. The editor, L. Kerr Dunn, has as her purpose the exploration of suffering, healing, death, insanity, alcoholism, and a host of other topics related to medicine. As such, Dunn uses literature and the humanities broadly to enrich the reader’s understanding of medicine as practiced in nineteenth century America. The contents of _Mysterious Medicine_ include eight short stories and one essay by Hawthorne and nine stories and one poem by Poe. Each work contains a brief introduction to situate the story in its historical, literary, medical, and scientific context. In addition to these introductions is a longer introduction to _Mysterious Medicine_ that has a number of aims. As an introduction to this collection of stories, an essay and a poem, this essay begins by tracing the development of medicine as a profession in the nineteenth cen-
tury and of Americans’ expectations of it and its practitioners. The introduction then interprets the Romantic artist as unifier of science and intuition, and rationality and the imagination. Dunn places Hawthorne and Poe within this Romantic framework, though she characterizes them as dark Romantics. Anyone acquainted with their works will likely agree. The introduction also supplies some biographical information about the two writers, though none of the material is new, a fact that is not surprising given the scrutiny that has attended Hawthorne and Poe during their lives and after death. These biographies of Hawthorne and Poe serve to make intelligible their attraction to medicine and medical science.

This anthology is the first to juxtapose the medical and scientific stories of Hawthorne and Poe and for that reason alone deserves acclaim. Yet it is not an easy work to classify. It is literary analysis, an attempt to use the arts and humanities to understand medicine and medical science, and at least to a minor degree, the history of medicine and science. Its contribution to the literature thus varies depending on the reader’s proclivities. *Mysterious Medicine* is perhaps most successful as an attempt to bridge literary analysis with the concerns of medicine and medical science. Through this analysis, Dunn helps the reader grasp the sometimes inchoate state of medicine and medical science in nineteenth century America.

Her method depends on close reading of the primary sources: the stories, essay, and poem at issue in *Mysterious Medicine*. To these texts, Dunn adds an understanding of the secondary literature, focusing with particular care on the journal articles, books, and a few websites of the past two decades of scholarship on Hawthorne and Poe. In addition Dunn cites a few older works, in one case exploring arguments that have circulated through the literature for some eighty years. These sources provide both context and relevance.

In an anthology of fewer than 300 pages, it is obvious that Dunn could not hope to include all or even most of Hawthorne and Poe’s output. The choice of inclusion was at the same time the decision to exclude. The exclusions are in at least two cases fascinating and questionable. Here this review focuses on Poe because the student of Maryland history will recognize him as a Baltimore resident late in his truncated life. One must admit, however, that the student of Maryland history will not learn anything specific about Maryland in *Mysterious Medicine*. This caveat is not surprising given that it was not Dunn’s intention to illuminate conditions in Maryland. Moreover, nothing in these selections from Poe mention anything about Maryland or its history. Nonetheless Poe remains one of the celebrated figures in Maryland’s literary history and so deserves commentary. In this context one notes that Dunn omitted the renowned stories “The Tell-Tale Heart” and “The Masque of the Red Death.” Both may have merited inclusion, a fact that Dunn seems to acknowledge by mentioning them in her introduction. “The Tell-Tale Heart” appears to be, depending on how one reads it, a chilling story of paranoia, perhaps even paranoid schizophrenia before medical science had such language. “The Masque of the Red Death” reminds one of the terrors of contagion in an
era before the discovery and use of antibiotics and when the science of vaccination was still in its infancy. Both stories are relevant for understanding the world of nineteenth century medicine. Even with these oversights, L. Kerr Dunn has skillfully edited an important collection of brief works by Hawthorne and Poe. This anthology deserves a place in libraries and private collections wherever the aim is to enrich an understanding of medicine and medical science in nineteenth century America.

Christopher Cumo
Independent Scholar


The rise of the abolitionist movement in the United States during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is one of the most discussed topics in American history. Given this vast historiography, it would appear quite difficult to produce new scholarship that both broadens and deepens our understanding of abolition and its effects on American society and politics from the late eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries.

In _Dismantling Slavery: Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, and Formation of the Abolitionist Discourse, 1841-1851_, Temple University’s Nilgun Anadolu-Okur, associate professor of African-American Studies and historian of the Underground Railroad, focuses her attention on the ten-year friendship between Frederick Douglass and William Lloyd Garrison and how this relationship from two people formed the abolitionist movement and the quest for women’s rights. Drawing on a plethora of primary sources, including newspapers, published and unpublished manuscripts, papers, and correspondence, Anadolu-Okur argues “the abolitionist rhetoric generated by Douglass and Garrison created new forms in a variety of genres” (2). Anadolu-Okur attempts to demonstrate “how the antislavery discourse in the early nineteenth century generated solidarity and collaboration among two people from different backgrounds, who became leaders of their communities, while actively contributing to the advancement of antislavery discourse to effect sociopolitical changes in nineteenth-century American society” (2). For Anadolu-Okur, the term discourse refers not just to the spoken or written word, but instead to “clusters of coherent ideas that relate to a self-determining account of reality generating concepts...an experiential, communicative, and social entity” (2). This, Anadolu-Okur suggests, is due to the importance of discourse in formulating social context and perception. At the heart of this friendship between Douglass and Garrison, Anadolu-Okur contends, lies the relationship “between the reverence of an African for _nommo_, the power of the spoken word, and a white man’s determination to bring truth and justice to his nation through moral conviction” (2). Focusing on this key aspect of the friendship between the two men, one historians
have neglected, allows Anadolu-Okur to differentiate herself from other scholars who have published studies on the history of abolition in the United States. Furthermore, according to Anadolu-Okur, taking this approach allows her to illustrate the “foundation that bred the grand fire of the abolitionist discourse” (22).

Though the approach to abolition, as well as Douglass and Garrison, is novel, Anadolu-Okur’s work is flawed. Anadolu-Okur begins Dismantling Slavery with a brief, but thorough, biographical synopsis of both Douglass and Garrison, their first meeting, and their eventual collaboration towards the eradication of slavery in the United States. However, there are certain sections of Dismantling Slavery where Anadolu-Okur misconstrues the overarching history of the period. For instance, in her discussion of the American Colonization Society and abolitionist opposition, she states that two of the founding members of the Colonization Society were Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun. In the reams of literature on African colonization Calhoun’s name is never mentioned as one of the society’s founders. Moreover, Anadolu-Okur, countering recent scholarship, posits that proslavery whites throughout the South were ardent supporters of colonization. However, proslavery support for African colonization was fractured. For instance, according to scholars such as Douglas Egerton, much of the planter elite throughout the Deep South were adamantly opposed to colonization, claiming that it was an abolitionist plot to weaken slavery in the region. One final point, she also makes the statement that in October of 1859, Stephen A. Douglas is the Democratic nominee for president. Douglas was not nominated until the Democratic Convention in 1860, and even then his placement on the presidential ballot was not a given. Southern Democrats, feeling betrayed at Douglas’ break with them over the Lecompton Constitution, walked out of the first Democratic National Convention in 1860, in order to deprive Douglas the nomination, and would eventually nominate their own candidate for president, John C. Breckinridge.

In the third chapter, Anadolu-Okur presents a series of vignettes about outspoken historical figures of the 1840s. Though she successfully demonstrates their relationship to the abolitionist cause, Anadolu-Okur fails to convincingly show how the discourse of Garrison and Douglass influenced the antislavery ideology of these other individuals. Moreover, though she recognizes the relationship between abolition and the call for women’s rights, she fails to adequately demonstrate the connections between Garrison and Douglass and the push for equal rights for both sexes.

In the fourth and final chapter, Anadolu-Okur demonstrates how the friendship between Douglass and Garrison fell apart. Though ideological differences pushed the relationship between Douglass and Garrison to the breaking point, Anadolu-Okur successfully demonstrates that it was public gossip, facilitated in part by Garrison that brought the friendship between the two men to a close.

Ultimately, Anadolu-Okur concludes, “without the discourse maintained between Garrison and Douglass, the abolition movement would not have possessed an intense, and multidimensional outlook between 1841 and 1851” (257). Though the work con-
tains some factual errors and problematic interpretations, Anadolu-Okur’s *Dismantling Slavery* does suggest an area of study where historians studying abolition can turn their attention, especially by focusing on the personal relationship between the two leaders of the movement. However, readers should also consult the vast historiography surrounding abolition.

Richard Smith  
University of North Carolina Gainesville


Andrew Diemer explored the changing definitions of black citizenship through the lens of the American Colonization Society (ACS) and the Fugitive Slave Act in Baltimore and Philadelphia. The larger national discussions of an abstract black citizenship had exigency in these cities. The free black populations, the two largest in the nation, “recognized the tenuousness of their legal protections and therefore, understood the necessity of political engagement” at the local, state, and national levels (6).

Diemer found that there were two primary ways free black Baltimoreans and Philadelphians understood their political engagement and claimed their American citizenship. The first way Diemer identified clearly addressed legislation like the Fugitive Slave Act, as individuals focused on a specific action. Free black advocacy for a specific, clearly defined boundary, like defense against kidnapping or re-enslavement, the practical threats that emerged from the Fugitive Slave Acts, “helped protect whatever liberties free blacks had acquired” (194). Violence was not only enacted against black individuals but also threatened the political and geographic border between Maryland and Pennsylvania. Maryland slave owners attempted to violate Pennsylvania’s state laws as they wanted to ensure that fugitive enslaved individuals in Pennsylvania would be returned to them. This prompted a much more explicit discussion and assertion of black citizenship by Pennsylvania’s free black population due to Maryland’s attempted legislation. Even limited rights (like the legal protection against kidnapping) were a threat to slavery’s economic hegemony.

The emphasis of free black birthright was the second way Diemer found free blacks claiming their rights of citizenship. Free black Baltimoreans and Philadelphians fought for their citizenship through active and vocal opposition to the ACS in an increasingly hostile political and social environment, which was exacerbated by European immigration. Many free blacks saw the United States as home and stressed their birth on American soil. The rhetoric and the political context made free blacks emphasize their Americanness rather than reject their African identity. Supporters of colonization (or colonization?) thought the internationalism of the “African” identity would
encourage free blacks to support colonialism and leave, thus providing an easy answer to American enslavement.

African colonization was used as an attempt by white politicians to resolve the brewing sectional tensions. Colonizationists, like Henry Clay, believed that colonization and economic nationalism would strengthen the bonds of the union. Southern support of the ACS was rooted in the protection of slavery. Northern support emerged from patriotism and the belief in “God’s providential design for the American nation” (14). Opposition was a fundamental part of free black political discourse, due to the prevailing belief that free blacks would be compelled and coerced to travel to Africa, much like they would be kidnapped and enslaved with the Fugitive Slave Act. Free blacks would not consent to leave their birth country. White opponents of slavery saw African colonization as “key to expanding anti-slavery’s popular appeal” (177). Removing free blacks would remove the problems surrounding enslavement and during the national discussions, race eventually became the marker for American citizenship.

Diemer’s text is a worthy introduction to the intersections of local and national discussions of citizenship though many of his sources are from Pennsylvania rather than Maryland. Many groups attempt to define American citizenship in ways that had practical applications and lived consequences, particularly in Maryland. Despite the many reasons to recommend the text, there are missed opportunities to discuss black citizenship, political engagement, and its relation to black religion. He does acknowledge that religion played a fundamental part of free black political activity, for example, “many free blacks on the border saw their work within their churches as an essential form of practical antislavery” (109) but does not fully explore the intersections of religion and politics throughout his work. Every action these individuals took was a political action. Fully mining these connections was not the purpose of Diemer’s text but it does suggest that further work on the early political religiosity of free blacks would be rich. Despite this small criticism, the book is a worthy introduction to the complicated intersections of race and citizenship in Maryland during the early 1800s.

Lisa Rose Lamson
Marquette University


In his new biography, Andrew R. Black resuscitates John Pendleton Kennedy’s position as a preeminent Whig politician and antebellum novelist. Well known in his own time, Kennedy’s popular novels and dedicated nationalist principles afforded him national prestige and the opportunity to socialize with prominent authors and elder statesmen.
Situating Kennedy’s importance firmly within these two spheres of influence, Black argues that historians can no longer separate Kennedy’s literary life from his political one. As Kennedy matured into an influential Whig ideologue, Black demonstrates that his writings helped to shape mainstream Whig culture influenced by Kennedy’s Southern upbringing. As a resident of Maryland, Black contends that Kennedy’s borderland heritage and lifelong ambivalence towards slavery helps to “explain what went wrong with the Whig experiment,” as his ideas became characteristic of the party’s writ large (ix).

Through careful literary analysis, Black locates within Kennedy’s work a deep sense of contradiction, not merely racial, that foreshadowed the collapse of the Whig Party. As Kennedy’s pen was utilized to advance a nationalistic outlook, so too did public events affect his writing process, often with adverse results. For Black, the Whig Party’s primary weakness was their profound inability to reconcile their economically progressive attitudes with that of their deeply ingrained predisposition towards compromise and social conservatism. Kennedy’s work embodied these struggles, and his first novel, *Swallow Barn*, quickly fell victim to this conundrum. Published in 1832 and revised in 1851, *Swallow Barn*’s publication history closely mirrored the existence of the Whig Party. By offering a popular mediating position first against Jacksonian democracy and later against sectional antagonisms, the book’s themes symbolized the unsolved problems that came to unravel the party.

For context, Kennedy had distinguished himself by the 1820s as a reliable nationalist and economic interventionist. But as Jacksonian democracy continuously grew in influence, Kennedy became disconcerted over the opposition’s constant suspicion of state power. Fearful of his antagonists, Kennedy intended to interject his emergent political partisanship all throughout *Swallow Barn*. Yet because Kennedy’s depiction of the Old Dominion was sensitive to national forces, the final result was a confusing, disjointed narrative. Early within the novel, Virginia is shown to be a semi-feudal, backward society in which the plantation aristocracy has condemned the rest of the white population to live in poverty. But as the nullification crisis unfolded, Kennedy rewrote a seemingly inconsequential plot device, a boundary dispute between two plantation owners, to be read as a lesson in Southern gentility, compromise, and the respect for the rule of law. In a similar fashion, events prompted Kennedy to include a defense of slavery as well, despite his belief that it was economically retrogressive.

Kennedy’s defense of the peculiar institution likely reflected his Maryland upbringing. But his inconsistency on the topic set into motion a culture of racial ambivalence that influenced Whig ideology and encouraged compromise. As a new Whig spokesman, Kennedy originally intended to sidestep the issue of slavery entirely within *Swallow Barn* but felt the need to address it following Nat Turner’s rebellion. Predictably, Kennedy defended slavery along conservative lines, arguing that historical processes forced it upon Virginians and that only a slow, localized and rational debate could see its demise. But because he saw abolition as divisive, Kennedy preferred to avoid the topic and removed discussions of slavery from his
next two novels. He also seldom spoke of the matter in public, evading it until the sectional crisis rendered its avoidance impossible. True to form, Kennedy continued to promote the middle ground. He initially adopted a hard stance against slavery during the Mexican-American War but soon returned to its defense, particularly with his 1851 reissue of *Swallow Barn*, as a means of promoting sectional compromise. Not until the Civil War’s aftermath was Kennedy able to solidify his position, acknowledging that Confederate aspirations were “no better…than the permanent defense of the great crime of slavery” (252).

For Black, these ideological inconsistencies, particularly on slavery, irreparably destroyed the Whig Party. Many, including Kennedy, continued to preach compromise throughout the Civil War but came to accept the Republican Party’s hardline stance against slavery as the only means of preserving the Union. Although the Whig Party had run its course, its death did not eradicate its intellectual legacy. With slavery gone, Kennedy was finally able to embrace Republican values. But as many former Whigs also joined Republican ranks, they brought with them their compromising spirit, helping to put an end to Reconstruction.

Deeply argumentative and grounded in a careful analysis of Kennedy’s writings, Black’s biography stands as a testament to the genre’s scholarly potential by carefully situating Kennedy’s life within the larger scholarship of borderland studies, literary criticism, and antebellum intellectual history. Those interested specifically in Maryland history, however, may appreciate Black’s restoration of a native figure but will regret his decision to avoid a thorough integration of Kennedy’s national influence within the context of local politics. Readers will only gain a cursory appreciation of the complexity of antebellum Maryland but will nonetheless be treated to an eminently readable and convincing biography of a man whose political thought and literary writings were both influential and inseparable. As a microcosm of Whig ideology, Kennedy’s life serves as a valuable window into understanding the party’s demise and legacy.

Daniel W. Farrell
Kent State University


Aaron Cowan recounts postwar attempts to revitalize the urban economies of cities in the U.S. rustbelt. He focuses on the use of tourism to entice people and spending capital into cities from the end of World War II to 1990. He uses four exemplars, in order: Cincinnati, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Baltimore.

All four cities faced a similar experience of urban decline as their industrial-based
economies shrunk, and in some cases, collapsed. All of them used tourism and tourism-related projects as opportunities to create a new image of the city, meet the demands of powerful downtown development interests, and provide physical trophies for politicians. Policies were crafted and budgets aligned to promote convention centers, hotels, stadiums, and other tourist-orientated investments.

Cowan focuses on different elements in each city case study. For example, city officials in Cincinnati used municipal funds from 1945 to 1975 to subsidize hotels and convention complexes, also known as “heads in beds” and “boxes with docks.” The construction of the city’s Convention-Exposition Center and new hotels were presented as a panacea for the problem of declining downtown. But unlike the old downtown hotels that were a setting for local civic engagements, these new hotels were for visitors.

A similar tale unfolded in St. Louis as federal dollars supported the municipal focus on downtown revitalization through the construction and promotion of a convention center. As with many cities, the wider benefits rarely achieved their promise while the costs ballooned.

Former industrial cities often feel the need for an urban makeover. The experience of Pittsburgh highlights the important role that professional sports teams and stadiums play in the remaking of urban images. Cowan, focuses attention on Pittsburgh and Baltimore in the period from 1970 to 1990. For Pittsburgh, a key component was the construction of Three Rivers Stadium and the rebranding of the industrial city as the livable city. Again it is the same tale of exaggerated promises of urban revitalization and harsh fiscal realities.

Cowan’s final case study is the remaking of Baltimore’s image through the Inner Harbor. He describes it as a project promoted by powerful Mayor Schaefer for local residents to become tourists in their own town. The tourist-based economic development overlapped with gentrification in selected neighborhoods, provided a festival marketplace for locals especially in its earlier years, and undercut more negative treatments of the city in the national media and popular culture. Inner Harbor, like Faneuil Hall in Boston, also marked an innovative shift toward using existing buildings to revitalize downtown. It represented a shift toward a more postmodern engagement with the existing physical fabric of the city in contrast to the demolition and rebuild of the modernist conception.

Cowan describes these urban tourist projects as flawed but important bridges in the transition from industrial to postindustrial. Tourism brought in people and dollars, stimulated some gentrification, leveraged private investments, and rebranded the city. Cowan presents Baltimore as one of the more successful projects.

All four case studies have a disheartening conclusion about the limits of solutions. There were costs and limits of the strategy. Despite promises, it did little to spread wealth and opportunity in hard pressed cities. While they aided downtown developers, solidified political reputations, and played an important role in reimagining a postindustrial city, they did little to solve the wider problems of poverty and limited opportunity for
many city residents. The projects rarely lived up to their grand promises to save the city. Tourist development has a role to play in the urban economy, but has limited capacity to fully address a city’s social injuries.

This is an excellent book. It is well-written, meticulously researched, and contains interesting observations. It is very readable, concise, and makes an important contribution to our understanding of why and how rustbelt cities embarked on tourist development projects to resuscitate their ailing downtowns and struggling economies. My only complaint: I wanted more. In particular, the book could have added more contemporary material so that we have a fuller assessment of these experiments in urban revitalization. But this ‘complaint’ in no way lessens this achievement. For those interested in urban America, and especially the trajectory of our rustbelt cities, *A Nice Place to Visit* is a great book to read.

John Rennie Short
University of Maryland Baltimore County


*Travels through American History in the Mid-Atlantic: A Guide for All Ages* seeks to provide a heartier, more educational travel guide without weighing down the suitcase. The guidebook highlights several tourist destinations across Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia and provides brief but fascinating historical context and anecdotes for each locale.

Mitchell showcases sixteen historic sites in the Mid-Atlantic, including Richmond, Harpers Ferry, Valley Forge, and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. All of the sites featured “are synonymous with a specific seminal event or era in American history, and...warrant a day, or perhaps two or three (including travel time) to enjoy fully” (xii). This is not a typical travel guide. Missing are hotel and restaurant recommendations, local events, and pithy historical vignettes typical of *Frommer’s* and *Lonely Planet*. Instead, it is an excellent travel companion for the amateur historian.

Mitchell provides a solid overview of what there is to see at each location peppered with the site’s historical significance in a narrative style. Quotes from letters, diaries, and other primary sources bring the buildings and artifacts at the historic landmarks to life and perhaps goes beyond the standard tour spiel and exhibit text. In the third chapter on Fort Frederick, the reader learns more about visible remains of the foundation of the officers’ quarters, which are animated with an explanation of the British army’s standard weekly rations, a mere “seven pounds of flour and beef or pork and a pint of rice” (34) and a daily ration of rum. The ravages of disease and starvation conditions at Jamestown, the subject of the first chapter, are illustrated by accounts from explorer
John Smith and other settlers. The author’s storytelling particularly comes alive in the chapters that focus on Civil War sites. At Antietam, chapter 11’s destination, he expertly weaves the park’s trail stops with the story of the battle. Major Rufus Dawes’s of the 6th Wisconsin Regiment recounted his escape from the Confederate Army’s assault: “It is a race for life that each man runs for the cornfield. A sharp cut, as of a switch, stings the calf of my leg as I run” (125). This recollection conjures a vivid image of the past more readily than monuments in an empty field. It is these embellishments to the historical account that set this book apart from other travel guides.

The guide’s approachable style makes for an enjoyable read. History-minded travelers would benefit from reading their destination’s chapter to brush up on the basics ahead of a visit. Mitchell also focuses on family friendly activities through the book and emphasizes the importance of visiting such historical landmarks to expand upon what is taught in school. Parents would find this guide tremendously helpful in answering the questions of curious youth and would even be an appropriate read for older children to prepare them for a family field trip. The beautifully drawn maps by Elizabeth Church Mitchell provide a basic layout for the sites featured in each chapter and allow the reader to visualize and conceptualize the landscape in time. Suggestions for other trips and further reading are also included at the end of each chapter. The side trips are generally just a quick drive away from the featured site and are an excellent way to expand an educational vacation. A wonderful selection of popular literature is provided as additional reading for the curious wanderer seeking a heartier helping of historical education and even includes selections suitable for children. Mitchell’s book is a helpful and informative alternative to the standard travel guide.

Lara Westwood
Maryland Historical Society


University histories offer great potential for scholastic research, but often times fall short of their promise. The growth and development of universities within the United States and around the world offer scholars the opportunity to tell complicated narratives that reveal unpleasant truths and challenge long-held beliefs regarding the role of universities in our society. However, despite such academic promise, many university histories avoid telling the troubling stories of its past, opting instead to recall moments of institutional greatness that illustrate the school’s devotion to innovation, excellence, diversity, and service. Most of these stories are written with a university’s alumni, and their financial power, in mind. Fortunately, George R. La Noue, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor in Public Policy and Political Science at the University of Maryland, Baltimore
County (UMBC), has shown some of the possibilities university histories have to offer in *Improbable Excellence: The Saga of UMBC*. Published on UMBC’s fiftieth anniversary, *Improbable Excellence* seeks to tell a troubling, but ultimately triumphant, story, as La Noue argues that UMBC overcame multiple, potentially institution-destroying, challenges to become a nationally and internationally recognized university.

La Noue maintains that UMBC’s establishment and development were beset with problems that could easily hinder the school’s long-term viability. Established as Maryland’s colleges and universities projected and experienced dramatic enrollment increases, UMBC immediately encountered problems. Some of them were geographic. UMBC’s location between Catonsville and Arbutus pitted the school within close distance to the professional schools of the University of Maryland in downtown Baltimore, not to mention ten public and private colleges and universities. The congested higher education market threatened UMBC’s institutional identity especially in the realm of academic development. In 1974, the Pear Committee, established by the Maryland Council for Higher Education to examine higher education in the Baltimore area, proposed that no program duplication take place. As La Noue maintained, such a proposal hurt a young school that needed to expand its academic inventory to attract more students. More problematic, the Pear Committee began a trend where the state flirted with the prospects of limiting UMBC’s ability to pursue doctoral work. Doctoral programs were vital to the school’s identity. Losing them La Noue declared, “would have negatively affected funding, teaching responsibilities, and prestige. Slowly, but surely, many of its most distinguished faculty, so carefully recruited, would have accepted job offers elsewhere” (xii, 31–34).

While the Pear Committee’s proposals were not fully implemented, political proposals continued to threaten UMBC’s institutional identity. During the late-1970s to 1990s, various studies floated the proposal of merging UMBC with other institutions in the Baltimore region. One such proposal occurred in 1978 and included the merger of UMBC with the University of Baltimore and the University of Maryland at Baltimore into a new University of Maryland, Baltimore. Another proposal included the merger of UMBC with the professional schools at the University of Maryland at Baltimore, which ultimately failed in 1999. La Noue noted that this merger could have turned both schools into a national player, but, “[i]n retrospect, all of Baltimore’s public higher institutions are stronger than they were two decades ago, so a case can be made that their diversity creates more benefits . . .” (49, 62–64, 66). More problematic, efforts emerged that called for UMBC’s closure. In 1981, Sheldon Knorr, Executive Director of the Maryland Higher Education Commission, proposed the closure of UMBC in order to establish an industrial park. The proposal was met by mass protests on the UMBC campus. While Knorr’s proposal ultimately disappeared, La Noue noted that proposals to close the school did not serve as a strong recruitment tool for prospective teachers and students (38–40).

In the midst of various “near-death experiences,” La Noue nonetheless showed a
school that continued to grow and flourish over the years. Part of UMBC’s success stemmed from the school’s connection to the University of Maryland. At times a hindrance, especially when College Park felt threatened, UMBC’s connection to the University of Maryland allowed for enough flexibility to develop some doctoral programs, thus allowing the school to develop the programs and recruit the faculty it needed (32, 35). Furthermore, the ability to attract promising faculty helped a great deal. While UMBC initially offered prospective professors “three buildings and a sea of mud,” the school nonetheless served as an attractive location to faculty eager for the opportunity to shape and build a new institution. As LaNoue noted, recalling his own decision to come to UMBC in 1972, “it was not what UMBC was then that should attract us, but what it might become” (xv, 161–62). In turn, UMBC’s ability to recruit promising faculty reflected its commitment to undergraduate teaching in a research setting, thus allowing the school to attract promising students that serve as the greatest markers of its improbable success (209).

*Improbable Excellence* is a noteworthy book that helps to highlight the promises university histories have to offer. To be sure, the book ultimately echoes the usual themes of other university histories: innovation, excellence, diversity, and service. However, the true value and greatest contribution of LaNoue’s work stems from the trials and tribulations that UMBC consistently faced. UMBC’s success was never guaranteed, a fact that often gets overlooked or forgotten given the school’s status as a highly successful and respected institution today. The school faced internal issues, as expectations for tenured faculty changed mid-course, leading to the departure of good, capable faculty members (164). Moreover, UMBC consistently faced external, political roadblocks that could have easily killed the school. As Joseph Popovich stated, “the creation and/or development of UMBC could have been stopped by an effective coordinating board” (40). That UMBC was not stopped, despite incredible odds, makes its success even more remarkable.

Richard Hardesty
Anne Arundel Community College
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Records are still preserved of a brilliant fancy ball given during the winter of 1837 at the residence of Mrs. Benjamin I. Cohen, on the southwest corner of Charles and Saratoga streets. It was a notable social event and so successful that it was repeated later in the winter in the Assembly Rooms, corner of Holliday and Fayette streets. Mrs. John H. B. Latrobe took a prominent part in the ball, appearing in three characters during the evening. Among others who appeared on this occasion were Mrs. Patterson Bonaparte, as Queen Caroline, in magnificent gown and costly jewels; Mrs. Charles Tiernan, as a Turkish lady, in gown of white and silver; Miss Frick, as a novice; Mrs. Robert Gilmor, Jr., as Medora; Miss Eliza Skipworth, afterward Mrs. Basil B. Gordon, as a Bernese peasant girl. Others present in costume were Mrs. Caton, Mrs. Robert Gilmor, Miss Emma Meredith, Miss Matilda Cohen, of Wales; Miss Shubrick and the young girls destined later to be Mrs. John Hanson Thomas and Mrs. Horatio L. Whittridge. To dance with these belles and appearing in equally picturesque costumes were a group of men, all of whose names have contributed to the upbuilding of Baltimore and Maryland.

“Records of a Brilliant Ball.” This undated newspaper clipping is among the papers of Miss Eleanor Septima Cohen (1858–1937) whose grandparents hosted the Fancy Dress Party in 1837. (Cohen Family Papers, MS 251, Maryland Historical Society.)
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