
MARYLAND

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

Maryland's Federalist Revival
Victor Sapio

The Development of Baltimore
Business, 1880-1914
Eleanor S. Bruchey

The Free Negro Population of
Washington, D.C., 1800-1862
Henry S. Robinson



Vol. 64 No. 1

SPRING, 1969

A QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

BOARD OF EDITORS

DR. RHODA M. DORSEY, *Chairman*

DR. JACK P. GREENE

DR. AUBREY C. LAND

DR. BENJAMIN QUARLES

DR. MORRIS L. RADOFF

MR. A. RUSSELL SLAGLE

DR. RICHARD WALSH

MSA SC 5881-1-253

MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

PUBLISHED BY
THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY



VOLUME LXIV

BALTIMORE

1969

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXIV

MARYLAND'S FEDERALIST REVIVAL, 1808-1812. <i>Victor Sapio</i>	1
THE DEVELOPMENT OF BALTIMORE BUSINESS, 1880-1914. <i>Eleanor S. Bruchey</i>	18, 144
SOME ASPECTS OF THE FREE NEGRO POPULATION OF WASHINGTON, D.C. <i>Henry S. Robinson</i>	43
MASTER'S THESES AND DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN MARYLAND HISTORY. <i>Compiled by Dorothy M. Brown and Richard R. Duncan</i>	65, 161
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES. <i>Edited by Edward G. Howard</i>	74, 169, 295
NOTES ON MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS. <i>Bayly Ellen Marks</i>	78, 171, 297
GENEALOGICAL NOTES. <i>Mary K. Meyer</i>	80, 173, 300, 422
REVIEWS OF RECENT BOOKS	82, 175, 302, 424
NOTES AND QUERIES	95, 186, 319, 441
IMPROVING MARYLAND'S AGRICULTURE, 1840-1860. <i>Vivian Wiser</i>	105
JOHN A. J. CRESWELL OF MARYLAND: REFORMER IN THE POST OFFICE. <i>Robert V. Friedenber</i> g	133
REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, 1968	188
IDEOLOGY AND POLITICAL PARTIES IN MARYLAND, 1851-1856. <i>Douglas Bowers</i>	197
SOUTHERN BAPTISTS AND EDUCATION, 1865-1900: A CASE STUDY. <i>W. Harrison Daniel</i>	218
MARYLAND'S REACTION TO EARLY'S RAID IN 1864: A SUMMER OF BITTER- NESS. <i>Richard R. Duncan</i>	248
SIDELIGHTS	280
RELIGIOUS CAUSES OF THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION IN MARYLAND. <i>Richard A. Gleissner</i>	327
TO PRACTICE LAW: ASPECTS OF THE ERA OF GOOD FEELINGS REFLECTED IN THE SHORT-RIDGELY CORRESPONDENCE, 1816-1821. <i>Edited by</i> <i>George Green Shackelford</i>	342
WARTIME DRAMA: THE THEATER IN WASHINGTON (1861-1865). <i>Maxwell Bloomfield</i>	396
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES. <i>Edited by P. W. Filby</i>	412
NOTES ON THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY MANUSCRIPT COLLEC- TIONS. <i>Ellen Lee Barker</i>	420
CONTRIBUTORS	Opp. 1, 104, 196, 327
COVER	98, 187, 320, 442

ILLUSTRATIONS

Photograph of the Strawberry Market in Marsh Market (Center Whole- sale Market), Pratt Street, 1901. Photograph by Eduard Loll- man	Cover, Spring
Alexander Contee Hanson, 1786-1819. St. Memin. The Baltimore Museum of Art	4
John Marshall, 1785-1835. Engraving. Md. Hist. Soc. Graphics Collection	10
Roger Brooke Taney, 1777-1864. Engraving. Md. Hist. Soc. Graphics Collection	14
View of Light Street, c. 1906. Library of Congress	23
Sailing craft tied up at Pratt Street near Light Street, Baltimore, Maryland. c. 1900. Md. Hist. Soc. Graphics Collection	30
Bruce Family, c. 1870. Photo attributed to Matthew Brady	45
John F. Cook, 1790-1855	55
William Syphax, 1825-1891	62
View of Baltimore from Federal Hill, c. 1870. From a Photograph. Mary- land Historical Society Graphics Collection	Cover, Summer
John Stuart Skinner, 1788-1851. Oil on Panel. Joseph Wood, 1825. Present owner unknown. From a photograph. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	109

John Merryman, 1737-1814. Oil on Canvas. Peale. Present owner unknown. From a photograph. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	115
Edward Stabler, 1794-1883. From a Photograph. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	125
John A. J. Creswell, 1828-1891. From a Steel Engraving. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	136
Ulysses S. Grant, 1822-1885. From a Photograph. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	139
Fayette and Holliday Streets, Baltimore, Maryland, c. 1900. From a Photo- graph by Eduard Lollman. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	148
First Aerial View of Baltimore Harbor, 1914. From a Photograph by Eduard Lollman. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	153
Watermelon Boats. Pratt Street Wharves, Baltimore, Maryland, 1902. From a Photograph by Eduard Lollman. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	156
Archbishop Francis P. Kenrick (1796-1863), 6th Archbishop of Baltimore, 1851-1863. Courtesy of the Baltimore <i>Catholic Review</i> .	Cover, Fall
Reverdy Johnson, 1796-1876. Engraving from a Daguerreotype. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	202
Francis Thomas, 1799-1876. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Col- lection	208
James A. Pearce, 1805-1862. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Col- lection	214
J. L. M. Curry, 1825-1903. Courtesy of Virginia Baptist Historical Society	224
Alfred E. Dickinson, 1830-1906. Courtesy of Virginia Baptist Historical Society	229
Jeremiah B. Jeter, 1802-1880. Courtesy of Virginia Baptist Historical Society	236
Frederick W. Boatwright, 1868-1951. Courtesy of Virginia Baptist Historical Society	242
The Rebel Army Crossing the Fords of the Potomac for the Invasion of Maryland. [Attributed to <i>Harper's Weekly</i> .] Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	250
General Bradley Tyler Johnson, 1829-1903. Maryland Historical Society	258
Augustus W. Bradford, 1806-1881. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	267
Colonel Harry Gilmor, 1838-1883. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	272
Annotated Page from McHenry Howard's <i>Recollections of . . .</i> Maryland Historical Society	296
Charles Calvert, Third Lord Baltimore, 1630-1715. Courtesy of The Enoch Pratt Free Library	Cover, Winter
William III, 1650-1702. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	332
Maryland State House (Reconstructed), St. Marys City, Maryland. Mary- land Historical Society Graphics Collection	336
Reverend Thomas Bray, 1656-1729/30. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	339
William Short, 1759-1849. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	348
Thomas Jefferson, 1746-1823. Photograph of Engraving by St. Memin. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	358
John Marshall, 1755-1835. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	365
Henry Clay, 1777-1852. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	373
James Monroe, 1758-1831	385
"Balloon View of Washington, D.C." <i>Harper's Weekly</i> , July 27, 1861	400
Ford's Theatre, Washington, D.C., 1893. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	405
Front Street Theatre, Baltimore, 1901. Photograph by Eduard Lollman. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	414
Program, 1879, Ford's Opera House, Baltimore. Maryland Historical Society Graphics Collection	417
Conjectural drawing of the 1821 courthouse of Port Tobacco based on archaeological findings. Drawing by J. Richard Rivoire	441



MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES OF THE
MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Elected at the Annual Meeting, February 10, 1969

President
COLONEL WILLIAM BAXTER

Vice-Presidents

J. GILMAN D'ARCY PAUL
BRYDEN BORDLEY HYDE
C. A. PORTER HOPKINS

Chairman of the Council

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

Corresponding Secretary

A. RUSSELL SLAGLE

Recording Secretary

EDWARD G. HOWARD

Treasurer

SAMUEL HOPKINS

Trustees of the Athenaeum

ABBOTT L. PENNIMAN, JR., *Chairman*

CHARLES L. MARBURG, *Co-Chairman*

MISS MARTHA BOKEL
WILLIAM K. COGSWELL

EDGAR W. GARBISCH
FRANCIS H. JENCKS

LUCIUS R. WHITE, JR.

Committee on the Gallery

FRANCIS H. JENCKS, *Chairman*

J. R. HERBERT BOONE
WILLIAM V. ELDER, III
MRS. HAROLD DUANE JACOBS
MRS. H. IRVINE KEYSER, 2ND

H. IRVINE KEYSER, 2ND
R. MCGILL MACKALL
MISS ELISABETH C. G. PACKARD
RICHARD H. RANDALL, JR.

Committee on the Library

DR. HUNTINGTON WILLIAMS, *Chairman*

CURTIS CARROLL DAVIS
HARRY S. DICKEY
ARTHUR J. GUTMAN
EDWARD G. HOWARD

LESTER S. LEVY
H. H. WALKER LEWIS
JACQUES T. SCHLENGER
A. RUSSELL SLAGLE

G. ROSS VEAZEY

Committee on Finance

ROBERT G. MERRICK, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN H. GRISWOLD, III
ROGER BROOKE HOPKINS
J. WILLIAM MIDDENDORF, JR.

JOHN E. MOTZ
THOMAS S. NICHOLS
TRUMAN T. SEMANS

Committee on Publications and Maryland History Seminar

MISS RHODA M. DORSEY, *Chairman*

ROYDEN A. BLUNT
JACK PHILIP GREENE
C. A. PORTER HOPKINS

WILBUR H. HUNTER, JR.
AUBREY C. LAND
J. RIEMAN MCINTOSH

MORRIS L. RADOFF

Committee on Membership

CHARLES P. CRANE, *Chairman*

GARY BLACK
JAMES W. McELROY

JOHN P. PACA, JR.
MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. PURNELL
GEORGE M. RADCLIFFE

Committee on Education

THOMAS G. PULLEN, JR., *Chairman*

HARRY BARD
FREDERICK W. BRUNE

LT. GEN. MILTON A. RECKORD
A. RUSSELL SLAGLE

Committee on the Maritime Collection

RICHARD H. RANDALL, SR., *Chairman*

S. VANNORT CHAPMAN
CHARLES P. CRANE
J. FREDERICK DOUTY
R. HAMMOND GIBSON
FREDERICK E. HECKLINGER
WILLIAM E. HILL
JAMES A. KNOWLES, JR.
DUNDAS LEAVITT
WILLIAM B. MATTHEWS, JR.

ROBERT E. MICHEL
ROLFE POTTBERG
G. H. POWDER
J. DAWSON REEDER
CHARLES E. SCARLETT, JR.
JOSEPH L. STANTON
WILLIAM C. STEUART
FREDERICK L. WEHR
H. GRAHAM WOOD

Women's Committee

MRS. W. WALLACE SYMINGTON, JR., *Chairman*

MRS. FRANCIS F. BEIRNE
MRS. MARCUS M. BERNSTEIN, JR.
MISS MARTHA BOKEL
MRS. KENNETH A. BOURNE
MRS. WALTER B. BUCK
MRS. EDWARD K. DUNN
MRS. SWEPSON EARLE
MISS LOUISA M. GARY
MRS. W. T. DIXON GIBBS
MISS JEAN H. GILMOR
MISS PRISCILLA D. HOWARD
MRS. BRYDEN BORDLEY HYDE
MISS PECHIN INGLE
MRS. J. RIEMAN McINTOSH

MRS. NICHOLAS B. MERRYMAN OF J
MRS. CLARENCE D. MILES
MISS B. FRANK NEWCOMER
MISS ELISABETH C. G. PACKARD
MRS. WILLIAM H. PITCHER
MRS. EDWIN C. POND
MRS. B. CARTER RANDALL
MRS. J. CREIGHTON RIEPE
MRS. RICHARD C. RIGGS
MRS. J. NICHOLAS SHRIVER, JR.
MRS. PAUL P. SWETT, JR.
MISS MARY GORDON THOM
MRS. CHARLES A. WEBB
MRS. GEORGE WEEMS WILLIAMS

Special Projects Committee

C. A. PORTER HOPKINS, *Chairman*

THOMAS M. ANDERSON, JR.
HOWARD BAETJER, II
HUGH BENET, JR.
PLEASANTON L. CONQUEST, III
GEORGE D. HUBBARD

W. BOULTON KELLY, JR.
JOHN W. NOBLE, JR.
ORLANDO V. RIDOUT, IV
W. CAMERON SLACK
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

ROBERT L. WEINBERG

HAROLD R. MANAKEE, *Director*

Honorary Members

THE EARL OF AVON

DR. LAWRENCE C. WROTH

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
DONORS IN 1968
GIFTS OF MONEY OR SECURITIES

\$1,000 or more

Mrs. William G. Baker
Mrs. Harry Clark Boden
Estate of Walter I. Dawkins
Jacob and Annita France Foundation
Mrs. Bessie D. Massey, from the estate of her sister, Evelyn D. Purdum
Middendorf Foundation
Mr. J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul
St. George L. Sioussat Trust
Miss Amy L. Steiner

\$100 to \$1,000

Society of the *Ark* and the *Dove*
Estate of Mrs. William Bevan
Mr. and Mrs. Marion V. Brewington
Daughters of the American Revolution, Maryland Division
Estate of Mrs. Samuel B. Dove
Mr. Charles P. Crane
Mrs. Cornelia M. Hurd and Mr. John Kenneth Hurd
Mr. H. H. Walker Lewis
Miss Mary Parlett
The Honorable George L. Radcliffe
Hereditary Order of Descendants of Colonial Governors in honor of Mrs. Harry Clark Boden
Mr. Richard H. Randall, Sr.
Society of the Cincinnati of Maryland
Society of the War of 1812 in the State of Maryland

Mr. A. Russell Slagle
Mr. and Mrs. T. Garland Tinsley
Miss Mary Ringgold Trippe through the Maryland Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy
Mr. Charles L. Wagandt II
Woman's Eastern Shore Society

Under \$100

Miss Elizabeth W. Baker
Daughters of the American Revolution, Mary Carroll Caton Chapter
Daughters of the American Revolution, Col. Thomas Dorsey Chapter
Daughters of Colonial Wars
Mr. H. Findlay French
Mr. Charles B. Gillett
Mr. Reverdy Johnson
Mr. David Kaufman
Mrs. E. F. Lines
Mr. William B. Marye
Maryland House and Garden Pilgrimage, through Mrs. Harry Clark Boden
Mrs. Clarence W. Miles
Mrs. Hooper W. Miles
Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Moses
National Questers Society
Mr. Harry J. Patton
Mr. Abbott L. Penniman, Jr.
Mrs. Jean H. Vivian
Anonymous, in memory of Mrs. Duncan K. Brent
Anonymous, in memory of Mr. John McKenney
Mr. John J. O'Connor

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD BOOKCASES AND
FURNISHINGS FOR THE NEW RARE BOOK ROOM

1968 only

\$1,000 or more

The Irvin Greif Foundation, Inc.
Mrs. John Campbell White

\$500 to \$1,000

Vera Ruth Filby
Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Joseph
Gutman
Mrs. Frank R. Kent
Mr. James E. Moss
Mr. J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul
The Honorable George L. Radcliffe
Dr. and Mrs. Huntington Williams

Less than \$500

Mrs. Charles R. Austrian
Mr. and Mrs. Frank F. Beirne
Captain and Mrs. Arthur C.
Bushey, Jr.

Mr. Edgar G. Heyl
Mrs. Albert D. Hutzler
Mr. H. H. Walker Lewis
Mr. Thomas Machen
Mr. William B. Marye
Dr. Thomas G. Pullen
Dr. J. Ben Robinson
Mrs. Henry Clay Smith

Friends of the late

Dr. Kent Roberts Greenfield

Mrs. Bryson Burroughs, Mrs. Clyde
Alvin Clapp, Mrs. Tenney Frank,
Dr. and Mrs. John T. King, Jr., Mr.
and Mrs. C. Gordon Pitt, Miss I.
Jewell Simpson, Mr. Frederick J.
Singley, Jr., Miss Mary Gordon
Thom

For gifts of objects, books and manuscripts, too numerous to list here, which have been received in the century and a quarter since its founding, the Society expresses lasting gratitude. Such contributions from countless members and friends have built the Society into a major repository for state and national treasures.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. 64, No. 1 SPRING, 1969

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Maryland's Federalist Revival, 1808-1812	
<i>Victor Sapio</i>	1
The Development of Baltimore Business, 1880-1914	
<i>Eleanor S. Bruchey</i>	18
Some Aspects of the Free Negro Population of Washington, D. C., 1800-1862	
<i>Henry S. Robinson</i>	43
Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations in Maryland History	
<i>Compiled by Dorothy M. Brown and Richard R. Duncan</i>	65
Bibliographical Notes <i>Edited by Edward G. Howard</i>	
<i>Plays by Marylanders, 1870-1916</i>	
<i>Compiled by Edgar Hey</i>	74
Notes on the Maryland Historical Society	
Manuscript Collections	
<i>Bayly Ellen Marks, Manuscripts Curator</i>	78
Genealogical Notes	
<i>Mary K. Meyer, Genealogical Librarian</i>	80
Reviews of Recent Books	82
Wright, <i>William Augustus Bowles: Director-General of the Creek Nation</i> , by Mary Young	
Young, <i>The Democratic Republicans of New York: The Origins, 1763-1797</i> , by Dorothy M. Brown	
National Archives, <i>Passenger Lists of Vessels Arriving at Baltimore, 1820-1891</i> , by Fred Shelley	
Harris, <i>Presidential Reconstruction in Mississippi</i> , by John C. Barrett	
Forbush, <i>Moses Sheppard, Quaker Philanthropist of Baltimore</i> , by W. Harrison Daniel	
Whitehill, <i>Dumbarton Oaks: The History of a Georgetown House and Garden, 1800-1966</i> , by Carlos R. Allen, Jr.	
Powell, <i>List of Officers of the Army of the United States from 1779 to 1900</i> , by Allan R. Millett	
Pine, <i>The Story of Surnames</i> , by P. W. Filby	
Pine, <i>The Story of Heraldry</i> , by P. W. Filby	
Lemay, <i>Ebenezer Kinnersley: Franklin's Friend</i> , by Louis Magazin	
Pedley, <i>The Manuscript Collections of the Maryland Historical Society</i> , by Whitfield J. Bell, Jr.	
Notes and Queries	95

Annual Subscription to the Magazine, \$5.00. Each issue \$1.25. The Magazine assumes no responsibility for statements or opinions expressed in its pages.

Richard R. Duncan, Editor

Published quarterly by the Maryland Historical Society, 201 W. Monument Street, Baltimore, Md. Second-Class postage paid at Baltimore, Md.

CONTRIBUTORS

ELEANOR S. BRUCHEY holds a Ph.D. degree from Johns Hopkins University, where she completed her doctoral dissertation, "The Business Elite in Baltimore, 1880-1914," in 1967. She had previously taught for six years at Michigan State University.

HENRY S. ROBINSON is an Assistant Professor at the new Federal City College in Washington, D.C. Professor Robinson holds a doctor's degree from the University of London. He has previously contributed to the *Dartmouth Alumni Magazine* and the *Bulletin of Negro History*.

VICTOR SAPIO is an Assistant Professor at Towson State College. His Ph.D. dissertation, "Pennsylvania: Protagonist of the War of 1812," is currently in the final rounds of the Frederick Jackson Turner prize.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

A Quarterly

Volume 64

SPRING, 1969

Number 1

MARYLAND'S FEDERALIST REVIVAL, 1808-1812

By VICTOR SAPIO*

IN 1800 Maryland's Federalist party, which had controlled the state since 1790, was successfully challenged by the Republicans. The state's electoral vote was divided evenly between Adams and Jefferson, and the state's congressional delegation was divided evenly when the election was thrown to the House. For the first time, Republicans gained a majority in the House of Delegates. By 1802 the Republicans had driven the Federalists into "a political coma" and gained such complete control of the state that their opponents were totally "unsuccessful in their efforts to recover power." In 1808, however, the passage of the embargo and the commercial restrictions of the Republican administration raised Federalist hopes, "as high as the presidency."¹

* The author wishes to thank Dr. Joseph Cox of the department of history at Towson State College for his help in formulating the thesis of this article and his constant help during its preparation.

¹ David H. Fischer, *The Revolution of American Conservatism* (New York, 1967), pp. xix, 80; Dorothy Brown, "Embargo Politics in Maryland," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, LVIII (September, 1963), pp. 193-94.

Robert Goodloe Harper used the rapidly developing anti-embargo sentiment to reorganize the party by calling two Federalists from each county to meet in Baltimore on the last Monday in July, 1808. This meeting was to plan strategy for the forthcoming state elections and provide for a Maryland delegation to attend a Federalist summit meeting planned for New York later in the summer. The results of this effort were mixed, but highly gratifying to the Federalists. For the first time since 1800 they gained a majority in the House of Delegates, contested effectively in the state's congressional election, and won two of the state's eleven electoral votes. Of equal importance, by his presence and activities at the New York meeting, Harper re-established his personal position among Federalist leaders and assured them that Maryland was no longer to be conceded to the Republicans without a fight.²

But this partial success could not be sustained. The economic recovery which followed repeal of the embargo, and the seeming de-escalation of the maritime controversy re-established Republican supremacy. In 1809 and 1810 Federalists lost their majority in the House of Delegates and made no gains in the state's Congressional delegation. Nevertheless, Federalists refused to give up. They contested elections much more vigorously than they had before and continued to consolidate the party structure in the hope that Republican diplomatic reversals might be turned to Federalist election successes. Their hopes soared when, just before the crucial state elections of 1811, in which both the state Senate and House of Delegates were to be elected, the feud between President Madison and Secretary of State Smith split the normally united Maryland Republican organization.³

² Robert Goodloe Harper to John Hanson Thomas, July 1808, Harper-Pennington Papers, Md. Hist. Soc.; Fischer, *American Conservatism*, pp. 86-94; John Pancake, "Baltimore and the Embargo: 1807-1809," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, XLVII (September, 1952), pp. 177-179; On the New York meeting see Samuel Eliot Morison, "The First National Convention," *American Historical Review*, XVII (July, 1912), pp. 744-63.

³ Irving Brant, *James Madison, Secretary of State* (Indianapolis, 1953), p. 467; John Carroll to R. G. Harper, July 4, 1811, Walsh to Harper, March 7, 1811, Harper-Pennington Papers; Robert and John Goldsborough to Harper and James McHenry, June 1, 1811, McHenry Papers, Md. Hist. Soc.; *Maryland Gazette* (Annapolis), July 11, 1811; For the Madison-Smith feud see Irving Brant, *James Madison, The President* (Indianapolis, 1956), pp. 275-76 and Charles Tansill, "Robert Smith," in Samuel F. Bemis (ed.), *American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy* (New York, 1958), Vol. III, pp. 151-201.

Federalists were in a particularly good position to take advantage of the division among Republicans as their organization had been considerably strengthened by the formation of the Washington Society. Alexander Contee Hanson had organized the younger and more aggressive Federalists because he thought it "mortifying" that the local party "has long been under the exclusive direction . . . of spiritless and temporizing men who have neither the ability to be our leaders nor the firmness to face the opposition." Offering Harper the Presidency of the Society, Hanson asserted that "the times require us to set aside such men and to choose a leader whom no motive will restrain from serving his country."⁴

Ostensibly a charitable organization, the Washington Society gave general direction to all Federalist activities within the state, provided financial assistance and literature to county organizations, settled intra-party disputes, and gave advice and encouragement in local campaigns. It organized the parades, celebrations and orations on Washington's Birthday and the Fourth of July, which became major Federalist electioneering devices, convened state-wide meetings of party leaders when the occasion warranted and was accepted, by both Federalists and Republicans, as the central organization of the Federalist Party in Maryland.⁵

The Federalists prepared for the campaigns of 1811 by inviting leading Federalists from every county to attend a meeting in Baltimore on the 10th of June. The invitation stressed "the critical posture of our foreign affairs, the embarrassments brought on our trade by the extraordinary restrictions and mysterious proceedings of the general government," and called on Federalists to exert themselves to "infuse into our state legislature a new spirit."⁶ The local leaders to whom the invi-

⁴ A. C. Hanson to Harper, March 30, 1810, Harper Papers, L. C. Harper accepted leadership of the society. Harper to Hanson, March 5, 1810, Harper Papers, L.C.

⁵ Bosely to Hanson, July 23, 1811, Alexander Contee Hanson Papers, Md. Hist. Soc. Bosely thanked Hanson for \$50 received and asked for \$150 more. Thomas Shaw to Hanson, July 19, 1811, Hanson Papers, Md. Hist. Soc. Shaw requested "more pamphlets," and thanked Hanson for \$500. Hanson to Harper, June 26, 1810, Harper-Pennington Papers. Republican sources attest to the importance of the Washington Society. See *Baltimore Whig*, Aug. 7, 1811; *Easton Star*, Oct. 22, 1811; *Baltimore American and Commercial Advertiser*, Aug. 29, 1811; *Maryland Republican* (Annapolis), Aug. 5, 1811.

⁶ J. H. Planter, James Hopewell, Ralph Neale to James McHenry, June 3, 1811, McHenry Papers, L.C.; John Herbert to McHenry, June 5, 1811, McHenry Papers, Md. Hist. Soc.



Alexander Contee Hanson. 1786-1819. St. Memin. THE BALTIMORE MUSEUM OF ART.

tations had been sent quickly convened their leading Federal friends. All agreed with McHenry's evaluation of the importance of the ensuing election and expressed "the strongest and most fearful apprehension for the fate of our country from the unfortunate policy and destructive measures of the late . . . administration." Respondents agreed to attend the meeting and to "infuse the friends of the Washington school with animated zeal in the patriotic pursuit of putting down a set of men who have brought ruin and disgrace upon the state."⁷

Many Federalists attended the meeting and returned to their home communities prepared to do battle. Local Federalists were again convened, the decisions of the Baltimore meeting were communicated to them, and all agreed to "adopt those suggestions" which "suit [our] local situation." The plans made at Baltimore were obviously very detailed as subsequent correspondence between local leaders and McHenry, Harper and Hanson discussed such minute details as food to be served at barbecues, specific handbills and pamphlets to be distributed in particular counties, the amount of money needed to conduct local campaigns, and the contents of letters to be sent to local newspapers.⁸ All this activity was kept relatively secret. The newspapers, particularly the *Federal Republican*, carried on the public campaign. That paper kicked off the campaign with the statement, "the question of Peace or War depends on the issue of the Senatorial election . . . If Mr. Madison finds the people will no longer support him in his present course . . . he will be obliged to change it."⁹

The issues, as presented by the Federalists, were amazingly simple. The Republican administration was totally dominated by Napoleon and exhibited an unreasonable and unjustifiable hatred toward Great Britain. It exaggerated every British violation of American rights and meekly submitted to the much more

⁷ Robert Goldsborough, John Goldsborough and J. Holliday to Harper and McHenry, June 1, 1811; Richard Frisby to McHenry, May 29, 1811; Tobias Rudolph to McHenry and Harper, May 30, 1811; J. C. Derbert to McHenry, June 5, 1811; James McHenry to "The People of Maryland," 1811 (no other date), McHenry Papers, Md. Hist. Soc. and L.C. The McHenry Papers at the Maryland Historical Society are much more complete than those at the Library of Congress and contain photo copies of virtually all the material at the latter depository.

⁸ Tobias Rudolph to McHenry (undated, but obviously after June 10, 1811), McHenry Papers, Md. Hist. Soc., Illegible signature to McHenry, June 23, 1811, McHenry Papers, Md. Hist. Soc.

⁹ *Federal Republican* (Baltimore), Aug. 23, 1811.

onerous French violations. Republicans refused to negotiate honestly with Great Britain, but accepted every French move at face value. The administration was determined to destroy American commerce and would willingly bargain away American independence to maintain itself in power. The newspaper campaign consisted of little more than constant repetition of these charges and the presentation of innumerable "facts" and incidents designed to prove them. The *Federal Republican's* charge that Madison will "prostrate your national honor, your commerce and your independence at the foot of the tyrant . . . subvert your best political institutions . . . and leave us in poverty, anarchy and ruin," sums up the Federalist campaign.¹⁰ But these charges were not merely campaign rhetoric. In their private correspondence, Federalist leaders expressed the same attitudes so candidly and so often that it must be conceded that they genuinely believed that the administration had sold out to Napoleon and that the nation's independence was in danger.¹¹

Federalist exertions prompted heightened activity by the Republicans. Warning the people that Federalists are "operating in every part of the state [with] extraordinary zeal and half-concealed plans," the Republican press cautioned that "they have one thing to their credit, an inseparable adherence to each other combined with a determined perseverance." Since the forthcoming election was a "struggle between the independence of this nation and its colonial vassalage to Great Britain," Republicans must exert themselves vigorously and remain united.¹² Admitting that the United States had grievances against France, the Republican press vehemently denied the charges of French influence and accused the Federalists of raising "ghosts and specteres" in an effort to divert the people from the real issues and turn them against their own government—a strategy common to all would-be tyrants. At the same time

¹⁰ Virtually any issue of any Federalist newspaper between June and October, 1811 will provide numerous examples of Federalist charges. The quotation is from the *Federal Republican*, Aug. 20, 1811.

¹¹ John Carroll, for example, wrote to Harper, "I suspect the administration is decidedly under French influence" and the administration will "plunge this country into a war with England." Carroll to Harper, Feb. 1, 1808, Feb. 7, 1810, Harper-Pennington Papers.

¹² *Eastern Shore Gazette and General Advertiser* (Easton), Aug. 13, 1811; *Maryland Herald* (Hagerstown), July 31, 1811; *Baltimore American*, Aug. 28, 1811; *Baltimore Whig*, July 20, 1811.

Republican editors charged Federalists with excessive partiality toward Britain and excessive hostility toward France.¹³

But foreign policy was not the major concern of the Republicans. This was a state election and domestic issues were much more important. Federalists were charged with opposing the development of domestic manufactures, religious freedom, the extension of the right to vote and freedom of speech. They favored excessive taxes, heavy spending and a standing army to burden the masses and to keep them under control. "Freeman" writing in the *Eastern Shore Gazette* reminded the people of "the reign of terror" suffered under Federalist rule and, citing from the journal of the House of Delegates, stressed Federalist opposition to electoral reform. If Federalists were to win the election, the suffrage would again be restricted and religious freedom obliterated. Remembering the Alien and Sedition Acts, "Veritas" recounted the "painful years of '98 and '99," of rapidly increasing debt, "odious taxes," and large armies. He asked the people to recall, "the gags put in your mouths, lest you complain of the whips upon your backs," and asked them to contrast that "with the present happy state of the nation."¹⁴

Federalists were also charged with elitism, secrecy, deviously conceived conspiracy against the welfare of the people and contemplation of fraud. Federalist leaders, charged the editor of the *Whig*, "intend to send persons . . . into doubtful counties who will vote, if they are allowed, on the pretext of being residents." A "Citizen of Maryland" attributed a sudden drop in the price of flour to an agreement reached by Federalist merchants, "that they would not purchase a barrel of flour previous to the approaching election." The Washington Society came under vehement attack. "It is estimated that the infamous means employed by the Washington Society . . . will cost them fifty thousand dollars and one million lies." They offered their minions "three thousand offices." Under the false pretense of establishing a school, the society extorted money from "rich

¹³ *Maryland Gazette*, July 23, 1811; *Eastern Shore Gazette*, Sept. 3, Nov. 5, 1811; *Maryland Herald*, Aug. 1, 1811; *Baltimore American*, Nov. 8, 1811.

¹⁴ *Eastern Shore Gazette*, Aug. 12, 15, 20, 1811; *Maryland Herald*, Aug. 14, 1811; *Bartig's Republican Gazette* (Fredericktown), Nov. 7, 1817. *Baltimore Whig*, Aug. 16, 22, 1811. (In the *Whig* in particular specific appeals were made to Quakers and Catholics on the religious issue. See Aug. 17, 19, 1811, e.g.)

blockheads" and used it to subvert our free government."¹⁵ Not only did the Washington Society intend to delude the people, but its own members also. "Many honest members . . . know nothing of their *leaders'* intentions and projects." The "mass of the Federalists are ignorant and honest;" many of them have "honest differences of opinion" with their Republican counterparts, "but their leaders have secret and treasonable purposes against the freedom of the land. They do not proclaim their real intentions" even to their followers.¹⁶

The vigorous Republican newspaper campaign was matched by equally vigorous organizational efforts. In contrast to the secret meetings and private conferences of the Federalists, Republicans organized publicly.

The Maryland Senate, elected every five years, consisted of fifteen Senators chosen by forty electors, elected by the counties which served as the basic electoral units.¹⁷ The Republican practice was to call mass meetings of all Republicans in the various election districts into which each county was divided. These meetings in turn chose delegates—generally four to seven—who attended a meeting at the county seat where the actual candidates were chosen. The district and county meetings were well publicized in local newspapers as were the decisions made and the resolutions adopted. The most vexing problem at these meetings was the allocation of candidates among the various districts of the county, but once this problem was solved, the candidates chosen by the county meeting were supported, to a man, by the Republican press. Voters were warned that anyone running as a democrat without the approval of the county organization could not be trusted as a "true republican" and in an evenly divided electoral college might cast his vote for a Federalist.

¹⁵ *Baltimore Whig*, Aug. 15, 17, 18, 24, 1811; *Maryland Republican*, Aug. 5, 15, 1811; *Eastern Shore Gazette*, Aug. 13, 27, 1811; *Maryland Herald*, Aug. 28, 1811.

¹⁶ *Eastern Shore Gazette*, Aug. 13, 1811; *Baltimore Whig*, July 23, 1811; *Maryland Republican*, July 29, 1811; *Maryland Herald*, Aug. 14, 1811.

¹⁷ Republicans made the method of electing the Senate a major issue in the election. A Republican victory, it was suggested, was important since it meant this "will be the last Electoral Election we shall ever hold." Republican electors should be chosen because a Republican Senate "would support such revisions in the electoral method." Furthermore, since the House and Senate, voting by joint ballot elected the Governor and Council, a Republican victory in the Senate election would assure that Republicans would control those offices which had "three thousand offices—in their gift. *Eastern Shore Gazette*, Aug. 13, 1811; *Maryland Herald*, Aug. 28, 1811.

Republicans were urged to give their united support to the regular nominees. There is no indication of the existence of any state-wide Republican organization which attempted to influence county decisions.¹⁸

Exactly the same process was used to choose candidates for the House of Delegates. Since that body was elected annually, there was a county-wide meeting of Republicans at least once a year. The choice of Congressional candidates and candidates for Presidential electors was complicated by the fact that Congressional and electoral districts did not always conform to county lines. Those districts generally consisted of one or more counties and a part of one or two others, and there was occasionally a bit more difficulty adjusting differences between component parts of a particular district. But these also were usually overcome.¹⁹

This open and public nominating process gave a ring of truth to the Republican charge that the Federalist party and the Washington Society were secretive, covert organizations made up of men of "cunning and intrigue" who used "secret exertions" and "half-concealed plans" to delude the public.²⁰ It was, certainly, a more democratic procedure which gave the people a greater voice in the nominating process and gave the Republican party a more deeply rooted and more broadly based party organization which won a stunning victory in the Senatorial election. A majority of the electors were Republican, and they elected a unanimously Republican Senate.²¹

One month after the Senatorial election, an election was held for the House of Delegates. The issues were exactly the same except that Republicans were warned not to let their victory in

¹⁸ *The Eastern Shore Gazette* for July 16, 1811 provides an excellent description of the process in Talbot county. For warnings against deviation from this system see the *Maryland Republican*, Sept. 8, 1811.

¹⁹ The process by which Republican candidates were chosen can be followed in the report of a meeting held in Denton on May 19, 1812 and reported in the *Eastern Shore Gazette* on May 26. The "superintending committee" of Caroline County met to chose candidates for Sheriff and the House of Delegates. They also chose seven deputies "to Meet such deputies as may be chosen on behalf of Queen Annes' and Talbot counties" to select a candidate for the seventh Congressional District. They chose six other deputies to meet with deputies from Talbot County and the upper districts of Dorchester County to dominate a Republican they would support for Presidential elector.

²⁰ *Maryland Herald*, Aug. 14, 1811; *Maryland Republican*, July 29, 1811; *Baltimore Whig*, Aug. 16, 1811.

²¹ *Federal Republican*, Sept. 5, 1811.



John Marshall. 1755-1835. Engraving.
MD. HIST. SOC. GRAPHICS
COLLECTION.

the Senate election dull their ardor, while Federalists were urged to even greater exertions—to no avail. The Republicans won a majority in the House of Delegates.²² Federalists attributed their failure not to Republican superiority, “but to inactivity in some and treachery in others.” Cathrine Harper complained bitterly that many leading Federalists whom she described as “a selfish, mercenary, money making set of men” refused to cooperate with the Washington Society because they looked upon it only as another stratagem for raising money. They “do harm to the cause by opposing everything that is proposed.” Hanson told Harper that the way some Federalists acted “filled me with disgust.”²³ However accurately these comments may reflect Federalist weakness, the fact remains that, unable to substantiate their charge of French influence, Federalists had no campaign issue with which to appeal to the people of Maryland. Their defeat did not discourage them. They did not accept the Republican claim that “Federalism in Maryland is palsied . . . and exhausted,” and looked forward to the Presidential and Congressional elections of 1812 optimistically.²⁴

²² *Maryland Herald*, Oct. 2, 1811.

²³ *Federal Republican*, Sept. 6, 1811; Cathrine Harper to R. G. Harper, March 5, 1811, Harper-Pennington Papers; Hanson to Harper, Nov. 30, 1812, Harper Papers.

²⁴ *Bartig's*, Oct. 5, 1811.

The ensuing winter and spring provided Federalists with a multitude of opportunities. As Congress vacillated between belligerence and apathy, Federalists alternately condemned Republicans for contemplating war and for not making adequate preparations for it.²⁵

Much as they dreaded a war, some Federalists predicted an ultimately happy result. Mismanagement and certain defeat would lead to a public revulsion against "the mad politicians that have precipitated the country unprepared . . . into a perilous conflict" and "a new order of things could be produced." Others were not so sanguine.²⁶

Until the Republicans took some positive action, Federalist opposition had to be as fluid as Republican policy was hesitant. When the Republican majority finally declared war, Federalists could chart their course more easily. On June 20, 1812, the *Federal Republican* set the theme of the Federalist opposition. In an editorial entitled, "Thou Hast Done a Deed Whereat Valor Will Weep," Alexander Contee Hanson charged the administration with plunging the country into war, "Without funds, without taxes, without a navy or adequate fortifications." He then outlined:

"the course we are determined to pursue as long as the war shall last. We mean to represent in as strong colors as we are capable that it is unnecessary, inexpedient, and entered into from a partial, personal, and as we believe, motives bearing on their front marks of undisguised foreign influence . . . We mean to use every constitutional argument and every legal means to render as odious and suspicious to the American people . . . the patrons and contrivers of this highly impolitic and destructive war. . . . We are avowedly opposed to the Presidency of James Madison."²⁷

²⁵ The best description of Federalist attitudes can be found in Bradford Perkins, *Prologue to War* (Berkeley, 1968), chpt. 12, and Roger Brown, *The Republic in Peril* (New York, 1964), chpt. 8.

²⁶ Benjamin Chew to John E. Howard, July 25, 1812, Bayard Papers, Md. Hist. Soc.; Tallmadge to McHenry, April 11, 1812, McHenry Papers, L.C.; McHenry to Tallmadge, April, 1812, cited in Bernard Christian Sterner, *The Life and Correspondence of James McHenry* (Cleveland, 1907), p. 578; James Boyd to McHenry, Nov. 30, 1812, McHenry Papers, Md. Hist. Soc.; Robert Walsh to Virgil Maxcy, Dec. 27, 1811, Galloway Markoe, Maxcy Papers, L.C.

²⁷ *Federal Republican*, June 20, 1812. Some Federalists did not "adopt this confession." Hanson to Hall, Aug. 22, 1812, Hanson Papers; Harper to John Hanson Thomas, July 7, 1812, Harper-Pennington Papers.

The Federalist campaign was little more than a reiteration of all the charges they had made in 1811 to which they added a list of imaginary "horribles" that would result from a continuation of the war and a Republican victory. "Disunion or an alliance with France—which is but another name for French rule over us," "Thirty thousand lives—good and useful citizens, the yeomanry of our country, fathers of families" lost; a system of French conscription, "\$180,000,000 which will come from the mouth of labor, from the farmer and mechanic;" burdensome taxes, "the capture of our vessels, the blockading of our ports, the bombardment of our cities;" "paper money by which the national debt will be increased by millions," are only some of the worst consequences predicted by the Federalists.²⁸

Though the Federalists had a plenitude of issues, and reason to be optimistic following their victories in the state elections in New England in the early spring and summer,²⁹ they had one very serious problem. There appeared to be no leading Federalist who could turn public dissatisfaction into a Federalist Presidential victory. To solve this problem, Federalist leaders called a convention to meet in New York to choose a candidate and to decide on tactics. The Federalist dilemma can best be traced by following Benjamin Stoddert's futile effort to secure that convention's support for John Marshall and that convention's ultimate decision to remain publicly uncommitted while working privately to secure the election of DeWitt Clinton, the dissident Republican nominated by the New York State legislature.

The only way to save the country, Stoddert told McHenry, was to bring "forward another Virginian as the competitor of Madison." This must be John Marshall because "it is vain to talk of any other man, and Marshall is a man in whom the Federalists may confide. By your pen support the cause on which all that is dear to you depends."³⁰ As the summer wore on Stoddert continued his efforts on Marshall's behalf. Under the pseudonym, "Maryland Farmer," he wrote a series of letters in the *Spirit of '76*, a Georgetown newspaper, and expanded his

²⁸ Benjamin Stoddert to McHenry, July 16, 1812, McHenry Papers, L.C.; *Maryland Gazette*, Oct. 15, 1812; *Federal Republican*, June 18, 1812; Carroll to Harper, Dec. 9, 1813, Leakin Papers, Md. Hist. Soc.; Benjamin Chew to Maxcy, Sept. 23, 1812, Galloway, Markoe, Maxcy Papers.

²⁹ Timothy Pickering to Harper, June 12, 1812, Harper Papers, L.C.

³⁰ Stoddert to McHenry, July 15, 1812, cited in Steiner, *McHenry*, pp. 581-83.

correspondence with leading Federalists. The Federalists, he calculated, could get eighty-eight electoral votes in New England, four in Delaware, "and certainly three in Maryland—probably more." These ninety-five added to fifteen he could "easily" win in North Carolina would easily "secure his election." Marshall also "has a chance of the Virginia votes—a good chance if the meeting in New York fix upon him." If the Federalists could deliver the ninety-five votes to Clinton, he told Harper, "they can also give them to Marshall," but they could not guarantee Clinton any votes south of Maryland. He urged Harper to attend the New York meeting. "If you do not, I believe Clinton will be the man fixed upon. If you do, I am sure Marshall will be." On the same day he wrote to Roger B. Taney making the same argument and telling Taney that Harper agreed with him. He urged Taney to write Harper in support of Marshall, "but you need not say I had advised it." Federalist support of a second string democrat seemed, to Stoddert, a sure prelude to defeat. Only the nomination of a Federalist would allow the party "to preserve their integrity." A "false step in New York may put all back" and assure a continuation of "the reign of Jacobinism." But, he concluded every one of these private letters, "on this occasion the first objective is to save the country from Madison. If Clinton is the most likely man he must be taken and will be taken tho' it will be on the same kind of principle that a naked man rush out of a house on fire . . . although he was sure to meet a mad dog at the door."³¹

Just before leaving for New York, Harper destroyed all of Stoddert's dreams. "From very recent and authentic sources," Harper wrote, "I am enabled to say that in Massachusetts it is impossible to carry a Federal ticket . . . in New York the success of such a ticket is doubtful." He doubted that anyone could take Virginia from Madison, and asserted that a combination of Clinton Democrats and Federalists could carry Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Vermont, and that, "much may be done in

³¹ Stoddert to John Steele, Sept. 3, 1812, Southern Historical Collections, University of North Carolina; Stoddert to Taney, Sept. 4, 1812, Harper-Pennington Papers; Stoddert to Harper, Sept. 14, Aug. 31, 1812, Harper-Pennington Papers. In the Sept. 4 letter to Harper, Stoddert indicates that he had written along the same lines to Philip Barton Key who planned to attend the meeting in New York.

Maryland," and Ohio. "In short," he concluded, "it appears to me that we have very fair prospects of electing Clinton . . . and hardly any possibility of Marshall. That it would be better to take Clinton than to risk the re-election of Madison and all its doubtful consequences." Harper sent a copy of this letter to John Hanson Thomas telling him that he had reached those conclusions "reluctantly," but found that they were "thoroughly approved by the great body of Federalists in this state." He urged Thomas to discuss the plan with leading Federalists in Frederick and Alleghany County, and should they approve, he suggested that the best method of giving it effect would ". . . be to have an understanding with the Clinton Democrats . . . and induce them to bring forward candidates from their own number for whom the Federalists would vote without taking any active or ostensible part. . . . This is the policy which has been adopted in the other parts of the state." He informed both Stoddert and Thomas that Clinton had given assurances that he would work for peace and not discriminate against Federalists.³²

Since the deliberations in New York were kept very secret and public reports vary considerably from private accounts, it



Roger Brooke Taney. 1777-1864. Engraving. MD. HIST. SOC. GRAPHICS COLLECTION.

³² Harper to Stoddert, Sept. 10, 1812; Harper to Thomas, Sept. 10, 1812, Harper-Pennington Papers. It is important to note that these letters were written *before* the New York Meeting took place.

is difficult to reconstruct precisely what took place. One participant, writing long after the meeting had taken place, described his coadjutors as "willing to combine with any portion of the citizens who were willing to withdraw from the support" of Madison, believing that "any man that could be elected would have been thought by the Federalists preferable to him." He denied that any bargains had been made with Clinton.³³

In the newspapers, Federalists repeatedly denied Republican charges that they had, in fact, reached a secret agreement with Clinton. In the *Federal Republican* Harper conceded that Federalists had agreed that the war was unnecessary and was not being waged effectively and therefore naturally gave their preference to any candidate who offered an alternative. "We thought it probable that [Clinton] would avail himself of the earliest opportunity of making peace . . . We were also of the opinion that while the war should continue there was great possibility of its being conducted by Mr. Clinton with far more ability." But he denied categorically any "understanding and coalition with Mr. Clinton and his friends."³⁴

Harper's private correspondence and the activities of Maryland Federalists reveal an entirely different picture. In his reports to party leaders, Harper told them that after lengthy discussions it had been agreed that it would be impossible to elect a Federalist and therefore "nothing remains for us but to acquiesce in the election of Mr. Madison or take the chance of getting rid of him . . . by giving our aid to Clinton." Except for three dissidents (Rufus King, Sitgraves of Pennsylvania and Radcliffe of New York) who acquiesced in the final decision, the meeting was unanimous. The expectation that Clinton would pursue a new policy "rests more on his position . . . than in his professions and assurances. But they have been ample and positive." The assurances, Harper reported, amounted to this: Clinton "looks with abhorrence on a French alliance . . .

³³ William H. Sullivan, *Public Men of the Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1847), pp. 349-51. He states that three Federalists from Maryland attended the meeting. Samuel Eliot Morison reaches the same conclusions in "The First National Convention," *American Historical Review*, Vol. XVII (1912), pp. 744-63 as does Edward Stanwood, *History of the Presidency* (Boston, 1928), p. 101. Both rely heavily on Sullivan.

³⁴ *Federal Republican*, Nov. 16, 1812.

thinks that a peace with England on honorable terms is easily attainable and ought to be made as soon as possible;" that he believed commerce ought to be supported; and that a large navy was a necessity. Clinton's views, however, could not be publicized because he could not be elected without democratic support, "which the avowal of such opinions and the knowledge that any explanations had been made by him to the federal party would in a great measure . . . eliminate." Clinton's communications must, therefore, remain "strictly confidential." The convention agreed "to let the Clinton democrats take the lead . . . and to support them silently with our votes." In one of the letters in which he reported these developments, Harper urged his correspondents, Federalist candidates for Presidential electors, to withdraw in favor of Clinton democrats, "should your election as Federalists be doubtful."³⁵

The activities of Lynn and Thomas, if they are at all typical, and there is no good reason to believe they are not, indicate that Maryland Federalists, on the whole, supported the decisions, and took the advice of the New York convention. Announcing their candidacy as presidential electors for the fourth district, they told the people, "We are opposed to the re-election of Mr. Madison . . . [and will] vote for any man of fair fame who may be held up to public view in opposition to Mr. Madison."³⁶ By the middle of November they had withdrawn from the race, throwing their support to Clinton democrats, who carried the district by less than 150 votes.³⁷

With such complicated maneuvering in the background, the campaigns in the fall of 1812 were somewhat confused. The Federalist press damned Madison and the war, but did not pay much attention to Clinton, except to point to the obvious division of the opposition. On the other hand, they were virulently partisan in elections for Congress and the House of Delegates, condemning Republicans of any persuasion who ran against Federalist candidates.

³⁵ Harper to Clement Dorsey, Sept. 25, 1812, Harper Papers, L.C.; Harper to Lynn and Thomas, Sept. 25, 1812, cited in Steiner, *McHenry*, pp. 583-87. An unsigned letter in the McHenry Papers at the Md. Hist. Soc., dated Sept. 24, 1812, in a handwriting different from Harper's, reports the same conclusions and urges the same tactics on Lynn and Thomas.

³⁶ *Federal Republican*, Sept. 14, 1812.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, Nov. 16, 1812.

The results of all their stratagems and efforts are somewhat difficult to assess. The Federalists did win a majority in the House of Delegates, but this victory is hardly indicative of a Federalist revival. As the editor of the *Maryland Herald* accurately pointed out, an examination of the vote showed that a majority of the people had voted for Republican candidates and only divisions within the party and narrow Federalist victories in two traditionally Republican counties had given the Federalists their majority. *Bartig's Gazette* attributed the Federalists' victory to the fact that news of Hull's surrender at Malden had first appeared in Maryland two days before the election.³⁸

The result of the Presidential vote is equally indeterminate. Madison, who had won nine of Maryland's eleven votes in 1808, won only six in 1812. But of the three he lost, two were won by Republicans who ran as Republicans professing loyalty to the party, if not to Madison. Madison's popular vote fell from twenty-three to twenty-one thousand, while the opposition vote increased from twelve to nineteen thousand. But not all these votes can be counted as Federalist gains. Most anti-war Republicans who voted against Madison remained Republicans.³⁹

The Federalists did make a gain in the Congressional delegation, narrowing the long-standing 6-3 division to 5-4. But this is hardly evidence of a Federalist resurgence. The division and distress caused by the war prompted Maryland Federalists to restructure their party and enabled them successfully to challenge the Republicans, especially on the local level. But the statement that "Federalists controlled Maryland" after 1808 is unwarranted.⁴⁰ The most that can be said is that the Federalists took advantage of the Republicans' international embarrassments and domestic divisions to revive their sagging fortunes and improve their organization. When the administration's embarrassments and divisions reached certain climactic points, they were able to make some headway and win some victories in a state which in more normal periods remained solidly Republican.

³⁸ *Maryland Herald*, Oct. 28, 1812.

³⁹ Roger Brown, *The Republic in Peril*, chpt. 7. The results of elections are based on figures taken from the Official Returns of Maryland Elections at the Hall of Records at Annapolis and the files of the newspapers cited in this article.

⁴⁰ Fischer, *American Conservatism*, p. 80.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF BALTIMORE BUSINESS, 1880-1914

By ELEANOR S. BRUCHEY

PART I

THE period 1880 to 1914 was one of fundamental change in the economy of the United States. The two most far-reaching changes in American society were the greatly increased tempo of industrialization and urbanization. Although the United States ranked second to Great Britain as an industrial nation before the Civil War,¹ it was, of course, only in the late nineteenth century that it emerged as a heavily industrialized one. By 1890 the United States changed from an agrarian to an industrial nation. Endowed with ample coal and iron ore, staples of industrial development, the rise to world leadership was rapid. By 1913 the United States produced about one third of the world's goods. Just as important as raw materials to this shift in emphasis in the economy, was the network of transportation across the country which was fairly completed in the 1870's and dramatically expanded the volume of business transacted in the national market. With urbanization a trend in this period this market was also becoming increasingly urban.²

Within the industrial sector a basic shift took place by 1900, with the rise in the number of firms manufacturing producers' goods. Before this leading industries had processed agricultural goods for consumption in largely local markets.

Still another change must be noted—that within the structure of the business firm itself. Increasingly the corporation became the prevailing type of business organization and increasingly the size of the firm grew larger beginning about 1880. By the beginning of the twentieth century most of the major industries were dominated by a few large firms which were organized and administered along centralized, functionally specialized, bureaucratic

¹ Douglass C. North, *The Economic Growth of the United States, 1790-1860* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961), p. v.

² Ross Robertson, *History of the American Economy* (2d ed.; New York, 1964), p. 331.

lines. Size alone, achieved either by horizontal or vertical integration or by both combined, was not enough to make the "modern" corporation. This was to come only with streamlined management which in this period gave especial attention to new marketing techniques. The consumers' goods industry was the first to introduce this new type of management (if one skips the railroads pioneering in big business) as here consolidation and centralization first took place. Then a little later, at the turn of the century, the producers' goods industries began to consolidate and reorganize.³ Thus by 1903 when the merger movement was about over the "modern" corporation had become "the basic unit in American industry."⁴

Similar but moderated changes took place in the economy of Baltimore. Baltimore was the "Queen of the Chesapeake," with a long history of commercial vigor dating from the 1790's and a tradition in shipbuilding which produced the "Baltimore Clipper" in that same decade, the fastest sailing ship before the Civil War.⁵ The importing of sugar and coffee and the exporting of flour dominated the foreign trade which was central to the economy of the city. Growing out of the complex of mercantile pursuits in this period were two developments of national note: the forming of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad in 1827, the first railroad in the country, to feed Baltimore's export trade with more western grain and the forming of the first investment banking house in the country, Alexander Brown and Sons, in 1800.

At the same time that foreign trade, especially the exporting of grain, and the importing of coffee and sugar remained vital to Baltimore, the wholesale and jobbing trade developed with the South. The Civil War wiped out this trade temporarily, and Baltimore was occupied by Federal troops to ensure its loyalty.⁶ Soon after the war, however, the threads of southern trade were taken up again, and southern investment became a major interest in the city's financial circles as well.

Fundamental change came in the 1880's as trade patterns

³ Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., "The Beginnings of 'Big Business' in American History," *Pivotal Interpretations of American History*, ed. Carl N. Degler (New York, 1966), II, pp. 107-138.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁵ J. Wallace Bryan, "Transportation System and Facilities," *Baltimore, Its History and Its People*, ed. Clayton C. Hall (New York, 1912), I, pp. 466-468.

⁶ E. Emmet Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures of Baltimore," *Baltimore, Its History and Its People*, ed. Clayton C. Hall (New York, 1912), I, pp. 501-512.

shifted and manufacturing mushroomed to make Baltimore an industrial center as well as a port. The coffee trade began to flounder as New York took over more and more of this commerce. In one month in 1883 New York imported almost as many bags of coffee as Baltimore did during that entire year.⁷ The sugar refineries disappeared and with them the sugar trade. Tropical fruit, however, became increasingly important to the port.⁸ Copper edged into the export picture and began to supersede all other items in value. Industrialization grew markedly from the 1880's on, strengthening old lines of manufacture and introducing new ones.

In 1890 the federal census reported for the first time a gross value of products of manufactures that surpassed the overall value of Baltimore's *foreign* trade—export and import. It would seem extremely unlikely that manufacturing would outrank in value the entire commercial sector, including the coastal and jobbing trades as well as foreign commerce, but it is incontestible that manufacturing rose to greater prominence than ever before and would thus help to change the character of the city. In the wake of intensified industrialism came an increasing reliance on the corporate structure for business organization, mergers, and branch offices of national concerns: in short, big business.

A bird's eye view of Baltimore's economy between 1880 and 1914 must indicate a city that was growing only moderately in population—from 332,190 in 1880 to 558,485 in 1910, taking just the incorporated city itself. Although this was a 68 per cent increase it was, at least, in part due to annexation of land to the incorporated area of the city, as well as to natural increase and immigration. Compared with other cities Baltimore slipped in rank from sixth place in 1880 to seventh place in 1910.⁹

The city proper in 1910, and 1914 as well, covered 31.5 square miles while the metropolitan district included about 295 square

⁷ *Annual Report of the President of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association for the Year 1884*, reproduced in John R. Bland, *A Review of the Commerce of the City of Baltimore* (Baltimore, n.d.), p. 125.

⁸ *Manufacturers' Record*, Sept. 3, 1914, Part II, p. 18. Hereafter cited as M.R.

⁹ Charles Hirschfeld, *Baltimore, 1870-1900: Studies in Social History* ("The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science," Series LIX, No. 2; Baltimore, 1941), p. 10; John M. Powell, "History of Baltimore, 1870-1912," *Baltimore, Its History and Its People*, ed. Clayton C. Hall (New York, 1912), I, p. 393; U.S. Department of the Interior, Census Office, *Tenth Census of the United States: 1880. Report on the Manufactures*, II, p. xxiii.

miles.¹⁰ Industry was scattered over different parts of the city including the waterfront. The harbor had been extensively improved in the 1890's so that by 1896 the 19 mile dredged ship channel was 600 feet wide and had been deepened to twenty-seven feet.¹¹ This was the depth maintained off the Canton piers, Fells Point and Locust Point. By 1910 the depth of the channel had been improved still further to thirty-five feet so that the largest ships might not be in danger of grounding.¹² Besides the various docks and railroad termini, which included grain elevators and coal piers, right on the waterfront were a great many industrial establishments such as fertilizer plants, a large oil refinery, a huge copper refinery, lumber yards, furniture factories, cooperage and woodworking establishments and canneries.¹³ Moving inland, there was the great warehouse and jobbing district, centering around Hopkins Place, many private banks clustered on South Street, and the clothing industry which lay entirely within the city limits, just east of the warehouse district bounded on the west by Charles Street and on the north by Baltimore Street.¹⁴ Outside the city limits there were a number of industrial suburbs such as Canton, Sparrows Point with its steel industry, Woodberry with its beehive of cotton duck mills and a large iron foundry and machine shop, Dundalk with its large foundry and machine shop and Brooklyn and Curtis Bay with their variety of industries including canning, baking and cooperage. Besides being geographically scattered in and outside of the city, industry itself in Baltimore presented a wide variety of activities with no single type dominating the business community as was the case in Detroit and Pittsburgh.¹⁵

Since the earliest days Baltimore's business had looked to the sea and in this period of the turn of the century it remained an important port. Its relative ranking in foreign trade among the ports of the country climbed from fourth in 1880 with a total value of over \$96 million, to third in 1900 with a value of \$135 million and then settled back to sixth in 1910 with a value of \$107 million. In this latter year Baltimore was outstripped by

¹⁰ *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Part II, p. 17.

¹¹ Maryland Bureau of Industrial Statistics, *Sixth Annual Report* (Baltimore: 1898), p. 71. Hereafter cited as *B.I.S.*

¹² Bryan, *Transportation System*, p. 500.

¹³ *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Part II, p. 18.

¹⁴ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 34.

¹⁵ *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Part II, pp. 18, 50.

New York, Boston, New Orleans, Galveston and Philadelphia and accounted for only 4.8 per cent of the cargoes of the Atlantic ports and about 3 per cent of the cargoes of all the ports in the country. Throughout this period Baltimore was consistently more important as an export than an import center. In 1880 it ranked fifth in the nation for imports and third for exports. In 1910 it was placed sixth nationally for imports and fourth for exports and among the Atlantic ports, fourth for imports and second for exports. In that year Baltimore handled 1.9 per cent of the national imports, 4.4 per cent of the national exports and 2.4 per cent of the imports and 7.6 per cent of the exports of the Atlantic ports.¹⁶ Between 1880 and 1900 imports averaged only about \$15 million per year¹⁷ which increased, at least, to \$27 million per year from 1901 through 1910. On the other hand, exports averaged \$50 million for the period 1881-1890, \$89 million for 1891-1900 and somewhat over \$88 million for 1901-1910.¹⁸ In miniature Baltimore illustrated the favorable balance of trade which characterized foreign commerce during this period.

Nationally, the imports of crude materials and semimanufactures rose while imports of crude foodstuffs fluctuated in importance.¹⁹ These same products dominated the import flow into Baltimore. Over the period the major imports were iron ore, pig iron, nitrate of soda and muriate of potash for the fertilizer industry, tin plate for the tin can industry, coffee and bananas. This latter, surprisingly, reflected the urbanization of the period in that it was a new product for urban, consumer demand.²⁰

¹⁶ U.S. Bureau of Statistics, *The Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States: 1880*, p. XXIII; U.S. Treasury Department, *The Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States: 1900*, I, pp. 50-51; U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Statistics, *The Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States: 1910*, pp. 38-40, 54-55. All figures have been rounded to the nearest million, as is true throughout the rest of the article; It should also be noted throughout the article that with the rise in prices over the period the dollar figures cited are not always of comparable value. Maryland Bureau of Industrial Statistics and Information, *Twenty-second Annual Report* (Baltimore: 1914), p. 171. Hereafter the Bureau is cited as *B.I.S.I.*

¹⁷ Hirschfeld, *Baltimore, 1870-1900*, p. 32n.

¹⁸ My calculations, based on figures cited in Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 529.

¹⁹ Robertson, *American Economy*, pp. 369-370.

²⁰ Maryland, *B.I.S.*, p. 75; George W. Engelhardt, *Baltimore City, Maryland* ([Baltimore], 1895), p. 66; Chandler, "Beginnings of 'Big Business,'" p. 115.



View of Light Street. c. 1906. LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

The national export picture presented even stronger trends than the import scene. The steady rise of semimanufactures and finished manufactures and the decline of raw materials, crude foodstuffs and manufactured foodstuffs bespoke the emergence of an industrial nation.²¹ In Baltimore's export flow the national pattern was reflected in the rising importance of semimanufactures: refined copper and iron and steel (see Tables 1-5). Indeed, copper, which had been important since 1894, was by 1911 the single most important item in terms of value. It made up nearly 28 per cent of the total value of exports in that year and went mainly to England, the Netherlands and Germany.²²

²¹ Robertson, *American Economy*, p. 369.

²² Maryland, *B.I.S.I.*, p. 323; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 529.

TABLE 1
COPPER EXPORTED FROM BALTIMORE FOR FISCAL
YEARS, 1880-1910, BY POUNDS AND VALUE*

Year	Pounds	Value	Year	Pounds	Value
1880	none	—	1896	58,494,356	\$ 6,332,852
1881	97	\$ 17	1897	87,121,392	9,664,652
1882	none	none	1898	94,430,786	10,576,571
1883	405,005	57,091	1899	81,928,041	11,713,548
1884	69,031	9,311	1900	100,731,320	16,655,872
1885	5,495,443	612,360	1901	65,010,303	10,401,474
1886	4,553	639	1902	82,502,340	10,764,383
1887	1,120,000	103,600	1903	95,499,909	12,108,865
1888	283,500	42,200	1904	113,097,650	14,272,300
1889	none	—	1905	174,571,773	24,153,776
1890	568,459	58,606	1906	161,378,005	27,603,483
1891	3,365,628	436,849	1907	137,667,734	29,779,563
1892	11,806,294	1,467,288	1908	109,274,165	15,403,959
1893	3,337,320	381,195	1909	131,538,344	17,361,185
1894	43,381,834	4,369,242	1910	169,865,518	21,813,742
1895	35,299,369	3,525,457			

* Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 525.

TABLE 2
GRAIN EXPORTED FROM BALTIMORE, 1880-1910,
BY BUSHELS*

Year	Wheat	Corn	Total Grain
1880	33,768,985	14,686,402	48,472,212
1881	19,676,640	12,735,083	32,421,758
1882	17,564,407	1,371,823	18,942,492
1883	15,375,093	10,012,247	25,478,909
1884	16,511,340	4,993,759	21,909,979
1885	4,575,262	14,752,196	18,394,881
1886	10,575,290	14,076,379	24,652,899
1887	10,717,353	7,158,432	18,048,979
1888	4,161,129	4,173,343	8,339,184
1889	4,507,165	16,617,177	21,256,362
1890	4,817,614	18,854,951	24,579,323
1891	16,074,292	4,096,234	21,191,713
1892	16,661,559	18,995,907	36,704,655
1893	13,048,702	7,486,403	22,359,681
1894	8,448,448	7,758,377	16,375,991
1895	3,977,261	9,645,758	13,842,198
1896	6,589,856	26,382,182	41,034,875
1897	15,304,037	43,048,008	66,923,456
1898	18,542,034	45,096,477	73,202,018
1899	9,549,270	46,786,127	61,727,093
1900	4,529,811	40,535,023	49,216,800
1901	19,962,737	24,711,790	48,854,100
1902	9,460,012	4,501,555	15,426,924
1903	3,373,689	19,113,566	23,469,950
1904	140,262	7,714,808	7,939,933
1905	2,076,035	15,415,604	22,754,652
1906	4,803,980	24,708,695	31,991,301
1907	8,221,087	19,785,174	28,126,953
1908	9,166,368	10,606,954	20,346,346
1909	2,991,527	6,772,958	9,866,184
1910	4,931,062	8,500,937	13,452,984

* Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," pp. 515-516.

TABLE 3
FLOUR EXPORTED FROM
BALTIMORE, 1880-1910,
BY BARRELS*

Year	Barrels
1880	497,042
1881	413,923
1882	463,878
1883	441,477
1884	437,713
1885	1,093,093
1886	1,662,504
1887	3,081,246
1888	2,417,874
1889	2,332,805
1890	2,624,282
1891	2,703,715
1892	3,661,623
1893	3,331,374
1894	2,943,562
1895	2,539,981
1896	3,065,845
1897	2,325,803
1898	2,813,166
1899	3,367,485
1900	3,003,787
1901	3,324,953
1902	3,074,335
1903	3,489,618
1904	1,281,266
1905	1,226,033
1906	1,547,891
1907	1,823,407
1908	1,347,098
1909	906,169
1910	879,046

* Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 518.

TABLE 4
TOBACCO EXPORTED
FROM BALTIMORE,
1880-1910, BY POUNDS*

Year	Lbs.
1880	59,149,631
1881	51,535,442
1882	40,482,879
1883	40,365,644
1884	31,088,969
1885	33,270,262
1886	46,526,218
1887	61,145,056
1888	58,160,700
1889	40,881,716
1890	55,227,903
1891	48,861,557
1892	55,905,539
1893	48,386,175
1894	59,895,584
1895	68,590,338
1896	72,868,530
1897	87,353,096
1898	84,975,614
1899	76,227,310
1900	87,445,660
1901	74,767,888
1902	65,598,262
1903	70,501,707
1904	79,622,832
1905	105,177,780
1906	97,105,169
1907	91,235,015
1908	93,279,562
1909	77,008,058
1910	87,066,093

* Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 519.

TABLE 5
RAW COTTON EXPORTED FROM BALTIMORE,
1880-1910, BY BALES AND VALUE*

Year	Bales	Value	Year	Bales	Value
1880	112,880	\$ 6,386,960	1896	141,649	\$ 5,259,191
1881	152,980	8,523,856	1897	174,369	6,407,319
1882	161,565	8,850,651	1898	220,227	6,463,132
1883	244,369	13,041,203	1899	241,782	6,913,410
1884	179,740	9,310,579	1900	197,578	8,001,051
1885	173,270	8,639,482	1901	159,352	7,386,291
1886	161,771	7,799,665	1902	133,081	5,603,844
1887	138,992	6,634,977	1903	121,395	5,449,438
1888	153,702	7,153,499	1904	93,844	5,458,571
1889	201,329	9,829,896	1905	178,541	7,914,566
1890	122,762	6,090,305	1906	165,406	9,210,316
1891	176,712	8,649,075	1907	117,559	9,167,459
1892	281,292	11,993,192	1908	118,122	6,778,895
1893	226,721	9,725,001	1909	119,536	5,887,944
1894	214,962	8,356,205	1910	60,367	4,178,526
1895	281,080	8,279,645			

* Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 520.

Other major exports were raw materials and particularly crude foodstuffs. Grain in particular formed a vital part of Baltimore's exports. Unlike the national trend it did not decline from the 1880's on, but, nearly doubled in the 1890's its ten year average annual volume of the 1880's. In the decade 1901-1910 it settled back to a slightly higher annual average than in the 1880's.²³ Indeed while always second to New York throughout this period, Baltimore's relation to that leader improved rather steadily. Whereas in 1875 Baltimore exported not quite one quarter the amount of grain that New York did, by 1901 its proportion had risen to three-quarters.²⁴ In the last two decades before the Civil War the production of corn and wheat had moved rapidly to the Middle West and therefore it is not surprising that most of the grain exported from Baltimore came from the West. Corn and wheat were the most important but occasionally rye, oats and others figured significantly as in 1912 when oats were exported in greater quantity than either wheat or corn.²⁵ The two arteries to the West were the trunk lines of the Baltimore & Ohio and the Pennsylvania railroads, each with large grain elevators right on deep water's edge. Both railroads owned a total of seven elevators in 1883 with a combined storage capacity of over five million bushels. Europe provided the market and by 1910, at least, Great Britain was Baltimore's best customer, especially for corn. Germany also consumed a lot of both corn and wheat. Sensitive to bad western harvests, Baltimore was also attuned to the demands of the market. Poor harvests in Europe caused the spectacular rise in grain exports from the city during the years 1897-1899.²⁶ All previous records were broken and hopes rose that Baltimore was "fast forging ahead towards first place as a grain export market."²⁷ In 1897 the port achieved first rank in corn and second rank in wheat.²⁸ But European markets could also contract as

²³ My calculations, based on figures cited in Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," pp. 515-516. These figures apply only to corn and wheat shipments, and exclude all other varieties.

²⁴ Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 516.

²⁵ Maryland, *B.I.S.*, p. 73; Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 63; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 515.

²⁶ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 66; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 530; Maryland, *B.I.S.*, p. 119.

²⁷ Maryland, *B.I.S.*, p. 73.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

happened in 1909-1910, causing Baltimore's grain exports to drop suddenly.

Flour was also of considerable note in the export trade but less so than unmilled grain. Early in its history Baltimore had become famous for supplying the West Indies and South America with this product which in those days was made from Maryland wheat. By 1883 the flour was coming in by rail from the West, although there was still some local product. South America, particularly Brazil, was the main market, taking over half the amount exported from the city, the rest going to England and Holland. By 1910 the market was more diverse and was affected by two major trends: the drop in European demand for American foodstuffs and the gradual atrophying of Baltimore's coffee trade with Brazil. Coffee had always formed the basis of Baltimore's two-way trade with that country.²⁹

A variety of other products, mainly unprocessed, completed the export picture. Raw cotton, coming largely by steamer from Norfolk and Savannah, held a fairly steady importance in Baltimore's export traffic throughout the entire period and went in the main to Liverpool and Bremen.³⁰ Starting in colonial times Baltimore had been an important market for leaf tobacco but the product grew in significance relative to other exports only in the mid 1890's. Almost the entire crop of Maryland and Ohio was shipped through the port as well as some from Kentucky, North Carolina and Virginia. England and Germany were the outstanding customers.³¹ Still other leading articles were lard which went to Germany, cattle which went to England, and iron and steel from the 1890's on, going to England.³²

Baltimore also developed an extensive domestic commerce fed by both ship and rail. By 1896 Baltimore commanded the second largest bay and coastal fleet on the Atlantic. Regular figures on bay and coastal trade before 1899 are lacking but a few fragmentary ones, at least, are sufficient to indicate its impressive proportions. For example, in 1896 coastwise tonnage exceeded

²⁹ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 59; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," pp. 530, 517, 520.

³⁰ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 54; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," pp. 530, 520.

³¹ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 79; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," pp. 519, 530.

³² Maryland, *B.I.S.I., Twentieth Annual Report* (Baltimore: 1912), p. 323; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," pp. 520, 530.

export tonnage by 60 per cent. However, it should be kept in mind that in describing the coastal trade in 1895 the Board of Trade commented that the coastal trade was larger in tonnage than the foreign trade but somewhat less in value.³³ This correction makes an authoritative comparison of the two types of trade impossible without systematic figures of both tonnage and value. However, in 1902 coastal trade was valued at \$175 million as compared with \$99 million for total foreign trade and in 1914, \$274 million as compared with \$166 million in total foreign commerce.³⁴ These random estimates go far to suggest the strong likelihood that at some point in this period 1880-1914 the coastal trade superseded foreign trade in importance.

The coastal trade was oriented toward the South as indeed was most of the domestic trade of Baltimore in this period. In the Southern jobbing trade, dry goods, clothing, provisions and groceries, boots and shoes, millinery, canned goods, notions, hats and drugs predominated.³⁵ The extent of this interest in the South can be seen in the dramatic assertion by the secretary of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association in describing the warehouse district of the city in 1883:

In the business section of Baltimore, west of a line drawn through South Street, nearly all those stately warehouses on Baltimore, Calvert, Light, Charles, German, Hanover, Sharp (Hopkins Place), Liberty, Howard, Lombard, Pratt and Eutaw Streets are devoted to a trade 70% of which lies in . . . Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi.³⁶

Although no systematic figures are available for domestic commerce, at least some idea of the value of this portion of it can be gleaned from the fact that in 1895 the distributive and jobbing trade of the city totaled more than \$350 million of which about three-quarters was with the South. By 1910 the total value was estimated at about \$400 million per year.³⁷

³³ Hirschfeld, *Baltimore, 1870-1900*, pp. 32-33n; Engelhardt, *Baltimore City*, p. 66.

³⁴ Hirschfeld, *Baltimore, 1870-1900*, p. 33; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 529; *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Pt. II, p. 50.

³⁵ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 34; Engelhardt, *Baltimore City*, p. 6.

³⁶ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 34.

³⁷ Hirschfeld, *Baltimore, 1870-1900*, p. 33; Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," p. 513.

Sustaining the vigor of the city's commerce and manufactures was the network of transportation facilities. In the early 1880's Baltimore was served by five railroads directly, including two trunk lines to the West, the Baltimore & Ohio, and the Pennsylvania Railroad, which had absorbed two local lines: the Northern Central Railway in 1874 and the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad in 1881. Three local lines supplemented the two major lines: the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad, the Western Maryland Railroad and the Maryland Central Railroad. Despite Baltimore's importance as a distributive center for the South, there was no direct railroad to that area. Three southern lines made use of steamship connections on the Chesapeake Bay to service the city: the Richmond and Danville, the Atlantic Coast Line and the Seaboard Air Line.³⁸

The two trunk lines were instrumental in hauling grain from the West for the export sector of Baltimore's economy, as has been previously mentioned. Although Baltimore actually was closer to the western grain than either of her sharp eastern competitors, New York and Philadelphia, it was only after intense squabbling between the various trunk lines linking Chicago with the eastern seaboard that a differential was established in 1877 of one cent per hundred over Philadelphia and three cents over New York. This enabled Baltimore to be competitive with the other export ports.³⁹

By 1914 the railroad picture was little changed in contour. The two major lines had grown larger, and the Baltimore & Ohio had the largest terminal on the Atlantic coast at Locust Point. It covered a mile of waterfront and handled thousands of immigrants and millions of tons of freight each year. Two very large grain elevators for the export trade, and large coal piers completed its facilities. The Pennsylvania Railroad had absorbed the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad. Its steamship terminal with two huge grain elevators was at Canton. The Western Maryland Railroad had been reorganized, modernized and considerably expanded since it had been taken over in 1901 by New York interests, headed by George J. Gould. It had been bought into a little later by Rockefeller as well. Its importance

³⁸ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, pp. 38-41, 45; Bryan, *Transportation System*, p. 492.

³⁹ Reid, "Commerce and Manufactures," pp. 512-513.

to Baltimore was much increased by its connection with the New York Central system. Its waterfront terminal was at Port Covington, which had storage capacity for 2000 freight cars.⁴⁰ Last and decidedly least was the Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad, an independent line formed in 1901 of 78 ambling miles from Baltimore to York, Pennsylvania with but slim *raison d'etre*.⁴¹ The route to the South by rail was still considered unsatisfactory by those who wished a direct line to the deep South without recourse to rail connections in Washington or steamboat connections on the Bay to Virginia.⁴²

Facilities for water transportation had much increased by 1914 from the beginning of the period. Thirteen lines engaged



Sailing craft tied up at Pratt Street near Light Street, Baltimore, Maryland. c. 1900. MD. HIST. SOC. GRAPHICS COLLECTION.

⁴⁰ *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Pt. II, pp. 38, 42-44.

⁴¹ George W. Hilton, *The Ma and Pa, A History of the Maryland and Pennsylvania Railroad* (Berkeley, Calif., 1963), *passim*.

⁴² Bryan, *Transportation System*, p. 498; *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Pt. II, p. 41.

in the coastal trade and six lines to foreign ports in the early 1880's had multiplied by 1914 to a total of thirty-four lines in domestic and foreign trade combined. Of the regular lines running to Europe, the North German Lloyd, which had started service in Baltimore in 1868, was the oldest. Fruit steamers plied regularly to Cuba, the West Indies and Central America and, of course, at all times there were tramp steamers visiting the harbor.⁴³

Turning now to the field of finance, by 1897 there were a total of thirty commercial banks in the city, twenty-one of which were national banks. The aggregate capital amounted to almost \$14 million.⁴⁴

In the 1890's Baltimore, along with the rest of the country, experienced a marked acceleration in the formation of trust companies. Thirteen such companies sprang up between 1895 and 1900 with an aggregate capital and surplus of \$40 million. By contrast, in the early 1880's there had been but one.⁴⁵

The South was a prime area for Baltimore investment, and many journalistic claims were made that the city was the financial center of that region. Soon after the Civil War, Baltimore had been quick to realize the attractiveness of investments in that area, and capital flow to the South had been a trend ever since. The *Manufacturers' Record* stated unequivocally in 1914 that Baltimore had been the financial center of the South for fifty years. It estimated that by 1900 the amount of Baltimore capital in that area was about \$100 million, spread in a wide variety of enterprises such as railroads, street railways, utilities, cotton mills, coal, iron and phosphate mines and lumber tracts. The paper's conservative figure for the 1914 situation had climbed to \$400 million.⁴⁶ However, the bias of the *Manufacturers' Record* is unmistakable. It constantly boomed both Baltimore and the South, presenting as encouraging a picture as possible to induce further investment. As it reported no figures for any other city's (especially New York's) relation with the South, it cannot be said here with certainty whether or not Baltimore was indeed the financial keystone of the region. Balti-

⁴³ Bland, *Review of Commerce*, p. 24; *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Pt. II, p. 41; Bryan, *Transportation System*, p. 499.

⁴⁴ Maryland, *B.J.S.*, p. 76.

⁴⁵ Hirschfeld, *Baltimore, 1870-1900*, p. 34; *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Pt. II, p. 33.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34; *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Pt. II, p. 33.

more's interests in the area, however, were heavy and of long standing. The most dramatic examples were the Atlantic Coast Line and the Seaboard Air Line, both of which had been initiated, promoted and knit together by Baltimoreans during the Reconstruction period. The securities of a third railroad, the Southern Railway Systems, were held extensively in Baltimore. Individuals aside, trust companies, bonding companies and savings banks all invested substantially in southern securities.⁴⁷

In the field of manufacturing Baltimore maintained a position among the leading industrial cities in the United States in this period but with increasing difficulty. It slipped from eighth place in 1880 to eleventh by 1914 as measured by the value of product (see Table 6). On the basis of this scale the cities which ranked ahead of Baltimore by 1914 were: (1) New York (decidedly first), (2) Chicago, (3) Philadelphia, (4) Detroit, (5) St. Louis, (6) Cleveland, (7) Boston, (8) Buffalo, (9) Pittsburgh, and (10) Milwaukee.⁴⁸ Baltimore's loss of pace with other leaders was slow until 1909. It clung to eighth place until 1905 when it dipped to ninth. In 1909 it plummeted sharply to thirteenth, and then partially recovered by 1914 to achieve eleventh place.

Other indicators point to the same general conclusion that Baltimore's position as a manufacturing center was respectable, if lacklustre, and that it was gradually being outstripped by more energetic cities. Table 6 shows the irregular decline relative again to the ninety-nine other most important industrial cities in terms of the net value of production, or, as it was later called, the value added by manufacture. Starting in ninth place in 1880, rising to eighth in 1890 it dipped back to ninth in 1900. There is a plunge in 1909 to thirteenth place and in 1914 a mild recovery, this time only to twelfth place. This indicator is perhaps the most valuable as it singles out the essence of the contribution of manufacturing.

Another scale of comparative measurement is the number of wage earners. In this category as is seen in Table 6, the decline was gentle with Baltimore hovering between fifth and fourth

⁴⁷ *M.R.*, Sept. 3, 1914, Pt. II, pp. 33-34.

⁴⁸ U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Abstract of the Census of Manufactures: 1914*, p. 280.

TABLE 6
BALTIMORE AS COMPARED WITH 99 OTHER
INDUSTRIAL CITIES IN THE U.S.: 1880-1914

Year	Gross Product ^a		Net Product		Wage Earners		Total Wages	
	Rank	Value ^b	Rank	Value ^b	Rank	Number	Rank	Amount ^b
1880 ^c	8	78,417,304	9	30,443,007	5	56,338	9	15,117,489
1890 ^f	8	141,723,599	8	67,953,598	8	83,745 ^c	8	35,914,854
1900 ^g	8	135,107,626	—	—	4	66,571	8	23,493,427
1905 ^h	9	151,546,580	—	—	5	65,224	9	25,633,550
1909 ⁱ	13	186,977,710	13 ^d	79,953,827 ^d	7	71,444	—	—
1914 ^j	11	215,171,530	12 ^d	94,638,311 ^d	8	73,769	—	—

^a Including custom work and repair.

^b In current dollars.

^c Average number of employees—includes officers, firm members and clerks.

^d Value added by manufacture.

^e U.S., Department of the Interior, Census Office, *Tenth Census of the United States: 1880. Report on the Manufactures*, II, p. XXIV.

^f U.S., Department of the Interior, Census Office, *Eleventh Census of the United States: 1890. Report on Manufacturing Industry*, Part II, p. XXXII.

^g U.S., Bureau of the Census, *Special Report on Manufactures, 1905*, p. CCLXXXII.

^h *Ibid.*

ⁱ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910*, Vol. X, Manufactures, 84.

^j U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Abstract of the Census of Manufactures: 1914*, p. 282.

place from 1880 through 1905 and then after a pronounced drop to seventh place in 1909, slipping further to eighth in 1914. The ranking and number of wage earners given for 1890 are incompatible with those of the other years as they include officers, firm members and clerks. For that reason they have been skipped over in the above discussion.

Table 7 shows the types of manufacturing in Baltimore which achieved national ranking in terms of the value of product. As one would anticipate from the gradual loss of place previously detailed, its manufactures figured more prominently in 1880 than in 1914. In 1880 Baltimore ranked among the top six cities in the United States in nine types of industry. Its copper and sheet ironware industry was first in the nation. This proved to be the only first ranking for the entire period. In fourth place came the manufacture of brick and tile, in fifth, carpentry and in sixth place the city offered not one but six industries: bread and other bakery goods, men's clothing,⁴⁹ marble and stonework, saddlery and harness, shipbuilding and finally tobacco

⁴⁹ Throughout this article clothing and men's clothing should always be taken to mean only the factory product—i.e., ready-to-wear clothing.

(cigars and cigarettes). In 1890 the list had shrunk to three industries: brick and stone masonry taking third place, and both bread and other bakery goods and men's clothing reappearing in sixth place. In 1900 one can see the rise in importance of men's clothing which now ranked fourth nationally. Tobacco manufactures had risen to fifth place. This ranking for these two industries was repeated in 1905. In 1909 the men's clothing industry had risen to third place in the nation. Heavy industry climbed into national view again after having been missing from the chart since 1880, with the manufacture of cars and general shop construction and repairs by steam railroads emerging in fifth place in 1904⁵⁰ and fourth place in 1909.

As a fragmentary supplement to Table 7, a few percentages are given by the censuses of 1904 and 1909 showing the proportion of the national output represented by Baltimore's largest industries. In 1904 men's clothing, including shirts, ranking third in the nation accounted for 6.2 per cent of the national value of product in that field. In 1909 Baltimore accounted for 6.4 per cent of the nation's men's clothing, including shirts. In the manufacture of cars, general shop construction and repairs by steam railroads, Baltimore in 1904 contributed a mere 1.4 per cent of the national value of product in the industry and in 1909 a slightly larger contribution of 1.8 per cent.⁵¹ So much for Baltimore's industrial position in the nation.

Concentrating on the local scene, as taken on its own terms regardless of the rest of the country, Table 8 presents the percentile growth in value of product for all Baltimore industries for each census year from 1880 to 1914. According to this index of aggregate growth, the 1880's appear the most vigorous. The slimmest percentage of progress is shown for the 1890's which, of course, reflects the prolonged depression from late 1892 to 1896. Adding the figure for 1899-1904 with that for 1904-1909 to arrive at a comparable decennial span, the percentage would be 35.6, which indicates a strong comeback in a period marred by a major local fire, a short recession in 1904, and a sharp dip in the national economy in 1907.

⁵⁰ Not included in Table 7. U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Reports of the Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910. General Report and Analysis*, VIII, p. 91.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

TABLE 7
BALTIMORE AS COMPARED WITH OTHER LEADING
INDUSTRIAL CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES AS
MEASURED BY THE VALUE OF PRODUCTS IN
LEADING INDUSTRIES: 1880-1909

Rank	1880 ^a	1890 ^b	1900 ^c	1905 ^d	1909 ^e
1st	tinware, copperware & sheet-ironware				
2nd					
3rd	masonry (brick & stone)			clothing, men's including shirts	
4th	brick & tile		clothing	clothing	cars & general shop construction & repair by steam R.R. Co's.
5th	carpentry		tobacco manufactures	tobacco manufactures	
6th	bread & other bakery goods men's clothing marble & stonework saddlery & harness shipbuilding tobacco (cigars & cigarettes)		clothing, men's factory product bread & other bakery goods		

^a U.S., *Tenth Census: 1880*, II, p. XXVI. The top 7 cities in 37 industries in which aggregate production reached \$30 million.

^b U.S., *Eleventh Census: 1890, Report on Manufacturing Industries*, Pt. II, p. XXXV.

^c U.S., *Special Report on Manufactures, 1905*, p. CCLXXX. Six principal cities which ranked highest in each of 15 selected industries according to the value of products.

^d *Ibid.*

^e U.S., *Thirteenth Census: 1910*, Vol. X Manufactures, p. 91. Six leading cities as measured by value of products in 15 leading industries as measured by the value of products in 1909.

TABLE 8
BALTIMORE CITY'S AGGREGATE INDUSTRIAL
GROWTH: PERCENTILE INCREASE IN THE VALUE
OF PRODUCTS IN CURRENT DOLLARS, 1880-1914

Years	Per Cent
1880-1890 ^{a,b}	80.7
1890-1900 ^{a,b}	13.8
1899-1904 ^c	11.1
1904-1909 ^c	24.5
1909-1914 ^d	15.1

^a Including custom work and repairing.

^b U.S., *Twelfth Census: 1900, Manufactures*, Pt. II, p. 334.

^c U.S., *Thirteenth Census: 1910*, Vol. VIII, *General Report and Analysis*, p. 99.

^d U.S., *Census of Manufactures, 1914*, I, p. 563.

Detailing the local scene further, Table 9 presents the major industries as given decadal by the censuses and shows the shifting pattern of manufactures in the light of the value of product. Despite the constant qualifying and regrouping of the categories used by the censuses, it is clear that the most consistently important industries by this standard were: the clothing industry, which was the undoubted leader throughout the period, canning, bread and other bakery products, fertilizer, foundry and machine shop products, slaughtering and meat packing, tinware, copperware and sheet ironware, tobacco, printing and publishing, and finally cars, i.e., construction and repairs of the rolling stock of steam railroads.

TABLE 9
THE MAJOR INDUSTRIES^a IN BALTIMORE CITY,
1880-1914, AS DETERMINED BY THE
GROSS VALUE OF THEIR PRODUCTS
(CURRENT DOLLARS, IN THOUSANDS)

1880 ^b		1890 ^c	
Industry	Value of Products	Industry	Value of Products
1. Clothing, men's	9,447	1. Clothing, men's ^d	15,033
2. Fruits & vegetables canning & preserving	5,201	2. Masonry, brick & stone	10,190
3. Fertilizer	4,287	3. Fruits & vegetables canning & preserving	5,723
4. Foundry & machine shop products	3,940	4. Tin & copper smithing & sheet iron work	5,248
5. Boots & shoes ^e	3,412	5. Foundry & machine shop products	4,718
6. Tin, copper & sheet iron ware	3,371	6. Slaughtering & meat packing wholesale	4,311
7. Carpentering	3,216	7. Fertilizers	3,957
8. Slaughtering & meat packing ^h	2,743	8. Liquors, malt	3,430
9. Iron & steel	2,673	9. Bread & other bakery products	3,395
10. Bread & other bakery goods	2,172	10. Flouring & grist mill products	3,285
11. Tobacco (cigars & cigarettes)	1,551	11. Tobacco, chewing, smoking & snuff	3,216
12. Tobacco (chewing, smoking & snuff)	1,531	12. Lumber, planing mill products	2,903
13. Furniture	1,513	13. Oysters, canning & preserving	2,794
14. Shipbuilding	1,445	14. Tobacco, cigars & cigarettes	2,690
15. Printing & publishing	1,374	15. Liquors, distilled	2,514

TABLE 9. *Continued.*

1900 ^d		1909 ^e	
Industry	Value of Products	Industry	Value of Products
1. Clothing, men's ¹	17,291	1. Clothing, men's ^k	36,269
2. Fruits & vegetables canning & preserving	8,477	2. Copper, tin & sheet iron products	12,833
3. Tobacco, chewing, smoking & snuff	7,054	3. Tobacco manufactures	10,270
4. Foundry & machine shop products	6,120	4. Slaughtering & meat packing	10,082
5. Tin & coppersmithing & sheet iron work	5,421	5. Foundry & machine shop products	9,074
6. Slaughtering & meat packing, wholesale	5,308	6. Printing & publishing	7,553
7. Carpentering	4,998	7. Cars ^l	7,365
8. Masonry, brick & stone	4,026	8. Canning & preserving	5,831
9. Bread & other bakery products	3,812	9. Bread & other bakery products	5,716
10. Fertilizers	3,752	10. Patent medicines ¹	5,471
11. Shirts	3,687	11. Confectionery	5,011
12. Cars ^l	3,530	12. Lumber & timber products	4,805
13. Clothing, men's custom & repair	3,061	13. Clothing, women's	4,333
14. Liquors, malt	2,934	14. Hats, straw	3,347
15. Furniture, factory product	2,691	15. Liquors, malt	3,150
1914 ^f			
1. Clothing ^k	44,482	8. Bread & other bakery products	6,606
2. Copper, tin & sheet-iron products	18,842	9. Fertilizers	6,201
3. Printing & publishing	10,284	10. Patent medicines ¹	5,878
4. Cars ^l	10,039	11. Lumber & timber products	5,073
5. Slaughtering & meat-packing	9,504	12. Tobacco, cigars & cigarettes	5,033
6. Canning & preserving	7,789	13. Hats, straw	4,826
7. Foundry & machine-shop products	7,688	14. Liquors, malt	4,724
		15. Coffee & spice Roast & grinding	4,393

^a "Mechanical and manufacturing industries" as stated in the census reports.

^b U.S., *Tenth Census: 1880. Report on Manufactures*, II, 383-384.

^c U.S., *Eleventh Census: 1890. Report on Manufacturing*, Pt. II, 46-57.

^d U.S., *Twelfth Census: 1900. Vol. VIII, Manufactures*, Pt. II, 340-345.

^e U.S., *Thirteenth Census: 1910. Statistics for Maryland*, 648-649.

^f U.S., *Census of Manufactures: 1914, I*, 584-587.

^g Including custom work and repair.

^h Not including the retail butcher.

ⁱ Factory product.

^j And general shop construction and repairs by steam railroad companies.

^k Including shirts.

^l And compounds and druggists' preparations.

Changing the criterion of measurement of industrial importance, Table 10 presents three possible alternatives: the amount of capital, the average number of wage earners, and the net value of production (or value added by manufacture). In this table, to avoid an overwhelming amount of detail, only the six most important industries by each criterion are given. The amount of capital is admittedly a very shaky standard to apply. The authorities responsible for the census itself from 1880 through 1914 were agreed on the especial partiality to error of the statistics collected under this rubric. They indeed had repeatedly urged the elimination of this category from the questionnaire as so few establishments had an accounting system

TABLE 10
THE LEADING INDUSTRIES IN BALTIMORE CITY,
1880-1914, AS DETERMINED BY CAPITAL, SIZE OF
LABOR FORCE AND VALUE ADDED BY MANUFACTURE
(IN CURRENT DOLLARS ROUNDED TO THE
NEAREST THOUSAND)

1880 ^a					
Capital		Average Number Hands Employed		Net Value of Product	
Industry	Amount	Industry	Number	Industry	Amount
Men's clothing	3,849	Men's clothing	11,157	Men's clothing	3,433°
Fertilizers	3,241	Fruits & vegetables canned ^c	10,923	Foundry & machine shop	2,053°
Foundry & machine shop	2,240	Boots & shoes ^d	2,694	Boots & shoes	1,779°
Printing & Publishing	1,954	Foundry & machine shop	2,676	Fertilizers	1,598°
Iron & steel	1,632	Shirts	1,696	Fruits & vegetables, canned ^c	1,346°
Shipbuilding	1,493	Brick & tile	1,529	Tin, copper & sheet-iron	1,120°
1890 ^b					
Men's clothing, factory product	9,783	Men's clothing, factory product	12,700	Men's clothing, factory product	6,910°
Foundry & machine shop	4,523	Fruits & vegetables, canned ^c	5,195	Masonry, brick & stone	4,913°
Liquors, malt	4,456	Masonry, brick & stone	4,376	Foundry & machine shop	2,924°
Fertilizers	3,979	Foundry & machine shop	3,222	Liquors, malt	2,209°
Masonry, brick & stone	3,011	Tin & coppersmithing & sheet-iron	3,061	Fruits & vegetables, canned ^c	2,209°
Tinsmithing, coppersmithing & sheet-iron	2,335	Oysters, canned ^e	2,666	Tin & coppersmithing & sheet-iron	2,200°

TABLE 10. *Continued.*

Capital		1900 ^a		Net Value of Product	
Industry	Amount	Industry	Average Number	Industry	Amount
Liquors, malt	9,689	Men's clothing, factory product	9,690	Men's clothing, factory product	7,067 ^a
Men's clothing, factory product	8,435	Fruits & vegetables, canned ^c	4,360	Tobacco (chewing)	4,558 ^a
Foundry & machine shop	4,971	Foundry & machine shop	3,375	Foundry & machine shop	3,972 ^a
Fertilizers	4,450	Shirts	2,475	Carpentering	2,623 ^a
Fruits & vegetables, canned ^c	2,862	Cars ^e	2,438	Liquors, malt	2,312 ^a
Cars ^e	2,236	Tin & coppersmithing & sheet-iron	2,227	Fruits & vegetables, canned ^c	2,045 ^a
		1909 ^b			
Copper, tin & sheet-iron	20,655	Men's clothing, including shirts	18,596	Men's clothing, & shirts	15,597
Men's clothing, factory product	19,283	Copper, tin & sheet-iron	4,172	Printing & publishing	5,326
Foundry & machine shop	7,863	Cars ^e	4,163	Foundry & machine shop	4,870
Tobacco manufactures	6,442	Foundry & machine shop	3,719	Tobacco manufactures	4,740
Printing & publishing	5,625	Tobacco manufactures	3,294	Copper, tin & sheet-iron	4,661
Liquors, malt	5,350	Canning & preserving	3,166	Patent medicines, compounds & druggists' preparations	3,335
		1914 ¹		Value Added by Manufactures	
Capital		Labor		Industry	Amount
Industry	Amount	Industry	Average Number of Wage-Earners	Industry	Amount
Clothing	19,749	Clothing	15,770	Clothing	16,627
Fertilizers	7,544	Copper, tin & sheet-iron	6,289	Copper, tin & sheet-iron	6,660 ^a
Liquors, malt	6,767	Shirts	4,449	Shirts	4,223
Foundry & machine shop	6,560	Cars ^e	3,490	Printing & publishing ³	3,418
Shirts	5,099	Fruits & vegetables, canned ^c	3,290	Liquors, malt	3,306
Printing & publishing ⁴	4,244	Foundry & machine shop	3,071	Bread & other bakery products	2,855

^a U.S., *Tenth Census: 1880. Report on the Social Statistics of Cities*, Pt. II, pp. 24-26.

^b U.S., *Eleventh Census: 1890. Report on Manufacturing*, Pt. II, pp. 46-57.

^c And preserved.

^d Includes custom work and repairs.

^e My calculations.

^f U.S., *Twelfth Census: 1900. VIII, Manufactures*, Pt. II, 340-345.

^g And general shop construction and repairs by steam railroad companies.

^h U.S., *Thirteenth Census: 1910. Statistics for Maryland*, 642-643.

¹ U.S., *Census of Manufactures: 1914*, I, pp. 577-587.

³ Book and job.

capable of calculating accurately the return from capital. Failing this, they could simply warn forthrightly that in the 1914 and all the preceding censuses the data compiled concerning capital had been "so defective as to be of very little value except as indicating very general conditions."⁵² With all their inadequacies, however, these figures do not turn up any surprises in this period. Indeed the same items crowd this list as repeatedly appeared prominently in the columns of Table 9. Men's clothing (both including or excluding shirts), fertilizer, foundry and machine shop products, tin, copper and sheet-iron ware, and printing and publishing emerge as among the most consistently heavily capitalized industries throughout the period. Malt liquors, iron and steel, and shipbuilding are the only ones to be added to this list that did not rank among the top six in Table 9. Even those which appear only fleetingly such as masonry, canning of fruits and vegetables, cars, and tobacco manufactures are familiar as being among the leaders in Table 9.

Judging the importance of an industry by the size of its labor force produces again results very similar to those in Table 9. The industries with the largest labor force were very often those with very large value of product. Men's clothing, shirts (which are sometimes coupled with the latter), canning of fruits and vegetables, copper, tin and sheet-iron ware products, foundry and machine shop products, cars, and tobacco manufactures reappear census after census as having the largest labor force. Again, as in the case of the industries most heavily capitalized, even those that figure only occasionally are familiar from Table 9, namely, boots and shoes, brick and tile, carpentering, masonry. The canning of oysters, is more important in Table 10 than in Table 9.

Another gauge of the importance of an industry is its rating in terms of the value added by manufacture. This test again points out the same collection of industries that has been stressed by all the other indices. Men's clothing heads the list each year followed in an ever varying order by copper, tin and

⁵² U.S., Department of Interior, Census Office, *Tenth Census of the United States: 1880. Report on the Manufactures of the United States at the Tenth Census*, II, pp. XXXIX-XL; U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Manufactures: 1914*, I, p. 4.

sheet-iron ware products, canning of fruits and vegetables, and malt liquors. Popping on this list just once or twice are such familiar industries as shirts, tobacco manufactures, boots and shoes, masonry, bread and other bakery goods, carpentering, and printing and publishing. Patent medicine is the only new one included in this survey. This index does, however, reveal a greater turn-over among the top six places than the other gauges, even though the industries that rotate in and out of these places are all at least among the fifteen listed each decade in Table 9. The conclusion seems clear that no matter which of these four types of measurement is used, very much the same group of industries will be highlighted with simply small changes of position over the period.

Implicit in all the above discussion and tabulations based on census reports is the reservation that the figures cited are by no means necessarily or probably complete. Not only can individual firms be omitted from an industrial count but also whole fields of industry can be lumped together at the end of each itemization of manufactures in the census as "all other industries" to avoid disclosing the operations of any individual firm. In the 1914 census of manufactures, for example, it was noted that twenty-one industries were omitted, of which fourteen reported values of product as exceeding \$1 million.⁵³

Likewise buried beneath all the foregoing discussion is another reservation: all that has been said concerns only manufacturing inside the boundaries of the incorporated city of Baltimore. Gradually the census became aware of the importance of suburbs to complete the industrial picture. Statistics began to be collected to this end in 1899 for the "metropolitan district." Briefly stated, the metropolitan district of Baltimore experienced the following growth within the period 1899-1914. The population grew from 577,670 to 693,253, an increase of 17.9 per cent. The number of manufacturing establishments rose from 2,352 to 2,698, or 14 per cent. The average number of wage earners increased from 71,688 to 84,937, or 16.2 per cent. The value of products rose 66 per cent from almost \$177 million to almost \$314 million, while the value added by manufactures increased by 57.6 per cent from about \$68 million

⁵³ *Census of Manufactures: 1914, I, p. 563.*

to \$113 million. In this last category Baltimore's metropolitan district ranked ninth in 1914 among others in the nation. Naturally Baltimore proper always dominated the metropolitan district throughout the period measured and in 1914 accounted for 83 per cent of the district's population, 68 per cent of the value of products, 92.7 per cent of the manufacturing establishments and 86.9 per cent of the wage earners.⁵⁴

Taking into account the wider area of Baltimore business activity does not, therefore, fundamentally alter the industrial profile given above which was for the incorporated section of the city. The major industry of the metropolitan district was clothing which was located entirely within the bounds of the city proper. The industries which operated to an important extent in the part of the district which was not inside the city limits also in 1914 figure heavily within the city limits, namely, copper, tin and sheet-iron ware products, malt liquors and slaughtering and meat packing. Fertilizer and distilled liquor would seem to have been more important in the suburbs than in the city.

The same limitations of course, plague the census figures for the metropolitan district as for the city. Particularly distressing is the necessity for the census to leave totally out of consideration such industries as petroleum, and copper refining, both of which operated extensively in Canton, indeed on a national scale of importance.

The steel industry at Sparrows Point, which likewise was of immense significance, had to be skipped because, as in the other two cases above, one firm so dominated the field that any figures would in effect reveal the operations of one company which was forbidden of the census. Thus it is necessary to supplement the evidence from even the metropolitan census to gain an accurate picture of the major industries of Baltimore in this period.

⁵⁴ *Thirteenth Census: 1910, X, Manufactures, 1909*, pp. 963-964; *Census of Manufactures: 1914, I*, pp. 563-564.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE FREE NEGRO POPULATION OF WASHINGTON, D. C., 1800-1862

By HENRY S. ROBINSON

THE NEGRO has played a prominent role in Washington since the city's early beginnings in the last decade of the eighteenth century. Immediately after George Washington reported to Congress in January, 1791 that he had fixed the confines of the District of Columbia, the ten square mile area was surveyed. The *Georgetown Weekly Record* of March 12, 1791, in reporting on the survey, listed in the party of Major Andrew Ellicott, the official surveyor, a certain "Ethiopian," Benjamin Banneker. Banneker, a free Negro, had acquired a reputation in his own right as a competent astronomer, mathematician and surveyor. While the District of Columbia was being surveyed, the official party received its meals in the cabin of George Bell and his wife Sophia, who were at that time slaves living near the Eastern Branch (the Anacostia River).¹ On subsequent occasions Sophia Browning Bell often used to recall the portly appearance of the sable son of Africa whose contributions were instrumental in placing Washington on the map. As a representative of his class, Banneker left a permanent legacy on a city where so many of his group were destined to play a prominent role.

The new city of Washington was southern from the point of view of slavery, ethnic population and cultural heritage, but it also contained from its beginning a substantial free colored population. In 1800 there were approximately 14,093 persons living in the District of Columbia. This area included Georgetown, Washington City, Washington County and Alexandria (retroceded to Virginia in 1846). The white population numbered 10,066, free colored—783, and slaves—3,244. By 1830 there were 4,604 free colored persons and 4,505 slaves in a total

¹ *Special Report of the Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Education* (Washington, 1871), pp. 196-197.

population of 30,261. By 1860 the free colored population had risen to 11,131, while the number of slaves had declined to 3,185 against a total of 75,080.²

One might wonder how the free colored community originated and why its numbers increased so rapidly. Contrary to the myth that all persons of African descent were slaves before 1863, the first federal census of 1790 showed that approximately 59,000 Negroes were free persons. In Washington, as well as in the slave states, free Negroes were of varied origins, viz., those whose ancestors had never been slaves (descendants of indentured servants); those who were born of free parents or of free mothers; those who had been manumitted; those who had bought their freedom or whose relatives had bought their freedom for them; and those who had run away from slavery.³ Immediately prior to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia in April, 1862, 78 per cent of the colored population was free.

In order to refute the theory that Washington's pre-Civil War Negro population was primarily unproductive, illiterate, poverty-stricken, shiftless and a general nuisance, primary and secondary sources of the period serve to show that the non-white population had a substantial nucleus of property owners and a number of industrious and literate persons who were leaders among their own people and were a contributing asset to the community.

In the early period there was considerable restrictive legislation which limited the free Negro's degree of freedom. As early as 1808 both Congress and the Corporation of Washington had passed such legislation. On December 6, 1808 an ordinance of the Corporation of Washington was passed which stated that ". . . no black person or person of color, or loose, idle disorderly person shall be allowed to walk about or assemble at any tippling or other house after 10 o'clock at night . . ." A fine of five dollars was provided for each offense.⁴

Later, in 1812, Congress amended the charter of Washington, and in doing so, the charter specifically stated that ". . . the said

² *Ibid.*, p. 27.

³ *Writer's Works Progress Administration, Federal Writer's Project, Washington, City and Capital* (Washington, 1937), p. 71.

⁴ *Special Reports—1871*, p. 312.

corporation shall have full power and authority . . . to restrain and prohibit the nightly and other disorderly meetings of slaves, free Negroes and mulattoes . . ." Slaves breaking the law were liable to whipping, not exceeding forty stripes, or to imprisonment not exceeding six months. Punishment for free Negroes and mulattoes specified a fine not exceeding twenty dollars for one offense. Failure to pay the fine meant imprisonment up to six months. This act also empowered the Corporation of Washington "to prescribe the terms and conditions upon which free Negroes and mulattoes and others, who can show no visible means of support may reside in the city . . ."⁵ A provision similar to the above was provided for by Congress in the Act of 1820 which reorganized the city government.

The Corporation of Washington, now empowered by Con-



Bruce Family. c. 1870. Photo attributed to Matthew Brady. Author's photograph.

⁵ *District of Columbia Code* (Washington, 1951), p. 31.

gress with the authority to regulate the Negro population, proceeded to enact such legislation ("concerning free Negroes, Mulattoes and Vagrants") on December 16, 1812. Section eight of that act stated "that if any free black or mulatto person or slave shall have a dance, ball, or assemble at his, her or their house, without first obtaining a permit for that purpose from the Mayor or other justice of the peace within the corporation, he, she, or they shall each pay a fine of twenty dollars, or be sentenced to confinement and labor for a time not exceeding thirty days . . ." ⁶ Punishment for slaves failing to obey the above act to the letter of the law provided up to ten lashes to be administered on the bare back. Persons, wishing to hold an assembly or ball in their homes, had also to state the number of guests expected and the hour at which it would end. In the event a greater number of persons attended than was stated or in the event the dance or assembly did not break up at the appointed time, the act provided that the individual to whom the permit was granted "shall, on conviction, pay a fine not exceeding ten dollars." In the event of inability to pay the fine, imprisonment up to ninety days at labor was authorized. ⁷

Perhaps the harshest law passed by the Corporation of Washington was the act of April 14, 1821 which placed severe restrictions upon the movements of the free colored. Free Negroes were required to appear in person before the mayor and to show their proof of freedom. They were also required to show the mayor a certificate signed by at least three respectable white citizens stating that they were of good character. All persons not having evidence of freedom were liable to arrest and imprisonment as absconding slaves. Free Negroes were also required to enter into bond with one good and responsible white citizen as surety for the good, sober, and orderly conduct of such person or persons and of his or her family. ⁸

An act of May 31, 1827 repealed the one of April 14, 1821, but the new one retained and refined many of the old law's provisions. Not only were all free black and mulatto persons required "to exhibit satisfactory evidence of their title to free-

⁶ Allen C. Clark, "Daniel Rapine, the Second Mayor," *Records of the Columbia Historical Society*, Vol. 25 (1923), pp. 205-206.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 205-206.

⁸ Samuel Burch, *A Digest of the Laws of the Corporation of the City of June 1, 1823* (Washington, 1823), pp. 126-135.

dom," but they were now prohibited from playing cards, dice, or "any other game of an immoral tendency." If found indulging in such worldly pleasures, the guilty party was liable to a fine not exceeding ten dollars.⁹ This restriction was carried over from an earlier act, dated December 16, 1812.

The ten o'clock curfew which had been in force since 1808 was reaffirmed. There were, however, a few exceptions; "free black or mulatto persons with a pass from some justice of the peace or respectable citizen" and such persons engaged in driving a cart, wagon, or other carriage were exempt. Persons passing to and from any meeting-house or place of worship were also exempt from this curfew.¹⁰ But a fine, not to exceed ten dollars, was provided for those who dared to break the law. For those individuals who refused to pay the various fines imprisonment up to six months was specified by the law. Similarly, persons found drunk in the public streets or guilty of obscene or profane language were also liable to arrest and subject to fines not in excess of three dollars.

The most stringent section of the act required that "every free Negro or mulatto, whether male or female, who may come to the city of Washington to reside, within thirty days thereafter . . . shall enter into bond to the Mayor, Board of Aldermen and Board of Common Council . . . with two freehold sureties, in the penalty of five hundred dollars, conditioned for his or hers (and every member of his or her existing family) good and orderly conduct . . ." ¹¹ Any member of a family not complying with "each and every provision of this section" was liable to banishment from the city or to commitment to the workhouse for a period not exceeding twelve months in any one commitment. The height of absurdity was reached in Washington by an ordinance passed in 1829 which prohibited colored person from frequenting the Capitol square! The penalty for violating this act was a fine not to exceed twenty dollars or thirty days in the workhouse.¹²

In order to restrict business activities on the part of free Negroes, the mayor of Washington was forbidden to grant a

⁹ Andrew Rothwell, *Laws of the City of Washington to the End of the Thirtieth Council June, 1833* (Washington, 1833), pp. 196-199.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

¹² *Special Report—1871*, p. 315.

license for any purpose whatsoever to any free colored person or to any person or persons acting as agents. The only exceptions were licenses to drive carts, dreys, hackney carriages or wagons and licenses for huckstering. Free Negroes were also prohibited from selling or bartering "spirituous liquors . . . wine . . . ale, strong beer, cider, or any fermented liquors within the limits of this city; nor shall any free Negro or mulatto . . . keep any tavern . . . shop . . . refectory or eatinghouse of any kind, for profit or gain. . . ." ¹³ But, if these laws had been strictly enforced, the economic livelihood and status of the free Negro would have been severely restricted. However, such was not the case, and numerous free colored men had businesses during the ante-bellum period.

Rigid controls had existed in the District of Columbia from its very beginning, but the Nat Turner insurrection of August 21, 1831 served to intensify the animosity between white and colored in Washington. Tensions increased in the city, and age-old prejudices erupted into open hostilities. In Georgetown, which was administered separately from Washington City, a series of new laws were passed and designed to control the activities of free colored persons. An ordinance of October 8, 1831 prohibited "all night assemblages of black or colored persons within the limits of this town, except for religious instruction, conducted by white men of good character, and terminated . . . at or before the hour of half past nine o'clock p.m. . . ." ¹⁴ Moreover, colored persons were prohibited from receiving through the post office or from having in their possession or circulation, "any newspaper or publication of a seditious and evil character, calculated to excite insurrection or insubordination among the slaves." ¹⁵

To the credit of the colored community several persons opposed these laws from their inception and challenged them in the courts. In *Costin v. Washington* in October, 1821, the Circuit Court of Washington ruled that "the power, given by the Congress to the Corporation, to prescribe the terms and conditions upon which free Negroes and Mulattoes may reside

¹³ Worthington G. Snethen, *The Black Code of the District of Columbia* (New York, 1848), pp. 45-46.

¹⁴ *Special Report—1871*, pp. 309-310.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 309-310.

in the City, is not repugnant to the Constitution. . . ."¹⁶ This case had been brought in behalf of William Costin, a free mulatto. In *Nicholas v. Burch* in March 1839, it was held that the Corporation of Washington had power to pass a by-law to prevent free colored persons from going at large through the city after 10:00 p.m. without a pass. Although these cases were decided in favor of the Corporation of Washington, they, nevertheless, showed that the free Negro population did not in any way acquiesce to the restrictive and oppressive legislation which had been enacted by the City Council. Historical patterns repeat themselves and scarcely more than a century would pass before discriminatory practices would again be challenged in the Washington courts.

Race relations reached a low ebb in August, 1835 when an attempt was made on the life of Mrs. William Thornton by her male slave. Mobs of enraged whites attacked and destroyed property owned by free Washington Negroes. In conjunction with the attempt on the life of Mrs. Thornton, Benjamin Snow, a free colored restaurant proprietor, added to anti-Negro feelings by speaking in disrespectful terms of the wives and daughters of Navy Yard mechanics. Following these remarks, a crowd of white men assembled and went to Snow's restaurant at the northwest corner of 6th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Unable to find Snow they dispersed. The following day they again assembled, searched for Snow, and still were unable to locate him. This time they wrecked his restaurant, burned the houses of some free Negroes, and broke the windows in one of the colored churches. The tension and excitement virtually turned the city into an armed camp. A small force of United States troops was posted at the entrance to public buildings, while clerks, who had been supplied with arms, stood at the windows.¹⁷ The mobs were finally subdued, and the city returned to normal.

As a consequence of the Snow riot, the Board of Aldermen adopted a resolution which was designed to prohibit Negroes, slave and free, from assembling together for any purpose what-

¹⁶ F. Regis Noel, "Notable Suits in Early District Courts," *Records of the Columbia Historical Society*, Vol. 24 (March, 1920), p. 87; 6 Fed. Cas. 612, October, 1821.

¹⁷ W. B. Bryan, *History of the National Capital* (New York, 1916), II, pp. 136-146.

ever after sundown. Legislation, forbidding free Negroes from operating taverns and dealing in alcoholic beverages, was also considered.¹⁸ Several prominent colored men also fled the city during the riot. Among them were William Wormley, the original agent of the *Liberator* in the Washington district, and William Thomas Lee and John F. Cook, both school masters. Fortunately, President Andrew Jackson gave notice that the fugitives would be protected if they returned, and, as a result of this guarantee, Lee and Wormley returned to Washington. But John F. Cook, who fled to Pennsylvania, did not return until the autumn of 1836.¹⁹

When one considers the above-quoted restrictive legislation, which was designed to control the social and economic livelihood of the free people of color, it is surprising to find that there were so many colored property owners and tax payers in the ante-bellum period. One of the earliest deeds on record in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia dates from April 21, 1806. In that year William Prout of Washington City leased to Moses Liverpool, a free Negro, a plot of land which was part of square 825 in Washington. The lot was located on south L Street.²⁰ In a deed recorded on May 26, 1812 George Bell sold to Peter Brown a lot in square 797 on south I Street.²¹ Both Liverpool and Bell had been former slaves. From the period 1806 to 1859 there were numerous deeds recorded in the names of free Negroes. These deeds dealt with the buying and selling of property, rents, leases, and bills of sale in which both human beings (manumitted slaves) and animals were concerned.

One of the most prominent colored men of this period was William Costin, who with his family had come to Washington from Mount Vernon in 1802. Costin was early engaged in the transaction of land and real estate. In a lease recorded on December 21, 1818 he received from Daniel Carroll of Dudington, D.C. a ninety-nine year lease on part of lot number four in square 730 on A Street, south on what is today known as Capitol

¹⁸ *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D.C.), August 14, 1835.

¹⁹ George W. Williams, *History of the Negro Race in America* (New York, 1883), II, pp. 182-213.

²⁰ Liber Q no. 16, p. 86, Recorder of Deeds Office, District of Columbia.

²¹ Liber AC no. 28, p. 319.

Hill.²² Not only was William Costin a shrewd real estate dealer, but he was also an humanitarian. Earlier in 1807 Costin had purchased his wife, Philadelphia, and two daughters from Thomas Law, husband of one of Martha Washington's granddaughters. In 1827 Costin received for the sum of one dollar from George Washington Parke Custis two slaves, Eliza Washington and Montgomery Parke; the latter one was four years old.²³ Both were later manumitted by William Costin, and Montgomery Parke was reared in his family.

Several of these real estate transactions involved sums totaling several hundred dollars. One such deed stated that for the sum of \$302.04 George Bomford sold to Francis Datcher, a free colored man, lot number four in square number 199 on I Street. The sale was recorded on March 30, 1827.²⁴ For \$700 Charles Bulfinch, the celebrated architect transferred to William Slade "all that part of lot number two in square 373" which was executed on June 17, 1844.²⁵ A number of transactions involved members of the same family or two parties who were colored. James and Rebecca Wright sold jointly to William P. Parke for the sum of \$400 a part of lot number twenty in the square south of square number 516 at 4th and I Streets, N.W. on April 8, 1848.²⁶ Similarly, Samuel Wormley and his wife Remitha of Cincinnati, Ohio sold Elizabeth Wormley Browne lot number thirteen in square 527 on August 22, 1859 for the sum of \$300.²⁷ Other such examples include John F. Cook, a schoolmaster and Presbyterian minister, who sold lot number six in square 198 on north K Street to Joseph H. Bradley on May 21, 1850, so that Cook could pay a debt to Charles Bradley.²⁸ One sizable transaction was made on July 13, 1858 when Carter and Josephine Stewart sold part of lot eleven in square 494 for \$1200 to W. F. Check.²⁹

These free Negro owners of property not only were interested in buying and selling lots and houses, but were also intent upon

²² Liber AT no. 44, p. 210.

²³ Liber WB no. 21, p. 194.

²⁴ Liber WB no. 18, p. 303.

²⁵ Liber WB no. 109, p. 265.

²⁶ Liber WB no. 142, p. 129.

²⁷ Liber JAS no. 185, p. 47.

²⁸ Liber JAS no. 12, p. 143.

²⁹ Liber JAS no. 158, p. 371.

protecting their holdings. On December 20, 1831 William Costin took out an insurance policy from the Protection Insurance Company for \$600.50. Three hundred dollars of the policy went to cover the household furniture, while the remainder was against loss or damage by fire on a one-story frame house. Later, on April 12, 1842, Costin took out a \$250 policy from the Firemen's Insurance Company of Washington and Georgetown; this policy was on his two-story house on A Street, south between New Jersey Avenue and 1st Street east. It covered his household and kitchen furniture. In a will in his own hand, dated on August 31, 1831, Costin bequeathed to his wife and family a number of houses, including lot number seventeen in square 688, which he had purchased for \$610 in 1830 from Robert S. Bickley of Pennsylvania.³⁰

For a free Negro to own property in Washington, he had to have an adequate income which meant some sort of occupation. In the first Washington City directory, published in 1822, there are listed the names and occupations of free colored adults. Some of these occupations were as follows: cobbler, carpenter, hairdresser, barber, waiter, messenger, blacksmith, sexton, tailor, bricklayer, hackman, and pastor.³¹

Several free colored men owned and operated their own businesses in the downtown sections of Washington. Among them were John Browne, father of Professor Hugh Browne, who kept a fruit store on Pennsylvania Avenue between 14th and 15th Streets as early as 1834, and Absalom W. Shadd, who operated a restaurant on the corner of 6th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Shadd succeeded Benjamin Snow, who had been prominent in the Snow riot of 1835. Later Shadd sold his restaurant in the 1850's for \$25,000 and moved to Canada with his family. Alfred Cook managed the Hope Club Hotel around 1845 on F Street between 14th and 15th streets; Alfred Lee had started a feed business at 2906 M Street, N.W. in Georgetown around 1830; Charles Datcher owned a shoemaking business at 15th Street near F Street; while William Butler maintained a similar

³⁰ Protection Insurance Company Policy, December 30, 1831; Firemen's Insurance Company of Washington and Georgetown Policy, April 12, 1842; and Will dated August 3, 1831, Private Papers of George Costin Williams, great-great-grandson of William Costin, Washington, D. C.

³¹ *The Washington Directory* (Washington, 1822).

shop on Pennsylvania Avenue between 17th and 18th streets, N.W.³²

In the decade 1850-1860 the economic status of the free Negro population rose considerably. More varied and different occupations were listed in official sources, such as meal huckster, cutler, feed merchant, gardener, steward, engineer, seamstress, nurse, musician, teacher, mechanic, baker, restaurant owner, and stevedore. Many also owned real estate valued from \$300 to \$4,300. Alfred Jones, a meal huckster, had an estate valued at \$1,000, while James Wright, a barber, possessed property valued at \$2,500.³³ Ann M. Lucas held property valued at \$2,000, while Francis Datcher, a messenger in the War Department, had an estate valued at \$2,100. One of the most affluent colored men of the time was Alfred Lee, a feed merchant whose estate was valued at \$4,000.³⁴ In the federal census of 1850 a number of persons were listed with no occupations but were evidently living on their incomes. Others styled themselves as laborers. This category doubtlessly included many who were engaged in private business. The law, designed to prohibit Negro business and enterprise, was hardly, if ever, enforced, if we take into consideration the number of caterers, restaurant owners and managers of hotels in this period.

The last federal census taken before the Civil War showed a substantial gain in the value of real estate owned by free Negroes. In the first three wards of Washington there were several colored persons who owned property in excess of \$3,000. Alfred Lee, the feed merchant, had increased his real estate holdings to a value of \$8,000 with a personal estate valued at \$23,000; Lindsay Muse, a messenger, held property worth \$6,000; John Cook, son of the Reverend John F. Cook, owned real estate with a value of \$5,000; Louisa Wormley's estate was valued at \$4,000; James Wormley's holdings were valued at \$4,000 and a personal estate valued at \$1,000; while Alfred Jones's personal estate was valued at \$10,400.³⁵

In wards 4 to 7 there were other property holders who were equally well off. John West, a plasterer, held real estate valued

³² Andrew F. Hilyer, *The Twentieth Century Union League Directory* (Washington, 1901), pp. 8-10, 44.

³³ *Seventh Federal Census*, 1850, vol. 1, pp. 42 and 50.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 114 and 138.

³⁵ *Eighth Federal Census*, 1860, vol. 1, pp. 3, 25, 124, 149, and 202.

at \$6,500; Benjamin McCoy, a sexton, \$4,800; Ann Costin, a seamstress, \$6,000; Harriet Carroll, a nurse, \$5,000; and John Gibson, who listed his occupation as fishing, \$12,000 worth of personal estate and \$1,200 of real estate.³⁶ One woman, Catherine Savoy, of the County of Washington (north of the boundary line, now Florida Avenue, N.W.) owned a dairy farm which was valued at \$4,000, and had a personal estate worth \$1,000.³⁷

With an increase in the economic strength of the free Negro, there was a corresponding increase in the number of private schools set up for the education of the children of this class. Between 1807 and 1861 no less than fifty-two colored day schools were opened; twelve were supported by white sponsors, while the remaining forty were supported by colored sponsors.³⁸

Most of the schools lacked formal organization. Two exceptions were the Columbian Institute which was governed by a board of trustees and the Union Seminary which had a three-year course of study. Many of the schools were held in private residences and in church basements. By 1861 it is estimated that there were 1,200 colored pupils enrolled in these schools.³⁹

With few exceptions most of the teachers did not compare in preparation to those of post-Civil War Washington. There were, however, a few well-educated teachers, such as John F. Cook, Jr., George F. T. Cook, and James H. Mason, who were all educated at Oberlin College in Ohio, and Dr. John H. Fleet, who attended the Lancastrian school with white children in Georgetown, and who later attended lectures at the old medical college on the corner of 10th and E Streets, N.W.⁴⁰

The public school system, with thirteen trustees, was established by the City Council on December 5, 1804. From its establishment the school system was maintained for white children only. No provisions were made for the public education of colored children, even though Negroes paid taxes for the maintenance of the schools. Realizing that the city fathers had no intention of educating the children of the free colored, a group

³⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 4, 71, 74, and 168.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

³⁸ Lillian G. Dabney, *The History of Schools for Negroes in the District of Columbia, 1807-1947* (Washington, 1949), p. 12.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-21.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

of former slaves, which included George Bell, Nicholas Franklin, and Moses Liverpool, erected and founded the first school for colored pupils in the District of Columbia on Capitol Hill in 1807. Since these three men were themselves illiterate, they engaged a white teacher named Lowe to instruct the pupils.⁴¹

Later another school had its opening announced in the *National Intelligencer* on August 27, 1818. This school was sponsored by the Resolute Beneficial Society of which William Costin was president; George Hicks, vice-president; James Harris, secretary; and George Bell, treasurer. The course of instruction included "reading, writing, arithmetic, English grammar, or other branches of education, applicable to their [the pupils'] capacities . . ." The terms were quoted as moderate, and it was specifically stated that "no writings are to be done by the teacher for a slave . . ." This provision was made, no doubt, for the express purpose of allaying the fears of the white citizens of Washington. Custom and law forbade this type of teaching to a slave.⁴²



John F. Cook. 1790-1855. Author's photograph.

⁴¹ Williams, *History of Negro*, p. 182.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 182.

Another school was started by Henry Smothers who built a school house in 1823 on the corner of 14th and H streets, N.W. His school was quite large and had an enrollment of a hundred to a hundred and fifty pupils. In 1825 John W. Prout took the school under his administration and called it the Columbian Institute. John F. Cook became the headmaster in 1834 and renamed it the Union Seminary. Cook was a remarkable man, who, in spite of personal hardships, maintained a thriving school and became the first licensed colored Presbyterian minister in Washington. Originally a slave, Cook's freedom had been purchased in 1826 by his aunt, Alethia Tanner. Cook had learned the shoemaking trade, but entered the Land Office in 1831 as an assistant messenger. Three years later he resigned his position to devote himself to study and education.⁴³

Interestingly, John F. Cook's school contained a male and a female department. Its enrollment averaged around fifty-three scholars. Some of the subjects taught were composition, scripture, reading, recitation, the manual of morals, lectures on physiology, the teeth, the respiratory organs, and the skin. The school's fourteenth annual examination was given on July 29, 1850.⁴⁴ After the death of John F. Cook in 1855 his school was continued by his son, John F. Cook, Jr., until May 1857. From May 1857 to July 1859 the school was managed by George F. T. Cook, who moved it from the Smothers school house to the basement of the 15th Street Presbyterian Church.⁴⁵

Another early school, April 1833 to 1843, was administered by James Enoch Ambush. It was a large school, and first met in the basement of Israel Bethel Church on Capitol Hill and then in various other places. In 1843 Ambush built a school in Southwest Washington and established the Wesleyan Seminary which remained in operation until August 1865.

The first seminary for colored girls in the District of Columbia was established in Georgetown in 1827 under the auspices of Father Vanlomen, pastor of the Holy Trinity Church. The seminary was administered by Maria Becraft, who had been educated in private schools in Washington and

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 182-185.

⁴⁴ Diary of John F. Cook, January 1850-March 1851, entries April 5 and 19; June 6, 7, and 10; July 29; November 29; and December 6, 1850. MSS in Howard University Library, Washington, D.C.

⁴⁵ Williams, *History of Negro*, p. 191.

Georgetown. Maria Becraft's father was for many years chief steward of the Union Hotel, and her grandmother, a free colored woman, was the housekeeper of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. This unusual young woman had earlier in 1820, at the age of fifteen, opened a school for girls in Georgetown on Dumbarton Street. Her seminary in Georgetown averaged thirty to thirty-five pupils.

One of the best known schools for colored girls in this period was Miss Myrtilla Miner's seminary. After being originally located on 11th Street near New York Avenue in 1851, the year of its origin, the school was finally moved to a lot comprising an entire square of three acres on New Hampshire Avenue between 19th and 20th Streets. The school had one teacher, Myrtilla Miner, and her assistant. It was housed in a two-story, small frame building. The course of study included lectures on scientific and literary subjects which were given by authorities in these fields. Each pupil had space for a flower bed which she cultivated with her own hands. There was a library containing a collection of paintings and engravings, the leading magazines and newspapers, maps, globes, and material pertaining to philosophical, chemical, and mathematical subjects. The Seminary had a wide reputation and received many distinguished visitors from official Washington. Some of these visitors included Mrs. Means, aunt of the wife of President Pierce, William Seward and his family, and many other Congressmen.⁴⁶

Religion played a prominent role in the lives of the free Negroes of Washington. In contemporary America the eleven o'clock Sunday service reveals a rather rigid segregated pattern. Such was not the case in Washington during its very early history. Until 1820, with few exceptions, white and colored Washingtonians worshipped in the same churches. As late as 1845 colored members continued to be received into fellowship at the Tenth Street Baptist Church. This policy was maintained even after a majority of the colored members had left the old First Baptist Church in 1839. Up to 1861 there were still Negro members in nearly all the white churches in Washington.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 194-201.

⁴⁷ Lucille W. Wilkinson, "Early Baptists in Washington," *Records of the Columbia Historical Society*, Vol. 30 (December, 1925), pp. 246, and 254-255.

What were the principal reasons that caused Negro worshippers to leave 'white' churches and to organize their own? In many churches colored members were relegated to the balconies and were not allowed to participate in the social affairs or to hold church offices. In one church colored members left rather than submit to the religious counsel of their slaveholding minister; in another one the white minister refused to hold colored babies in his arms for baptism; and in still another, colored members had to enter by an outside gallery.

In the District of Columbia one of the oldest Negro churches is the Israel Metropolitan Christian M.E. Church which was founded in December, 1820. Israel C.M.E. Church grew out of the white Ebenezer Church. It was originally known as the Israel Bethel Church of Washington. Among its original members were Basil Simms, Moses Liverpool, Nicholas Franklin, George Bell, Ann Nichols, Walter Humphries, Harriet Beans, William Costin, William A. Nichols, Scipio Beans, and John Francis Cook. Of the above members in the organizational movement, Basil Simms, George Bell, and John F. Cook were elected to the Church's first board of trustees in 1838. The Reverend David Smith served as the first pastor of Israel Bethel Church. Other well-known pastors of this early Negro church were D. A. Payne, Michael F. Sluby, John Cornish, William Cornish, and Clayton Durham.⁴⁸ Many of the prominent Negroes of Capital Hill and Southwest Washington associated themselves with Israel Metropolitan C.M.E. Church.

The Negro Baptists of Washington founded their First Colored Baptist Church on August 29, 1839. This church was composed of former members of the white First Baptist Church. Moses Clayton was chosen as the first moderator in August, 1839, while Sampson White was unanimously elected as its first pastor. In October, 1840 the First Colored Baptist Church (the Nineteenth Street Baptist Church) became a member of the Philadelphia Baptist Association.⁴⁹

In 1836 the Asbury Methodist Church was officially organized when a frame building named in honor of Bishop Asbury was

⁴⁸ Bishop C. H. Phillips, *Official Church History of the Israel Metropolitan C. M. E. Church* (Washington, 1957), p. 7.

⁴⁹ William I. Lee, Sr., *Nineteenth Street Baptist Church, One Hundredth Anniversary, 1839-1939* (Washington, 1939).

erected on the corner of 11th and K Street, N.W. Asbury Methodist grew out of Foundry Methodist Church which had been organized in 1814. In 1817 there were 172 white and 118 Negro members of Foundry Methodist, but by 1827 Negro membership had increased to 176. It was not until 1833, however, that Negro members were represented on the Official Board. On September 27, 1833 Eli Nugent was granted an exhorter's license, and in 1840 he received deacon's and elder's orders. From 1836 to 1863 the trustees of Asbury Methodist were both white and colored. The pastors, who were white, were assisted by local colored ministers. Asbury's Sunday school was organized by the Reverend John F. Cook and Benjamin M. McCoy, one of the trustees. In 1845 a brick church was erected which cost about \$15,000. By 1854 membership had varied from fifty to seventy-five persons.⁵⁰

Colored Presbyterians of Washington also organized the First Colored Presbyterian Church of Washington on November 21, 1841. In the previous month John F. Cook was received as a licentiate by the Presbytery of the District of Columbia. Later this new group was received into the District of Columbia Presbytery on May 3, 1842. Some of the church's original eighteen members were John F. Cook, David Carroll, Elizabeth Carroll, Charles Bruce, Ann Chew, Alfred Cook, and Eliza Stewart.⁵¹ At a later date the name of this church was changed to the Fifteenth Street Presbyterian Church.

The Reverend John F. Cook preached his trial sermon at the Fourth Presbyterian Church. This was a momentous period in the history of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, for it was the first time that a colored Presbyterian minister had preached a trial sermon in Washington. In the face of threats to pull down the church the pastor, John C. Smith, stood firm and Cook became a licentiate.⁵²

In the year 1861 the colored churches of Washington and Georgetown numbered about twelve. They served not only as centers of religious worship and instruction for young and old

⁵⁰ Harry J. Robinson, "History of Asbury Methodist Church," *Asbury Methodist Church, 1836-1956, Souvenir Book* (Washington, 1956), pp. 19-22.

⁵¹ John W. Cromwell, "The First Negro Churches in the District of Columbia," *The Journal of Negro History*, Vol. 7 (Jan., 1922), pp. 80-83.

⁵² J. T. Kelley, "The Reverend John C. Smith, D.D.," *Records of the Columbia Historical Society*, Vol. 24 (May, 1920), pp. 130-131.

alike, but as centers where the free Negro could meet and express himself on current issues. During the administration of Andrew Jackson, the first Negro Conference to meet in Washington was held in the Israel Bethel Church. The first Negro ministers' union in Washington was organized by Bishop Payne, John F. Cook, and Levi Collins.

In addition to the church as a center for social welfare, there existed among the free people of color in Washington several social and beneficial organizations. Among the colored women of Washington there was a Colored Female Roman Catholic Beneficial Society which functioned as early as 1828. It specifically stated in its rules that membership was restricted to *free* colored women and descendants of *free* colored women. Members were chosen by ballot; a fifty cents entrance fee was required for membership; and monthly dues of 12½ cents were paid. Benefits of one dollar per week up to six months were provided, and if a member had been eighteen months in the Society, she was entitled to free burial.⁵³

On November 25, 1825, the Columbian Harmony Society was organized. Its first officers were Francis Datcher, president; William Costin, vice-president; John B. Hutton, secretary; and William Jackson, treasurer. This society operated and administered a cemetery for the burial of free Negroes. In December, 1850 Enoch Ambush founded an anti-tobacco society in the Fifteenth Street Presbyterian Church.⁵⁴ Anthony Bowen had the distinction in 1853 of organizing the first colored Y.M.C.A. in Washington.⁵⁵ There was also a Southwest building association which was known as the Island Colored Building Association. Its trustees were Enoch Ambush, Palmer Briscoe, and Samuel Payne.⁵⁶

That the free colored population was by no means devoid of intellectual interests is evident when we examine an early document, dated October 17, 1833. This document is entitled "Exhibition number one, 'For the Benefit of a Young Man, about to Disenthrall Himself from Slavery'." Some of the topics

⁵³ *Rules and Regulations of the Colored Female Roman Catholic Beneficial Society of Washington* (July, 1828), pp. 2, 3, and 6.

⁵⁴ Diary of John F. Cook, entry of December 1, 1850.

⁵⁵ Carter G. Woodson, *The Negro In our History* (Washington, 1927), p. 453.

⁵⁶ Liber JAS 171, p. 242.

discussed were as follows: "On Slavery and Freedom", by Edwin Freeman; "Plato, on Immortality of the Soul", by James Wright; "Indignant Sentiments on National Prejudices, Hatred and Slavery", by Alfred Jones; "Epilogue to Addison's Catoe", by Eli E. Nugent; "General Description of America", by John Freeman, Jr.; and "American Sages. An Address on Eloquence", by John T. Johnson. John F. Cook was manager of the exhibition and Benjamin C. Freeman, assistant manager. Admission was 12½ cents.⁵⁷

A number of free colored Washingtonians were active in the anti-slavery movement. Elizabeth Savoy, wife of Edward Savoy, a successful caterer, worked with the underground railway and helped slaves to make their way northward to Canada and freedom. On the other hand, there were those free Negroes who, like their white brethren, owned slaves. Many of these slaves were relatives whom the latter had purchased from white slaveholders. When Congress abolished slavery in the District of Columbia in April, 1862, among some of those receiving compensation were a number of colored slaveholders. One colored man received \$2,168 for ten slaves, and another \$832 for two slaves.⁵⁸

Unlike contemporary Washington, discrimination in the pre-Civil War period against free Negroes was widespread in places of public accommodation, viz., restaurants, hotels and taverns. From several sources we learn that free Negroes were admitted to the legitimate theatre but not to restaurants, bars, and hotels. One exception was Shadd's restaurant where John F. Cook often used to take his meals. Free Negroes were not allowed to sit beside white persons on the omnibuses, the predecessors of the horsedrawn streetcars. When the latter replaced the omnibuses, Negroes were required to stand on the platform with the conductor. Not until 1865 was discrimination on public conveyances abolished.

As early as 1821 Negroes were admitted to the legitimate theatre. In August of that year a new theatre was erected on Louisiana Avenue between Four-and-one-half and Sixth Streets.

⁵⁷ *Exhibition Number One, For the Benefit of a Young Man, about to Disenthrall Himself from Slavery* (October 17, 1833), Frances Datcher, MSS, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

⁵⁸ *Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.), March 3, 1894.



William Syphax. 1825-1891. Author's photograph.

Separate boxes were provided for colored persons.⁵⁹ Again in 1833, we see that colored patrons were freely admitted to and comprised a large proportion of the audience of a local theatre. In a letter dated July 15, 1833 from Joseph Jefferson, lessee of the Washington Theatre, to the City Council we find that the former asked for a modification of the curfew law, in order that the theatre might receive the full support of the colored population. This request was motivated from economic interests, for the theatre managers were paying a tax of \$6 a night to the city for use of their theatres.⁶⁰

When we compare residential segregation in Washington today with residential patterns in pre-Civil War Washington, we find that free Negroes were not as rigidly segregated as might have been previously imagined. In fact, hundreds of colored families lived in neighborhoods that were mixed or predomi-

⁵⁹ Aloysius I. Mudd, "Early Washington Theatres," *Records of the Columbia Historical Society*, Vol. 5 (1902), p. 77.

⁶⁰ Jeannie Tree Rives, "Old Families and Houses—Greenleaf's Point," *Records of the Columbia Historical Society*, Vol. 5 (1902), pp. 58-59.

nantly white. Very few neighborhoods were solidly black as exist today in Washington. Relations between white and colored were generally good in mixed neighborhoods, and children of both groups played together in harmony.⁶¹

From official records and information obtained from descendants of some of the free Negroes of Washington we find that many were able to read and write and had children who were attending school. Many of the free people of color were born in the District of Columbia. Others came to Washington from nearby Maryland and Virginia. Some of these people were children or descendants of the most aristocratic white families of Maryland and Virginia. In a few isolated cases some of the free colored men and women married white persons and lived together in the city. In some families there was an admixture of American Indian blood, and one well-known family regarded themselves for many years as having no Negro blood, and attributed their dark complexion to Indian ancestry.

Within Washington a large number of free colored men were engaged in successful businesses, and many of this class were highly respected by the white community. As evidence of this we refer to a statement by S. Burch, Justice of the Peace in Washington, dated April 1836: ". . . I have known intimately the . . . man William Costin and I do state that a more upright, honorable and reputable man of colour has not during that period resided within this city. . . ."⁶² In the *Washington National Intelligencer* of June 1, 1842, there is the following obituary to William Costin. "Died, very suddenly . . . William Costin, free colored man, aged 62 years. The deceased filled the situation of Porter to the bank⁶³ during the long period of twenty-four years, and his service therein was characterized by the most unflinching integrity and remarkable punctuality in the performance of his various duties . . ."⁶⁴

Similarly, we find that Francis Datcher, a messenger in the War Department, was honored by Secretaries of War on several occasions. Datcher began his long career during the administration of Andrew Jackson and served in that capacity until his

⁶¹ *Seventh and Eighth Federal Censuses*, and information obtained from private citizens.

⁶² Character reference, Private Papers of George C. Williams, Washington, D.C.

⁶³ Bank of Washington.

⁶⁴ *National Intelligencer*, June 1, 1842.

death in February, 1862. From John B. Floyd of Virginia he received a large Bible bound in red morocco, lettered in gold and resting on a mahogany stand. Jefferson Davis, who later became President of the Confederacy, presented Datcher an ebony cane with a silverhead inscribed 'from Jefferson Davis to Francis Datcher'. This cane was handed personally to Datcher by Secretary of War Davis.⁶⁵

No history of Washington could be written without some mention of James Wormley. This remarkable and prosperous businessman began his career driving a carriage for his father. In this job he became acquainted with many white businessmen and was selected to take charge of a popular clubhouse on G Street, N.W., near the War Department. His reputation as a steward was renown. After the Civil War Wormley opened his own hotel on 15th and H Street, N.W.⁶⁶

As a final remark we can state categorically that the school-teachers, doctors, lawyers, ministers, businessmen, and civil servants, who achieved important positions in Washington after 1865, were for the most part leaders in the ante-bellum free colored community or descendants of this class. It is thus evident that in 1865, when slavery had at last been abolished in the United States and the rebellious southern states had been defeated, the colored population of Washington was adequately represented by a capable leadership of persons who had served in such capacities before the Civil War. No longer can it be said that the Negro in Washington at the close of the Civil War was illiterate, poverty-stricken, and without adequate leadership. This survey refutes this theory and attempts to reveal an enlightened group of Negro people who have generally been ignored or overlooked.

⁶⁵ Ellen L. Fisher to Carter Woodson, October 21, 1929, Carter Woodson Papers, Library of Congress.

⁶⁶ *The Evening Star*, October 18, 1884.

MASTER'S THESES AND DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN MARYLAND HISTORY

Compiled by DOROTHY M. BROWN AND RICHARD R. DUNCAN

PART II

—G—

- Garber, Marie Macaulay, E. Brooke Lee Vs. Charter: The Fight to Modernize Montgomery County Government, 1938-1950, M.A., George Washington, 1964.
- Gardner, G. Page, A Study of Public Education in Howard Country, Maryland, M.A., Maryland, 1926.
- Garitee, Jerome Randolph, Maryland on the Eve of the War of 1812, M.A., American, 1963.
- Gatchel, Theodore Dodge, Early's Raid on Washington, June-July, 1864, M.A., American, 1933.
- Geiger, Mary Virginia, S.S.N.D., Daniel Carroll: A Frammer of the Constitution, Ph.D., Catholic, 1943.
- Geoghegan, Sally B. I., The Political Career of Joseph I. France of Maryland, 1906-1921, M.A., Maryland, 1954.
- Gerrity, Mary John, Sister, The Growth and Development of Catholic Secondary Education for Girls in Baltimore and Vicinity from Colonial Times to the Present, M.A., Catholic, 1942.
- Gibson, Laurita, Sister, Catholic Women of Colonial Maryland, M.A., Catholic, 1939.
- Gibson, Mary Ellen Snyder, The Physiographic History of the Washington County, Maryland, M.S., George Washington, 1929.
- Giddens, Paul H., The Public Career of Horatio Sharpe, Governor of Maryland, 1753-1769, Ph.D., State Univ. of Iowa, 1930.
- Gienger, Guy W., A Comparative Study of Maryland Agriculture, M.A., Maryland, 1936.
- Gleissner, Richard A., The Establishment of a Royal Government in Maryland: A Study of Crown Policy and Provincial Politics, 1680-1700, Ph.D., Maryland, 1968.

- Goldman, Eric Frederick, *The Early Political Career of Charles J. Bonaparte*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1938.
- Goll, Eugene W., *The Poe Amendment's Defeat: Maryland Voters Reject the Negro Disfranchisement Movement, 1903-1905*, M.A., Maryland, 1967.
- Gould, Clarence Pembroke, *The Land System in Maryland, 1720-1765*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1911 (Repr in *J.H.U. in Hist. and Pol. Sci.*, ser. 31, no. 1).
- Gould, Joseph Glenn, *The Decline of Puritanism in Maryland*, M.A., Maryland, 1935.
- Green, Harry Joseph, *A Study of the Legislature of the State of Maryland with Special Reference to the Session of 1927*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1927.
- Grimes, Elizabeth, John Angle James Creswell, M.A., Columbia, 1939.
- Griswold, Ardyce Marion, *A History of the Columbia Union College Library, Takoma Park, Maryland, 1904-1964*, MLS, Catholic, 1964.

—H—

- Haeuser, John R., *The Maryland Convention, 1774-1776*, M.A., Georgetown, 1968.
- Hagensick, A. Clarke, *Maryland's Legislative Council in Action*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1960.
- Haigley, Marie de Chantal, S.S.N.D., *Severn Teackle Wallis: Protagonist of Reform*, M.A., Catholic, 1965.
- Hales, Charles Albert, *The Baltimore Clearing House*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1938.
- Haller, Mark Hughlin, *The Rise of the Jackson Party in Maryland*, M.A., 1954.
- Halsey, Columbia E., *The Life of Samuel Eccleston, Fifth Archbishop of Baltimore, 1801-1851*, M.A., Catholic, 1963.
- Hand, George E., *The Sons of Temperance in Maryland, 1842-1860*, M.A., Maryland, 1941.
- Hanley, Thomas O'Brien, *The Impact of the American Revolution on Religion in Maryland, 1776-1800*, Ph.D., Georgetown, 1961.
- Hanna, Hugh Sisson, *A Financial History of Maryland (1789-1848)*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1906 (Repr. in *J.H.U. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Sci.*, ser. 25, nos. 8-10).

- Harley, Robert B., *The Land System in Colonial Maryland*, Ph.D., State Univ. of Iowa, 1948.
- Harrington, Mary Brendan, O.P., *The First Charles Carroll in Maryland*, M.A., Catholic, 1957.
- Harry, James Warner, *The Maryland Constitution of 1851*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1902 (Repr. in *J.H.U. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Sci.*, ser. 20, nos. 7-8).
- Hart, Ethel Juanita, *Negro Suffrage in Maryland*, M.A., Howard, 1934.
- Hart, Richard K., *Maryland's Maritime Enterprises during the American Revolution*, M.A., Maryland, 1947.
- Hartdagen, Gerald Eugene, *The Anglican Vestry in Colonial Maryland*, Ph.D., Northwestern, 1965.
- Hartle, Reaford B., *The Teacher in Maryland since 1865*, M.A., Maryland, 1932.
- Harvey, Katherine Andrews, *The Coal Miners of Western Maryland: Some Economic and Social Developments, 1850-1910*, M.A., American, 1962.
- Hawkins, Hugh Dodge, *The Birth of a University: A History of the Johns Hopkins University from the Death of the Founder to the End of the First Year of Academic Work, 1873-1877*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1954.
- Heavill, Helen Aldena, *A Checklist of Maryland Imprints for the Year 1861 with a Historical Introduction*, MLS, Catholic, 1962.
- Helldorfer, Rita Marie, S.S.N.D., *The Gubernatorial Career of Albert Cabell Ritchie, Governor of Maryland, 1920-1935*, M.A., Catholic, 1955.
- Helldorfer, Teresa Marie, S.S.N.D., *The Editorial Opinion of the Baltimore Catholic Review on Contemporary Domestic and Foreign Affairs, 1913-1923*, M.A., Catholic, 1961.
- Henry, J. Maurice, *History of the Church of the Brethren (Dunkers) in Maryland*, Ph.D., George Washington, 1924.
- Hetzel, Frederick, *The French and Indian War in Maryland*, M.A., Maryland, 1932.
- Higgins, William Burton, *The University of Maryland and its Relation as a Training Institution to Maryland Rural Life, 1920-1936*, M.A., Maryland, 1937.
- High, James H., *Reluctant Loyalist, Governor Horatio Sharpe of Maryland, 1753-1769*, Ph.D., U.C.L.A., 1951.

- Hirschfeld, Charles, *The Rise of a City: Studies in the Social History of Baltimore, 1870-1900*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1939.
- Hlubb, Julius George, *An Analysis of Student Enrollment at The Baltimore City College, 1954-1965*, Ed.D., George Washington, 1965.
- Hoage, James Alden, *The Establishment of the Church of England in Maryland*, M.A., George Washington, 1966.
- Hoffman, Morton, *Changes in Baltimore's Housing, 1949-1950: with special Reference to the Role of Government*, M.A., American, 1953.
- Hottel, John Z., *Loyalism in Maryland*, M.A., Maryland, 1931.
- Howard, Addis James, *Maryland Privateers and Navy in the American Revolution*, M.A., Maryland, 1942.
- Howell, William Rabon, *The Government of Kent County, Maryland*, Ph.D., American, 1929.
- Huashalter, Kenan, Brother, *The Descendants of Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, M.A., Catholic, 1944.
- Hull, William Issac, *Maryland, Independence and the Confederation*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1892 (Repr. in *Md. Hist. Soc. Fund. Pub.*, no. 31).
- Hutcheson, Harold Houston, *Tenche Coxe: A Study in American Economic Development*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1936.
- Hutzel, Willard Joseph, *Political Clubs in Suburbia: A Case Study of Club Politics in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland*, Ph.D., Maryland, 1966.
- Hyland, Mary Imelda, Sister, *Governor Thomas Sim Lee, A Maryland Patriot*, M.A., Catholic, 1944.

—I—

- Ireland, Robert Michael, *The Legal Career of William Pinkney, 1764-1822*, Ph.D., Univ. of Nebraska, 1967.
- Isaac, Erich, *The First Century of Settlement of Kent Island*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1957.
- Ives, J. Russell, *The Status and Trend of Agricultural Cooperation in Maryland, 1900-1936*, M.S., Maryland, 1937.

—J—

- Jacob, Grace Hill, *The Negro in Baltimore, 1860-1900*, M.A., Howard, 1945.

- James, Bartlett Burleigh, *The Labadist Colony in Maryland*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1897 (Repr. in *J.H.U. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Sci.*, ser. 17, no. 6).
- Jenkins, Blanche Leora, *Public Education in Maryland, 1868-1875*, M.A., Maryland, 1940.
- Jenkins, David S., *A History of Colored Schools in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, and A Proposal for their Consolidation*, M.A., Maryland, 1942.
- Jeness, S. M., *The Development of Public Education in Cecil County, Maryland*, M.A., Maryland, 1929.
- Johnson, Keach D., *The Establishment of the Baltimore Company: A Case Study of the American Iron Industry in the Eighteenth Century*, Ph.D., State Univ. of Iowa, 1949.
- Jones, Wilbur A., *Land Grants under the Proprietary Government in Maryland, 1633-1775*, M.A., Maryland, 1937.
- Jordan, David William, *The Royal Period of Colonial Maryland, 1689-1715*, Ph.D., Princeton, 1966.

-K-

- Kahn, R., *A History of the Peabody Institute Library, Baltimore, Maryland, 1857-1916*, MLS, Catholic, 1953.
- Karinen, Arthur E., *Numerical and Distributional Aspects of Maryland, 1631-1840*, Ph.D., Maryland, 1958.
- Karraker, Cyrus H., *A Comparative Study of the Sheriff in England and the Chesapeake Colonies, 1607-1689*, Ph. D., Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1927.
- Kartendick, James Joseph, *The History of St. Mary's College, Baltimore, 1799-1852*, M.A., Catholic, 1942.
- Keane, James Patrick, *The Status of Catholics in Maryland, 1689-1760*, M.A., Catholic, 1950.
- Kekan, Joseph F., S.M., *James Cardinal Gibbons and the Press*, M.A., Catholic, 1949.
- Kent, George Robert, *The Negro in Politics in Dorchester County, Maryland, 1920-1960*, M.A., Maryland, 1961.
- Kidder, Paul S., *The Federal Probation Office for the District of Maryland*, M.A., American, 1963.
- King, Sarah B., *A Checklist of Maryland Imprints from 1847 through 1849, with a Historical Introduction*, MLS, Catholic, 1954.

- Kinnaman, John A., *The Internal Revenues of Colonial Maryland*, Ph.D., Indiana, 1955.
- Kirby, Madge, *A History of the Goucher College Library Baltimore, Maryland, 1885-1949*, MLS, Catholic, 1952.
- Klein, Sarah, J., *The History and Present Status of the Library of St. John's College, Annapolis*, MLS, Catholic, 1952.
- Koudelka, Janet B., *A History of the Johns Hopkins Medical Libraries, 1889-1935: A Chapter in the Medical Library Movement in the United States*, MLS, Catholic, 1963.
- Krabill, Verlin C., *A History of Education of Frederick County, Maryland*, M.A., Maryland, 1929.
- Krausse, Harry William, *History of Public Education in Baltimore*, M.A., Maryland, 1943.
- Kubula, Mary Fulginetta, Sister, *The Career of James Roosevelt Bayley, First Bishop of Newark, Eighth Bishop of Baltimore*, M.A., Catholic, 1942.

—L—

- Land, Aubrey C., *Daniel Dulany the Elder: A Study in Achievement*, Ph.D., State Univ. of Iowa, 1948.
- Lander, Carol Elizabeth, *Montgomery Junior College—A Case Study of Community Service*, M.A., George Washington, 1966.
- Latane, John H., *The Early Relations between Maryland and Virginia*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1895 (Repr. in *J.H.U. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Sci.*, ser. 13, nos. 3-4).
- Lauchheimer, Malcolm H., *Labor Law of Maryland*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1917 (Repr. in *J.H.U. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Sci.*, ser. 37, no. 2).
- Lekan, Joseph F., S.M., *James Cardinal Gibbons and the Press*, M.A., Catholic, 1949.
- Les Callette, Millard Grant, *A Study of the Recruitment of the Union Army in the State of Maryland, 1861-1865*, M.S., Johns Hopkins, 1954.
- Livingood, James W., *The History of the Commercial Rivalry between Philadelphia and Baltimore for the Trade of the Susquehanna Valley, 1780-1860*, Ph.D., Princeton, 1937.
- Loevy, Robert Dickinson, *Baltimore Votes: 1948-1959*, M.A., Johns Hopkins, 1959.

- Loevy, Robert Dickinson, Political Behavior in the Baltimore Metropolitan Area, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1963.
- Love, Anne Gordon, A Century of Agricultural Progress in a Rural Community: Sandy Spring, Maryland, 1844-1949, M.A., Maryland, 1949.
- Luney, Alice Woodson, A Checklist of Maryland Imprints from 1841 through 1842 with a Historical Introduction, MLS, Catholic, 1959.

-M-

- McCarthy, Harry Bryan, A History of Dental Education in Maryland, M.A., Maryland, 1948.
- McConville, Francis W., The History of Catholic Secondary Education in the Counties of the Western Shore of Maryland, M.A., Catholic, 1944.
- McCormac, Eugene I., White Servitude in Maryland, Ph.D., Yale, 1901.
- McDonnell, Francis R., An Inquiry into the History of Baltimore Catechism, M.A., Catholic, 1943.
- McNelis, Donald Thomas, The Maryland State Teachers Colleges: A Status Study, 1962-1963, Ed.D., George Washington, 1963.
- Maganzin, Louis, Economic Depression in Maryland and Virginia, 1783-1787, Ph.D., Georgetown, 1967.
- Marchall, John P., C.S.V., Francis Patrick Kenrick, 1851-1863: The Baltimore Years, Ph.D., Catholic, 1965.
- Maring, Norman Hill, The Background of the Establishment of the Anglican Church in Maryland, M.A., Maryland, 1943.
- Marks, Bayly Ellen, Royal Maryland: The First Critical Decade, 1692-1702, M.A., Virginia, 1967.
- Marth, William Conroy, The History of Education in Talbot County, Maryland, to 1865, M.A., Maryland, 1940.
- Martin, Thomas Carlyle, The Junior High School Movement with Special Reference to the High School Situation in Maryland, M.A., Maryland, 1926.
- Maser, Ruth Goldwater, Personalized Justice in the Juvenile Court of Baltimore City, M.A., Johns Hopkins, 1955.
- Meiring, Bernard Julius, Educational Aspects of the Legislation of the Councils of Baltimore, 1829-1884, Ph.D., Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, 1963.

- Meredith, Everett, *Propaganda and Maryland's Entrance into the American Revolution*, M.A., Maryland, 1936.
- Mereness, Newton D., *Maryland as a Proprietary Province*, Ph.D., Columbia, 1902.
- Mester, Edmund C., *The Constitutional Position of the Legislature of Maryland*, M.A., Maryland, 1949.
- Middleton, Arthur P., Jr., *Along the Tobacco Coast: the Maritime Life of the Chesapeake Colonies, 1688-1763*, Ph.D., Harvard, 1947.
- Miller, Fred Lothar, *Religious Toleration in Colonial Maryland during the Period of the Royal Governors*, M.A., Maryland, 1935.
- Mitchell, Luther Craven, *The Attitude of the Baltimore Sun Papers toward the Negro from 1940-Pearl Harbor Attack*, M.A., Howard, 1944.
- Montgomery, Nancy C., *Maryland's Contribution to the Revolutionary War in Men and Supplies*, M.A., Catholic, 1955.
- Moore, John Phillips, Jr., *The Landed Gentry of Maryland: A Study of their Political Influence on Colonial Society, 1700-1710*, M.A., Maryland, 1964.
- Moran, Michal, *The Writings of Francis Patrick Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, (1797-1863)*, M.A., Catholic, n.d.
- Morrison, Vera Estelle, *A History of Higher Education under Maryland Protestant Denominational Auspices, 1780-1860*, Ed.D., George Washington, 1939.
- Morriss, Margaret S., *Maryland Trade during the Period of Royal Control*, Ph.D., Bryn Mawr, 1911.
- Morton, Joseph Chandler, *Stephen Bordley of Colonial Annapolis*, Ph.D., Maryland, 1964.
- Mowll, Jack Usher, *The Economic Development of Eighteenth Century Baltimore*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1956.
- Murphy, Robert B., *A Checklist of Maryland Imprints from 1831 through 1834, with a Historical Introduction*, MLS, Catholic, 1952.
- Murray, Mary Elizabeth, *History of Paper Money in the Maryland Colony*, M.A., Maryland, 1930.
- Murtha, Ronin John, O.S.B., *The Life of the Most Reverend Ambrose Maréchal, Third Archbishop of Baltimore, 1768-1828*, Ph.D., Catholic, 1965.

Myers, Gibbs, *Maryland Newspapers in the Eighteenth Century*, M.A., Maryland, 1931.

Myers, William Starr, *The Maryland Constitution of 1864*, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1900 (Repr. in *J.H.U. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Sci.*, ser. 19, nos. 8-9).

—N—

Nance, Nellie Ward, *Revegetation of a Denuded Area of Tidewater, Maryland, below the Great Falls of the Potomac after the Flood of March 19, 1936*, M.A., George Washington, 1938.

Nazarczuk, Marie, *Response of Maryland to the Compromise of 1850*, M.A., Maryland, 1965.

Newcomer, Joe Corby, *The Origin and Early History of Western Maryland College*, M.A., Maryland, 1941.

Nichols, Maurice Seymour, *A Study of the Decisions of the Highest State Court in Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia Relating to Public Education*, Ed.D., Maryland, 1959.

Nowland, Anne H., *Senator Joseph Irwin France and Foreign Affairs, 1920-1922*, M.A., Maryland, 1957.

—O—

Oberle, George Vincet, *The Contribution of the Society of St. Sulpice to Lay Education in the State of Maryland*, M.A., Maryland, 1943.

Oliver, Gerald E., *Causes for the Downfall of the Established Church in Maryland*, M.A., Maryland, 1931.

Olszewski, Doris Morgan, *Strike on the Baltimore and Ohio, 1877*, M.A., George Washington, 1952.

O'Neil, Maureen, *Checklist of Maryland Imprints for the Year 1860 with a Historical Introduction*, MLS, Catholic, 1963.

Otto, Robert L., *The Maryland Senatorial Election of 1950: Butler vs. Tydings*, M.A., Maryland, 1962.

Owings, Donnell M., *His Lordship's Favour: A Treatise on Office Holding in Maryland, 1633-1769*, Ph.D., Harvard, 1942.

Owings, Vivian B., *A History of the Library of Morgan State College from 1867 to 1939*, MLS, Catholic, 1952.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Edited by EDWARD G. HOWARD

PLAYS BY MARYLANDERS, 1870-1916

COMPILED BY EDGAR HEYL

LAMBERT, MARIE, see GALLY, DAVID B.

LANAHAN, JAMES, see MILLER, WILLIAM

LANE, ALEX MC GILL

Omar Khayyám; book and lyrics of a comic opera in 2 acts, by A. M. Lane. 45 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© Alex McGill Lane, Hagerstown, Md.; D:8600, May 28, 1906; 2c. May 28, 1906.

Tsi-an; by A. M. Lane.

© Alex McGill Lane, Hagerstown, Md.; D:8740, June 27, 1906.

LANGDON, W. H. and P. M. ALLISON

Conrad and Lizzette; a drama in 4 acts, by W. H. Langdon and P.M. Allison.

© W. H. Langdon and P. M. Allison, Baltimore; 1875:4325, Apr. 28.

Wrestling Joe; or, The bully of the mines, in a prologue and 4 acts, by W. H. Langdon and P. M. Allison.

© W. H. Langdon and P. M. Allison, Baltimore; 1871:3099, Apr. 10.

LEHMAYER, MAURICE J.

Appomattox; or, Love and war, a comic opera in 2 acts and 3 scenes, by M. J. Lehmayr. Typewritten.

© M. J. Lehmayr, Baltimore; 1892:23262, June 2; 2c. June 2.

LESTER, LISLE

Beryl; a melodrama in 5 acts, by L. Lester, from the Ledger story, Beryl's husband. Baltimore, 1874.

© Leslie Lester, Baltimore; 1874:8905, July 6.

LESTER and WILLIAMS

Hook and I; a burlesque comedy in 3 acts, by Lester and Williams.

© Lester and Williams, Baltimore; 1890:35527, Nov. 11.

Me and Jack; a burlesque comedy in 3 acts, by Lester and Williams.

© Lisle and Williams, Baltimore; 1890:35528, Nov. 11.

LEWIS, CHARLES E.

At 3 a. m.; by C. E. Lewis. [15] p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. July 10, 1909; D:16733; Charles E. Lewis, Baltimore.

Life (The) of Hiawatha; Indian passion play, adapted from Longfellow's poem, Hiawatha, in 6 scenes, by C. E. Lewis. 19 p. f°. Typewritten.

© 1c. July 9, 1913; D:33886; Charles E. Lewis, Baltimore.

LEWIS, JOHN WINDER

Across the ocean; a play in prologue and 5 acts, by J. W. Lewis.

© J. Winder Lewis, Baltimore; 1872:5110, May 16.

Benedict Arnold; a standard American drama in 5 acts, by J. W. Lewis.

© John Winder Lewis, Baltimore; 1875:775, Jan. 26.

LEWIS, JOHN WYNDER

Commoners (The); a comedy in 5 acts, by J. W. Lewis.

© John Wynder Lewis, Baltimore; D:192, Mar. 9, 1901.

King Koka-nut; or, The milk in the cocoanut, a dramatic composition in 4 acts, by J. W. Lewis.

© John Wynder Lewis, Baltimore; D:1583, Mar. 15, 1902.

LEWIS, WILLIAM ALBERT

Vampire (The); a realism in 1 act, by W. A. Lewis.

© William Albert Lewis, Baltimore; D:1621, Mar. 18, 1902.

Plays © in other states-5.

LINDHOLM, ALICE MAY, see CHASE, ALICE MAY

LINDLEY, HARRY

Moods and tenses; an original comedy in 4 acts, by H. Lindley.

© Harry Lindley, Elkton, Md.; D:288, Mar. 30, 1901.

Plays © in other states-6.

LIVINGSTON, BENJAMIN NATHANIEL

Independent (The) broker; 1 act playlet, by B. N. Livingston. 13 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Feb. 23, 1911; D:23549; Benjamin N. Livingston, Baltimore.

O'Mara's fate; a play in 3 acts and a prologue, by B. N. Livingston. [70] p. 4°. Typewritten.

© Benjamin Nathaniel Livingston, Baltimore; D:4951, Apr. 26, 1904; 2c. Nov. 5, 1906.

Sara's fate; 1 act comedy-drama, by B. N. Livingston. [26] p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Feb. 23, 1911; D:23490; Benjamin N. Livingston, Baltimore.

Schmalz Gesicht & company; musical comedy in 2 acts, book and lyrics by B. N. Livingston. 54 p. 4°. Typewritten. [Words only].

© 1c. Sept. 14, 1911; D:25271; B. N. Livingston, Baltimore. Plays © in other states-2.

LLOYD, A. PARLETT

Crank's retreat; comedy-drama in 4 acts, by A. P. Lloyd. Baltimore, Oliver W. Clay & co., Ltd., 1885. 85 p. 8°.

© A. Parlett Lloyd, Baltimore; 1885:8844, Apr. 15; 2c. May 18. *Drifting alone*; a comedy drama in a prologue and 4 acts, by A. P. Lloyd.

© A. Parlett Lloyd, Baltimore; 1884:14544, July 17.

LOGAN, OLIVE

Strucken [sic] (The) deer; by O. Logan.

© Olive Logan, Berwyn, Md.; 1899:56662, Sept. 5. Plays © in other states-36.

LORD, ALICE E.

Christopher Columbus; or, The Columbiad, a drama in 5 acts.

© Alice E. Lord, Baltimore; 1892:32455, Aug. 6.

Lord Raglin at the World's fair; a comedy in 4 acts, by A. E. Lord.

© Alice E. Lord, Baltimore; 1893:48748, Nov. 1.

Vision's (A) quest; a drama in 5 acts, representing the hopes and ambitions, the love, marriage, pleadings, discouragements, and achievements of Christopher Columbus, discoverer of America, by A. E. Lord. Baltimore, Cushing & co., 1899. 123 p. pl. 12°.

© Alice E. Lord, Baltimore; 1899:79190, Dec. 6; 2c. Dec. 23.

LORD, BESSIE EMORY

Call (The) of the banshee; a play in 1 act, by B. E. Lord. 23 p. 4°. Typewritten.

© 1c. Aug. 13, 1914; D:37916; Bessie Emory Lord, Glencoe, Md.

LOWRY, MARGARET E.

Doomed for life; a sensation [sic] drama in 5 acts, with original scenes, music, sensations, tableaux, and mechanical effects, by M. E. Lowry.

© Margaret E. Lowry, Baltimore; 1874:676, Jan. 21.

Truth; a sensation [sic] drama in 5 acts, by M. E. Lowry, with original scenes and music.

© Margaret E. Lowry, Baltimore; 1873:3088, Mar. 28.

Varveine; a sensational play in 5 acts, by M. E. Lowry.

© Margaret E. Lowry, Baltimore; 1873:11166, Sept. 30.

NOTES ON MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

By BAYLY ELLEN MARKS, Manuscripts Curator

THE SOCIETY has added many valuable manuscripts to its collections in the last quarter. While space prohibits a complete listing, the following collections are outstanding.

The Charles W. Booz & Sons Records, MS. 1671, have been an important addition to the collection of Baltimore business records. The accounts, day-books, time books, and hauling books of the shipbuilders and marine railway owners, located on Thames Street in Fells Point, give a clear picture of ship-building in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This collection was a gift of Elias W. Barthelow, Jr. for the Booz family, via Richard Randall, Sr. for the Society's Maritime Collection. The sixteen volumes cover the 1880-1949 period.

Mrs. Joseph L. Hughes has given a considerable amount of her late husband's material on the history of Harford County, Maryland to the Society. Among the manuscripts of interest in the *Joseph Hughes Harford County Collection*, MS. 1675, are the following: Harford County land documents, 1665-1868, a prescription book of Dr. John Archer, 1792-1793, the papers of the Bel Air Academy, 1829-1833, and Confederate military material from Atlanta, 1862-1863. Material on the Hall family includes additions to the accounts of Sheriff Aquilla Hall's store in Bush Town, 1756, 1775-1776. Also included are Revolutionary War militia subscription lists, Harford County tax lists for 1776, "Persons Taking the Oath of Allegiance in Maryland, 1778," accounts of the North East Forge, 1835-1838, and of the Principio Iron Works, 1826-1835, and the survey book of Thomas White, 1725-1744. The collection also contains a considerable amount of Hughes' own writings on the history of Harford County. The nine boxes cover the period between 1660-1965.

More material of the Latrobe family of Baltimore has been given to the Society in the form of the *John H. B. Latrobe Diaries*, MS. 1677, covering the years 1824-1840, by Mr. John

E. Semmes, Jr., the son of Latrobe's biographer. The diaries of the Baltimore lawyer and philanthropist cover the early years of his legal practice, and record legal business and fees as well as personal data and reflections concerning his colleagues before the bar. The volume for 1835-1840 is an abstract letterbook of his considerable correspondence. Three volumes cover the years of 1824-1840.

Through the generosity of Miss Jessie Snow of Baltimore, the records of the *League of Nations Association, Maryland Branch*, MS. 1674, of which Miss Snow was executive secretary, have been received. This extensive collection encompasses all the working records of the Association from 1928-1943, including the Annual Reports. There are also Miss Snow's reports, articles and speeches on the League of Nations General Assemblies in Geneva, which she attended in 1928 and 1932. Records of the United Nations Committee, 1942-1943, and some records of the United Nations Association, Maryland Branch, to 1951 are also included. A considerable body of material comprises the records of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, of which Miss Snow was executive secretary. Concerned with the effort to get the United States into World War II on the side of the Allies, it forms a valuable insight into American politics just prior to entry into World War II and into mobilization of the American public in 1942 and 1943. The ten boxes and five volumes cover the period between 1928-1951.

Recently the papers of Methodist clergyman *Fletcher E. Marine*, 1829-1889, MS. 1016.3, were separated from the larger collection of *Marine Papers*, MS. 1016, and were placed in a new listing. In 1879, the Rev. Fletcher Marine published a *Sketch by Rev. John Hersey*, a Methodist missionary who died in Baltimore in 1862. Included in Marine's papers is data concerning the publishing of the book, reviews, and a considerable portion of Hersey's correspondence, notebooks, and sermons. Beginning in 1829, Hersey's papers detail the life of the Methodist Church in the South and in the Middle Atlantic states. His letters to clergy and laymen dwell on the development of missions, the spiritual life of the church, and the upheaval within the church prior to the Civil War. Two boxes cover period of 1829-1889.

GENEALOGICAL NOTES

By MARY K. MEYER, Genealogical Librarian

THE MOST important genealogical collection in the Society's Library is that of the church records of Maryland. This collection consists of some 230 volumes with indexes and includes records of births, baptisms, marriages, burials and vestry proceedings. Among the denominations represented are Protestant Episcopal, Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Quaker, Roman Catholic, Unitarian, Moravian, Reformed, Evangelical and Lutheran.

Although we generally think of the earliest settlers of Maryland as being Roman Catholic, there was in fact a high percentage of Protestants, and these were followed shortly by a large number of Quakers. Many Roman Catholic records were destroyed just prior to and following the establishment of the Church of England as the state church in 1692. During this period services of the Roman Catholic Church were conducted clandestinely, and records, if kept at all, are few.

The Episcopalians, Quakers, and many of the German sects kept excellent records which have been well preserved. The Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians were indifferent record keepers because they differed in their attitude toward the sacraments. This resulted in records which are something less than the genealogist might desire.

Many of the entries in this collection date from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Inasmuch as vital records were not required by law to be recorded until more recent times, the church records remain the only source of such information for the early period.

Under an act of 1865, the clerk of the circuit court in each county and the clerk of the Court of Common Pleas in Baltimore City were required to record births and deaths. However, the records were kept indifferently or not at all, and the law was finally repealed. It was not until the 1890's that Maryland's present system of recording vital records became firmly established.

At this date, the collection has become the Society's most important genealogical record, and it is unmatched elsewhere. Throughout it has been the work of genealogists, members of various patriotic groups, and other interested and devoted volunteers. Copies in long hand (in many instances in German or a translation) have been made from original church registers, representing many years of painstaking work. The collection continues to grow and recently records of numerous churches of Washington County, Maryland have been added.

Because of its immense value to the genealogist, the collection is in constant use, and as a result many of the volumes are in a sad state of disrepair. In a short time some of the volumes will become unreadable. Bindings are broken, but the volumes cannot be rebound for lack of margin or because of the general fragility of the paper; also outer margins are being worn away with constant loss of entries. Normally the cheapest form of copying would be by Xerox, but unfortunately, the pages are too large for any machine. In any case, reproduction in this form does not really do what is best for the collection.

At present readers may have to search all 230 volumes for an elusive name, and it is therefore desirable that a master index should be made. This would save the researcher much time and effort as well as preclude the necessity of ever having to totally reproduce the collection in the future.

There are perhaps, two million entries, but the Society is willing to underwrite the cost of cards and cabinets to hold them. This, one of the most ambitious of genealogical projects, needs voluntary assistance. The Society appeals for an individual or organization to approach the librarian with a view to beginning the work on the more fragile volumes—before information is irretrievably lost.

The most recent addition to the Society's manuscript genealogy collection is that of the late Joseph E. Hughes, who was long active in Harford County, and Maryland historical and genealogical pursuits. This collection (G-5048) consists of five boxes of material concerning Harford County families and related land records. The collection has been indexed and is available for research in the main library.

REVIEWS OF RECENT BOOKS

William Augustus Bowles: Director-General of the Creek Nation.
By J. Leitch Wright, Jr. (Athens: University of Georgia Press,
1968. Pp. viii, 211. Footnotes, bibliography, map, illustrations,
index. \$6.95.)

During the decades immediately following the Revolution, America's Southeastern frontier offered unique opportunities for an upwardly-mobile young man with a talent for oratory and a taste for trade and diplomacy. Perhaps the most famous of those who exploited such chances was Alexander McGillivray, mixed-blood chief of the Creek Nation. Longer-lived and at least equally adventurous was William Augustus Bowles (1763-1805) sometime Director-General of the Creek Nation and of the *soi-disant* state of Muskogee. Bowles, a native of Frederick, Maryland, first encountered the Indians when he was forced to become a teen-age dropout from the British army in Florida. During this period of his life he acquired two Indian wives and a talent for the Indian trade. After the war, Bowles and his Bahamian backers established a trade with the Indians of Florida in competition with the British firm of Panton, Leslie and Company. In 1785, the Lower Creeks named their favorite trader Director-General of the Nation.

Bowles' long-range purpose was to use his position as trader and chief to establish an Indian state, Muskogee, as a British protectorate. He hoped that this state would include a number of Indian tribes, and would attract white settlers who by a gradual process of intermarriage and example might produce a civilized, biracial society. To this end, he attempted to manipulate a complex and shifting set of alliances and counter-alliances with the Bahamian traders, the southeastern tribes, and the governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Spain. He traveled north to Halifax and east to London in pursuit of British assistance; in the 1790's he circumnavigated the globe as the sometime guest, sometime prisoner of the government of Spain. In 1801 and 1802 Muskogee retaliated with a declaration of war against Spain, and the Muskogee navy improved the Indian trade by the capture of several Spanish prizes.

During the unsettled '80's and '90's, neither Britain nor Spain was certain that this ambitious frontier politician, with his Indian connections, could be lightly dismissed. At any rate, no official of their respective governments wanted to be held responsible for having dismissed him—just in case. Unfortunately for Bowles, after

the Peace of Amiens, the European powers left him to the mercy of his American enemies, who persuaded his Upper Creek enemies to turn him over to the Spanish. He died, awaiting trial, in a Spanish prison.

Leitch does not attempt the unprofitable task of trying to determine whether Bowles was an overambitious entrepreneur, a creative statesman, or merely one of history's more successful psychotics. Instead, he follows Bowles' various presentations of himself—with felicitous detachment and appropriate humor. His fascinating account of the Director-General's adventures is carefully annotated from documents in American, British, and Spanish archives. Both author and reader must lament the cultural circumstance which confined the archives of the State of Muskegee to the busy brain of William Augustus Bowles.

The Ohio State University

MARY YOUNG

The Democratic Republicans of New York: The Origins, 1763-1797.

By Alfred F. Young. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1967. Pp. xvi, 636. \$12.25.)

It is difficult to write with restraint of Alfred F. Young's study of the Democratic Republicans of New York. Winner of the Manuscript Award of the Institute of Early American History and Culture, this detailed grass-roots analysis of political strategy and the development of parties is a significant and stunning contribution to state history in the early national period.

Choosing to keep his focus on state politics in tracing the first interaction of local and national forces, Professor Young investigates four major aspects: "politics as it is organized by the leaders, how it appears up front to the voters, how it all turns out in elections and what the elected do with political power." What emerges is a curious dichotomy in the Empire State. On the state level, dominance rested with the Clinton Whigs, the Clinton Anti-Federalists, the Clinton Republicans; on the national level, New York voters almost consistently returned anti-Clintonian Federalists and supported the policies of Alexander Hamilton.

Obviously central to Young were the policies, politics and person of Governor Clinton. "Old George with his Irish ways" served six consecutive terms until finally ousted by John Jay in 1795. Leading a state that had been dominated by its "opulent families," the landlord Delanceys, Livingstons, Schuylers, Van Rensselaers and Van

Cortlandts, Clinton's modest background was compensated for in his revolutionary war record and his hold on the yeomen in his home county of Ulster and neighboring Orange and Dutchess. His skillful use of patronage, land sales, adroit wooing and careful assessment of delicate family and sectional pride and differences enabled him to build a series of alliances with the Van Cortlandts and Chancellor Robert R. Livingston, to suggest Federalist Rufus King as a Clintonian anti-Federalist candidate for the United States Senate, and to cooperate with the difficult and ambitious Aaron Burr. His opposition was led by the powerful landlords, the Schuylers and Van Rensselaers and some Livingstons, who, annoyed at this upstart leadership, marshalled the votes of their tenants. In New York City Schuyler in-law Alexander Hamilton led the nationalist merchants and mechanics who sought commercial protection; on the frontier, settlers who sought more security than the tax-conscious Clinton administration was willing to provide, turned to the Constitution and the Washington Federalists. In New York, party was clearly determined in response to the shifting coalitions and policies fashioned by George Clinton.

Young examines this Clinton-anti-Clinton duality most effectively in the election of 1792. In this confrontation the voter could ballot on Washington's first and Clinton's fifth administration. Until the creation of the Bank of the United States, the ensuing orgy of speculation and the Federalist bank panic of 1791, New York had been unresponsive to Hamilton's national policies. On the defensive, New York Federalists charged the Clinton incumbents with gross profiteering in land speculation and appealed for rotation in office. Only the raw Clinton strategy of throwing out the ballots of three contested counties enabled the Governor's forces to beat back the challenge of Federalist John Jay. Yet, paradoxically, at this moment of state peril, the Republican choice of Clinton as Jefferson's running mate marked the state party's rise to prominence as a "major component of a national party."

1792 also marked a transition in electoral backing for the Clinton Republican forces. Young cites the French Revolution and the ensuing British maritime measures as the catalyst which aligned New York City's mechanics behind the Republicans. The formation of Democratic-Republican societies and the Republican tendencies of the religious and mechanic associations enabled the Republicans for the first time in 1794 to capture six of New York's ten Congressional seats. At the same time, however, Young credits Republican blunders for allowing a Federalist resurgence in 1795. Republicans stayed with Geñet too long (symbolized by the marriage of Geñet

to Cornelia Clinton), bucked Washington's prestige in their intransigent opposition to the Jay Treaty, were unable to overcome the peace-or-war issue the Federalists raised over the Jay negotiations.

Though there were increasing Republican inroads in the frontier vote and Republican success in New York City, the Federalists were still dominant in 1796. Young credits prosperity, the Federalist moderation in New York, and the vulnerability of the long-tenured Clintonians. The party of the outs on the local level, the Federalists could profitably criticize local deficiencies. Yet by 1797, Young indicates, the Republicans clearly had broader backing and better issues to attract a wide electorate. They noted that when the Federalists had controlled New York City, they had ignored the growing poverty of the new immigrants. Yet, the Republican reforms were highly selective. Though Young cites their humanitarian and social causes, he notes their less than ardent crusade to extend the suffrage (and thus to enfranchise the tenants of Schuyler) and their hesitancy to promote economic reform measures.

In his thorough analysis of geographical, personal, clan, social and economic factors and relationships in New York politics, Professor Young has provided the most complete study of the emergence of state parties in the early national period. The only point one might question is the date 1763 in the sub-title. Professor Young's major contribution is his study of the ten years from the Constitutional convention to the end of Washington's administration.

Georgetown University

DOROTHY M. BROWN

Passenger Lists of Vessels Arriving at Baltimore, 1820-1891. (Pamphlet accompanying Microcopy No. 255, Washington: National Archives, 1967. Pp. 6.)

This quite modest little pamphlet describes records that are sure to interest many readers of this *Magazine*: lists of passengers who arrived at the Port of Baltimore for more than seven decades in the nineteenth century. The lists normally give the name, age, sex, occupation, and the country of origin of each passenger. The lists are reproduced on 50 rolls of microfilm which can be purchased at a cost of \$322. Indexes to names of passengers, which also have been filmed, are identified in the pamphlet and these microfilms are also available at cost.

The pamphlet, which was prepared by Joyce D. Ciarrocchi, is available without charge on request. This particular microfilm publication is a recent one in a series begun in 1940 to make important

and frequently used records easily and inexpensively accessible everywhere. Some 1,300 separate publications on some 100,000 rolls are now available in this long-term program.

National Archives and Records Service

FRED SHELLEY

Presidential Reconstruction in Mississippi. By William C. Harris. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967. Pp. x + 279 Illustrations, notes, index. \$8.00.)

One of the most overlooked periods of nineteenth-century Southern history, according to Professor Harris, has been that of Presidential Reconstruction in the individual states. Most histories pass over this period with only a few general comments. Even though a great deal has been written about the struggle between the President and Congress, such works by their nature must focus on the national scene. The volume under review is the first detailed study devoted exclusively to Presidential Reconstruction in a Southern state. The emphasis is upon political and economic developments, and events in Washington are mentioned only as they relate to local matters. Mississippi provided the author a fertile field of investigation because it "was not just typical of the states of the cotton South; in some ways its characteristics and experiences were an extreme form of those common to other states of the region."

Professor Harris relies heavily upon W. M. Drake ("The Mississippi Reconstruction Convention of 1865" and "Constitutional Development in Mississippi 1817-1865") for his excellent treatment of the reconstruction convention of 1865. The first debate of the convention was the longest. It occurred when the Committee on the State Constitution made its report on slavery. Debate revolved primarily around the issue that "it would be misleading to leave the impression that the abolition of slavery was the result of the voluntary action of the Convention, when it was evident that it had been forced upon them by a conqueror." A compromise amendment was finally accepted, but the convention avoided including in the constitution a precise statement concerning the new relationship of the Negro with the state. The delegates concluded that this was the duty of the legislature and this body, when it assembled should "provide by law for the protection and security of the person and property of the freedom of the State, and guard them and the State against any evils that may arise from their sudden emancipation." The result was the Mississippi Black Code, the first attempt by a state to define the place of the Negro in its postwar society.

The code is reviewed by the author as "a victory for the conservative or moderate plan in the legislature. . . ." At first most Mississippi editors either hailed the code or at least withheld their opinions. The attitude of the press, however, began to change when Northern hostility became pronounced, and by early 1866 the leading newspapers of the state, with few exceptions, condemned the code as the enactment of foolish men. "Both the national and local reaction to the Mississippi laws," says Professor Harris, "promoted the belief that the Black Code was the work of extremists who desired to return the Negroes to a form of slavery, when actually, though harsh, it represented at least partially a triumph for the conservatives in the legislature. The effect was to discredit greatly the work of the legislature and to continue the uncertainty regarding the status of the freedmen."

Presidential Reconstruction in Mississippi is a worthy addition to reconstruction literature, and it is hoped that more state studies will be undertaken by students of the period. The author has set for them a high standard of scholarship.

Virginia Military Institute

JOHN G. BARRETT

Moses Sheppard, Quaker Philanthropist of Baltimore. By Bliss Forbush. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1968. Pp. 317. \$6.00.)

In 1775 Moses Sheppard, the youngest of nine children, was born to Sarah and Nathan Sheppard. During the American Revolution this Quaker family moved from the Philadelphia area to Nova Scotia and their property was confiscated. After the war they returned to the United States and settled in Maryland. When Moses was eighteen years old, he went to Baltimore, a city which was to be his home for the remainder of his life. Upon his arrival in the port city of 20,000 inhabitants, he secured employment with a merchant, John Mitchell. Sheppard's success in the world of business was rapid. Within a few years he was Mitchell's partner, and later he became an independent merchant who engaged in numerous business ventures. He invested in textile mills, a twine factory, a tobacco warehouse, a mining company, real estate, turnpikes, railroads, and banks. He became one of Baltimore's more affluent and philanthropic citizens, leaving at his death in 1857, an estate in excess of a half million dollars to establish a hospital for the treatment of mental illness.

Sheppard devoted his life to two things: accumulating a personal fortune and participating in works of benevolence. He considered himself to be a trustee for the wealth which he acquired and he felt a responsibility to use it to aid those less fortunate than himself. Throughout his life, he was active in numerous benevolent projects. Although he had been the recipient of meager formal education, he was vitally interested in providing educational opportunities for others. He helped to establish the first Quaker school in Baltimore, and he aided over one hundred youngsters, not all of whom were Quakers, to obtain an education.

For many years Sheppard was active in the Quaker mission program to the American Indians, and he used his influence in an effort to prevent the exploitation of the Indians. On the question of slavery Sheppard was a moderate. He was opposed to slavery but he was not an abolitionist of the William Lloyd Garrison type. He supported the work of the American Colonization Society and the Maryland Colonization Society. He believed that the Negro's best hope of achieving a stable and progressive society would be realized in Africa. He was convinced that Negroes could not compete successfully with white men in an integrated society. He helped many free Negroes to migrate to Liberia, and he continued to assist them after their arrival. He was instrumental in educating several Africans for service on that continent.

Sheppard contributed to the support of orphanages and homes for the aged. In the 1840's he became interested in the treatment of mental illness and finally decided that his estate should be used for the treatment of that disease. The charter for an asylum was obtained, and a board of trustees were named prior to Sheppard's death. The institution was later erected and received its first patients in 1891. Seven years later another philanthropist, Enoch Pratt, left the hospital an estate of over one million dollars.

Bliss Forbush, President of the Trustees of Sheppard and Enoch Pratt Hospital, has written an informative and useful biography of Moses Sheppard. His study rests mainly upon manuscript sources, and there are forty-one pages of notes. The book is a sympathetic but not eulogistic treatment of a man who revealed little of his inner self in his correspondence, and who kept no extensive diary. Additional values of the book include considerable data on the commercial history of Baltimore and the theological factions which beset the Society of Friends and resulted in the Hicksite split in the 1820's.

Dumbarton Oaks: The History of a Georgetown House and Garden, 1800-1966. By Walter Muir Whitehill. (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967. Pp. x, 147, Illustrations, index. \$6.95.)

The story of this handsome Georgetown house is here told in the delightful, urbane style we have come to expect from Walter Muir Whitehill. It is a short but leisurely stroll through one of the gardens of history. The first five chapters, about half of the text, trace the men and the families who have owned the land and the house, each leaving behind traces of their character and personality. From Ninian Beall, Maryland planter and entrepreneur, who first obtained title to the tract in the seventeenth century, through William Hammond Dorsey, who built the original house, the Virginia Beverleys, who held it from 1805 until it passed to the Calhouns in 1822. In 1829 James E. Calhoun sold the house and land to Brooke Mackall, a customs officer. In 1846 it passed to the prosperous hardware dealer Edward E. Linthicum. The house then descended through the hands of the Dents and the Blounts until in 1920 it was purchased by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss who have made of it a lasting monument, restoring and recreating the house and gardens.

Through this activity, Mr. and Mrs. Bliss fulfilled their dream of a "country house in the city," pruning away nineteenth century embellishments and building upon the original Federal house of 1800. Mrs. Bliss engaged the assistance of Mrs. Beatrix Ferrand, the prominent landscape architect, in creating the magnificent gardens. Much of the work was done while the Blisses were on various State Department assignments.

The renewed house was consciously designed to contain the famous Byzantine collection which Mrs. Bliss had accumulated in a lifetime of travel, and the Pre-Columbian art acquired by Mr. Bliss during his extensive travels. In 1940 the house was deeded to Harvard University and is administered as a part of that university for advanced Byzantine studies. An adjacent park of twenty-seven acres is operated by the National Park Service.

Mr. Whitehill devotes relatively little space to the important Dumbarton Oaks Conference. His concern is, perhaps rightly, with the history of an estate which has become, through the generosity of its owners, an important national intellectual center.

A handsome selection of illustrations provides the reader with a graphic history of the house and its inhabitants supplementing the distinguished text.

List of Officers of the Army of the United States from 1779 to 1900.
By William H. Powell. (Detroit: Gale Research Company,
1967.)

Powell's *List of Officers*, originally published in 1900, is a compilation of other compilations and registers of the U. S. Army's officer corps, primarily the War Department's annual registers, Heitman's *Historical Register of the U. S. Army* and Cullum's *Biographical Register of the Graduates of the Military Academy*. Not so comprehensive as Heitman nor detailed as Cullum, *List of Officers* still can be a useful research tool for military historians and genealogists—if used with care and not cited as the ultimate authority.

The first portion of the book is a list by unit of the officers of the Continental Army and the U. S. Army through the War of 1812. As the records are sketchy, so are the lists. There are errors: Josiah Harmer becomes "Joshua Harmon" in the space of one page.

The major part of *List of Officers* is an alphabetical register of Army officers, 1815-1900, giving a skeleton account of their service through promotions and brevets. Personal information is limited to state of birth and state of appointment, not much help to the analyst of social origins. A quick examination does give one the impression that the nineteenth century officer corps was not the Southern refuge of heroes sometimes thought; that the national origins of Army officers were English, Irish and German is clear. Again, such a list, while most useful for tracing non-West Pointers, contains inevitable errors. Checking the officers of the Seventh Cavalry of 1876 to get some idea of the list's accuracy, I found the name of Captain Thomas B. Weir missing.

The third section of the book is a list of volunteer officers appointed to the regiments which fought in the Philippine Insurrection and a list of volunteer officers (generals and staff officers) appointed by the President during the Civil War.

In all Powell's *List of Officers* is not so useful as Heitman which covers the same ground (except for the Revolution), but it should be part of a research library's military history holdings.

University of Missouri—Columbia

ALLAN R. MILLETT

The Story of Surnames. By L. G. Pine. (Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle, 1968. Pp. 152. \$4.75.)

For those needing to know the origin of a surname it is necessary to consult Bardsley's *Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames* (1901) and Reaney's *Dictionary of British Surnames* (1961), but in

his latest book, L. G. Pine has attempted to assist the researcher in tracing the origin of surnames. He has eschewed any idea of a dictionary, and instead has provided the material and background from which the reader may work out the meaning and origin of his or her surname. As usual, the work is stimulating, and should provide historical researchers and others with many hours of happy and fruitful reading. The chapter on sources and suggestions for further reading should be studied carefully, since there are works mentioned which do not usually appear to merit study, but Mr. Pine quickly demolishes any misconceptions as to the uselessness of any particular work.

Maryland Historical Society

P. W. FILBY

The Story of Heraldry. By L. G. Pine. Wood engravings by K. F. Rowland. (Rutland, Vt.: Charles E. Tuttle, 1968. Pp. 164, illustrated. \$4.75.)

L. G. Pine, a former editor of *Burke's Peerage* and similar works, has succeeded in telling the history of heraldry in a concise and readable form. For the serious student there are more erudite works, but this book is aimed at the American researcher who wishes to know the rudiments of the art. It can be read straight through because of its clarity and practical approach.

Although the book deals primarily with English heraldry, there are chapters on Scotland, Ireland, America and India. The chapter on America is particularly sensible, and is worthy of a pamphlet for free distribution to all those aspiring to the use of arms.

There is a glossary of terms used in heraldry, simply explained, a reading list, and an explanation of the component parts of the heraldic achievement. The arms from wood engravings are outstanding.

Maryland Historical Society

P. W. FILBY

Ebenezer Kinnersley: Franklin's Friend. By J. A. Leo Lemay. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.)

The material presented in this well-documented little book is highly important to students of colonial culture, especially in the realms of religion and science. The portrayal of Ebenezer Kinnersley as an exponent of rationalistic Enlightenment thinking, and the story of his ministerial preachings attacking the emotional excesses

of revivalism constitute the clearest, is the most interesting and precise analysis of the religious controversy provoked by the great awakening that this reviewer has ever read.

As a scientist, popular lecturer throughout the colonies and principal collaborator in Franklin's electrical experiments, Kinnersley emerges from the pages of this book as a fascinating man of science in colonial America. The author has described this meticulous, careful and conscientious colonial scientist with sensitivity and understanding.

Despite the real contributions Lemay makes to the intellectual history of colonial America, the book does have serious shortcomings. The book is uneven in quality. Although the chapters on religion and science are exceptionally well done, the third and final chapter, dealing with Kinnersley as an educator in the English School of the Philadelphia Academy, is superficial and often deals with inconsequential observations devoid of depth. In general however, this is a very fine book.

College Misericordia

LOUIS MAGAZIN

The Manuscript Collections of the Maryland Historical Society.

Compiled by Avril J. M. Pedley. (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1968. Pp. xii, 390. \$15.)

Historical and other specialized libraries like the Maryland Historical Society's fulfill one of their purposes by collecting and conserving books and manuscripts and making them available to scholars. Many institutions have acquired important articles simply by existing—their mere presence is an invitation to prospective donors—and every researcher knows of valuable collections that have come to rest in unlikely and remote places. In addition, most institutions do organize and preserve what they have, albeit often according to no system of reasonable rationality; Professor Labaree has told of finding a letter of Benjamin Franklin in a small New England library, in a folder labelled "Very Valuable Papers"—a category distinct from the same institution's "Valuable Papers." But making a collection accessible to scholars is no less important a part of the library's task. Books and manuscripts—and museum objects, too—should be used, but they cannot be used unless they are known to exist. To acquaint scholars with a library's special collections by means of a printed catalogue or guide requires policy, decision, and plan in the officers and staff; and to carry the plan out demands intelligence, imagination, and diligence.

The Maryland Historical Society has now issued a guide to its manuscript holdings. It is a product the Society can take pride in, and one which historical scholars everywhere will find instructive and exciting. The library's collections are large and richly varied, as one would expect. They range in time from the first Lord Baltimore to Governor Ritchie, and in subject matter from problems of land tenure to those of automobile traffic control. Robert Gilmore, Jr., benefactor of the arts, Samuel Purviance, Quaker merchant of the Revolution, the architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe, Washington's aide Otho Holland Williams, the Secretary of War James McHenry, the lawyer and historian William Wirt, David Baillie Warden, American consul at Paris and self-appointed agent for American cultural institutions, the Ridgley and Lloyd families of the Eastern Shore are all represented by large assemblages of manuscripts. Here too are the minutes of the Electric Sewing Machine Society, which undertook to train steamstresses in the use of machines so they could earn more; 20 volumes of records of the Free Summer Excursion Society, which provided outings for poor children; and 35 volumes of accounts, day books, programs, and playbills from Ford's Theater. One expects Baltimore and Maryland materials in abundance and in variety; but what is the provenance of the letters John Adams Aiken of Massachusetts wrote from Andover and Dartmouth, or of the nice collection of Daniel Webster letters? The large collection made by J. Thomas Scharf is a reminder of our continuing indebtedness to indefatigable local historians who collected, preserved, annotated, and published the records of our early history in the last century. And as if all this were not enough, the library contains some 10,000 more individual letters and documents too miscellaneous to be sorted out in any kind of collection.

In all, 1724 "collections" are catalogued. Some are large, but many consist of only six or eight documents or even a single account book, diary, or scrapbook, like the copy of Burnaby's *Travels* annotated by an unknown Dorchester County Loyalist. To a considerable degree the guide reflects the sources, conditions, and even form of the several collections. Admittedly many items, being unique, are intractable, not lending themselves to rationalization; yet one wonders whether the compiler might not have taken the opportunity the guide offered to consolidate closely related collections (as has been done with the Ford Theater collections). The Archer ledgers (Pp. 48 and 49), the Sir Thomas Adams biographical sketches (Pp. 7 and 8), the Calvert Papers (Pp. 281 and 282), the Marye collection (Pp. 1049 and 1050) are examples; and there are many others. A separate entry for account books and ledgers might have been

helpful—especially for such miscellaneous items as the daybook of the North West Fork Bridge store, 1786-88 (which is not indexed under store, daybook, or accounts); and local and county institutions (such as the Anne Arundel Circuit of the Methodist Protestant Church records) might have been grouped under the appropriate principal author, not the local division. Some few items might have been quietly eliminated, like the manuscript copy of Articles I-X of the Federal Constitution in an unknown hand. But these were policy decisions; the compiler, Mrs. Pedley, and Mr. P. William Filby, the Society's librarian, were aware of the questions and considered them; and we cannot quarrel too much with their decisions.

To the Society, and especially the officers and trustees who supported this guide, it is a kind of benchmark in the Society's history, tangible evidence of significant and permanent achievement. To the staff it provides a description and analysis of the real strengths of the collection, and of its lacks. And to scholars everywhere it is an invitation to visit the Society at the first opportunity. Within a year, it seems safe to predict, there will be a measurable increase in the use of the Society's manuscript collections—and that is one of the things every good historical society hopes to see.

American Philosophical Society Library

WHITFIELD J. BELL, JR.

NOTES AND QUERIES

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Hours of opening:

Gallery: Tuesday through Saturday, 11 to 4
Sunday, 1-4

Library: Tuesday through Saturday, 9-5

The Society is *not* open on Monday.

Manuscripts are being restored, microfilmed and processed for various projects, and therefore it is essential for researchers to inform the Library of any intended visit. Material needed on Saturday must be ordered on Friday.

To aid in the formation of a directory of work in progress in Maryland history, the Maryland Historical Society would like those working on theses, dissertations or other publications in Maryland history to contact:

Miss Bayly E. Marks
Manuscripts Curator
Maryland Historical Society
201 W. Monument St.
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

This directory will be kept at the Society, and will include name, address, title, short description and projected date of completion of work in all areas of Maryland history, as a reference to what is being done and whom to contact.

TAX LISTS OF 1783 FOR BALTIMORE AND HARFORD COUNTIES TO BE PRINTED

During the preparation of the Guide to *The Manuscript Collections of the Maryland Historical Society* (The Society, \$15.00) it became apparent that the Society held many manuscript tax, debt, militia and other lists which were hitherto unrecorded. They may be the originals or copies of originals, but they are, as far as is known, unique. Readers are now using them heavily and unless they are microfilmed they will become unreadable in a very few months. It is therefore with great

pleasure that the Society announces an arrangement with Mr. Wistar Brown, President of Microsurance Inc., of Philadelphia, whereby all lists will be microfilmed and then printed up in book form by Rhistoric Publications, a division of that company.

The whole project has the blessing and cooperation of Dr. Morris Radoff, Archivist and Records Administrator of the State of Maryland, Hall of Records.

Because of the absence of any census records for Maryland between 1776 and 1790, the publication of the tax list of 1783, the most complete for Maryland, will prove an invaluable aid to economists, genealogists, historians and sociologists. Unlike the census records, the tax lists give each householder by name, the exact number of his dependents under and over the age of 16, the numbers of his slaves, the types of taxable property, and the value. The plan is to make hard cover publications of the actual tax list, but it is important to note that the copy will be facsimile and not a transcription. Indexes will be included where they already exist, and there will be notes by the Society's staff concerning the nature of the document and any peculiarities or omissions in the original text.

Initially the tax lists for 1783 for Baltimore and Harford Counties will be issued in two volumes. Approximate prices are \$30 a volume prepublication, or \$35 after 1 June 1969. Orders and inquiries may be sent to the Librarian or to Rhistoric Publications, 302 North 13th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.

Any organization or person holding tax lists or indexes in typescript or other form are asked to communicate with the Society as quickly as possible.

It is regretted that the originals will not be available for study while they are being processed. However, there are microfilm and photostat copies at the Hall of Records in Annapolis which may be used in the interim.

The University of Maryland Art Gallery is planning to organize an exhibition of the work of James Peale (1749-1831), and Jeffrey R. Brown, Assistant to the Director, is gathering material for a catalogue raisonné of his works: miniatures, portraits, historical paintings, landscapes, and still lifes.

He would be pleased to receive information about the artist's work and any papers that might expand knowledge of his life.

Photographs with pertinent data concerning subject, size, date, inscriptions, and provenance would be particularly appreciated.

Please send any information to:

Jeffrey R. Brown
Assistant to the Director
Art Gallery
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

THE 32nd MARYLAND HOUSE AND GARDEN PILGRIMAGE

DESCRIPTION: Tours include counties of the tidewater areas and the rolling farm lands of Maryland, as well as suburban Baltimore. Large estates, 17th Century manors and town houses, colonial cottages, and both traditional and modern suburban houses offer diversity. Fine antiques in settings of charm and historical interest add to the pleasure of the Pilgrim. Chesapeake Bay Cruises include walking tours in towns reminiscent of colonial seaports.

SCHEDULE—1969—

- May 2 —Guilford Walking Tour, Suburban Baltimore
- May 3 —Talbot County
- May 4 —Queen Anne's County
- May 6 —Ruxton, Suburban Baltimore
- May 7 —Frederick County
- May 8 —Stevenson, Greenspring Valley, Baltimore County
- May 9 —Dulaney Valley, Baltimore County
- May 10—Anne Arundel County
- May 11—St. Mary's County
- May 17 & 18—Chesapeake Bay Cruises to Chestertown,
Eastern Shore of Maryland

ADMISSION: Ticket for each day's tour \$5.00. Single house ticket \$1.50. Cruise tickets, including lunch, \$15.00.

ACCOMMODATIONS: Attractive inns, comfortable hotels and motels, and city and rural restaurants are accessible. Luncheons are served in a local church on most tours.

Request for Help

I am seeking information on John P. Howard (1799-1841) who was said to be related to John Eager Howard. In 1822 he married Henrietta E. Beckwith in Baltimore. She died February 8, 1826. On

September 12, 1826 in Baltimore he married Louisa Margareta Stemmer, whose family gave the name of Stemmer's Run. He was initiated in the Winder Lodge #77 Masonic Order, June 25, 1828, and died October 11, 1841 at Aisquith Street, leaving a wife and five children. Where was he born, and who were his parents?

V. H. Hackney
The Marshall National Bank
Marshall, Texas

Request for Help

Keswick Home For Incurables of Baltimore City is interested in securing a photograph of its first Home, owned by Mr. Robert Turner, located at 270 E. Fayette Street and occupied by The Home For Incurables of Baltimore City from 1884-1887.

Virgil A. Halbert
Executive Director
Keswick Home For Incurables
of Baltimore City
700 W. 40th Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21211

Request for Help

The collection of materials for a selective letterpress edition of the papers of Governor Jonathan Trumbull (1710-1785) has begun under the sponsorship of the Connecticut State Library and the University of Connecticut and with the endorsement of the National Historical Publications Commission. Editors for the project are Albert E. Van Dusen (University of Connecticut) and Glenn Weaver (Trinity College, Hartford). Scholars knowing the location of Trumbull items are requested to write to the editors in care of the Connecticut State Library, Hartford, 06115.

Correction: Several errors in graphic notations occurred in the December, 1968 issue. The cover portrait is actually one painted by Rembrandt Peale and is in the collection of the Peale Museum, City Collection. The caption for General Harper was incorrect and should have read Robert Goodloe Harper instead of Charles. Third, the sketch by C. F. de St. Memin of James Asheton Bayard is in the Baltimore Museum of Art.

COVER—*Photograph of the strawberry market in Marsh Market (Center Wholesale Market), Pratt Street. 1901. Photograph by Eduard Löllmann.*

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION (*Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code*). 1. Date of Filing: Sept. 30, 1968. 2. Title of Publication: Maryland Historical Magazine. 3. Frequency of Issue: Quarterly. 4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor. Publisher: Maryland Historical Society, 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201; Editor: Dr. Richard R. Duncan, Department of History, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007; Managing Editor: Harold R. Manatee, 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 7. Owner: Maryland Historical Society. No stock—non-profit organization. 8. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and Other Security Holders Owning or Holding 1 Percent or More of Total Amount of Bonds, Mortgages or Other Securities: None. 9. The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes have not changed during preceding 12 months. 10. A. Total No. Copies Printed (Quarterly): 4,300. B. Paid Circulation (1.) Sales Through Dealers and Carriers, Street Vendors and Counter Sales: None; (2.) Mail Subscriptions (Memberships): 3,388. C. Total Paid Circulation: 3,388. D. Free Distribution (Schools and Libraries): 808. E. Total Distribution: 4,196. F. Office Use, Left-over, Unaccounted, Spoiled After Printing: 104. G. Total: 4,300.

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Harold R. Manatee, *Director*

Coins, Gold Coins, Obsolete Paper Currency and

Political Items Urgently Needed.

MASON - DIXON COIN EXCHANGE

THOS. P. WARFIELD, Member, Professional Numismatic Guild, Inc.

208 W. Saratoga St., Baltimore, Md. 21201

Now available

The
Manuscript Collections
of the
Maryland Historical Society

A guide to the manuscripts in the Maryland Historical Society, describing over 1700 collections, comprising approximately 1,000,000 items, with subject, name and place index.

390 pp.

\$15.00

Plus 35¢ postage, etc.;

tax, if applicable, 3%

***Order from:* MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY**

201 W. Monument St

Baltimore, Md. 21201

**TONGUE, BROOKS
& COMPANY**

I N S U R A N C E

Since 1898



213 ST. PAUL PLACE
BALTIMORE

**TRADITIONAL
FURNITURE**

*From America's outstanding
sources . . . in wide open
stock selection.*

Our workroom offers complete restoration service . . . cabinetwork, refinishing and reupholstering.

FALLON & HELLEN
11 and 13 W. Mulberry St.
Baltimore, Md. 21201
LExington 9-3345

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

PHOTOGRAPHY

Since 1878

HUGHES CO.

Copy and Restoration Work a Specialty.
Black and White or color.
Phone: 889-5540

C. GAITHER SCOTT
115 E. 25th Street
Baltimore, Md. 21218

FAMILY COAT OF ARMS

A Symbol Of Your Family's Heritage From The Proud Past

Handpainted In Oils In Full Heraldic Colors — Size 11½ × 14½ — \$15.00

Research When Necessary

ANNA DORSEY LINDER
PINES OF HOCKLEY

166 Defense Highway

Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Phone: 263-3384

PLUMBING — HEATING — AIR CONDITIONING

M. NELSON BARNES & SONS, INC.

Established 1909 *Phone: 252-4313* 2011 Greenspring Drive, Timonium

BOOKBINDING

TU 9-7847 — TU 9-5095

Magazines, Books & Records

JOSEPH RUZICKA, INC.

3200 Elm Avenue (11)

Restoration of Rare Volumes

PUBLICATIONS

Studies in Maryland History

- His Lordship's Patronage: Offices of Profit in Colonial Maryland.*
By Donnell M. Owings. 1953 \$ 6.00

Texts and References for School Use

- Maryland: A Students' Guide to Localized History.* By Harold R. Manatee \$.75
The War of 1812 On The Chesapeake Bay. Illustrated paperback.
By Gilbert Byron, 1964 \$ 2.00
My Maryland. By Kaessmann, Manatee and Wheeler. History of Maryland, Revised edition \$ 4.50
The Star-Spangled Banner. Illustrated booklet. Description of the writing of our National Anthem by Francis Scott Key \$.50
Indians of Early Maryland. By Harold R. Manatee. 1959 . . . \$ 1.80
Maryland in the Civil War. By Harold R. Manatee. 1961 . . . \$ 4.50
Wheeler Leaflets on Maryland History. (24 titles) each \$.10

Miscellaneous

- The Manuscript Collections of the Maryland Historical Society.*
Avril J. M. Pedley, comp. 1968 \$15.00
A History of the University of Maryland. By George H. Callcott. Illustrated. 1966 \$ 7.50
Quakers in the Founding of Anne Arundel County, Maryland.
By J. Reaney Kelly. Illustrated. 1963 \$ 5.50
The Maryland Press, 1777-1790. By Joseph T. Wheeler. 1938 . . \$ 4.00
History of Queen Anne's County. By Frederic Emory. 1950 . . . \$ 7.50
From Mill Wheel to Plowshare. By Julia A. Drake and J. R. Orndorff. Orndorff Genealogy. Illustrated. 1938 \$ 5.00
Chesapeake Bay Sailing Craft. By M. V. Brewington. Illustrated pamphlet \$.50
Semmes and Kindred Families. By Harry Wright Newman. 1956 \$10.00
The Hollyday and Related Families of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. By James Bordley, Jr., M.D. 1962 \$10.00
The Regimental Colors of the 175th Infantry (Fifth Maryland)
By H. R. Manatee and Col. Roger S. Whiteford. 1959 \$ 2.00
Lucas Genealogy. Annabelle Kemp, comp. 1964 \$12.50

World War II

- Maryland in World War II: Vol. I, Military Participation, 1950;*
Vol. II, Industry and Agriculture, 1951; Vol. IV, Gold Star Honor Roll, 1956. H. R. Manatee, comp. each \$ 3.25
History of the 110th Field Artillery, with Sketches of Related Units.
By Col. John P. Cooper, Jr. Illustrated. 1953 \$ 5.00
Maryland in World War II—Register of Service Personnel,
5 vols. each \$20.00

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

201 W. Monument Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Postage and tax,
if applicable, extra.

THE OUTSTANDING WINNER OF 4 AWARDS

The Emergence of the New South: 1913-1945

George B. Tindall

Vol. X, *A History of the South*

Professor Tindall's monumental work has been honored with four awards: The Sydnor Award for the best book in Southern history published in a two-year period; the first annual Jules F. Landry Award for the most distinguished work published by the LSU Press in 1967; the first annual Lillian Smith Award from the Southern Regional Council; and the Mayflower Cup for the most outstanding nonfiction work by a North Carolinian.

"An extraordinarily impressive interpretation of the South's experience . . . imaginatively conceived, gracefully written, and based upon exhaustive research."—Dewey Grantham, *Indian Magazine of History*

822 pages, illustrations. \$12.50

Politics and Progress

THE RISE OF

URBAN PROGRESSIVISM IN BALTIMORE, 1895-1911

James B. Crooks

This important study is the first to concentrate on a major American city during the progressive era. Author James B. Crooks dissects and analyzes the rise of urban progressivism in Baltimore in the context of the national reform movement in the United States during the 1890's and 1900's.

"In putting Baltimore under a microscope, Crooks has enlarged our understanding of urban problems during the progressive era and the response of progressives to those problems."—Arthur Mann, author of *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age*.

"A lively account of Baltimore's version of the righteous, raucous crusade for urban political reform that swept across this country in the 1890's . . . a brisk, engaging book."—*Baltimore Evening Sun*

272 pages, illus. \$8.50



LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BATON ROUGE