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Tolchester Steamboat Company quarters, unknown photographer, c.1925. Maryland Center for History and Culture, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Tolchester Photograph Collection, PPl28.74. Located on Light Street in Baltimore, Maryland, this company operated a steamship line that ran daily excursions from the city to the Tolchester Beach Amusement Park in Kent County, Maryland.

Similarly to summers past when the Tolchester Steamboat Company connected the citizens of Baltimore City and Kent County via daily excursions, the two locations were entwined at the Maryland Center for History and Culture during the summer of 2022. From June to August, the H. Furlong Baldwin Library had the privilege to host an intern from Washington College, which is located in historic Chestertown, Kent County, Maryland, as part of the College’s Explore America Summer Internship program. This program connects Washington College students with hands-on learning experiences at an array of leading cultural institutions and nonprofits across the Mid-Atlantic region. The focus for the internship at the Library was to provide an intern with the opportunity to gain archival processing and digitization skills while engaging with materials related to Kent County as well as with other areas of Maryland.

Hilde Perrin, a rising senior at the College majoring in History and German, joined Library staff in June to begin her internship. Working with our Imaging Services Technician, Leslie Eames, Ms. Perrin scanned 63 photographic prints from the Tolchester Photograph Collection and then provided descriptions for each digital image in preparation for publication on MCHC’s Digital Collections portal. As a result of Ms. Perrin’s excellent work, researchers and visitors have digital access to a wonderful collection that depicts the attractions at the Tolchester Beach Amusement Park from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century. A popular vacation destination for Baltimoreans, this Kent County park consisted of a bathing beach, amusement park, racetrack, and hotel, and was in operation from 1877 to 1962. Ms. Perrin also digitized a selection of photographs from the Library’s Subject Vertical File showing various landmarks and buildings throughout Kent County and the 1832 census conducted on behalf of the Maryland State Colonization Society of the free Black population living in Kent County. All of these valuable resources are now available on the Digital Collections portal as well.

After the digitization component of the internship, Ms. Perrin learned how to process archival materials from Special Collections Archivist Sandra Glascock. She arranged and described three small collections that are all related to African American history in Maryland. Additionally, she produced collection guides, or finding aids, for these materials that have been published on the Library’s Finding Aid Database. These guides provide information on a photograph collection depicting Baltimore’s Parks Sausage Company, which was the first African American-owned business to be publicly traded on the New York Stock exchange; an Anne Arundel family genealogical collection containing two record books listing not only family members but the enslaved farm laborers as well; and documents related to the manumission and service of William Howard, who served in the 30th United States Colored Infantry during the American Civil War.

Sandra Glascock
Maryland Center for History and Culture

To learn more, visit these links:
Tolchester Photograph Collection in MCHC’s Digital Collection:
mdhistory.org/digital-resource/collection/tolchester-photograph-collection

Kent County items in MCHC’s Digital Collections:
mdhistory.org/digital-resource/relatednames/kent-county-md

Finding Aids:
mdhistory.libraryhost.com/repositories/2/resources/1304
mdhistory.libraryhost.com/repositories/2/resources/1193
mdhistory.libraryhost.com/repositories/2/resources/1306
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COMPiled BY ANNE S. K. TURKOS AND ELIZABETH CARINGOLA
Dear readers,

In ancient Greek mythology, muses were considered patron goddesses of arts and sciences, providing divine inspiration to poets and philosophers. The muse of history, Clio, was one of nine sisters. Their mother was Mnemosyne—the goddess of memory, invoking the idea that research and creativity originate in remembrance. As this issue of *Maryland Historical Magazine* was coming together, a theme emerged almost surreptitiously: that of memory and memorialization, of how objects are preserved, individuals celebrated, and tragedies commemorated.

We open this issue with an image from our collections: the cover features a striking photograph of the Tolchester Steamboat Company quarters in Baltimore from around a century ago. The company once ran daily excursion steamships to the Tolchester Beach Amusement Park in Kent County from its pier at Light Street in Baltimore City. The photograph was digitized during an internship project at our H. Furlong Baldwin Library, in collaboration with the Starr Center for the Study of the American Experience at Washington College. Our Special Collections Archivist Sandra Glascock tells more about how the work of digitization helps preserve these invaluable snapshots of times and places past.

The question of memorials, which events and people are memorialized, and how, has been particularly poignant in recent American history. “Joan of Arc, Patriots, and the Nativity: Reflections on the Centenary of Local First World War Memorials in Libertytown, Maryland” by Corey Campion and Caylee Winpigler gently pulls the curtains back to reveal the personal history and some of the deeper symbolism behind the memorial to a local soldier fallen in the war. By deciphering layers of meaning that the memorial would have held for generations of people since the war, the authors use the concept of “postmemory” to describe interpretation closer to the present day, when the First World War is expe-
rienced indirectly, as none of the original participants or those with direct memory of it are around any longer.

Compared to some other wars in the history of the United States, the First World War can seem curiously underrepresented in the nation’s collective memory. To remedy that perception and bring our readers closer to some of the lived experiences of fellow Marylanders, our Director of Collections Harrison Van Waes has curated a portfolio of images of objects in MCHC collections related to the Great War. It is remarkable how a helmet, a gas mask, or a medal attached to an individual can bridge that distance of a century. These—and many more—images related to the First World War can be found in our Digital Collections, mdhistory.org/digital-resource.

From World War I in Frederick County we jump to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Eastern Shore. Joining a host of higher education institutions that have been examining—and publishing—their historical ties to slavery, Carol Wilson presents several years’ worth of research on enslavement at Washington College. While Dr. Wilson’s overall findings do not come as a surprise to anyone familiar with the history of Maryland, it remains vital to document the specific names, numbers, and facets of participating in enslaving practices. It is also especially important to recover as much as possible about the lived experiences of people who were enslaved and what directions their lives took after emancipation.

Our final research piece in this issue is an excerpt from Gregory Wood’s recent book *Becoming the Frenchified State of Maryland: Reflections on the Lives and Contributions of Acadians, Saint-Domingue Refugees, and European Émigrés*. Taking up from where Mr. Wood’s previous publication, *A Guide to the Acadians in Maryland in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, left off, this two-volume work follows the history of these three Francophone communities in Maryland from 1755 to the early twentieth century. Mr. Wood’s writing is almost cinematic as it zooms in on the daily lives of individuals while experiencing epidemics of cholera, using lotteries to pay for civic projects, and passing by Elizabeth Patterson and Jérôme Bonaparte during their budding romance. It then zooms out to depict events on the national and world stage such as the Louisiana Purchase, uprisings in the island of Hispaniola, and Napoleonic Wars in Europe, providing a vividly comprehensive view of this period.

Readers looking for their next page turner in Maryland history are invited to sink their teeth into our Book Reviews section, the Brewington Prize, and the Maryland History and Culture Bibliography, which offer plenty of recent titles in
the history of higher education, weapons, Indigenous communities, Abraham Lincoln, the Civil War, and many more. We are always looking for fresh new research on Maryland history: for information on how to submit to the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, please visit mdhistory.org/publications/mdhs-magazine.
Figure 1. Memorial and Gravesite of William Bunke, Libertytown, Maryland, photograph by Corey Campion, July 5, 2020.
The recent unveiling of the National World War I Memorial in Washington, DC, marked both a long-anticipated and thought-provoking milestone in the nation’s now century-old struggle to remember the Great War. During the initial postwar decades, the nation’s capital experienced a frenzy of memorial construction whose subjects ranged from Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, and Ulysses S. Grant to the father of homeopathic medicine, the passengers on the Titanic, and nuns who served as nurses during the Civil War. If the burial of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery in 1921 and the dedication of a memorial to the First Division of the American Expeditionary Forces in 1924 ensured the First World War at least some presence in this expanding commemorative landscape, the absence of a single memorial to the nation’s collective wartime experiences was glaring. It also proved enduring. The massive Liberty Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri, whose dedication in 1921 drew both presidential sanction and international recognition, served for decades as a de facto national memorial. With the approach of the war’s centennial, however, calls from a host of public and private constituencies to correct one of Washington’s largest commemorative shortcomings finally inspired action.
Granted congressional approval in 2014 and partially unveiled in April 2021, the new National World War I memorial aims to provide a long-awaited space in the nation’s capital in which to honor all American service members for their dedication and sacrifice in the “war to end all wars.”

While this latest addition to the capital’s memorial topography resolves a decades-old debate over whether to include the First World War in the national commemorative narrative, it has nevertheless inspired a host of new controversies over how best to immortalize the conflict within the capital’s existing landscape. In the wake of the memorial’s unveiling, public officials, scholars, and critics have continued to raise questions surrounding both the memorial’s location and symbolism as well as its place in what many view as an already over-militarized civic space. More broadly, the chronology of the site poses additional questions about the purpose and legacy of World War I memorials today. Realized more than a century after the Great War ended, the new memorial constitutes a work of what scholars such as Marianne Hirsch refer to as “postmemory.” Unlike those tablets, statues, and parks designed and dedicated during the 1920s and 1930s by those who fought in and lived through the First World War, the realization of the national World War I memorial is generations-removed from the event and actors it seeks to immortalize. It does so, then, not on the basis of direct experience and memory but indirect experience relayed across several generations, or postmemory. The same proves true for the memorial’s future visitors who, absent any living connection to the war generation, must rely on trans-generational information gleaned from textbooks and on-site informative panels to interpret the memorial’s meaning.

Although much can and will be said about the new national memorial and its controversies in the months and years ahead, it is to another matter highlighted by the unveiling of the new memorial that the present article responds: the centennial of hundreds of local World War I memorials found in towns and cities across the country. How, a century later, to interpret those sites of commemoration established in the first decade after the Great War? Like the new national memorial, these original monuments are now only accessible in the realm of postmemory. Just as scholars and the public must grapple with the meaning of a memorial erected a century after the First World War, they must also consider the meaning of those memorials dedicated a century ago. Focused on the latter challenge, this article draws upon the lessons of one case study found just outside the nation’s capital in Libertytown, Maryland.

About an hour’s drive north from the monument metropolis that is Washington, DC, stands a fascinating memorial dedicated to one Private William Bunke. The memorial, which stands prominently at the front of the cemetery of St. Peter the Apostle Roman Catholic Church, comprises Bunke’s headstone, behind which sits a large rock plinth. In the middle of the plinth is a wide opening, which houses a ceramic nativity scene. Above the scene hangs a small bronze plaque, which reads:
Standing atop the plinth is a life-size plaster statue of Joan of Arc, her sword sheathed, and her flag held proudly forward. Compared with the standardized military headstones that mark the final resting place of many American veterans of the Great War, the eclectic elements of Bunke's memorial constitute an arresting sight whose initial significance in the 1920s and 1930s might elude some observers today. With these observers' experiences in mind, the following analysis draws upon a variety of sources, including local newspaper accounts, parish archives, and personal diaries, to recover the meaning of Bunke's memorial at the time of its construction in the 1920s. From there, it considers how visitors might access such information and assess the relevance of Bunke's memorial, or, by extrapolation, any local First World War memorial, as it enters its second century of commemorative service.

For anyone stopping at Bunke's grave today, their first impressions likely begin with a simple question: who was William Bunke? While the site itself offers little by way of an answer, archival sources from the Maryland National Guard and St. Peter the Apostle Church combine with records in the local press to reveal a rich and moving story. William Bunke was born on September 18, 1891, in Baltimore. By his ninth birthday, the young boy had lost both of his parents and was adopted by Edward and Margaret Hobbs of Libertytown. The couple had two other children named William and Juliet, and together the family attended St. Peter the Apostle Church. For Bunke, the parish community, led by Reverend Father Samuel J. Kavanaugh, became an extension of his adoptive family, nurturing him as he developed the deep Catholic faith that later sustained him during his military service overseas.

Shortly before Bunke's twenty-fourth birthday, the Great War erupted in Europe. Despite their government's initial reluctance to enter the conflict, Americans followed the events overseas with great interest. From headlines announcing the start of a “bitter death struggle” between France and Germany in August 1914 to the tragedy of “108 of 180 Americans lost” in the sinking of the *Lusitania*, the Frederick County press that served Bunke's community kept residents well informed with detailed daily reports of the fighting “over there.” Included here, of course, were headlines announcing the discovery of Germany’s infamous Zimmerman Telegram, which in early 1917 invited Mexico to form a military alliance with Germany against the United States, along with the ongoing German campaign of unrestricted submarine warfare. As the *Frederick Post*
predicted, these developments proved enough to “throw the United States into war” and send Bunke and dozens of his local friends and neighbors to the trenches in France.4

On July 21, 1917, two months before his twenty-sixth birthday, Bunke learned that his draft number had been selected. He responded quickly, and, recognizing the seriousness of the situation, drafted a will to be executed in the event that he did not return home. In his will, he bequeathed a third of his assets to Father Kavanaugh, who had arrived at St. Peter the Apostle in 1901, just after Bunke had moved to Libertytown. Growing up, Bunke had developed a close bond with Kavanaugh and, once overseas, maintained the connection through letters.5

After enlisting, Bunke joined Company A of the 115th Infantry with other Frederick County residents. According to his diary, he left Frederick on September 10, 1917, for basic training at Camp McClellan in Anniston, Alabama. Nine months later, he traveled north to Hoboken, New Jersey, before sailing for and arriving in Brest, France, on June 27, 1918. In the weeks that followed, Bunke and his company moved to the Alsace sector in eastern France, where they entered the trenches on July 27. After several skirmishes, the company moved to the Meuse-Argonne sector where they took part in what proved to be one of the final battles of the war. On October 20, a day after sustaining injuries in battle near the Bois de Grande Montagne, Bunke died. His final letter home, penned on September 10 to Father Kavanaugh, appeared in the local paper six weeks later. In a stroke of tragic irony, he described a scene that must have mirrored the one that claimed his life, and he reflected on the importance of his faith while at war:

The Huns sent us quite a surprise of artillery fire. The big shells came over thick and fast and tore things to pieces all around . . . during the bombardment we didn’t have a casualty. I think we were very fortunate. Don’t you, father? That shows how God is taking care of us all the time and watching over us. It is God Whom we will have to thank for guarding and watching over us there.6

Three weeks after Bunke died, the war ended with the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918. Of the roughly 116,000 Americans who fell in the war, approximately 90 hailed from Frederick County, Maryland. Among those 90 casualties, Bunke was the only one from Libertytown.

After learning of his death and reading his final letter home, Bunke’s family and community had to wait almost two years to plan his funeral. Logistical challenges and difficult Franco-American negotiations slowed the repatriation of fallen American soldiers from France. Bunke’s family requested his body as soon as possible, but his remains did not return to Frederick County until the fall of 1921. With years of painful delays finally behind them, Bunke’s friends and family laid him to rest in front of his home parish on October 16. As the local paper reported, hundreds of people attended the service, including Bunke’s fellow servicemen and members of his local chapter of
the Knights of Columbus. The sermon was given by Reverend Walter Drum, S. J., the
brother of Brigadier General Hugh Drum who was on General John J. Pershing’s staff
throughout the war. Following a musical performance by Bunke’s friend Mrs. James
Sappington people filed out of the church to watch as the casket “draped with a large
American flag was buried.”

In the months that followed Bunke’s funeral, Kavanaugh oversaw the construction of
an elaborate memorial to mark the beloved fallen soldier’s grave. Throughout the first
postwar decade, Kavanaugh’s work became an important site of mourning for those in
Libertytown and the surrounding region. On at least two occasions, in fact, Bunke’s
grave featured prominently in the county’s official Memorial Day celebrations. In 1926,
service members gathered at the Frederick County War Memorial, unveiled three years
after Bunke’s funeral, where they commemorated the conflict with speeches and a pa-
rade through downtown Frederick. The day’s festivities concluded, however, with a car-
avan of automobiles that carried local veterans and civilians twelve miles north to Bunke’s
grave. While celebrants had decorated the graves of fallen soldiers in downtown Freder-
ick’s Mt. Olivet Cemetery earlier in the day, Bunke’s was the only grave outside the city
to receive an official visit. The same proved true the following year, when Frederick
County veterans again included Bunke’s memorial in their ceremonial plans. In fact,
they invited Governor Albert Ritchie and other local leaders to deliver Memorial Day
remarks not at the county war memorial, but at Bunke’s gravesite. In its first decade,
then, the Libertytown memorial resonated with many local residents as they sought an
appropriate site at which to commemorate their experiences of the Great War.

Any explanation of the site’s popularity must include its incorporation of symbols
and references, which, a century later, may not carry the same meaning for visitors as
they did for Bunke’s contemporaries. Most prominent among these is the life-size Joan
of Arc statue, which sits atop the nativity scene and appears as a kind of sentry, guard-
ing Bunke’s grave and greeting anyone who visits the church. While most observers
today would likely recognize the iconic figure, they could be forgiven for not appreci-
ating the specific relevance that she enjoyed in the 1920s and 1930s. More than a mere
reference to France, where Bunke fought and died, Joan’s story embodied for many
wartime Americans both the Christian faith for which the American military claimed
to fight and the ideals of justice and freedom which were to define a world finally made
“safe for democracy.” Imbued with such meaning, images of Joan of Arc abounded in
the United States from the war years through the 1930s. In addition to wartime propa-
ganda posters and Cecil B. DeMille’s 1916 film Joan the Woman, which played in Fred-
erick through 1918, statues of the medieval warrior appeared in public and private
spaces across the country. Most famous among these was Anna Vaughn Hyatt’s eques-
trian statue of Joan of Arc, which was unveiled on Riverside Drive in New York City
in December 1915 and became the site of patriotic celebrations throughout the war
years and beyond. Closer to home for Bunke’s contemporaries was a copy of Henri
Chapu’s famous sculpture of Joan, erected by the president of Frederick’s Hood College
in memory of their youngest daughter, who died in 1902. In 1926, the local newspaper included a full-page history of Joan of Arc’s life and memory as part of an ongoing series on the history and culture of postwar Europe. That same year, Frederick County’s high school graduates and their families listened as the commencement speaker identified in “the Maid” the perfect example of how to adhere to one’s purpose without wavering amid setbacks. Given Joan’s ubiquity, Frederick County residents would have been hard pressed not to see the relevance of Bunke’s guardian.9

In addition to its omnipresence in local and national culture, Bunke’s friends and family would have found a second source of significance in Joan’s image. Only a year before Bunke’s funeral, the Catholic Church had announced her canonization. While efforts to declare Joan of Arc a saint reached back to the nineteenth century, the timing of the final decision was, in fact, closely related to the war. Confronted with a wave of anticlerical and socialist sentiment that cast responsibility for the conflict on outdated political, religious, and economic institutions, the Church hoped that Joan’s canonization would “recapture the public imagination” and so bolster its standing in a postwar world. In Frederick County, the canonization of Joan of Arc made for front-page news and included a photo and description of a celebration held in her honor at Fordham University. For parishioners in Libertytown, it must have seemed fitting that the cemetery’s newest grave be attended by one of the newest saints.10

It was precisely in her presence among the parish’s fallen that a third explanation for the relevance of Joan of Arc to Bunke’s contemporaries emerged. She was, in fact, a common symbol of postwar American mourning. From service medals to official military division histories, Joan “played a significant role in the way that grieving Americans looked back on the Great War, embodying both the spirit of France for which the doughboys fought and in many cases sacrificed themselves and the virtue of the chaste Christian soldier.” For a site dedicated to the memory of one of the region’s beloved sons, the statue of Joan of Arc would have proven a familiar and moving icon.11

The same can be said for the plaque which hangs beneath it. Roughly the size of a standard sheet of paper, the marker is easily missed upon first glance, lost between Joan of Arc above and the nativity scene below. Nevertheless, its text provides an important connection to Libertytown’s past and integrates Bunke into an interesting local historical narrative. Originally plotted in 1782 and known as Duke’s Woods, present-day Libertytown was the meeting place of an anti-Stamp Act group known as the “Sons of Liberty” in the years that preceded the American Revolution. In a nod to this past, as well as the “spirit pervading the country after the war of independence,” the town renamed itself Libertytown in the early nineteenth century. Acknowledging the town’s Revolutionary War-era history, the plaque equates Bunke with those “American patriots” who, in the late eighteenth century, sacrificed their lives for the cause of freedom.12

In so doing, the memorial echoed popular wartime narratives that cast the First World War as an extension of the Revolutionary War that saw Americans once again fight in defense of liberty, freedom, and justice. Emphasizing the historical linkage in
his request to Congress for a declaration of war against Germany, Woodrow Wilson appealed to America’s unique historical duty, arguing that, in 1917, “America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness.” Like that of many national leaders before and after his time, Wilson’s interpretation of the Revolutionary War as a model of national unity in defense of shared principles ignored the long-forgotten regional and political divisions which had threatened the revolutionaries’ success at every turn. Such inaccuracy aside, Bunke and his contemporaries would have been quite familiar with a wartime culture determined to connect the Great War with the Revolution. From Nora Bayes’s famous performances of the hit song “Over There” in Revolutionary War-era uniforms to liberty bond campaign posters urging Americans to make the same sacrifices for their country in 1917 that their ancestors had made in 1776, reminders of the connections between the two conflicts abounded. It is little wonder that a doughboy buried in Libertytown would be called a patriot upon his death.13

If the plaque affirming Bunke’s patriotism is easily overlooked by observers, much harder to miss is the opening below, which houses a year-round nativity display. The foot-tall figures which fill the crèche were imported from Belgium and stand on a stage-like platform crafted by former church groundskeeper Charles McKinney. Like most of his fellow parishioners, McKinney knew of Bunke’s love for Christmas and found in a nativity display a fitting reminder of the fallen soldier. At the same time, the image of Christ’s birth invokes the same message of faith that Bunke left in his final letter home from France. Recalling his experience on the front line, Bunke confessed that he was “very much frightened.” After drawing upon his faith, however, his “nerve came right back” as he realized God was watching over him. In his description of his own experiences, Bunke echoed one of the most famous passages of Scripture regarding his beloved Christmas. As the Gospel of Luke recounts, on the night of Christ’s birth, an angel of the Lord appeared to the shepherds, commanding them not to be afraid because, God was, to use Bunke’s words, “watching over them” by sending a Savior. In this way, then, the nativity scene at Bunke’s grave offered his contemporaries not only a reminder of his character but his faith as well.14

Of course, to recover more of the contemporary meaning of local First World War memorials, like Bunke’s grave, communities must extend the scope of their inquiry to include the broader landscapes in which these commemorative sites first emerged and operated. As French memorial scholar Antoine Prost reminds us, “The significance of monuments stems first of all from the fact that the space in which they stand is charged with meaning.” Returning to the same local historical sources that reveal the contemporary significance of Bunke’s grave, one discovers how much Prost’s observation rings true for a site such as the parish cemetery in Libertytown.15

Upon his arrival at St. Peter, Kavanaugh undertook to beautify the space, rethinking its layout and symbolic content. As a result of this process, the cemetery evolved into a striking transatlantic commemorative space. More than a decade before Joan of Arc
assumed her watchful position atop Bunke’s grave, Kavanaugh had already drawn parishioners’ attention to events overseas with the addition of another unique memorial. About a hundred feet to the north of Bunke’s grave lies one of the first memorials erected in the United States to commemorate the sinking of the Titanic in April 1912. At the base of a large sculpture of a crucified Christ, flanked by life-sized figures of Mary and John the Apostle, rests a small marble tablet. The inscription on the tablet reads:

ERECTED
by the members of
St. Peter’s Church
In memory of the
TITANIC’S DEAD
Blessed by
Rev. Francis Klauder C.S.S.R.
and
Rev. Samuel J.
Kavanaugh
April 19, 1912

While the sculptures, which predated the tragedy, were evidence of Kavanaugh’s broader beautification plans for the cemetery, the marker was a spontaneous addition inspired by his ties to several passengers who died aboard the ship. Despite its simplicity, the memorial proves quite powerful. Resting at the foot of the two figures mourning a crucified Christ, the simple white stone delivers a moving reflection on what the local Frederick press described as a “horrible loss of life.” In the process, the memorial echoed a theme of many subsequent sites across the nation which, through varied forms and aesthetics, focused on the innocence of those who died. Most prominent among these, perhaps, was Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney’s Titanic Memorial in Washington, DC. Completed twenty years after the Libertytown memorial, Vanderbilt’s work also drew upon Christian notions of innocent sacrifice with its cruciform, angelic like male figure dedicated to “the brave men who perished in the wreck . . . that women and children might be saved.” If Kavanaugh’s marker lacked much of the aesthetic complexity of the memorial in the nation’s capital, it nevertheless called local attention to national and international events and helped to extend the commemorative reach of the cemetery beyond the parish itself.16

In a similar fashion, Kavanaugh had constructed in the cemetery a replica of the famous Massabielle Grotto from Lourdes, France, where St. Bernadette received her eighteen visions in 1858. To be sure, the Grotto in Libertytown was not the first replica of the French site to be constructed in Maryland. At Mount St. Mary’s University in nearby Emmitsburg, Father John Dubois, a refugee from France who established the school in 1808, built a replica of the Lourdes Grotto in 1875. The exact extent to which
the grottos in France and Emmitsburg inspired Kavanaugh is unknown. In 1914, he constructed a similar site at the rear of the churchyard. Dedicated to parishioner Martha Josephine Riddlemoser, Kavanaugh's grotto closely resembles both grottos. Like Bunke's Joan of Arc statue, the site illustrates Kavanaugh's interest in drawing upon transatlantic and Catholic iconography to memorialize both local and national loss.17

No less striking than the cemetery's international focus, however, is the way in which it also echoed broader trends in the local memorial landscape. This was especially true in the decades that separated the First and Second World Wars. About one hundred yards to the south of Bunke's memorial lies the grave of another veteran of the Great War. Originally from Pennsylvania, Levi Waters settled in Frederick County, Maryland, after returning from his wartime service in France. An African American, Waters served in Company F of the 92nd Division of the Regular American Army. Known as the “Buffalo Soldiers,” after the eponymous African American cavalrymen of the nineteenth century, Waters' division fought in the same Meuse-Argonne sector where Bunke died and was instrumental in helping bring the war on the western front to an end. After surviving the horrific fighting that attended the final months of the war, Waters returned, in February 1919, to Frederick County, where his mother lived, and confronted the hardship and discrimination that attended life for African American veterans in the Jim Crow era. Ten years later, he died in a car crash, which garnered front-page attention for several weeks in July and August 1929. While describing in detail the accident and Water's treatment at a local hospital, the press made only brief mention of his military service. On August 19, The Daily News announced Waters' death and noted simply that he “was a veteran of the World War and rendered service in France.” Beyond this scant description, only Waters' official military headstone, which was not placed until 1938 despite a request for the marker submitted by his mother in 1929, commemorated his role in the war. Indeed, the contrast between Waters' marker and the memorial that adorns Bunke's grave could not be greater.18

How to interpret this contrast? To be sure, nothing in the historical record suggests that officials at St. Peter dictated the kinds of headstones that individuals could have according to race. The nature of Bunke's memorial most reflects his prominent role as a beloved member of the parish and as a close friend of Kavanaugh. By contrast, Waters, who was not originally from Libertytown, enjoyed far less connection to the St. Peter community and, most likely, came to rest there only as a result of his mother's local residency. Moreover, his standardized military-issue headstone, though far less elaborate than Bunke's, is not unlike those found on the graves of many First World War veterans. Nevertheless, the discrepancy between the two graves would have, for contemporaries of Bunke and Waters alike, reflected the socio-economic and racial disparities that informed local and national First World War memorials across the United States. Among the topics of reflection raised by those memorials' centenaries are precisely these disparities. Just as the rich symbolism of Bunke's memorial demands explanation today, so too does the poverty of symbolism at Waters' grave.19
For all that Bunke’s memorial and the parish cemetery offered his contemporaries by way of poignant transatlantic references and rich symbolism, the site’s meaning had already begun to change less than two decades after Bunke’s funeral. In the 1940s, a parishioner named Sebastian Grabenstein, with no personal connection to Bunke or his story, took charge of caring for the nativity scene. Like Bunke, Grabenstein loved Christmas and was drawn to the unique crèche, which he felt was a point of pride for the church. To ensure its longevity, he worked each year to refurbish any broken pieces, string up the lights, and refresh the greenery each holiday season. In the decades that followed, parishioners and journalists alike flocked to the site, not to see Bunke’s grave, but the nativity scene itself. A 1969 Catholic Review article affirmed the substitution of the crèche for Bunke as the site’s principal focus. With hardly a word about the soldier’s grave, or Joan of Arc, the author described how “Near the church stands a stone manger, lighted each night for the enjoyment of the passerby.” To be sure, Bunke’s grave is not the only site of memory to undergo such a shift in meaning as visitors begin to access the past across generational lines. Most famously, perhaps, the “Changing of the Guard” has for decades rivaled, if not replaced, the fallen of the First World War as the principal focus of commemoration at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery. Yet, as local and national memorials such as these reach their centenaries, they invite reflection upon precisely those ideas and evolutions that informed their past and promise to shape their future.20

To return to the questions posed at the start of this analysis: Whither the meaning of local First World War memorials a century after the Great War? What to conclude about those hundreds of local memorials that upon their construction a century ago spoke to a specific generation and set of experiences to which visitors now have no living connection? When considered through the example of William Bunke’s gravesite, at least, answers to such questions appear to lie at precisely the intersection of national and local memorial landscapes.

For its part, the new national memorial promises to bring renewed American attention to the First World War and its enduring influence on the nation today. Often glossed over in textbooks and curricula and long neglected in a capital memorial landscape most known for its monuments to Washington and Lincoln as well as the Second World War and the Vietnam War, the First World War has long escaped the spotlight that the construction of a national memorial brings. From its prominent location near the White House, the new site will serve to educate millions of annual visitors about the war and invite reflection on its place in American history alongside the multitude of other conflicts commemorated in the surrounding space. Moreover, the national memorial’s unique design shifts away from the white male perspective that dominated many memorials erected in the 1920s and 1930s. Instead, the site will depict the diversity of American wartime experiences by way of a 58-foot bronze relief sculpture that includes depictions of women, African Americans, and other ethnic and religious minorities. In this way, the new national memorial aims not only to draw attention to the Great War but to the rich diversity of experiences that it produced.
Yet, like any national memorial, the site risks appearing to visitors as an abstraction, unconnected with the local communities and historical narratives that inform their daily lives. Such was the realization of Secretary of War John W. Weeks, who upon opening the funeral for the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery in November 1921 noted, “Whether he came from the North, the South, the East or the West, we do not know. Neither do we know his name, his lineage, or any other fact relating to his life or death, but we do know that he was a typical American who responded to his country’s call.” Unlike Weeks’ audience, who had lived through the war and likely had some personal connection to a “typical American” veteran, visitors to the new memorial will not benefit from such relationships as they experience the site’s portrayal of the past. In this instance, then, the national memorial invites a return to those now century-old local World War I memorials, like Bunke’s gravesite.21

Amid the renewed attention to the Great War that the latest addition to the capital landscape and its attendant controversies bring, local World War I memorials have an opportunity to escape the obscurity into which many have fallen and, in so doing, render experiences of the new national memorial more meaningful. By revisiting their own local sites of memory, people across the United States can rediscover those events, figures, and tragedies that defined the war experience in their hometowns. An excellent opportunity for collaboration between local history teachers, students, public historians, archivists, and librarians, exploration of these local sites could produce onsite information panels, articles, and public presentations that can reaffirm and preserve the sites’ original meaning for generations to come. In Libertytown, such effort would reveal the rich symbolism and personal connections behind William Bunke’s striking, if perhaps obscure to contemporary viewers, memorial. At the same time, it would draw attention to the broader commemorative terrain in which he rests—to the nation’s first memorial to the victims of the Titanic, the replica of the Grotto of Lourdes, and the grave of Levi Waters. Inevitably, the process would inspire reflection on the war’s legacy for the region and, thus, render the conflict more meaningful for residents today. Once aware of the stories of Bunke, Waters, Kavanaugh, and others, visitors from Libertytown could engage with the new national memorial on a more intimate level, equipped with specific images and individual narratives through which to make sense of the site’s abstractions and generalizations. Though generations removed from those who endured the Great War, these visitors would experience the national memorial in much the same way as the war generation experienced the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier or the unveiling of the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City a century ago—approaching the national narrative through the lens of the unique local experiences that it comprises.

NOTES


11. Steven Trout, Memorial Fictions: Willa Cather and the First World War (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2002), 49.


During the First World War, the then Maryland Historical Society had around 800 members, 64 of whom served in the military. Each of these members was represented by a blue star on the service flag, with the exception of three members, represented by a gold star, who died while in military service. At a board of directors meeting held on February 11, 1918, former Maryland governor and president of the Society Edwin Warfield announced that he would pursue the acquisition of a service flag to honor these members. Hung for a time at the entrance of the Enoch Pratt House, at the corner of Park Avenue and Monument Street in Baltimore, the flag was taken down after the war and formally added to the collection in 1968.
In this issue of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Corey Campion and Caylee Winpigler critically examine the headstone and memorial of William Bunke (1891–1918) in “Joan of Arc, Patriots, and the Nativity?: Reflections on the Centenary of Local First World War Memorials in Libertytown, Maryland.” If you found yourself learning something completely new about the war, you are not alone. Individuals and scholars alike have long overlooked the American role in the conflict due to the passing of time, controversial involvement, subsequent wars, and the lack of “unifying collective memory about its meaning.”

The United States committed four million soldiers and sailors and more than 116,000 dead in the last year and a half of the so-called “war to end all wars.” Of that total, more than 62,000 Marylanders answered the call of military service as volunteers or draftees, including 11,000 African Americans. At home, military installations at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Fort McHenry’s General Hospital No. 2, and Camp Meade, supported the troops through training and medical care. Meanwhile, civilians rallied to the war effort by buying war bonds, planting victory gardens, and supporting the American Red Cross and YMCA, among other organizations.

In the initial decades following the end of the war, individuals and various organizations erected memorials—more than sixty—across the state to commemorate and honor Maryland’s veterans and war dead. Many of these fixtures have become neglected, forgotten, or as argued by Campion and Winpigler, “are now only accessible in the realm of postmemory.” Fortunately, for Marylanders and scholars alike, we do not have to rely solely on monuments in our efforts to understand and interpret Maryland in the First World War.

At the Maryland Center for History and Culture—then Maryland Historical Society—we began collecting artifacts from the war in France while it was still ongoing and installed our first exhibition on the event—the “Over There Room”—in June 1919. In the century since, we have collected thousands of documents, images, and objects from the First World War as part of our greater mission to “collect, preserve, and interpret the history, art, and culture of Maryland.” As a companion to Campion and Winpigler’s writing...
on the Bunke memorial, presented on the next few pages are a few images and objects from within our First World War collections.

Readers may enjoy these resources and more in our Digital Collections Portal at: mdhistory.org/digital-resource
The gas mask and steel helmet have become synonymous with the First World War. The American Army did not have a standard-issue gas mask when they entered the conflict in 1917, so they acquired the British variant, known as the Small Box Respirator (SBR). The U.S. also purchased thousands of the steel British Mark I Brodie Helmet to protect troops. These items were used by Stanley Adolph Dolle (1893–1986), who was a Baltimore hardware store clerk when the war broke out. Enlisting during the first month of American participation, he joined Troop A, Maryland Cavalry, Maryland National Guard. Federalized in August 1917, his unit became part of the 104th Military Police Company within the 29th “Blue and Gray” Infantry Division, where they witnessed the last four months of the war and the grand Meuse-Argonne offensive. After the war, Dolle became a hardware store manager and remained active with the veterans’ group Troop A, Post 58, 29th Division Association.
Beginning in 1903, the U.S. Army utilized the M1903 Springfield as its standard service rifle. By the end of the war, over one million were in use, with another 1.5 million M1917 Enfields produced to keep up with the number of Americans in uniform. While the exact wartime use of this rifle is unknown, it was collected by August Mencken Jr. (1889–1967), a civil engineer, model maker, author, and firearms enthusiast. The lesser-known younger brother of famed author H. L. Mencken (1880–1956), August was working as a civil engineer for the Claiborne, Johnston & Company firm when the war broke out. Reporting to a draft call on July 20, 1917, August was initially certified to serve in the military, but did not ultimately serve in that capacity. Turning back to his civilian work, he spent the majority of the war supervising the construction of Camp Meade, one of the country’s key eastern army cantonments, which processed more than 400,000 troops. August may have acquired this rifle during his time there.
Women of the World War I period, and their contributions, have largely been forgotten in lieu of the more memorable “Rosie the Riveter” imagery of World War II. The Woman’s Land Army of America was one of many women’s organizations that supported the war effort at home and abroad. Between 1917 and 1919, more than 20,000 city and suburban women traveled to rural areas to plow fields, drive tractors, and tend to farms left by men who were then in military service.12

One of these “farmerettes,” as they came to be known, was Lilian Sarah Greif (1885–1970) of Baltimore. The daughter of a Jewish German immigrant grocery store owner, Greif attended the Maryland Institute College of Art (MICA) and spent a number of pre-war years working as a silver and copper craftswoman, hand-making and selling jewelry alongside two other women.13 She remained active in the community her entire life as a member of the Women’s Civic League and vocal city park preservationist.14
At least a dozen of the 2.5 million WWI Victory Medals distributed after the war are in MCHC’s collection, including this example with perhaps the most interesting story.

Lieutenant Ferdinand Oscar Wolfgang Reinhard, MD (1886–1950) was born in Baltimore to German immigrants. After attending the Boys’ Latin School and Johns Hopkins University, he worked as an Assistant Dispensary Physician for the Johns Hopkins Department of Medicine.\(^{15}\) His wartime experience began much earlier than that of most Americans. On June 27, 1915, he left Maryland to volunteer in the Serbian branch of the Red Cross, returning in May 1916. During his travels, he passed through numerous war-torn nations, including Greece, Turkey, Austria-Hungary, and Germany. Reinhard survived a serious case of typhus and was a firsthand witness to the horrors of war.\(^{16}\) He received his officer’s commission in the U.S. Army Medical Corps in June 1917 and was in France by November. Reinhard spent his war service as the medical officer for several aero squadrons before returning home in March 1919.
These U.S. Signal Corps Binoculars are one pair of 106,000 shipped overseas by Bausch & Lomb and were carried by Lieutenant Edgar Gaierty Lynch (1897–1942). Born in Baltimore, Lynch attended only two years at Loyola College (high school) before dropping out and working as a law office clerk. On July 1, 1916, he quit his job and joined Company A, 5th Regiment, Maryland National Guard, and was a part of the Mexican Expedition. Upon returning to Baltimore, he returned to work for a few months only to reenlist and head to training camp with the 29th Infantry Division. Pulled from his unit to serve as an officer, Lynch finally arrived in France in October 1918 and saw action in the Meuse-Argonne offensive with Machine Gun Company, 162nd Infantry, 81st Infantry Division. Following the armistice, Lynch suffered a brief illness before he returned to Baltimore for a career in insurance, and, upon his death, was buried at Arlington National Cemetery.
The 1914 or “Mons” Star was awarded to troops of the British Empire who were active in France or Belgium between August and November 1914. This example was posthumously awarded to the family of John “Johnny” Prentiss Poe Jr. (1874–1915) of Baltimore. The great-nephew of author Edgar Allan Poe, Johnny Poe was a star football player at Princeton before turning to coaching. Beyond a series of odd jobs in between coaching stints, Poe went and served in the military, wherever the action was and whichever country needed soldiers. Prior to World War I, he served with the 5th Regiment, Maryland National Guard (1898), 23rd Infantry Regiment (1899), Kentucky National Guard (1903), U.S.S. Dixie (U.S. Marine Corps Detachment) (1903), Honduran Army (1907), and Venezuelan Revolutionary Forces (1908).

Within weeks of Britain’s declaration of war, the famous “soldier of fortune” announced his intentions to join the British Army. By September 1914, he was in England, where he secured a position with the Royal Garrison Artillery. Too far behind the lines for his taste, Poe transferred to the “Black Watch,” a prominent Scottish infantry unit. On September 25, 1915, his unit was decimated on the first day of the Battle of Loos. Among the fallen was Johnny Poe.
FIGURE 9. George Buchanan Redwood (1888–1918), oil on canvas by Thomas Cromwell Corner (1865–1938), 1918. Maryland Center for History and Culture, The Redwood Collection, Gift of Mrs. Francis Tazewell Redwood, XX.4.216
**Figure 10.** Identification disc, unknown maker, 1917.

Maryland Center for History and Culture, The Redwood Collection,
Gift of Mrs. Francis Tazewell Redwood, XX.4.584
George Buchanan Redwood (1888–1918) was a Baltimore native, Harvard graduate, and newspaperman for the Baltimore News. Prior to the declaration of war, Redwood enrolled at the Plattsburgh, New York, officer training camps (1915–1916) that were established during the American Preparedness Movement. He attended additional training in the summer of 1917, before he was assigned to Company I, 28th Infantry Regiment, 1st Infantry Division. His division was the first American division in France following the declaration of war.23

On March 28, 1918, near Seicheprey, the lieutenant led a four-man patrol in enemy territory. They encountered six German soldiers and managed to capture four, who later provided valuable intelligence. For this mission, Redwood was awarded the Croix de Guerre by the French government and his own government awarded him the Distinguished Service Cross—the nation’s second highest military award for valor.24

On May 28, he was twice wounded during an attack by the division on Cantigny. Despite his condition, later that evening, he volunteered to investigate German movements and was killed during this reconnaissance mission. For this action, he was posthumously awarded a second Distinguished Service Cross—denoted by the oak leaf cluster pin.

To commemorate Redwood as the first Maryland officer killed in action during the war, the Baltimore City Council moved quickly to rename the controversial “German Street” to “Redwood Street” in September 1918.25
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FIGURE 1. Drawing of Washington College’s second buildings.  
Courtesy of the Washington College Archives and Special Collections,  
Washington College print collection, MS 0147
Slavery at Maryland’s Washington College, 1782–1865

BY CAROL WILSON

In an 1894 history of Maryland higher education, Rowland Watts described the institution where he had once taught: “Upon a beautiful natural eminence, one fourth of a mile north of Chestertown, is situated that venerable institution known as Washington College. From its observatory may be had a magnificent view of the beautiful town of Chester, the windings of the romantic river of the same name, and, to the north, and west, a stretch of fertile and well improved agricultural country.” What Watts failed to note in his glowing description was the presence of enslaved laborers—in the town, on nearby farms, even at the College itself.¹

Slavery was deeply embedded in American institutions, and as recent scholarship has shown, higher education was no exception. Historian Craig Steven Wilder writes, “The academy never stood apart from American slavery—in fact, it stood beside church and state as the third pillar of a civilization built on bondage.” Enslaved people and the wealth they created were everywhere in early America. Slavery existed in Chestertown and the surrounding area from the College’s founding in 1782 until Maryland abolished slavery in 1864. The College itself had deep and numerous ties to slavery throughout its early history, profiting from the labor of enslaved men, women, and children. Many of the men responsible for the College’s success—founders, donors, presidents, and trustees—held people in slavery. Profits from the labor of enslaved people paid students’ tuition and other expenses. Local slaveholders rented and purchased College land, and received loans from the College. Enslaved people lived and worked at the College.²


This work began in 2018 as a research project involving Washington College students. I am grateful for their contributions. For more information, see the website: slaveryandfreedomatwashingtoncollege.org.
Yet Washington College was also the site of freedom for many enslaved people. As part of the “middle ground” state of Maryland, Washington College, like surrounding Chestertown and Kent County, witnessed a constant tension between slavery and freedom. In the two decades after its founding in 1782, many people connected to the College enacted individual manumissions; some were even part of an abolitionist organization operating in Chestertown. Manumissions dropped off in the early nineteenth century, and organized abolition disappeared from the area. Some whites concerned about slavery moved into the colonization movement. At the same time, the College became more deeply entwined with the institution of slavery—using enslaved people as labor on the campus and providing loans to enslavers who used human property as collateral. By the antebellum era, manumissions had virtually ceased, and slaveholders had mounted an aggressive defense of human bondage. Enslaved people continued to be a presence at the College. As such, Washington College followed a pattern of slaveholding attitudes and behaviors typical of Maryland and the Upper South region.

**Founding Era, 1782–1800**

Washington College was founded in 1782, during an era of expansion of higher education following the American Revolution. Eighteen new colleges opened between 1782 and 1800, and college presidents, even those from northern institutions, toured the South to fundraise from the wealthy. That meant, of necessity, enslavers. As he sought...
to build the Kent Free School into an institution of higher education, Rev. William Smith traveled the Eastern Shore of Maryland seeking donations from wealthy residents. Not surprisingly, a majority of these early donors claimed human property.\(^4\)

The slaveholding of the early supporters of Washington College ranged widely. Members of the elite, like Governor William Paca, General John Cadwalader, and General George Washington, held large plantation workforces, often numbering in excess of one hundred people. The numbers of those enslaved by donors ranged from a high of over three hundred (Edward Lloyd of Talbot County) to a single enslaved individual held by several donors.\(^5\)
Among the donors were the seven original founders of the College, all enslavers. In addition to William Smith, the founders—Joseph Nicholson, James M. Anderson, John Scott, William Bordley, Peregrine Letherbury, and Benjamin Chambers—represented Chestertown’s elite. Most had served in either military or civilian leadership roles during the Revolution. Benjamin Chambers was the Clerk of Court for Kent County. Joseph Nicholson served as the Register of Wills and Kent County Sheriff. Lawyer Peregrine Letherbury was a member of the state legislature. Anderson, Bordley, and Scott were physicians. All the founders were active in local church and civic organizations. All seven were slaveholders, enslaving between two (Smith) and thirty people (Chambers).6

Likewise, it was not uncommon for college presidents to be enslavers, and Washington College was no exception. Ten presidents led the College through the Civil War. Six of them enslaved people, and at least one more hired enslaved workers. The presidents who did not enslave people were in office for a total of less than five (out of eighty-two) years. All but one of the slaveholding presidents were ministers, of either the Episcopal or the Methodist churches.7

The first provost of the College of Philadelphia (later the University of Pennsylvania), Rev. William Smith, took charge of the Kent Free School in 1780 and quickly began building it into what would become Washington College. When Smith arrived in Chestertown with his family, he likely brought one enslaved person with him, a teenager or young woman named Dinah, and acquired a boy named Primus soon after his arrival.8

Dinah is named in a letter from Smith’s wife Rebecca to her son Charles (a graduate of the College’s first class) in 1784: “Black Dinah begs that her best respects be given to Mr. Charles.” William Smith may also be referring to Dinah in a 1793 letter to his friend Dr. Benjamin Rush detailing the news of Rebecca’s death, when he mentions “her faithful little black girl.” It is also possible that Dinah is the slave listed in Smith’s Philadelphia tax records from 1769 and 1774. The references to Dinah suggest that she may have worked in the Smith household under the purview of Rebecca Smith.9

Primus, however, was the personal servant of William Smith and likely worked for Smith at Washington College. Smith’s great-grandson and biographer Horace Weymss Smith refers to Primus as “a favorite negro body-servant of Dr. Smith” and states that Smith “had great regard for Primus whom he bought as a child in Maryland in 1783 and who had been constantly by his side for nearly twenty years.” Primus is undoubtedly the “black boy” mentioned in several letters written by Smith to his friends Benjamin Rush and Jasper Yeates on the death of Rebecca Smith. Smith describes his enslaved man as overcome with grief, “weeping and faithful.” Primus is also discussed in a letter by Smith’s niece Williamina Ridgely to her mother Ann Ridgely in Dover. As a girl, Williamina had attended school in Chestertown with her sister; now a young woman living in Philadelphia, she frequently corresponded with her mother. In January, 1801, Williamina dated an event by saying it was “about the time poor Primus was sent to the hospital.” Primus died in May 1801.10
William Smith enslaved at least one more person during his lifetime, a man named Cyrus, possibly acquired to replace Primus. Williamina Ridgely was scathing in her description of Smith’s treatment of Cyrus in an 1803 letter to her mother, writing, “Doctor Smith is alive and alive like to be, he has advertised his servant Cyrus for sale because he is given to drink. If I can get his letter to the public about Cyrus I will send it to you, it is Satan reproving sin.” Two days later, Williamina sent her mother the advertisement for Cyrus, noting, “I send you the advertisement of Doctor Smith about his servant because I think it is a shame for him to find fault with the man for what he does himself.”

William Smith’s successor, Rev. Colin Ferguson, was also an enslaver. Born and raised on a farm in northern Kent County, Ferguson was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and returned to teach at the Kent Free School. Upon Washington College’s opening, he became professor of languages, mathematics and natural philosophy. When Smith returned to Philadelphia in 1789, Ferguson assumed the presidency, serving until 1804. He died not long after retiring, and his 1806 will shows that he claimed five enslaved people as his property. It is likely that some or all of them were bequeathed to Ferguson by his father, Colin Ferguson Sr., who had died only a few years earlier. But the younger Ferguson was already a slaveholder, claiming two people in the 1790 census. Colin Ferguson’s inventory lists the names of the people he enslaved: George, 25, identified as a “cripple”; Pere, 18; Jude, 23; and two children—Thomas, 9, and Hannah, 7. Whether any of these people were present at the College working for Ferguson is not known, but it is likely.

Like those who ran the College, many students also came from enslaving families. Given that only the wealthiest Americans had the opportunity to attend college before the Civil War, it is not surprising. The wealth that enslaved people created for elite families enabled the sons from these families to attend college from the colonial era through the Civil War. Students—teenaged boys and young men—had their educations paid for by the forced labor of adults as well as boys and girls their own age, and even younger.

A Washington College tuition ledger reveals the extent of enslaving among students’ families. The document lists the names of twenty-six parents and guardians of students enrolled in May 1806. While twenty were enslavers, only three definitely were not. (The status of three more is unclear.) Slaveholding size among the parents and guardians ranged from a single enslaved person (claimed by Elizabeth Worrell of Chestertown) to sixty-seven people (claimed by Sidney George of Cecil County). Information about average slaveholding size in Maryland in 1806 is not available, but data from the 1800 and 1810 censuses gives some idea of how very wealthy these individuals were. In both 1790 and 1850, the most common slaveholding in Maryland was between two and four people, with somewhat higher numbers on the Eastern Shore and in southern Maryland. About 80 percent of Maryland slaveholders claimed fewer than ten people. (The majority of Marylanders never enslaved people.) Not only did Washington College students come from
families that profited from enslaved labor, the extent of this labor made some of them the wealthiest citizens in Maryland.\textsuperscript{14}

Guardians’ Accounts (records of expenses of orphans’ legal guardians) also provide evidence of the connection between enslaved labor and the financial support of students attending the College. Some individual accounts show that the students’ tuition (as well as other expenses) was offset by the hiring out of enslaved people. The following examples indicate that, despite being orphaned, young men could become highly successful, supported by the labor of people they enslaved.

One such student was Thomas Bordley, born in Kent County in 1772, the middle child of one of the College founders, prominent local doctor William Bordley and his wife, Elisabeth Tilden Bordley. Thomas had two sisters; the births of all three were recorded in the Quaker Meeting minutes (Cecil Monthly Meeting), suggesting that Elisabeth came from a Quaker family. She must have left her faith at some point, because she and her husband William were enslavers, something that was prohibited in the Quaker faith by this time. When Thomas was a student at Washington College, his father died. But William Bordley left his family well-provided for. In addition to a house in Chestertown, Bordley owned a 130-acre farm outside of town called Kindness, where he enslaved seven people. His son Thomas inherited this land. The Guardians’ Accounts show that Thomas’s tuition, board, and other expenses were paid for by the rent of Kindness and the hire of three enslaved people: Joe, Rachel, and Sam.\textsuperscript{15}

Thomas Bordley graduated from Washington College in 1790 and became a physician in Kent County, following in the footsteps of both his father and his guardian, James M. Anderson. Thomas Bordley did not practice medicine for long, however; he died in 1803. Yet by the time he died, Bordley had amassed a significant amount of property. His estate encompassed eleven enslaved people, including the Joe and Rachel referenced earlier. Bordley had manumitted Sam in 1797.\textsuperscript{16}

Another student supported by the work of enslaved people was Samuel Davis III. He attended Washington College from 1790 through at least 1795, when he turned eighteen. Samuel’s father was one of the original donors to the founding of Washington College. He died in 1790 and left his son 460 acres of land as well as three enslaved people: Stephen, Patt, and Bill. Although his mother Hannah was still living, Samuel Davis was appointed a male guardian to oversee his support. The guardian’s accounts indicate that, to pay for Davis’s tuition and other bills, income was generated by the hiring out of Stephen, Patt, Bill, and two other enslaved people, Will and Martha.\textsuperscript{17}

As an adult, Davis decided to reward three of the slaves who helped him through college by granting them freedom. In 1797, he manumitted Stephen, twenty-one, immediately; Martha and William would have to wait several years until they reached the age of twenty-one. It is not known if Samuel Davis III graduated from Washington College; however, he secured sufficient education to establish himself as a lawyer in Kent County. But Davis did not have long to practice his profession; by 1809, he had died.\textsuperscript{18}
The histories of the students Thomas Bordley and Samuel Davis illustrate the tension between slavery and freedom in Maryland at this time. During the American Revolution, many white Americans began questioning the legitimacy of slavery. The ownership of human beings seemed incongruous with—possibly even dangerous to—a republican form of government. On the Eastern Shore of Maryland, two other factors were even more significant than political ideology. Quakers had begun opposing slavery in the 1750s, and as Methodism swept through the region, a significant number of slaveholders began to free their slaves on religious grounds. The changing economy of the region made manumission practical, too, as farmers moved away from labor-intensive tobacco toward corn and wheat production. A small group of white men organized to press for the abolition of slavery altogether. Members of the Washington College community were well represented in both these endeavors—individual manumission and the broader goal of abolition.

Between 1782 and 1857, forty-four College-related owners in Kent County manumitted nearly two hundred of the people they enslaved. The bulk of manumissions occurred during a roughly twenty-year period beginning in 1782, the year the College was founded. The majority of manumitters were donors to the College’s creation and members of the Board of Visitors and Governors.

Some manumitters also supported abolition. During the Revolutionary era, sentiment for abolishing slavery and organizations working to end it existed in every state as far south as North Carolina. Before the 1830s, the Upper South had more abolition societies than the northern states. Maryland had several organizations, including one in Chestertown that was active in the 1790s. Early abolitionist organizations engaged in numerous activities: they pressed state and federal governments for laws to facilitate manumission, to end the African slave trade, and to abolish the institution of slavery altogether. They also worked in their local communities to educate free Blacks and protect them from illegal kidnapping into slavery. Beginning in 1794, local and state organizations met annually in Philadelphia to coordinate their efforts.

The Chestertown Abolition Society sent representatives to at least two of the annual conventions, held in Philadelphia. Both of the representatives in 1795 had College affiliations. Edward Scott had graduated from the College in 1788, while James Houston served as President of the Board of Visitors and Governors. Other members of the Chestertown Abolition Society had Washington College connections. The organization’s president, James M. Anderson, also served as President of the Board of Visitors and Governors. Attorneys John Scott and Joseph Hopper Nicholson were both alumni, their fathers among the seven founders of the College. Three other members—John Lorain, Peregrine Letherbury, and William Bordley—were among the original donors. The latter two were also founders of the College.

Many members of the Chestertown Abolition Society were part of either local Quaker or Methodist congregations that eschewed slaveholding. Some of those who joined the organization, however, were in fact slaveholders, including several of the...
CONSTITUTION
OF THE
CHESTER-TOWN SOCIETY,
FOR PROMOTING THE
ABOLITION OF SLAVERY,
AND THE RELIEF OF
FREE NEGROES, AND OTHERS,
UNWILLFULLY HELD IN
BONDAGE.

“Woe unto him that buildeth his House by Unrighteousness, and his Chambers by Wrong; that useth his Neighbour’s Service without Wages, and giveth him not for his Work.” Jeremiah, xxii. 13.

“We hold these Truths to be self-evident:—That all Men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.”

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

Baltimore:
Printed by William Goddard and James Angell,
M.DCC.XCI.

FIGURE 4. Constitution of the Chestertown Society for . . . the Abolition of Slavery
(Baltimore: Goddard and Angell, 1791)
College community. How can we explain this discrepancy in the absence of surviving documents in the words of the people involved? Some owners did choose to eventually free the people they claimed as property, while others freed only some of those they enslaved.23

State law limited who could be freed: no one over the age of fifty (later reduced to forty-five), and no one deemed unable to care for themselves. Some whites claimed free Blacks were likely to be a burden on the community, despite ample evidence of Black industry. Some members of the Chestertown Abolition Society may have been interested only in supporting free Black people, others in exploring the idea of ending slavery, discussing it with their fellow white men. The abolition of slavery—freedom for all Black women and men—was a subject under debate as whites grappled with the place of African Americans in the new nation.24

The Scott family of Chestertown serves as an example of the early national era’s struggle over slavery, with members of the family engaging in slaveholding, individual manumissions, and the larger goal of abolition. This family had a multi-generational history with Washington College, including representation among early donors, founders, alumni, and trustees.

John Scott the elder was a Chestertown doctor and early supporter of Washington College. One of the College’s original donors, Scott was also one of the founders, and a member of the first Board of Visitors and Governors. He was also a slaveholder: he owned two large farms on Upper Langford Bay outside town where he enslaved over twenty people. John Scott and his wife Elizabeth Calder Scott had four sons who graduated from Washington College. (They also had two daughters.) Despite growing up in a home with enslaved people, three of the four Scott sons had ties to early abolitionism in Kent County.25

John Scott the younger was the salutatorian of Washington College’s first graduating class. A lawyer, he served as Honorary Counsellor for the Chestertown Abolition Society in 1792. Lawyers for abolition societies assisted in drawing up manumission papers, monitoring local laws that applied to slavery, and bringing cases for people who had been illegally enslaved. In 1796, Scott manumitted one person he enslaved—a 35-year-old man named Tom, also known as Tucker.26

William Scott served on the Board of Visitors and Governors from at least 1816 until his death in 1822, and was likely a graduate of the College. Like his brother, William Scott was a lawyer. In 1806 he represented Nancy, Benjamin, and Mary Green, members of a Queen Anne’s County family held illegally in slavery. Although their case took seven years, the Greens ultimately achieved their goal of freedom. Soon after, in 1816, William Scott was appointed Clerk of the Kent County Court, a position he held until his death in 1822.27

Edward Scott graduated from Washington College in 1788, and may have taken part in a “Dialogue on Slavery” presented at that year’s graduation. He studied medicine in Philadelphia and trained under Chestertown physician (and College Board member)
James M. Anderson. Edward Scott settled in Galena (then called Georgetown Cross-roads) and set up practice. He also held people in slavery, but, like his siblings John and William, became interested in the cause of abolition. After joining the Chestertown Abolition Society, Edward was one of two men representing the organization at the American Convention meeting in Philadelphia. Of all of the Scott family, it was Edward who most translated abolition sentiment into action. He registered his first manumission, that of James, in 1793, and between 1803 and 1816, he freed eight more people, some immediately, some at a future date. Yet despite freeing some people, the Scotts continued to enslave others. William appears in the 1820 census claiming eight enslaved people, while Edward enslaved three people as late as 1840, two years before his death.28

Another slaveholder-abolitionist was James Mouat Anderson, a Chestertown physician who had a long association with the College. His father, also a doctor and also named James Anderson, was one of the early donors to the College, and one of its original trustees. The younger Anderson, who entered into practice with his father, also followed in his footsteps by donating to the College’s inception, and joining the Board. By 1819, he became its President.29
James M. Anderson also presided over the Chestertown Abolition Society. Likely, Anderson’s support for abolition was related to his religion; he was a leader in the Methodist church. But James M. Anderson also enslaved people, some of whom he eventually freed. Beginning in March 1785, Anderson issued his first set of manumissions, granting delayed freedom to eight enslaved people. Anderson had perhaps inherited these enslaved people from his father, who died in 1783, and claimed eight slaves in the 1783 Tax Assessment. Anderson freed nine more people in 1785, and several years later he manumitted another five.30

Despite leading the Abolition Society and freeing over twenty people, James M. Anderson was still enslaving people at the time of his death in 1820. In his will, he provided for the freedom of his enslaved man David in 1826, and stated that whichever of his four children agreed to care for “his old woman mammy Grace” (also enslaved, described as about eighty years old) would gain David’s service until he was freed. A codicil appended two years later, however, added five years to David’s manumission date, making him thirty when he would be a free man. Why Anderson performed such a seemingly cruel act on the eve of his death is unclear. Had David done something to anger him? Or had Anderson acted paternalistically, deciding David was not yet ready for freedom? Anderson’s act clearly shows the power whites had in 1820s’ Maryland, even those who granted enslaved people freedom—they held the fate of the enslaved in their hands.31

Transition era, 1800–1830

In the first few decades of the nineteenth century, Washington College and the surrounding area followed the pattern of the state with regard to slavery and freedom. Manumissions continued, albeit at a greatly reduced rate. Organized abolitionism ceased to exist, while some of those concerned about the issue of slavery found a home in the colonization movement. This movement sought to deport free Blacks (and people freed from enslavement for that purpose) from the United States to Africa. Colonization was an especially appealing idea in border states with rapidly increasing free Black populations, like Maryland.

One supporter of colonization was Peregrine Wroth, a local physician who had graduated from the College in 1803. He also taught Chemistry and Geology, and was the longtime Secretary of the Board. Wroth was also an enslaver. In later life, he wrote various letters, poems, and reminiscences, including his fond memories of life growing up on a Kent County farm. In an 1858 narrative he titled “The Yule Log,” Wroth recalls Christmas at the farm, describing a cozy scene with happy slaves, grateful for what their master gave them, content in their situation, part of a community that functioned because all members knew their places.32

Like many Maryland whites, Wroth viewed the growing free Black population with suspicion. Colonization was popular in the state, appealing to those who saw...
slavery as problematic for the nation’s future but could not tolerate equality with free African Americans. Wroth reflected this attitude, asserting in an address to the Kent County Colonization Society that free Blacks “cannot amalgamate with their former masters either in government or society.” He added, “They distrust our councils; compel us to do violence to our political creed—and must ultimately sap the foundations of the Republic.”

Fellow Board member and alum John Bowers Eccleston was also a colonizationist. Born in Kent County in 1794, he was orphaned at age eleven. While Eccleston attended Washington College as a student, his education was funded by the hire of four enslaved people: George, Bob, Sina, and Aaron. Despite the loss of his father, the income generated by the four gave Eccleston, like Thomas Bordley and Samuel Davis, an advantage in life. Eccleston went on to become a successful lawyer, judge, and landowner in Kent County. He served briefly in the Maryland House of Delegates, but spent most of his career as an attorney before his appointment as a judge in Maryland’s Second Judicial District and Court of Appeals.

Judge Eccleston involved himself in a wide array of local groups—religious, business, political and educational—and from 1823 to 1858 he was an active member of the College’s Board of Visitors and Governors. In 1841, Eccleston, along with several other Board members, represented Kent County at the state colonization convention. By the time of his death in 1860, Eccleston claimed ownership of four people.

During his time at Washington College, Eccleston, along with other students, would have encountered bondsmen and -women on the grounds of Washington College. Enslaved people were part of the households of the majority of presidents, for example, at times living at the College. Occupation of the first College building began in 1788, and the east end housed the presidents, including Rev. Francis Waters. A Methodist minister, Waters served two terms as the head of Washington College, from 1819 to 1823 and 1854 to 1860. In 1820 Waters claimed ownership of four people: Phil, twenty-five; Dinah, twenty; and her two children: Sally, four, and Violet, seven months. At least one of them, probably Dinah, worked at the College; an entry in the Board Meeting Minutes showed Waters receiving compensation for his “servant’s” labor in making fires and sweeping in the school room.

By 1821, however, Waters had decided to free all four of the people he enslaved, filing manumission papers at the Kent County Courthouse. But they were not granted their freedom immediately. According to the terms set out by Waters, Dinah and Phil were to become free on January 1, 1827, while the two girls would remain enslaved into their mid-twenties. Such term slavery was common in Maryland. Enslaved people got the promise of freedom; masters hoped to get more dutiful workers. Dinah, Violet, and Phil eventually gained their freedom. No freedom certificate for Sally has been found; it is possible she died before becoming free, was sold, or was freed but never applied for documentation.
Rev. Timothy Clowes succeeded Francis Waters as President. Clowes and his family moved to Chestertown in 1823 and occupied the east end of the College building. It was Clowes who had the misfortune to be at the helm of the College when it burned down in 1827; he and his family lost most of their possessions. Although he enslaved no one himself, Clowes made use of the labor of Charlotte, hired out by longtime College Treasurer Joseph Wickes for an annual fee of $18. Whether Charlotte worked serving Clowes in his capacity as president, or as a domestic servant to the Clowes family (or both), she lived and worked on the College grounds.38

Between 1827 and 1844, there was no official residence for staff and students, who boarded in nearby Chestertown. In 1844, a new building opened on the site of the first structure, and by 1854, two more had been added. Presidents and faculty members were housed there, including at least two presidents with enslaved people in their households. People enslaved by Board members were also present at the College, working at various tasks. For example, an 1821 receipt in the College’s financial records shows the Board Committee of Repairs authorizing payment of $15.75 to Board member and local physician Thomas Whittington for “work done by his negro man at College.” At the time of his death in 1823, Whittington claimed seven enslaved people, only one of whom was an adult male. His name was Bill, and he was later freed “in consideration of his faithfull attention” to Whittington. Alternatively, the enslaved worker could have been a young man named James whom Whittington sold in August 1822, for $370.39

**Figure 6.** Committee of Repairs, authorization of payment to Thomas Whittington, 1821, Board of Visitors of Governors Early Records, 1782–1852. Courtesy of the Washington College Archives and Special Collections, Washington College chronological collection, MS 005
Whittington’s behavior of concurrently holding people in slavery, freeing people, and selling people was not unusual for Maryland enslavers at this time. In his 1811 will, Whittington declared his intention to free all of the people he enslaved. Yet in the final version, written soon before his death in 1823, he freed only Bill; his six other enslaved people were transferred to other owners. Previously in 1811, Whittington had manumitted a woman named Nan. Yet that same year, he sold another woman, Hannah, and between 1805 and 1822—the same period that he considered freeing all of his slaves—he sold six people.\(^40\)

Fellow Board member Peregrine Wroth also hired out enslaved workers to the College. A receipt shows reimbursement to Wroth in the amount of $16.65 for “having the bell rung” in 1832. Bell-ringing was manual labor; likely Wroth was being compensated for work done by one of the people he held in slavery. At this time Wroth enslaved five people, including one adult man, likely the bell-ringer.\(^41\)
The majority of enslaved people to be found on College grounds probably worked for the Steward's Department, typical of colleges at the time. The Steward supervised boarding at the College; between 1819 and 1827 and from 1844 onward, students were required to board at the College unless they lived at home. Five stewards have been identified; all but one were enslavers.42

Research on other colleges suggests what tasks the enslaved workers of the Steward's Department performed at Washington College. Scholars Louis P. Nelson and Benjamin Ford note that the labor of caring for students, presidents, and faculty was never-ending and mostly done by enslaved people. They prepared food, cared for livestock, washed clothes and sheets, cleaned yards (including privies), and performed such seasonal work as tending gardens, chopping wood, and hauling ice. Food preparation was constant, labor-intensive, and included both daily cooking and longer-term tasks like smoking hogs. Livestock (cows, pigs, chickens) would have been kept nearby, tended by enslaved people. Women were usually in charge of laundry—another labor-intensive task and one done outdoors in a yard. For laundry, cooking, and heating students' rooms, and classrooms in the colder months, wood was a constant need. Enslaved men traveled to woodyards, chopped wood, and stacked it for curing. Alan Taylor's description of the University of Virginia as “an especially complex and crowded plantation” could describe many early colleges.43

Kitchens, washhouses, slave quarters, privies, woodsheds—the spaces where slave work occurred—would have been separate from but likely close to student areas. This would be true particularly of an institution the size of Washington College, comprised of no more than three buildings. Enslaved people often lived where they worked, in garrets and basements. Students could have also encountered slaves working and running errands in town.44

In 1819, Washington College’s Board of Visitors and Governors established a set of Rules and Regulations to govern student behavior on campus, particularly with regard to boarding. Meals were served at set times; students were expected to behave decently (“no throwing victuals”) and abide by a nighttime curfew. The Rules also listed what students could ask of the “servants of the Steward.” Students could not demand that these workers “perform any service . . . not in the way of their ordinary Business.” Students could expect the “servants” “to make up their Beds, and sweep their rooms and other parts of the College at least once a day,” but could not require more than that, especially the cleaning up of any mess that students had deliberately made. In addition, the Rules cautioned that, “No student shall at any time offer the least insulting behavior to the steward, nor abuse any of his domesticks.”45

A final connection between Washington College and slavery is seen in arrangements regarding land purchases and loans. The College drew direct financial support from several means—tuition payments, grants from the state, rental of College-owned lots, and later sale of those lots. In 1728, local planter Simon Wilmer sold one hundred acres of land to the College’s predecessor, the Kent Free School, which then passed to the
College in 1782. To raise funds for a building, part of the land was divided into sixty-three lots and rented out, starting in 1783. In 1819, the Board authorized the selling of the lots. The majority of renters and purchasers held people in bondage, each enslaving between one and ninety-two persons.46

By the 1820s, the College added another source of revenue: providing loans to local residents in amounts of $1,000–3,000 with interest, holding their property as collateral. Usually that property was in the form of land, but sometimes it included enslaved persons. Most loans were repaid on time, but when the buyer defaulted, the collateral became College property.47

This was the case with Kent County farmer William Maxwell. In 1832, he was granted a loan of $2,000, giving the College a mortgage on his farm and eight people, about half of his enslaved workforce. Maxwell failed to repay his debt, and in 1843 the Board sued him. Maxwell was clearly in financial trouble, facing three additional debt-related lawsuits that year. The Board apparently granted him more time to settle his debt, possibly because of his ties with the College. His father, also called William Maxwell, was one of the original donors to the College’s founding; his son, James Henry, was a student in the 1830s.48

By 1848, Maxwell and his wife Wilhelmina had sold some of the land they owned near Kennedyville, using the profits to pay off their debt to the College. It does not appear that the enslaved people listed on the original mortgage were sold, or even listed for sale. In the 1850 Slave Schedule, the Maxwells claimed six men and boys, three women and girls, ranging in age from three to forty-one. Only the eldest man was old enough to be one of the group listed on the loan agreement. But there is no evidence of their sale, suggesting that the people used as collateral may have died, run away, been hired out, or informally transferred from the Maxwells to a relative or friend.49

The Antebellum Era, 1830–1865

By the antebellum period, manumissions in Kent County had virtually halted. Interest in colonization continued, but increasingly slavery was aggressively defended as not only acceptable, but the only choice for allegedly inferior people of color. Washington College echoed this trend. Despite slaveholders’ commitment to enslavement, the free Black population continued growing. Throughout this era, Maryland had the largest free Black population of any state. Numbers in Kent County increased to slightly over one-quarter of the total population.50

College Presidents in office from 1832 through the Civil War all held people in bondage. They included Richard W. Ringgold, a Kent County native, who led the College for over twenty years (1832–54), having first chaired the Board of Visitors and Governors. Ringgold kept Washington College afloat during very lean times; the College building had burned to the ground in 1827, and fundraising to replace it was a
priority. Like previous presidents, Ringgold was also a professor, at times doing much of the teaching himself because there were so few students. But while the College struggled financially, Ringgold did not; by 1850, he claimed ownership over eight people. Most of them likely worked at Ringgold’s farm near Rock Hall but one or more likely worked as servants in his house in Chestertown and at the College. In 1853, Richard Ringgold resigned as president of Washington College, citing the institution’s continued inability to attract students. At that time there were only twenty-seven paying students. Ringgold left Chestertown and retired to his farm. By 1860, he had manumitted two of the people he enslaved.51

Ringgold’s successor, Rev. Francis Waters, returned to the College to serve a second term as President from 1854 to 1860. Despite having earlier manumitted four people, the census shows that by 1860 Waters was holding two people in bondage—a twenty-eight-year-old man and a twelve-year old girl. As Waters and his family lived in East Hall, the two would have been living and working on campus. The document also shows one person—a girl aged seventeen—enslaved by Rev. Andrew Sutton. At this time Sutton was a professor, but he would soon take over the presidency. He and his family also lived at the College.52

Students also encountered enslaved people who worked for the Steward. The College Rules regarding the Steward’s Department were updated in 1856, reaffirming that, “No student shall molest or interfere with the servants of the College, when engaged in their ordinary work or require of a servant to do what is not in the line of his appropriate duties.” This hints at what the Board knew or feared about the behavior of the students toward the enslaved workers at the College. Recent works on enslaved workers at other colleges demonstrate that they were subject to exploitation and abuse ranging from insults and pranks to more serious assaults including beating, whipping, and rape. As Jennifer Bridges Oast explains, while students did not own the enslaved people they encountered on College grounds, “they did not need to do so in order to receive the social benefits of mastery.” In short, enslaved people on college campuses were vulnerable to maltreatment from the boys and young men away from parental supervision, often for the first time.53

Slaveholding was also common among members of the Board of Visitors and Governors during the antebellum era. College policy dictated that the Board be composed of between seventeen and twenty-four members, with seven from Kent County. They were among the county’s elite, prominent in government, law, and medicine, and many—perhaps most—enslaved people.54

Perhaps the most prominent and influential Board member was Ezekiel Forman Chambers. The son of founder and Board member Benjamin Chambers, Ezekiel Chambers graduated from the College in 1805, served in the Maryland legislature and the US Senate, but spent most of his career as a judge of Maryland’s Second District and the Court of Appeals. He also served on the Board of Visitors and Governors for several decades, chairing it from 1843 until the Civil War. Chambers was perhaps the
Ezekiel Chambers was one of the wealthiest men in antebellum Kent County, with several homes in Chestertown, farms in Kent and Queen Anne’s Counties, and over fifty people held in bondage. At least three of the people Chambers enslaved made attempts to free themselves, but only one, Harriet Fuller, is known to have succeeded. As escapes by enslaved people reached record numbers in Kent County in the 1850s, Chambers chaired a meeting of enslavers outraged over their loss of property. Among those who spoke were fellow Board members (and sitting members of Congress) Senator James A. Pearce and Representative James B. Ricaud. Chambers aired a belief common among slaveholders that enslaved people only considered escaping bondage after being incited by whites. It was easier to fault the “machinations,” as Chambers put it, of white abolitionists than to believe that enslaved people wanted freedom and were capable of claiming it.

In 1864, Chambers and two fellow Board members represented Kent County at the state constitutional convention that ultimately decided to end slavery in Maryland. Chambers, however, defended slavery vigorously on moral, religious, and legal grounds. “It is ruinous,” he said of emancipation, “not only to us, as it takes away our property, but ruinous to the slaves themselves, I will not use hard terms, but I will ask what is to become of them?” Despite living among a large community of hard-working, self-supporting free Black people, Chambers insisted that out of slavery, African Americans could not survive. “These people will follow the fate of the Indians. Two such different races [Black and white] cannot mingle as equals.” As he argued they were unfit for citizenship, at least eight men enslaved by Ezekiel Chambers joined the United States Colored Troops to defend their country in the Civil War. When Chambers applied for compensation, as allowed by state and federal policy, he was denied, judged as “Disloyal.” After war’s end, Chambers (along with five fellow College Board members from Kent County) continued holding children to labor through the system of apprenticeship.

The postwar years saw Board member (and Chambers’ classmate) Peregrine Wroth exchanging letters with a number of friends and relatives in the South and lamenting the loss of what he termed the “good old times.” In January 1866, he wrote to former Confederate general Robert E. Lee, asking for a picture and autograph. Lee complied, and the two began corresponding, sometimes through their wives. Later that year, Mrs. Wroth wrote to Mrs. Lee, “Your husband and the other great men at the head of the armies of the Confederacy—how earnestly we prayed for your success, rejoiced at your victories, mourned over your reverses.”

Wroth continued this theme in a letter to former Confederate General D. H. Hill, who was at that point editor of a southern literary magazine, *The Land We Love*. Wroth wrote, “I contend that the condition of the negro has been infinitely improved and meliorated by bringing them to this country. Since the days of Noah, the negro race has occupied, both in their country, and in whatever land they have been introduced, the position of slaves—and that by divine infliction—and it is evident to me, that such,
under existing circumstances, is their proper status.” Yet despite his contempt for Black people, Wroth had been willing to serve as a witness for two freedom certificate applications on the eve of the Civil War.59

The College continued granting loans in the decades leading up to the war, accepting enslaved people as collateral. Like William Maxwell, William Peacock was a slaveholder who became indebted to Washington College. A farmer in northern Kent County, Peacock purchased forty acres of timberland located along Fairlee Creek from the College in 1841. The cost was slightly over $1,000, and Peacock entered into an agreement to pay the amount in installments, with interest, by August 1844. As collateral, Peacock offered four enslaved people: Henry, thirty-six; Minte, thirty-four; Harriett, eleven; and Jim, seven. Peacock made some of his payments on schedule, but by January 1844, he was in arrears and wrote to Board Treasurer Joseph Wickes to ask for more time. Peacock explained that he had creditors who owed him money, causing him to fall behind on his payments to the College. By September, the Board had lost patience, and the College sued Peacock to recover the debt of about $350 still owed. The Kent County Court ordered him to render up his goods and chattels to the Board of Visitors and Governors. To recover the debt, the Board decided to sell the enslaved people Peacock had offered as collateral.60

The advertisement appeared in the Kent News on July 12, 1845, announcing the sale of four people enslaved by William Peacock. Jim, now age nine, and Harriett, now age fourteen, had been listed on the original contract; however, the two adults, Henry and Minte, had been replaced by two more children: Emory, age six, and Juliana, age four. What happened next is not known. No record of the sale of the enslaved children has been found. It is possible that they were in fact not sold. A scrap of paper in the financial records of the College dated 1846 records twenty-eight bushels of wheat “made on College Lots bought of Peacock,” suggesting that the Board repossessed the sold land to recover the debt. But by the time of the 1850 census, William Peacock held only three people in slavery, none of whose ages match those in the advertisement or original contract, raising the possibility of their sale. Slave sales were not always recorded, and not all records were preserved. The fate of these six enslaved people remains unknown.61

![Figure 8. “Sheriff’s Sale,” Kent News, July 19, 1845.](Collection of the Maryland State Archives, Special Collections (Kent News Collection), MSA SC 2901-3-63)
The authors of the recent collection *Slavery and the University* write that the most common response on learning that a college profited from slaves is surprise, indicative of the “nation’s continuing failure to come to grips with slavery’s scope, scale, and historical significance.” Slavery was far from marginal in United States history: it existed in all the original colonies, in the nation’s capital, and before 1865, the majority of presidents, Supreme Court justices, and members of Congress enslaved people. Even after slavery was abolished in the North, slave-grown cotton fueled the prosperity of northern textile mills, as well as the insurance business and Wall Street banks.62

Washington College owed its early success in part to the unpaid and unacknowledged labor of several generations of enslaved people. Like many institutions of higher learning founded in the United States before 1865, the College was inextricably linked to slavery in numerous ways. The men and boys who founded, supported, managed, and attended the College were to a large extent enslavers. Enslaved people lived and worked on College grounds, and those who rented and purchased land, and received loans from the College also enslaved people. But Washington College was also a place where issues relating to slavery and race were contested, and some enslaved people even acquired freedom. Nonetheless, what Craig B. Hollander and Martha A. Sandweiss have written about Princeton University applies to Washington College: students and professors, presidents and Board members all inhabited a “landscape of slavery.”63
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Becoming the Frenchified State of Maryland: Reflections on the Lives and Contributions of Acadians, Saint-Domingue Refugees, and European Émigrés
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INTRODUCTION TO THE VOLUMES

The following text is an excerpt from the sixth chapter of Becoming the Frenchified State of Maryland: Reflections on the Lives and Contributions of Acadians, Saint-Domingue Refugees, and European Émigrés (Baltimore: Otter Bay Books, 2022), reprinted with the permission of the author. This publication is a two-volume work of 1,553 pages that focuses on three historic communities from 1755 to the early twentieth century. Volume 1 comprises 13 chapters describing Francophones who found themselves in Maryland often under challenging circumstances. Many arrived in eras of war and revolution and remained to contribute substantially to the economic, social, religious, educational, and professional growth of the region.

This book was originally envisioned as an important companion work to A Guide to the Acadians in Maryland in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries (Baltimore: Gateway Press, 1995), but it soon developed into a much-needed history of all Francophones, including the saga of West Indian refugees (free and enslaved), of whom very few pages were written at any one time in the past. From Mr. Wood’s love of Baltimore, more and more details were added to the narrative to shed light on individuals, families, neighborhoods, occupations, material culture, the arts, and the Sulpician influence on Maryland and the American continent, with many references to Frederick, Emmitsburg, Annapolis, southern Maryland, and the Eastern Shore.

Having drawn extensively from newspapers, journals, depositions, Catholic parish and institutional registries, city directories, vessel registrations and shipping records, censuses, immigration and naturalization resources, property descriptions, tax records, wills and inventories, the author covers a lot of historical and genealogical ground. Volume 2 is a resource of 880 pages featuring a myriad of individuals in 56 appendices.

The volumes are supported by the award-winning website, acadianswerehere.org, and the author’s website, francomaryland.com (with photo gallery, blog, and ordering information). Becoming the Frenchified State and Acadians in Maryland in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries are both available from Amazon Books.

EDITOR’S NOTE: The following excerpt has been edited for length, clarity, and accuracy, whereas the editorial style of the book was not altered. The Glossary featured at the end of the excerpt was generously compiled by the author for the benefit of our readers.
The U.S. Census of 1800 showed that Baltimore had narrowly bypassed Boston as the third largest city in America. Now with 26,514 residents, she had nearly doubled in size in the past decade. New York and Philadelphia still maintained their predominant positions, but Baltimore would stay just ahead of Charleston as the most populous city in the south and would continue to enjoy her phenomenal growth throughout the first half of the new century. The population of the state of Maryland in 1800 was determined to be 349,692, of which nearly 108,000 were enslaved. Virginia, however, led the country in inhabitants and her non-free total alone was just about the same as the entire population of Maryland! Enslavement was indeed a thorny issue—approximately one of every six inhabitants in the country was in bondage.

The 1700s ended on a sad note. The universally respected George Washington had passed away suddenly on his Mount Vernon estate on 14 December 1799, at the age of sixty-seven—an event prompting even Napoléon Bonaparte to declare a week of mourning in France a month after a coup had made him first consul, or virtual leader, of that country. Within six months, the political center of the nation changed from Philadelphia to the new federal city of Washington, but the Federalists in power were rapidly losing executive and legislative influence to Democratic-Republicans.

John Adams passed through Baltimore on 15 June 1800, but upon arriving in Washington, he had to stay in Tunnicliffe’s City Hotel until the President’s House could accommodate him on 1 November. Abigail, the first lady, joined him for a short while and then left for Massachusetts by February. There was little time to get comfortable in a drafty and cold executive residence which would only welcome them for four months. The national election in December (to be counted on 11 February 1801) ended in a tie between Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr, with the incumbent Adams a few votes behind. In mid-February, after an all-night session of the House of Representatives, the former was elected president, and Jefferson’s inauguration took place on 4 March. His supporters barely controlled the Senate, yet held a decided 69–36 advantage in the House.

It would not be long before the young nation was granted the opportunity to expand her borders beyond her wildest dreams. France’s costly misfortunes in the West Indies soon forced her to reassess her reach and to divest of the vast Louisiana territory that stretched from the Mississippi River to the Rockies. As every American knows, Jefferson would commission Meriwether Lewis and William Clark to lead an expedition to explore the new holdings. Setting out on 31 August 1803, these valiant men and their entourage would spend over two years in the west before sighting the Pacific Ocean in November 1805, at which time Jefferson would be close to being affirmed for a second term of office.

Maryland kept building her “Frenchified” base in spite of the country’s financial crisis in the late 1790s, a recession that would last until 1803, and a depression in
Europe that greatly affected American exports. Close examination of the two most significant Baltimore newspapers, the *Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser* and the *American and Commercial Daily Advertiser*, provides more than adequate evidence of French activity in the state and the public’s constant eye on the Caribbean and the European world.

In the first half-dozen years of the nineteenth century, much of the newspaper advertising was purchased by merchants and seafaring concerns. Besides national and international news and commentaries, each edition also featured updates of port entries and clearances, reassuring accounts of local vessels spoken at sea or anchored in world harbors, notices concerning runaways and sales of the most vulnerable, information on personal bankruptcies, cultural announcements, opportunities to test one’s luck in charitable and civic lotteries, marriage and death news, public health warnings, properties for sale, private school initiatives, and occasional poetry selections. Not all city merchants were likely to spend money hawking wares and services in the press, but those that did so provide a glimpse of what durable goods, fabrics, necessities, and frivolities were popular and available for purchase.

For the first two years, 1801 and 1802, French mercantile notices in Baltimore bore the familiar names of 1796: Boislandry, Ghequière, Carrère, and Martin & Jauffret. Newcomers were also hard at work: Le Duc & Bonnefin, Houzelot & Faroux, Lamarrèe, auctioneers Bentalu & Dorsey, Bertheau, Latour & Co, L. & P. Lannay, Vallette, Romain, Frelet, Jolly, Delinotte, Jambu, and Zacharie, Coopman and Co. Most of these advertisers relied heavily on West Indian trade and the usual imports of tobacco, Havana sugar, and coffee. Transatlantic trade brought in linen, calico, glass, salt, books, and wines. Newer products appeared as well: India nankeens (buff-colored cotton trousers), starch, hair powder, medication, and cotton bales. Charles Vallette was a confectioner and a distiller of cordials; Alexis Romain’s business at 141 Market (Baltimore) Street offered a “large and extensive assortment of the most fashionable wigs” from London; Charles Delinotte, 59 Howard Street, had 2500 wt. of hog’s lard available on 5 March and kegs of more pork products like sausage and bologna on 3 December; and Le Duc & Bonnefin, 168 Market Street, expanded its Fell’s Point stores to a third location, with groceries, wines, teas and the usual sugars and coffee. In November, Houzelot & Faroux opened a fur manufactory at 17 Market Street, promising a constant supply of muffs, trims for ladies’ cloaks, and tippets (scarf-like garments for the neck and shoulders); and at another shop, prayer books, or *Devout Christian’s Vade Mecum*, were available for practicing Catholics.

Trade to southern waters did not end just because European armies and navies stood in the way. The destinations were just more carefully chosen: Gold’s schooner *Nestor* found herself in Jamaica, Laguira, and Cap-Français in January and February 1801; the Whites’ schooner *Belvidere* arrived in Baltimore from Turk’s Island, north of Saint-Domingue, on 7 February; Pearl Durkee’s *Intrepid* was cleared for Aux Cayes on 20 March; and Paul Gold, master of the schooner *Thomas*, which was owned by Louis
Bernard, undertook a voyage to Cap-Français in April. Later in the year, Durkee once again completed a voyage to Aux Cayes (4 September), the Nestor cleared for Cap-Français (7 September), Durkee cleared again for Aux Cayes (12 September), and François Glavarry’s Eagle was anchored in Aux Cayes (19 November). In the first half of 1802, glances at port activity show Captain Jenne in Jacmel (Saint-Domingue) and St. Jago-de-Cuba (March and April), Captain Billups in Cap-Français (February) and in La Guira (June), and Captain Glavarry in the West Caicos and at Port-Républicain (26 June; entry, 26 August). Paul Gold, co-owner of the schooner Cygnet with his brother Peter, found himself sailing from Baltimore to the not-so-typical destination of Fort Adams, Mississippi (2 July)! In home port, the Charitable Marine Society was still maintaining an active role. On Saturday, 26 September 1801, its quarterly meeting was held at five in the evening at Mr. John Baker’s, Fell’s Point.

Youth and adults were challenged physically, socially, and intellectually in the ballroom and in the classroom. There were steps to be learned and perfected and people to meet, under the supervision of French masters like James Robardet (Second Street), François Brunelot (68 Cumberland Row), and a Mr. P. L. Duport (a New York professor and composer of quadrilles). Private schools certainly had remained attractive since the 1750s in Annapolis, Mrs. Callister’s initiatives in the 1780s, and the many innovative efforts from the 1790s. On 21 March 1801, an unnamed school was in need of a qualified French language instructor to take on a few scholars and teach gentlemen at night. In the fall, James Escavaille proposed a French academy for fifteen scholars to be opened in a large and elegant house on Harrison Street—that dwelling being so spacious and his family’s needs so moderate that boarders could be accommodated in “several handsome apartments.” At the same time, a Mr. Le Breton advertised an academy at his residence at 36 N. Gay Street: a little of everything would be taught during the day—including French—and there would be a night school exclusively for French instruction “by the simple and curious method of the analysis,” which appears, by its stilted English, to be a highly grammatical approach. While novel for the time, a septuagenarian named Mordecai M. Mordecai also posted a notice for instruction in Hebrew in September, just to demonstrate that another community in the city was beginning to identify its own linguistic needs.

The real estate market involving Frenchmen was less than overwhelming in 1801. In the fall, M. A. Vigarous offered for sale a lot with two frame houses on Frederick Street, which he claimed to be valuable and just right for two small families; John Carrère was the agent for leasing of a three-story brick dwelling on Harrison Street (2 Nov 1801).

It was inevitable that the economic issues of the age would challenge a number of Francophones. At various stages of debt settlement in 1802 were Robert Charles Boislandry (third notice, 1 April; full discovery, 30 April), Bernard Salenave (second notice, 1 April; full discovery, 15 May), Raymond Dumas (former trader in the city whose effects were being held to pay debts, 29 April), Augustine Boughan (first notice, 26
June), and John A. Jolly (first notice, 26 June). Circumstances leading to bankruptcy will not be explored here, but sometimes warning signs appeared well in advance. In October of the previous year, Salenave, who married into the Acadian Chameau-Prevetory family, had been attempting to sell his pilot boat schooner Maria and bragging that it was “expected to be the fastest in port” and able to carry 500 barrels of merchandise.6

Personal circumstances also played a role in one’s lives. Henry Molier was planning on leaving the continent (1 April), and John Marche, Frederick Street, intended to return to his former residence and commercial house in Port Républicain (old Port-au-Prince, Haiti) on 1 July. Marche was calling in his debts, selling horses, gear, and other vehicles, and placing 6000 acres in Kentucky, near Port St. Vincennes, on the market. Some just needed a break. Francis Brunelot wrote a general letter to his dancing pupils dispelling fears of his departure after seven years in the city and affirming that he was just taking time out from the summer heat (26 June). This was not the first time that he needed space: in November 1801, he had used the newspaper to inform his pupils that he needed about a week off to mourn the passing of Mrs. Xousse de Souche, “one of his dearest friends.”7

Initial news of improving political conditions in Saint-Domingue raised hope among some émigrés and refugees like Marche who wanted to return to the West Indies to reinvest or, at least, to recover lost properties and fortunes. In spite of high losses due to fighting and disease, the French in Saint-Domingue were temporarily keeping Toussaint and his allies at bay. On 19 June 1802, firsthand news arrived in Baltimore from Capt. Allen, master of The Two Betsy's, that most of Saint-Domingue was “tranquil and flourishing” and that the northern part was fast improving and under restoration.

On one hand, Whites were happy that Toussaint Louverture and Henri Christophe had capitulated and that Black cultivators, facing the massive destruction of property, had at least agreed to return to the plantations to await work instructions. A number of the “most respectable planters, chiefly whites” had been summoned to meet with French general Charles Leclerc at Cap-Français to discuss reorganization and transfer of the island from military to civilian control. On the other hand, seven to eight thousand Blacks were thought to be wandering aimlessly in the mountains, without leaders and short of arms and provisions. Toussaint had as yet been banished from the island, but was allowed to return to his own plantation according to his terms of surrender.8 A Frenchman aboard a vessel in quarantine at the fort in Baltimore sent the following to Bryden’s Marine List or Merchants’ Coffee-House: “There is an avenging God who punished perfidy. The traitor, the cunning villain, is at length in irons.”9 Four days later, the local press cited a report from the National Intelligencer regarding a “malignant disease . . . of such a peculiar violence on individuals” causing death to those who contracted it. Whatever its source, Leclerc seemed to be in charge, and on 10 June, he issued a proclamation accusing Toussaint and others of conspiracy.
The coming months, however, would be devastating for the elite French troops on the island. Word that slavery had been restored on Guadeloupe and Martinique only fueled the counterattack. General Leclerc, husband of Napoléon’s sister Pauline, finally lost his own personal battle to yellow fever and died on 2 November 1802. His replacement, the son of the American Revolutionary War hero Rochambeau, could not turn the rising tide against the French. The situation, as in the 1790s, was complex, but in the end, approximately 50,000 French troops fell victim to weapons and disease on the island, thus forcing Napoléon to give up on the West Indian part of his empire and Louisiana. Many surviving planters eventually fled to Cuba and thrived there with coffee and sugar enterprises until 1808, at which time another wave of refugees left for Baltimore and an even greater number for New Orleans.

The seafaring and mercantile public in Baltimore benefited greatly from James Bryden, who opened the Merchants’ Coffee-House in 1801 to entertain and interview those involved in port activities. “Bryden’s List” was an almost daily feature in the newspaper. Rather than just provide a list of entries and clearances, Bryden gathered information from seamen on conditions and major news at foreign and domestic ports. When vessels were spoken at sea or identified as having been seen in world locations, families, merchants, investors, and insurance folks could be reassured that masters, crews, and passengers had covered routes safely or perhaps without serious accident or incident. Marine information and other “intelligence” were shared freely—sometimes with sea coordinates, often with an indication of the number of days that a vessel was out at sea. Correspondents other than captains wrote in a colorful and detailed manner about life abroad and harrowing encounters or just shared their prejudices toward certain peoples and events. Of course, these efforts had been attempted in some fashion off and on before Bryden.

One can imagine the heated discussion and outrage in the city when the story of Captain Davidson of the St. Domingo Packet and a Baltimore-based captain named Rogers (himself a former U. S. Navy officer) came off the press on 24 May 1802. The two seamen had spent eighteen days—four of them in solitary confinement—in a “loathsome, pestiferous” prison at Cap-Français. Living on just bread and water, they were finally liberated without explanation of the charges against them and ordered “never to return, under pain of death.” Given just four days to leave without benefit of their own larger vessels, they had contemplated departing in the longboat of Davidson’s vessel before the Baltimore-bound Pomona luckily provided passage. The news of the mistreatment spread quickly to New York and Philadelphia. Sea captains would take notice in the future and keep on their guard, for, as a correspondent in Cap-Français remarked: “The general’s conduct [presumably Leclerc] towards these gentlemen is flagitious and insulting, and may be compared to those of a mischievous boy, who tortures and mutilates a wretched animal, and smiles at its agonies.” Even after having aided personae non gratae, the generous master of the Pomona was already soliciting cargo with the assistance of merchant Pierre A. Guestier for his vessel’s return to
Cap-Français and Port-Républicain the very day of the aforementioned comments, which also coincided with the local announcement of Martha Washington’s death on the previous Saturday.

On 1 June 1802, Bryden proudly treated customers to a collation from eleven to two in his coffee room. In his invitation to celebrate the first anniversary of his business, he expressed how “useful and necessary” his establishment was in spite of initial doubts of its success. In the past, customs officials or a health officer had perfunctorily observed vessel movement, but after captains brought their vessels into the quarantine area at the fort, they frequently went ashore and disappeared. Bryden made it a point to get to the principals by boat before their dispersal, and, for his efforts, he was backed by small investors in his service to the greater community. His “Coffee-House” also gave people a place to hang out, chat, and drink. Bryden made sure that turtle soup was also available there and at the Fountain Inn, his other enterprise, which served the delicacy every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday in season.

To back up Bryden’s efforts, regular Charitable Marine Society gatherings were an occasion to share expertise and experiences. As per bylaws, seamen and associates met on 26 June, this time at Mr. Stewart’s Inn on Bond Street, in Fell’s Point. Thorndike Chase was elected president, but no Acadian or Saint-Domingan was represented among the newly-appointed officers and managers. A year later, the annual event was held on Monday, 27 June, at seven o’clock, at Peck’s Hotel, Fell’s Point.

Property sales improved in 1802 and 1803. Available accommodations were far more well-appointed than the two previously cited notices. Several transactions in the northwest quarter of Baltimore were handled by the trusted French seminary clergy, who managed several lots and dwellings in their own neighborhood. One such piece of real estate under Sulpician supervision was the dwelling of the former Spanish consul, lately rented by a Mrs. Petit. Located near the intersection of New and Eutaw Streets, the three-story brick house and lot featured “a convenient kitchen, stable, coach house, and garden, in good order . . . the best water, the most healthy situation and the finest prospect of the whole city and precincts of Baltimore” (23 June 1802). A year later, on 27 April 1803, a number of ninety-nine-year leases were offered on lots on Ross and Morris Streets near the turnpike road in front of the French academy. That day as well, smaller lots (only 240 feet in depth, with wide alleys in back) became available on Price and Ross Streets. Again, application could be made at the seminary, for “these lots were well calculated for small country houses, in the most healthy place about Baltimore.” On 5 July 1803, the priests offered a three-story house—described as roomy and with a well-smithed interior, and a pump—that was immediately available for the presumed “genteel family.”

Returning to 1802, Benjamin Denys, 59 N. Howard Street, was wishing to sell land and buildings that he owned further up the street: a new two-story brick house “well calculated for the flour business” and a back building on a lot 167½ feet deep, with a pump at the door, a garden, and alley access (24 June 1802). The next day, Charles
Pallon announced an auction to take place on his holdings on High Street on 30 June: a brick and a frame house and lots were offered, with furniture to be sold afterward (25 June). This was Pallon's second attempt to divest, the first being in January 1801, when a lot on High Street—perhaps the same—was up for a private sale. At that time, the houses were described as an elegant two-story brick and a two-story frame on a 52'x166' lot, divided by a four-foot-wide alley and featuring a pump in the yard, stable, and a “neat little garden.”¹³ If country property were desired, merchant John Carrère served as agent for a summer retreat two miles from the city and adjacent to properties of prominent individuals. What “genteel family” could turn down a new and nearly complete brick home on fourteen acres, with an oat crop to be shared and blessed with “the best and purest waters?” (26 June).

Moreover, Gripière de Montalibor had an interesting proposition involving rental or exchange for merchandise two lots with three houses at 35 Jones Street. With more than adequate frontage, these properties were near the falls and of certain value for a manufactory needing a large supply of water (3 July). A vacant lot, another nearby lot and frame building, and a new brick building on Harrison Street backing on to Jones Falls were also available at auction. Interested parties were informed that the frame structure had been a bake shop; the brick structure, “calculated for starch manufactory” (16 July).

* * *

With an economy on the rebound, people of color, however, grappled with familiar challenges. For free Blacks, some conditions had improved in an urban setting, but runaways were a constant concern voiced in the newspapers. Sea captains were put on alert not to harbor or transport fugitives, being valuable commodities in homes, manufactories, and small businesses.

* * *

By 1803, Saint-Domingue was becoming a nightmare for the French army even as Napoléon was more solidly in charge of France as her first consul for life. Perhaps Bonaparte possessed some feelings for the West Indies because his first wife, the widow Marie Josèphe Rose (only later known as Josephine) Tascher, had been born in Martinique in 1763 and his youngest brother Jérôme had been stationed in the navy in that region since late 1801!

Jérôme was recalled to Europe in the summer of 1803, but avoided his brother’s wishes for a quick return. On a visit to Baltimore, he met Elizabeth Patterson, daughter of the rich merchant William. The nineteen-year-old and eighteen-year-old lovers quickly decided that marriage was a most appropriate path, with all city parties—community, clergy, and family—lacking sensitivity to Napoléon’s more political desires for his brother. The new Bonaparte couple enjoyed the adulation of Americans for over a
year and were stymied more than once by British designs of spoiling their transatlantic voyage to France.

While the young Bonapartes were cavorting on the social scene in America and elder brother was expanding his powers in France, rivals in Saint-Domingue were quite ferocious and often senseless in inflicting wrath upon one another. The French may have been considered impolitic in allowing indigenous allies to respond much too enthusiastically after victories in the French and Indian War, but little can compare to the savagery unleashed in early 1803 as dogs procured by Louis de Noailles, one of America’s distinguished allies at Yorktown, feasted on prisoners:

There have been a very severe attack at Aux Cayes, but the brigands were repulsed with a great loss. A number of *Blood Hounds* have arrived here from the Havanna; a number of prisoners taken within those few days were taken into an open field, where they were liberated, and the dogs let loose on them; they were almost immediately torn to piece[s], and their flesh devoured:—this mode of treating the brigand prisoners has much alarmed those in the country, the brigands continue to hover around the towns, setting fire to the cane patches and buildings adjacent; however, as we have been reinforced everything seems tranquil.\(^{14}\)

The fighting had begun in March, with the debarkation at Tiburon of a French battalion, which then fought its way to Aux Cayes with bayonets drawn. The French suffered fifty casualties; their opponents’ losses were much higher, with 100 deaths and 400 wounded. By mid-April, it was reported that ammunition was seized at Aux Cayes and ordered to be put on waiting vessels for safekeeping.

For the French occupiers, life became more difficult. One could only regret that “the face of the most beautiful and fertile island in the world” had been marked with so much desolation. The plains and mountains were controlled by the rebels, the French only held possession of a handful of positions, men and women continued to flee the island, and five thousand French troops were daily awaited from France to shore up defenses in the south. Sickness was everywhere; food was scarce.\(^{15}\) It was feared that war between France and England was also imminent. A small measure of sympathy for oppressed Blacks was expressed in a comment from Havana that was shared with the *Boston Centinel* on the occasion of America’s acquisition of Louisiana:

The Marquis De Montalvo sailed yesterday for New Orleans, to deliver up Louisiana to the Great Nation, which has an agent here buying up *Blood Hounds*, to hunt the poor negroes in St. Domingo.\(^{16}\)

On 5 July, intelligence from mid-June made its way to the States that the port of Cap-Français was not as vulnerable to attacks as other ports and that General Rochambeau was expected there soon. Just three days earlier, Marylanders had learned from a
vessel from New York that Britain had declared war on France on 16 May. News traveled in many directions and arrived as quickly as possible, though not necessarily chronologically. In August, the Baltimore press received a letter from a correspondent from New York then in Cap-Français which tersely gave the latest update: “The country is in greatest disorder, expecting war every moment. Three 74’s and six English frigates blockade this port, and take every French vessel bound in or out. The duty is taken off all American produce and a few importations.”

With commerce slowed in Saint-Domingue, vessels still left Baltimore for the West Indies, but fewer captains and merchants risked contact with Hispaniola. From customs records, it is clear that seamen from families of Acadian descent, at least, braved the troubled waters mainly to deal with St. Martin’s, the Barbados, Antigua, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Curaçao, Jamaica, Cayenne, St. Barts, and Cuba. When Capt. Francis Glavarry arrived home from Curaçao on 6 October, he brought hides, fustic (tropical wood from the mulberry tree from which a yellow dye was extracted), and the usual coffee and sugar. One of the last two reports from the West Indies indicated that the English had captured Demerara and Surinam and that Rochambeau’s life was in constant danger. The Norfolk Herald reported that the commander’s two cooks and a prefect had been hanged after having been found plotting against him!

Meanwhile, back on quieter soil in Baltimore, the city had a Library Company, of which Francis Beeston, the rector of St. Peter’s, was secretary in 1803. The French College opened its doors in 1803 and was just one more step forward in the intellectual and cultural development of the city. That school, established by the Rev. William DuBourg, further encouraged the development of allied academies. One such school was started for young ladies by Mr. and Mrs. Baconais and employed some alumnae of Mme Lacombe, who had distinguished herself in education since the 1790s. In fact, the school started in a house formerly occupied by Mesdames Lacombe and Petit, near the French seminary and quite possibly on the same property mentioned in a notice in June 1801. The Baconais couple described their endeavor as one in which “pupils will have a constant opportunity of speaking the French language, all the members of said academy (except the English tutor) to the number of four or five, being French natives, whom a residence of above ten years in this country has accustomed to its language and manners, some of them even having received their education in the well known and approved academy formerly kept under Mrs. Lacombe’s direction. . . .” By September, Mr. Baconais, who had come to Baltimore from Paris via Philadelphia, shared an expanded curriculum in the newspaper: sewing, embroidery, drawing, dancing, geography and the use of globes, writing, and arithmetic would complement the language element that focused on “the grammatical and ornamental parts of English and French idioms.” A month later, the Baconais academy relocated to Pratt Street, housed in a beautiful dwelling built by a Mr. Valk and at that time under the new ownership of William Smith, Esq. A Monsieur Decourt eventually became a partner with Baconais at 57 Pratt. Mr. Ouffroy, one of their instructors there, “moonlighted” as a teacher to
young gentlemen in evening hours.\textsuperscript{22} Meanwhile, DuBourg’s French College still needed at least one staff member in the fall: in September, the search was ongoing for a teacher skilled in English grammar and composition, writing, and arithmetic.\textsuperscript{23}

Competition for French instruction remained high. In October, a new private instructor was on the scene. Erudite and experienced, Charles Carré was the author of a work on “the principles of the English tongue,” which was printed in Paris in 1778.\textsuperscript{24} Carré had taught French and English in Baltimore and Philadelphia from 1793 to 1799 and was now living at Mr. Frelet’s home, 17 Second Street. He created a busy agenda for himself: English classes from three to six o’clock in the afternoon; French, from six to eight or nine; and morning tutoring in private homes. In November, a Mr. Harlé, an expert in Latin, Greek, and English, was available for a “Belles Lettres study,” a seminar also entitled “Polite and Classical Literature” in his ads.\textsuperscript{25} In December, J. Berge, French teacher at the Baltimore Academy, supplemented his income there with evening lessons for a few gentlemen at his own lodgings at 4 S. Gay Street.\textsuperscript{26} Over in Annapolis, St. John’s College had to deal with disgruntled instructors of Latin and Greek who had resigned and acknowledged that its best-placed students were in French. While that fact should have pleased the elite scholars, they were placed at a disadvantage for several months due to the death of their professor De L’Allie after a long absence. Over on the Eastern Shore in little Centreville, Queen Anne’s County, French was alive at Miss Keets’s Boarding School, where a Mr. Pairo was identified as its instructor.\textsuperscript{27}

On the street, French merchants continued to have a great influence on commerce: Martin & Jauffret advertised such diverse items as gunpowder and cloth (15 March), claret (11 May), and cotton and claret (16 August) in its store at 42 N. Gay; and Lewis (Louis) Pascualt and John Carrère had separate listings for lots, a warehouse, and houses for sale (24 March). Charles Ghequiré was now selling Canadian muskrat skins (4 April) and tea and fans from the New York market (16 April). The German-educated Frenchman was apparently quite enthusiastic for pelts: on 13 April, he had promised “to give cash and the highest market prices for bear and otter skins, shipping furs, and red, blue, and grey deer skins.” Ghequiré formed a partnership with Herman Kunckel on 6 May and had a store and warehouse on S. Charles Street, just a few buildings north of French Town. In June, the firm announced receipt of almonds, tea, and lemon juice; in July, featured goods included writing paper, spirits, quills, fans, German window glass, and the usual spices, teas, and almonds; in August, linen from Bremen. With his partner, he offered a very diverse inventory in late autumn consisting of Málaga raisins, sixty casks of superior quality claret, and four hefty bales with 10,000 muskrat skins (23 November). At year’s end, both returned to a more traditional fare of tobacco, wine, brandy, and glassware, as well as beads and platillas (8 and 19 December).

That spring, Baltimore had welcomed the well-known portraitist and engraver, Charles Balthazar Julien Févret de Saint-Mémin, who took up residence in a dwelling at 71 Water Street, opposite Cumberland Dugan’s rope store. Saint-Mémin was ready
to use his method of physiognotrace to capture likenesses of gentlemen and ladies for $25 and $35, respectively (29, 30 April, 1 May, 27 May, 1 August). Just in his early thirties, he had come to America in 1793 and would remain for twenty-one years along the coast in New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Richmond, and Charleston. Among those sitting for him in Maryland were Edme Ducatel, Paul Bentalou, merchants Isaac Van Bibber and John Oliver, Gen. Samuel Smith, and James McHenry. 28

Saint-Mémin was not alone in his art. Bache and Todd temporarily set up shop at a printer's house at 191 Market Street, and claimed to only charge twenty-five cents per profile (16 and 18 August). J. Wood, another rival for small portraiture, promoted polygraphic physiognotrace (simply said, colored impressions) from his room at Mrs. Gray's, near the post office (17 November).

One inventor also captured public attention. Jean-Baptiste Aveilhé first spent several months trying to interest area residents in his horizontal windmill (29 April, 25 July, 22 August, and 10 September). Aveilhé and his wife, Elizabeth Chazal, from Cap-Français, were the parents of two children to be baptized at St. Peter's in 1802 and 1805 even though they resided in Havre-de-Grace, in Harford County.

On the food and beverage side, Joseph Frelet sold ice and ice cream at 17 Second Street and in Tripolet's Alley (9 April, 5 May), and the prominent food merchants, Le Duc & Bonnefin, provided wines, teas, spices, sugars, mocha, coffee, cheese, and pickled oysters for the finest tables at 168 Market Street. Such diverse products like cloth, hemp, twine, gloves, brandy, and sugar were available at Von Kapff & Brune's store on Bowley's Wharf (11 May). The partnership of Roger & Hincks was known for its French Store at 178 Market Street (3 and 9 May). Pierre Antoine Guestier was expanding his business at 5 Commerce Street (24 November, 8 December), with olives, women's shoes, and handkerchiefs for sale, as well as the usual claret and sugar.

Possibly in celebration of another year of his coffeehouse venture, James Bryden arranged for a special attraction in his ballroom on Light Street. From 15 to 24 June, a wax museum was open daily (except Sunday) from nine in the morning to nine in the evening. The curious were able to view lifelike figures of American presidents Washington, Adams, and Jefferson, with worthy images of contemporary French icons Bonaparte, Toussaint, and Charlotte Corday. 29 Bryden had mastered the art of bringing people together in his public rooms. Be it turtle soup, meetings, popular art, ‘sea talk’ or classes, he kept a high community profile. Even Duport's dancing school sought his central location. 30

Business failures continued to upset lives in the greater French community in 1803. Joseph Williams (merchant, dealer, chapman), quite possibly the brother-in-law of Mary Magdalene Le Blanc Blossom (30 July, 3 September), and the merchant Francis Charles Bertheau (30 August, first notice) were the latest to acknowledge that they were without sufficient funds.

The community was not unaware that certain inhabitants required assistance. Religious instruction for people of color had been provided at the seminary since the mid-
1790s, and active Catholic women also cared for the indigent, sick, and orphans. In March 1803, the longtime rector of St. Peter’s Parish, which also served as the nation’s first cathedral, announced that a charity sermon would be preached there the following Sunday “for the benefit of the school under the direction of the Female Humane Society,” if the weather cooperated. On 14 September, an extremely worried Joseph Paillottet stepped away from his traditional role as teacher to solicit aid for a sea captain’s widow with dementia who had wandered off from the safety of her home in their neighborhood:

To all charitable brethren and sisters, whereas the widow RAINGUINOIRE, aged 60 years, has fallen into an insanity, and eloped from her house and friends in French-town, near Charles-street, on Friday night the 10th instant, to that she has either destroyed herself or remains dead in some solitary place, for want of food, unknown to her neighbors—You are hereby requested to make all the inquiry possible of her situation and place; in so doing you will serve humanity, and oblige Your humble servant

JOSEPH PAILLOTTET

Lotteries were the preferred method for raising funds for churches and civic projects. Just as twenty-first century officials in America justify that support for casinos can have a positive impact on educational funding, finance necessary projects that taxation cannot totally fully cover, and provide for Native American needs on reservations, lottery schemes aroused the public’s passion to win small and large jackpots and contribute to just causes and projects, provided that all tickets could be sold. Net revenue was rather modest when compared to the money appropriated for prize-winning tickets. Between March and December 1803, the Federal Gazette promoted no fewer than eight different lottery schemes: six involved construction of a religious nature (St. John’s Church, the Baptist meetinghouse in Fell’s Point, the proposed Roman Catholic cathedral, Holy Trinity German Roman Catholic Church in Philadelphia, and churches in Havre de Grace, Maryland, and in Petersburg, Virginia) and two were civil endeavors (the Lehigh navigation project in Philadelphia and a town clock/alarm bell for Baltimore).

Of course, there was a dimmer view taken with other games of chance, which were finally regulated by city ordinance. On 17 March 1803, Baltimore city fathers had acted to restrain gambling by imposing a penalty on those wagering in a fraudulent manner in licensed houses. The game of “la rouge et la noire” (red and black) was absolutely prohibited and carried a $20 fine for each and every instance. Anyone losing or winning $5 or more at cards, dice, or any other game was subject to payment of $10. Of course, no control could be imposed on what happened on private property.

All throughout the summer and early fall, the city was plagued by a cholera outbreak, causing a very significant number of deaths. The casualty count started slowly, and the
The first list of health-related interments was published in the 20 June edition of the Federal Gazette. Sixteen individuals had perished in the week—most significantly, thirteen children—yet only five succumbed to cholera, with other causes evenly distributed and “non-worrisome”—smallpox (1), drowning (1), old age (1), still born (2), worms (2), hives (1), fits (1), and unknown (2). By 5 July, ten of the fifteen deaths for the previous week were attributable to cholera. On 11 July, the total jumped to twenty-one of the thirty-three unfortunates. The rise was dangerous: twenty-six deaths to the disease, mostly children, out of thirty-six reported interments on the 1 August reporting date.

Then, a downward trend showed hope: twelve cases out of thirty (22 August); and five out twenty-three (26 September). As the crisis seemed to have subsided in mid-month, the city government sprang into action and Mayor James Calhoun shut down the city to visitors, baggage, and goods from New York and Philadelphia—all banned within three miles of Baltimore (13 and 14 September). Isolated from the next wave of the disease, the city dealt with her current nemesis as its victims increased slightly to eight of twenty-four deaths (3 October). Calhoun next directed action against Alexandria, Virginia: public mail, persons with a special license, and those who had not entered Alexandria over the last fifteen days were however exempt from the prohibition (5 October).

By 20 October, the mayor rescinded the ban issued for all three cities.

In the early fall, it was evident that a large number of foreign seamen in port could lead to trouble that was not necessarily health-related. Officers like young Jérôme Bonaparte were welcomed; seamen of lower rank were carefully monitored because they could be disorderly and too fond of letting alcohol get control of them. But then, pretty much the same could be said throughout the course of history. In September and October, while cholera chiefly afflicted Baltimore’s youth, French Consul D’Hébécourt felt obliged to put his foot down on rowdy comportment shown by the seamen of a French frigate at anchor:

> The subscriber, agent for the French republic at Baltimore, wishing to prevent any cause of misunderstanding between the inhabitants of this city and the French sailors, and secure the store and tavern-keepers, &c from any trouble or loss, has the honor of informing the public at large, that no expense whatever, made by the French sailors shall be paid by the French government. The store and tavern-keepers, &c are therefore earnestly requested not to furnish any thing to the said sailors, except for ready-money—as no notice shall be taken of any credit granted to them, unless authorized either by me or the officers of the French frigate La Poursuivante, who shall respectively become responsible for their authorization.33

Apparently, some sailors also tried to make a little money in town privately or were detained by residents who themselves coerced or influenced such seamen to disobey ship regulations. In response to possible foul play, the vessel’s commander warned citi-
zens of their own responsibilities and vowed “to prosecute those, who after this public notice, persist in retaining any of his crew.” In addition, a mini-crime wave was in progress. On 7 October, the press reported that numerous robberies of stores on the wharves had been going on for nearly three weeks and that some businesses had been hit more than once. One of the suspects, a seaman named Tool, was apprehended aboard the French ship *Le Bleureau* and put in jail.

Problems developed with French property that could possibly get into foreign hands improperly. As people sought refuge from the islands, certain vessels had been commandeered for needed transportation or just subjected to piracy. D’Hébécourt wanted it made clear to potential purchasers that there were inherent risks in such transactions and that he, as “agent for the commissary general of the commercial relations of the French republic,” had the authority to inform the American public that “no French vessel can be sold without a special authorization of the owners, or of the agent of the French republic.”

French agents in Baltimore were also preoccupied with helping French citizens seeking passage to France, advice, or financial help.

* * *

Application for special monetary assistance was required, but only available for a limited time. A ship to Bordeaux was put at the disposition of French nationals, but she would not be flying the French flag. Perhaps some of the administrative headaches of the year would eventually come to an end, but for the time being, Frenchmen were in transit all over the West Indies and in America, decisions concerning Louisiana had to be accommodated, and “French” seamen would continue to be difficult to supervise and understand because they were multinationals, often recruited by agents in such cities as Hamburg, Bremen, and Danzig.

Louisiana had served two masters, France and Spain, in the eighteenth century. While it was Spain that had welcomed Acadian resettlement in the mid-1760s, the colony had not completely lost her *francité* because of the 1762 treaty involving the French and Spanish Bourbon royal families. In 1800, those living in New Orleans were overjoyed that France had reclaimed possession of Louisiana by the secret treaty of Ildefonso. Still, no one could clearly foresee that the cession would be short-lived. Spain was allowed to continue to administer the territory after the treaty. France, however, was finding her position in the West Indies jeopardized by circumstances in Saint-Domingue. By a stroke of good fortune, American representatives, who were in France in April 1803 negotiating an accommodation for American access to New Orleans, were suddenly offered France’s entire holdings on the continent. By the end of the month, the United States had agreed to pay $15 million for Louisiana and the assumption of some French debts. On 2 May, the formal treaty of cession was signed. Just a few weeks earlier, on 6 Germinal XI (the equivalent of 27 March 1803), the inhabitants
of New Orleans had expressed that “France has done justice to our opinion, by believing in the unalterable attachment which we have preferred for her. Thirty-four years reign of a foreign power have not weakened in our minds the close love of our native land, and now in returning under her flag, our joy is equal to the sorrow we felt when forced to separate from her.”37 Surprise! Word of the sale needed to be sent to America and approved in Washington, but by October, the Senate ratified the transaction and an act was passed on 10 November. France still had to take procedural control of Louisiana from the Spanish on 30 November, withdraw her remaining 7000 troops from Saint-Domingue, then quickly formalize the cession of Louisiana to the United States on 20 December.

Louisiana would soon join Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan in the expansion of settlement and markets. The upper Midwest would have been quite adequate for the time, but the area drained by the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers was enormous and the far Northwest’s expanse and possibilities were still a wondrous mystery until Lewis and Clark and others to follow could measure its wealth. For the moment, Louisiana dominated the conversation.

On 18 November, an article of great detail appeared in the Federal Gazette.38 Its goal was to begin introducing Marylanders to the origins of Louisiana, her political divisions, militia, regions, the Mississippi River, and inhabitants, especially those of New Orleans. For exiles who remained in Maryland since the 1760s, it was explained that the “government of Baton Rouge, especially to the east side, which includes all the country between the Iberville and the American line, is composed partly of Acadians, a few French, and of a great majority of Americans. On the west side, they are mostly Acadians.” In the next two editions, the public learned about her defenses, sugar cultivation, justice system, indigenous peoples, land, and the Missouri River (19 November); and the function of the Cabildo, taxes and duties, imports and exports, manufacturing, and shipping (21 November). Then, from 22 November to 2 December, columns and columns of text focused on debate on the treaty in the Senate and in the House. After the debate ended, Appendix No. II of the “Account for Louisiana” appeared in the Maryland press on 5 December. Just in case that subscribers or others of interest wanted a more convenient pamphlet, copies of “An Account of Louisiana” were available for purchase in early December for a quarter-dollar at M. & J. Conrad & Co., 138 Market Street.39

In short, Louisiana was a much more positive headline than the social, political, military, and commercial disaster taking place in the West Indies. In October, word was received in Philadelphia that Cap-Français had been blockaded by the British and was certainly not open for trade from the United States. A few had decided to weather the storm in Port-au-Prince by hoisting an American flag on a house and “trust[ing] to the virtue of that for protection from the Blacks, in case they came in possession of the place.” Those hunkered down were absolutely disgusted with those commanders in the service of France who were only concerned with their own fortunes. These corrupt
military officials were criticized for sitting back and letting Blacks overrun plantations and kill their owners, then—the dirty work accomplished—stepping in the situation with an armed force a few days later to “put the millions of coffee, cocoa, cotton, &c so recovered” into their own pockets.

The gentleman making this report had viewed this disgraceful action firsthand before departing for America. What he witnessed was a scarcity of food, flour distributed to a chosen few, inflated prices, and soldiers and health workers working without compensation. Hospitals had little medication, and their bedridden had no choice but to live in their own excrement for days as “worms an inch long and other vermin devoured the living along with the filth their bodies voided.” Whites left in fear for Cuba on overcrowded boats, and it was observed that many mulattoes—“numerous, brave and inured to war”—had been forced into military duty, unpaid and beginning to desert in droves. Not a person was untouched in some major way. Once again, America was a beacon of great hope for those having the means to escape the island of Hispaniola:

Scarce a Frenchman, I conversed with, but cursed the nation they belonged to, and those who had been in America spoke of it as a Paradise, and would often say of the Americans, Oh! happy Americans! If I had the means of subsistence I would live and die among you: so much for Bonaparte's colonial government.40

From the Baltimore tax rolls of 1798 to 1804, city directories, and registers of St. Peter's Church, it is evident that most refugees and émigrés found life in the city and surrounding areas to be satisfactory and more than temporary. They surely outnumbered the original Acadians and their descendants. Beaudu, Boislandry, Castaing, Cheffontaine, Champayne, Cherac, Comte, Cornet, Dano, de Leyritz, Desobry, Despeaux, Ducatel, Elwes, Fraise, Hardivillier, and many others paid their taxes, married, had children, and were laid to rest in Maryland. Some Saint-Domingue refugees (Arieu, Denis, Faure & Berrenger, Frais(s)e, Martiaq) were located on South Charles in 1804, but the great majority were to reside a little everywhere, from the western part of the city to Market Street to Old Town to the wharf areas to Fell’s Point. The young Bonapartes lived at 36 South Street, near Elizabeth’s father’s dwelling and the Patterson countinghouse at 18 South.

No inhabitant was particularly far from the water and commercial areas. In 1804, land transportation north to Frederick and Pennsylvania destinations left from 41 N. Howard Street, and travelers had to arise very early to commence their journeys. The Frederick stage operated on Tuesdays and Saturdays at 3 a.m., while the Hanover-Lancaster stages left on Tuesdays and Saturdays, just a little later at 5 a.m.!

Water packets were more frequent as weather allowed and were fortunately available at the more reasonable hour of nine in the morning. Transportation to Virginia cities
such as Alexandria, Norfolk, Petersburg, and Richmond was advertised in the newspaper, with departures depending on cargo or “as convenience permits.” Packets to the north and to destinations off the Chesapeake left Bowley’s Wharf/28 Cheapside daily (with weekend exceptions) to the other Frenchtown at the head of the Bay (the journey then continuing by land to New Castle, Delaware, and Philadelphia) and two or three days per week to Annapolis, Appoquinimink (Delaware), and Chestertown. [The] Acadian community had been involved for a long while with the Norfolk packet—Peter Gold’s President in 1794 (Moreau de St. Méry account) and now, ten years later, Peter and Paul Gold’s schooner Victory, Simon Deagle’s schooner Norfolk, and Robert Walker’s schooners Two Brothers and Mary and Kitty. The Victory, for example, was an 84-ton schooner that could hold 500 barrels of cargo and was pierced for ten guns. She doubled as a packet, and, in the summer of 1804, she was advertised as “built of best materials,” available for sale, freight, or charter, and ready to take on any cargo with two or three days’ notice. A misprint in the 23 August edition of the American wrongly identified her captain as Peter Caulk, not the rightful Peter Gold. In 1805, the Montezuma went into service as the new Gold packet.

On 25 February 1804, the Democratic-Republican party chose Jefferson again to be its national candidate. The election in the following December would be a fairer process thanks to the passage of the 12th Amendment to the Constitution. By May, Napoléon proclaimed himself emperor. In addition, the tragic duel between Aaron Burr and Alexander Hamilton took place on 11 July and was of great interest to subscribers to the press. So much happening in a nation that now numbered six million inhabitants!

* * *

No one, however, advertised more than Joseph Paillottet. Notices for his École Française and Night School were almost a daily feature in the press from July through the end of December. Language instruction was also not forgotten by non-French institutions: Mr. Patterson, the Rev. Mr. Sinclair, Lawrence & Cochran, and Mrs. Groombridge all sought new students. Dancing academies stayed strong with masters Duport and L. D. Du Coudray, and there was even news of an African Dance School. Religious books from many faiths were readily available, and a biography of the enigmatic and despised Toussaint Louverture was sold to those wanting to have a better understanding of one of the leaders who had upset their world order. It was also not surprising to see a French poem or jeu d’esprit for the non-English subscribers of the American.

Health issues were addressed in the press. With so many temptations in a port city, venereal disease was still a silent issue that would be addressed more publicly in the press a year later. In addition, the dreaded cholera returned in August. For the week ending 13 August, twenty-eight total deaths were reported, divided nearly equally between adults and children. Cholera claimed eleven of the victims; cholera morbus,
another. Consumption continued to be an issue of the era, with four fatal cases. A couple of drownings, two flux cases, teething, the croup, fits, abscess, asthma, and whooping cough accounted for the other known deaths in that particular week.

***

Politically, most in America chose to show tact and respect for Napoléon, who ascended to another level of power on 18 May 1804; others regretted the passing of the previous governments in France. Surely there were conservative royalist planters and merchants in Baltimore who mourned the victims of the guillotine, and those who were ardent republicans longing for the “old days.” Christopher Sink, of Baltimore, offered this extravagant tribute to the Republic that had not survived Napoléon’s designs. For Bastille Day, he advertised the following:

VIVE LA REPUBLIQUE
To the Lovers of good Things, CHRISTOPHER SINK takes this method to inform his friends in particular, and the public in general, that he intends having an elegant Dinner, at his residence, east side of Harris’s Creek, directly opposite Mayor Stoddart’s, on Sunday next, the 14th inst. in honor of the French Anniversary. Mr. S. thinks it not improper to state that the dinner in part will consist of the following dishes—turtle soup, fish, crabs, &c of every description, without adulteration, will be provided.

Amusements of the day: —Billiards, quoits, shuffle board and nine pins, and a number of other [unintelligible] amusements; and the last of music.

N.B. C.S. flatters himself that his old friends will continue firm in the cause, as he intends making a bold push.41

Quite an interesting event, especially since Sink does not appear to be a wealthy man. In the 1804 city directory, he is listed as a hairdresser at 15 Fell’s Street, Fells Point!

***

One Bonaparte who indeed made a positive impression on Baltimore was Napoléon’s youngest sibling. The young lovers, Jérôme Bonaparte and Elizabeth (Betsy) Patterson, were married on Christmas Eve, 1803. While there were not paparazzi in those days, there were still frequent reports of sightings of the couple and their entourage and of their failed efforts to cross the Atlantic to seek Napoléon’s favor in the year to come. Nothing could have been finer than the British seizing a precious human cargo!
The Baltimore Bonaparte connection proved to be an antidote for the bad feelings that had built up between some Americans and French over the previous years. Just as modern republican America has expressed a fascination for royals, early nineteenth-century Marylanders enjoyed having a local girl with ties to a European dynasty, even if it had been created on shaky, false pretenses, without an established prior history. In July 1804, the Bonaparte teens had ventured through New York on their way to Ballston Springs, a spa southwest of the more-famous Saratoga Springs. The Sans Souci Hotel there was the largest in the United States in 1803. The vacationing couple was addressed in a newspaper article as “Citizen and Lady.” Shortly thereafter, the press was aware that the title had changed and that “His Imperial Highness . . . and his lady, Princess Eliza” had arrived in Boston by the west bridge to Chapotin’s Boarding House on Summer Street. Stylish they were, in a coach drawn by six horses, with two or three servants in attendance. Two and a half weeks later, a New York source reported that the couple’s nine-day stay in Boston had ended on 6 August and that “Jerome Bonaparte, his lady and suit [sic]” had set out for Baltimore. According to the Boston Centinel, they had been treated to a warm welcome in Massachusetts “with every suitable mark of respect and attention,” and it was further clarified that their entourage included a secretary, a surgeon, and four servants.

In a 20 August account, the American carried news of the “royals” moving on to New York City, where brother Napoléon as first consul had been previously elected an honorary member of the New York Academy of Art. The academy seemed to be impressed that they had just received his personal, handwritten acceptance. Through the rumor mill however, New Yorkers were told that Jérôme had been pressured for some time to give up his American fantasy. It was said that “I [Napoléon] have sent you two frigates: If you return come alone, if you tarry expect no promotion.” While the press in New York would not confirm the rumor, they thought it plausible and presumed that Jérôme would choose love over family and political pressure and continue to reside in the United States.

Earlier, on 17 August, the Bonapartes had dined aboard the French frigate Cybelle in New York harbor. Guests included the city mayor, the state governor, and other unnamed individuals. The Cybelle and the second French frigate, the Didion, were “handsomely dressed with flags” and provided salutes as the parties arrived and left the first vessel. Betsy apparently scored points with the citizenry, and a poem composed in New York in her honor was published in Baltimore later in the month.

For all the headaches that Jérôme was giving Napoléon, the emperor also had a situation on his hands when their eldest brother Lucien was hurt in a duel with his brother-in-law, Prince Camilo Borghese! Lucien was quite an individual—some seminary education; a ladies’ man; a first marriage with an illiterate innkeeper’s daughter that resulted in two children before her death in 1800; an affair with a banker’s widow, Alexandrine Jouberthon, that produced a child out of wedlock followed by eight others after their marriage; an advisory role and uneven, stormy relationship with Napoléon;
a failed escape to America with his family in 1810; a rejected passport to America in 1816; and final residence in Italy. Napoléon unsuccessfully tried to force him out of his longtime marriage because it, too, did not fit his plans. The new emperor did indeed have his way with Jérôme’s marriage with Betsy, which was annulled in 1806 so that he could properly marry an equal, Catherine of Württemburg, in 1807.

Jérôme eventually had to confront his brother Napoléon. On All Saints Day, subscribers read the following:

The Gazette of last evening states that ‘M. Jerome Bonaparte and his fair spouse have at length taken their departure for France’ [and adds that] He attended the theatre on Thursday night last with his lady, and when the play was over they repaired on board a packet at one of the wharves, which had been engaged for the purpose, and proceeded down to North Point, where with one or two of her relations, who accompany them to France, they were put on the fast-sailing schooner Cordelia, captain Towers, which had been fitted up and ballasted for the purpose.

We are not sufficiently acquainted with the secret movements of Jerome Bonaparte, to say, wether [sic] the foregoing statement is, or is not correct.48

Another rumor. On 29 November, the Maryland Gazette noted that “Thursday evening last arrived in this city, Prince JEROME BONAPARTE and lady; and on Friday morning they embarked on board Le President for France—In the afternoon the frigate weighed anchor and proceeded down the bay.” Two days later, on 1 December, word came from Norfolk that the French imperial ambassador had arrived in this country and had sailed to Annapolis pursued by a British frigate. Surely the Bonapartes “are said to be on board the Frenchman.”49 False again! On 4 December, the American addressed the aborted sailing: “It is true, as stated, that Prince Jerome has again safely returned to this city, after making another unpropitious attempt to reach his brother’s empire.” There was some speculation that Jérôme would just stay and become an American citizen!

In March 1805, definitive word came from Baltimore that the young Bonapartes had left in a vessel bound for Amsterdam, where Jérôme intended to leave Betsy temporarily. Unfortunately, his pregnant wife was refused entry to Holland and France and gave birth to their son Jérôme Napoléon in London on 7 July. The two adults stood very little chance of reuniting, and that reality was revealed in Maryland in two reports in early 1805. From a previously published London Morning Chronicle, the French Minister of Marine was quoted as saying to M. Pichon at the consulat général in New York: “And even if he loves this woman, let him learn, for her sake, to quit her.—Let him return and keep near his brother—he will give him credit for the sacrifice.”50 Another account a month later seconded the futility of the cause by refer-
ring to letters from France intercepted by a British frigate and published for all to read: Betsy’s introduction to French society was “expected to be a thing of no easy accomplishment.”

Betsy never set foot on French soil, and soon after giving birth, she returned home to Baltimore. The Baltimore press noted in mid-November 1805 that “Madame Jerome Bonaparte and child, Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Ebe, and Mr. Patterson, came passengers in the brig Mars, from London.” The Maryland General Assembly granted her an official divorce in 1813 after she had filed a petition the previous year. She would actually outlive her son, known as Bo. He died in Baltimore on 17 June 1870 and was buried in Loudon Park Cemetery (Section B, Lot 37). Betsy passed away at the age of 94 almost nine years later, on 4 April 1879.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS:

Acadian: an inhabitant of the French colony of Acadie (later comprising Nova Scotia and other maritime areas). Founded in the early seventeenth century, the region had several proprietors before falling under British control by terms of the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). Acadians were allowed to remain on their productive lands, as long as they promised to remain “neutral” in some degree. Desiring their fertile lands and wary of their stubbornness and weak allegiance, some British authorities, with support from New England, began deporting the people in 1755. About 6,000 were forcibly transported to America’s English colonies and to England, among other places. Four vessels brought over 800 Acadians to Annapolis in late November/early December 1755, and officials distributed the exiles to a variety of locations on the Western and Eastern Shore. With the conclusion of the Seven Years’ War, Maryland Acadians were asked to patiently await permission to settle elsewhere. Even with births and deaths affecting the 1755 total, approximately 800 Acadians were still listed in the colony in 1763. Some went to Philadelphia, but many found the means to leave for Louisiana from 1766 to 1769. Those who remained in Maryland re-established themselves in Baltimore and earned their living as seamen.

Charitable Marine Society: a beneficial group of seamen and merchants formed in 1796. Acadian Captain Joseph White was one of its founding members.

émigrés: used here to represent French individuals who willingly came to settle in America.

“Frenchified State”: a term used by Gouverneur Ogden, an influential member of the New York legislature and relative of the Seton family, who was extremely
critical of Elizabeth Seton’s new religious venture in Emmitsburg. In late 1809, he declared that “novel things [like convents] . . . would not have been permitted by the populace in any other place than in the democratic, Frenchified State of Maryland [where] the religion they profess is uncongenial to the habits, manners and nature of Americans.” That French influence would only increase significantly over the succeeding years.

**French Town:** the first of several Francophone neighborhoods in Baltimore. It was located on S. Charles Street and its alleys, between Baltimore (Market Street) and Pratt. The term “French Town” was in use as a descriptor in Baltimore real estate in the early 1770s, if not before. (Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, 4 Sep 1773).

**mulatto:** a term that is now considered outdated and inappropriate because of its etymology. It is used here to denote a category in baptismal and other Church documents, which distinguished Negro/Black from mixed race. It is also a term that is still highly used in Caribbean history. “Mulatre” was an important racial group in the former French colony of Saint-Domingue. Rife with distinctions in a very complex, nuanced, and volatile society, the colony was divided into *grands blancs*, *petits blancs*, *Noirs*, *mulâtres* (free and enslaved), slaves, and maroons (fugitive slaves living in the mountains). Some persons of mixed parentage did enjoy societal advantages and educational benefits regardless of the circumstances leading to that distinction. Dr. Diane Batts Morrow, a professor of history and African American Studies at the University of Georgia, has written that the privileged “free mulattoes constituted an assertive, wealthy, and entrenched middle tier in the color-based, three-tiered caste system characteristic of Caribbean plantation societies.”

**Saint-Domingue:** a French colony situated on the island of Hispaniola, which was renamed Haiti in 1804. Maryland had very active commercial relations with Saint-Domingue and her Caribbean neighbors for many decades. In the 1790s and early 1800s, revolts and occupation tore the region apart politically and economically. The 1793 flight by sea of planters, merchants, both enslaved and free, brought a lot of challenges, customs, creativity, new products, and wealth to life in Maryland and to other North American cities.

**Sulpicians:** a French order of priests who came to Baltimore in 1791 to found a seminary, yet also wound up supporting Bishop John Carroll and his successors in missionary and educational endeavors.
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Maryland Center for History and Culture’s Brewington Book Prize 2022

Lyman D. Hall, The Stewards of West River: A Maryland Family during the American Revolution

After careful deliberation, the Maritime Committee of the Maryland Center for History and Culture (MCHC) has awarded the 2022 Brewington Book Prize to Lyman D. Hall for The Stewards of West River: A Maryland Family during the American Revolution (2021, independently published).

Chosen from a competitive selection of 15 titles on the Chesapeake Bay and US maritime history published throughout 2021, Hall’s book centers around a Revolutionary War era shipyard located on the West River. The author uses this start point to tell the story of the Steward family from their immigration more than one hundred years earlier through their service in the Revolution, as well as recent Marine Archeology of the site.

A lifelong history enthusiast, author Lyman Hall served in the Air Force and then joined a major commercial airline until his retirement 36 years later. In 1985, he bought a historical site on the West River in Maryland called Norman’s Retreat. It was historically recorded as a nineteenth-century farm, but the site contained extensive archival remains for an eighteenth-century shipyard. The history of his property reignited Hall’s love of history and soon led to extensive research: people, places, traveling the Revolutionary War battles, and researching historical persons associated with the Steward shipyard that eventually led to the writing of Stewards of West River.

Beginning in 2016, The Brewington Book Prize has been awarded annually by the Maryland Center for History and Culture for the best book on maritime history related to the Chesapeake Bay or the nation. The prize comes with a $500 honorarium and is named for Marion V. Brewington (1902–1974), a legendary maritime curator and historian from Salisbury,
Maryland. During World War II, Brewington was the curator for the US Navy. After the war, he was the maritime curator of MCHC (then known as the Maryland Historical Society), a trustee of the Chesapeake Bay Maritime Museum, and later held curatorial and administrative positions at the Peabody Museum of Salem, Massachusetts, and the Kendall Whaling Museum in Sharon, Massachusetts. His books include *Chesapeake Bay: A Pictorial Maritime History* and *Chesapeake Bay Log Canoes and Bugeyes*.

**Previous winners of the Brewington Book Prize include:**


When I entered the graduate program at Johns Hopkins University in the early 1960s, along with seven other candidates eager to complete a doctorate in history, I studied in Gilman Hall. Close by our desks, so close that we could reach across an aisle to grasp a book, was a first-rate history library. We enjoyed paid research fellowships, and we imbibed from our distinguished faculty the understanding that we were historians representing a specific discipline. Our dissertations, the final gateway to our doctorates, had to be based on original research into a specialized topic, and it was expected that they would be published. Little did we realize, then or now, how crucial Daniel Coit Gilman was to the practical aspects of our training and to the underlying philosophy that installed his ideas about graduate education.

Michael Benson seeks to end this amnesia. As he writes in this exceptionally researched study, *Daniel Coit Gilman and the Birth of the American Research University*: “I would contend that Daniel Coit Gilman was the most important figure in the shaping of the American research university and that the lack of modern scholarship on his role leaves a significant vacuum along the spectrum of the ‘new’ American system of education in the latter nineteenth century” (VIII). Shocked at the lack of attention paid to Gilman, even in the Hopkins book store, Benson, the president of Coastal Carolina University, is well positioned to tell this story. After research in Gilman’s papers and writings, Benson does not hesitate to support the bold claim of another educator: Gilman’s role in establishing Johns Hopkins University was perhaps the single most decisive event in the history of learning in the Western hemisphere (So much for the development of the American public school!). Gilman’s legacy, he writes, “will always be that of the father of the modern research university, a uniquely American invention that remains the envy of the world” (VIII). Benson makes the irrefutable case that, from these universities, new discoveries of lasers and DNA finger printing, and scientific agriculture, and a myriad of other innovations have come. In a statement that will no doubt gratify Hopkins’ admissions officers and fundraisers, “One would be hard pressed to find a US institution that has contributed more per capita and in a shorter period of time than Johns Hopkins University” (IX).

Benson does not intend a full-scale biography of Gilman; rather, this is a targeted study of Gilman’s essential role in the creation of the university. Ac-
Accordingly, he begins with Johns Hopkins, the bachelor Quaker business man with no college credentials, and his 7-million-dollar bequest. At the time it was the largest such gift in American history, to be divided between the university and the hospital. Benson then turns to Gilman's story: the young academy-trained son of prominent Connecticut parents who studied at Yale and subsequently travelled overseas investigating higher education, returning to Yale as a head librarian, and later an administrator of that institution's Sheffield Scientific School. By the time Gilman was in his early forties, his reputation was such that the board of regents of the California university system chose him as its first president. It was no surprise when the university's trustees in Baltimore invited him to become the first president of Johns Hopkins in 1875.

The heart of this book is a detailed examination of how Gilman launched, as he put it in his inaugural address, “our bark upon the Patapsco” (260). Today, knowing this institution as a billion-dollar enterprise, it is hard to imagine the tabula rasa Gilman faced with challenges that he turned into opportunities. From the beginning, Gilman directed the recruitment of world-renowned faculty; he oversaw the recruitment of promising graduate fellows; he made clear his commitment to men over buildings as the institution settled into prosaic buildings in downtown Baltimore, at the same time that he supported first-rate laboratories and libraries. In 1876, at his official inauguration, Gilman detailed twelve points that animated his development of the requirements for the PhD. Many of these ideas had been adumbrated elsewhere; it was Gilman's genius to put them together into the composite form that became the new American research university with its emphasis on graduate training and publication. Gilman played a lesser but still significant role in the birth of the hospital and medical school.

This is a book, as indicated in its title, that deals with the birth of the institution. Benson does not cover the remaining twenty-five years of Gilman's presidency, although he does note Gilman's other contributions to American higher education, especially his involvement in the Slater fund and Carnegie Institution. He does highlight Gilman's emphasis on the development of learned societies intended to lessen discipline specialization, as well as his support of scientific journals and what became the Johns Hopkins University Press. Benson is not interested in the private life of Gilman who is married and has two children in a paragraph, and remarried, after the death of his first wife, in three paragraphs. What remains is a portrait of a disciplined, skillful, respected, controversy-adverse pioneer with a vision and the opportunity to install that vision. In the process Gilman created an enduring model for the American research university.

Jean H. Baker
Goucher College, Emerita

In 1790, Maryland was the third largest slaveholding state in the union. In Prince George’s County, more than 60 percent of people lived in bondage, and paths to freedom were few. Statewide emancipation was unlikely given the economic interests of elected officials, and flight was risky, dangerous, and illegal. For many Black Marylanders, the best hope to escape their enslavement was to try to force their individual captors to free them, a legal progress known as manumission.

Between the Revolution and the Civil War, five generations of enslaved families sued for their freedom in Prince George’s County and in district and federal courts in nearby Washington. Hiring lawyers such as Francis Scott Key to represent them, members of the Queen, Mahoney, Thomas, Butler, Shorter, and Bell families staged more than a thousand legal actions over seven decades. In so doing, these Black litigants “accumulated a substantial reservoir of legal experience and knowledge” (149) and together advanced claims to freedom from slavery that creatively leveraged the nuances of colonial common law, the 1772 decision in the English case of *Somerset v. Stewart*, and a host of local technicalities.

Several of these enslaved petitioners won their cases. Others lost. Nevertheless, their family members persisted. Their efforts, William G. Thomas III writes in *A Question of Freedom*, shook the legal foundations of slavery in the Chesapeake, prompting the region’s elected and judicial officials to repeatedly restrict the ways in which a petitioner could argue for liberty from slavery. In 1793, for instance, the Maryland Assembly pushed freedom suits down to lower courts they deemed more sympathetic to enslavers. In 1796, the same legislature required the lawyers of unsuccessful petitioners in freedom suit cases to pay their opponents’ court costs. Fifteen years later, in 1810, a freedom suit brought by Mina Queen spurred the District of Columbia Circuit Court to rule that oral information passed down over generations about the legal status of an ancestor was inadmissible hearsay.

As evidentiary grounds narrowed and legal escape hatches closed, interstate sales increased, and *A Question of Freedom* culminates with the 1838 sale and forced migration to Louisiana and Missouri of 272 enslaved Marylanders from a slave labor site owned by the Jesuit proprietors of Georgetown College (now University). Thanks to the scholars and activists associated with the GU272 Memory Project, that event is now notorious. However, many of the other pivot points around which this twisting history turns are far less well known, and Thomas is to be cheered for the years of dogged, difficult research that informs each paragraph.

Readers of *A Question of Freedom* will also be struck by the book’s commitment to radical transparency—that is, to highlighting the limits of the surviving archival records and the positionality of the author. Indeed, Thomas is a descendant of the Duck-
etts, a tobacco-growing clan who enslaved members of the Queen family for decades until they were forced to free them during the Civil War. Thomas discloses this in the book’s prologue and offers recurring commentary between subsequent body chapters regarding his own efforts to face this “hurtful history” (2) and to open a dialog with living members of the Queen family. These reflective interludes are often affecting and are reminiscent of Edward Ball’s *Slaves in the Family* (1998) and Saidiya Hartman’s *Lose Your Mother* (2006).

Still, *A Question of Freedom* offers a sometimes-frustrating reading experience. Thomas is committed to framing his actors as participants in an emplotted sequence of events within a legible and propulsive storyline. The suits reconstructed here, however, are complicated and messy, and the book’s actors are numerous and unruly. *A Question of Freedom* lacks sufficient wayfinding apparatus to help readers navigate through this dizzying and cacophonous maze, and I finished the book convinced that the narrative mode was an imperfect vehicle for such rich and complex source material. For instance, Thomas sometimes struggles to gracefully situate individual cases within regional and national contexts, leading to some heavy-handed toggling between micro- and macroscales.

The same structural restrictions prevent *A Question of Freedom* from signaling its analytical or evidentiary intervention in ongoing scholarship about Black litigants in the early United States. That is a missed opportunity. As Thomas is well aware, scholars such as Kimberly Welch, Anne Twitty, and Kelly Kennington have examined freedom suits in Missouri, Mississippi, and Louisiana, while Eva Sheppard Wolf and Ted Maris-Wolf have focused upon individual families navigating the legal boundaries between slavery and freedom in Virginia. Clearly situating Maryland’s petitioners in that larger body of scholarship would help readers see what was significant and particular about what happened in Prince George’s County.

Richard Bell
University of Maryland, College Park


In 1791, Thomas Jefferson wrote enthusiastically about Benjamin Banneker’s intelligence, respectability, and his forthcoming almanac. By 1809, Jefferson’s feelings about the free Black mathematician had changed. That year, he suggested Banneker was not a particularly gifted thinker and wondered aloud whether Banneker had actually been capable of writing an almanac. Warren Milteer argues that Jefferson’s shifting assessments reflected a broader uncertainty, as white Americans “struggled to determine the proper place for free people of color in society” (69). In *Beyond Slavery’s Shadow*, Milteer explores white southerners’ efforts to fix the place of the
region’s free people of color, using legal and extralegal means to enhance white power and ensure the marginalization of others. Despite those efforts, key questions persisted: Who were free people of color, and where did they fit in the United States? Exploring those questions across a long chronology and broad geography, Milteer has crafted a richly informative study of the complex experiences of free people of color in the South.

The roots of those experiences lay in the colonial period. As a small population grew, colonial lawmakers increasingly restricted free people of color. Milteer’s chapter on the colonial period presents the central ideas that move through his text. White people were often ambivalent about the place of free people of color in their communities, and a vocal minority dedicated to racial exclusion often pushed for the harshest legal restrictions. Still, as recent scholarship in legal history has shown, restrictive laws did not necessarily define peoples’ lived experiences. Significant numbers of white people and their neighbors of color disobeyed exclusionary laws, and, at times, white officials declined to enforce restrictions. Despite the uncertain results of laws, Milteer shows that measures enacted in one place often set precedents for neighboring communities. For instance, in 1662, Virginia criminalized sex between Africans and English people, a statute that echoed across the British colonies, with similar laws enacted in Maryland, Delaware, and both Carolinas. Most compellingly, the archives include a range of characters Milteer uses to illuminate the complex experiences of free people of color. Among these figures was King Tony, a free man of color who bequeathed extensive Virginia landholdings to generations of descendants in his 1677 will. Across the three centuries of study, Milteer draws on legal records and stories of individuals to show proliferating legal restrictions, ambivalent enforcement, and the diverse lives of free people of color in the South.

Freedom expanded in the era of the American Revolution through a combination of laws and advocacy. Alongside state level conversations about manumission, Milteer explores freedom suits filed by people of color. We read here the story of a woman named Phillis, resident of Delaware, who won a freedom suit in part based on testimony that her grandmother was “an East Indian” with “straight black hair” (47). The case raises important questions about how race functioned in the South; Phillis used racial assumptions about hair texture to assert that she was not Black and therefore could not be enslaved. Milteer might have done more here and elsewhere to disaggregate the broad category of free people of color and consider how race functioned within this group.

Phillis, like others, was liberated into an increasingly restrictive context. Milteer focuses much of his work on oppressive legislation and radical, racist white southerners who constructed an order of racial exclusion. In the aftermath of the Revolution, state authorities enacted a raft of residency restrictions for free people of color, though they were enforced sporadically. In some cases, white southerners tried to enforce segregation within communities; for example, people of color could only view a hot air bal-
loon exhibited in Charleston on Tuesdays and Saturdays. Moments of crisis, like the 1831 Southampton Rebellion, increased legal restrictions; North Carolina outlawed preaching by people of color in the 1830s, while Baltimore required ministers of color to have special permission to preach after 10 pm.

In the face of these restrictions, some people of color found space within southern communities, often as workers. Skilled workers like restaurateurs and barbers sometimes passed their abilities through generations, linking communities and establishing a firmer position for select families. Here we see most clearly the huge archival range undergirding this project; the bibliography includes dozens of archives spanning at least eleven states as well as Nova Scotia and the District of Columbia. Milteer’s book is an argument for synthesis as an historical approach. He covers extensive ground and draws on countless anecdotes to make sense of “the collective lives of free people of color” (11). But herein lies the book’s key limitation. Milteer introduces characters like the Virginia landowner King Tony and the Delaware litigant Phillis, and he highlights the restrictive contexts that make their stories surprising. But who were these people? Because he looks to tell us so much, Milteer’s work is a collection of glimpses, more than it is a collection of lives. I would like Milteer to have turned his keen archival eye more frequently toward specific individuals, pausing to say more about how they moved into surprising positions and how they made choices within constrained contexts.

*Beyond Slavery’s Shadow* is an important overview of free people of color and their experiences across the South. It is clear, engaging, and richly informative. Readers will find a great deal to clarify the lives of this minority group as well as the construction of racial order across early America.

Christopher Bonner
University of Maryland, College Park


It has been eerie reading *Gun Barons: The Weapons That Transformed America and the Men Who Invented Them* in 2022. On the one hand, Russia’s invasion of Ukraine placed American weapon systems in a positive light (at least among the West). Direct military assistance from NATO countries, including the American-manufactured FGM-148 Javelin anti-tank missile system—a joint product of Raytheon Technologies and Lockheed Martin—proved decisive in blunting Russia’s early advances. This led to a number of contemporary cultural artifacts, such as the ubiquitous “St. Javelin” meme which blends Orthodox iconography with the products of the military-industrial complex. On the other hand, mass shootings in Uvalde, Buffalo, and Highland Park have been added to an ever-lengthening list of tragedies perpetuated by sick in-
individuals with access to semi-automatic firearms. This, in turn, led to one of the most significant pieces of gun control legislation in a generation. I do not know how the war in Ukraine will turn out or what, if any, changes in gun violence might occur because of this legislation, but if there is a major takeaway from *Gun Barons*, it is that contemporary Americans ought not discount the significance of the innovations and entrepreneurialism of our country’s arms manufacturers.

Former *Baltimore Sun* reporter John Bainbridge Jr.’s well-crafted narrative history explores the men behind the growth and development of American weapons technology in the nineteenth century. It also helps explain how the United States has arrived at its current situation with weaponry. As Bainbridge notes, there is a love-hate relationship in America regarding firearms. In the public imagination, the manufacturers of these implements alternate between the extremes of Merchants of Death on the one hand and the Arsenal of Democracy on the other. But in an imperfect world, their products are essential.

*Gun Barons* provides a group biography of men such as Samuel Colt, Eliphalet Remington, Oliver Winchester (who sold men’s furnishings when he lived in Baltimore), Horace Smith, and Daniel Wesson, whose companies have become household names. Buttressing Bainbridge’s narrative are numerous nineteenth-century publications that featured these men. Scholars of early American technology will be familiar with the “Yankee whittling-boy” at work. In any number of the individuals profiled by Bainbridge, he relates a now familiar tale of an ingenious young man put to work at a demanding, yet menial, position. This young person’s ability to innovate in arms technology eventually led to a public display of their handicraft. Doubted at first, the results of the invention spoke for themselves, whether through increased accuracy, higher rates of fire, decreased cost to manufacture, or some combination of the three. Then, even with occasional setbacks (patent infringements and the like), the inventor eventually triumphed over his competitors to establish a prominent business whose products have become household names. This pattern repeated over and over.

The American Civil War looms large in *Gun Barons*, and with good reason: the federal government’s increased demand for firearms led to massive purchases, which transferred huge amounts of capital over to northern manufacturers. Virtually all of these manufacturers were northern concerns; and, finally, their advanced products ultimately provided Union soldiers with a battlefield edge.

Although the Ordnance Department decided to rely upon the standard muzzle-loading Springfield rifle, the entrepreneurial spirit of the gun barons led them to cut out the middleman and go straight to the customer. Competition between Winchester and Spencer to get their arms directly into the hands of Union soldiers led to the piecemeal adoption of two rapid-firing rifles, the Henry and the Spencer. In the hands of John T. Wilder’s “Hatchet Brigade” these weapons provided a decisive battlefield edge. At the 1863 Battle of Hoover’s Gap, the rapid-fire Spencer rifles of the 17th Indiana turned back a Confederate assault. Bainbridge relates the following from one of the
Union participants: “No human being could successfully face such an avalanche of destruction as our continuous fire swept through their lines” (218).

To modern ears, knowledgeable about the destructiveness of twentieth and twenty-first century warfare, that Union soldier’s account of Hoover’s Gap heralded a new era. As Bainbridge observes, it was with that battle that “mass killing had taken another step forward” (219). The technological changes in small arms brought about by capitalist entrepreneurs in the mid-nineteenth century United States had profound effects on both the North American continent and for the rest of the world. Although the Lakota, Cheyenne, and Arapaho defeated Custer’s cavalry at Little Bighorn—in part through their own adoption of rapid-fire weaponry—American Empire in the Great Plains was in part determined by superiority in armaments. The “titans of American gun industry” were “part of the vanguard” (274).

Andrew J. B. Fagal
Princeton University


Most memoirs from the American Civil War focus on the experiences of the soldiers who fought in the conflict or the civilians who witnessed the war rip through their community. Very few look at the experiences of children and youth. Even fewer discuss the experiences of youth who witnessed significant battles of the American Civil War. The latter is exactly what _The Civil War Memoir of a Boy from Baltimore: The Remembrance of George C. Maguire_ does. Originally written in 1893 but never before published, this book traces the experience of a 14-year-old boy who followed the Fifth Maryland Infantry and his brother-in-law into the Civil War. Maguire was neither a soldier nor a drummer boy but instead, as described in the text, a regimental mascot. As a result, his experiences were much different than one might see in a typical memoir of the Civil War. First, he recounts his time as an adolescent. Throughout his memoir, though primarily early on in the text, Maguire’s experiences of camp life are rendered through his youthful eyes. Notions of bravery, self-sacrifice, and fear present in many other Civil War memoirs are missing in Maguire’s account. Instead, most moments, even those centered on the dead, are seen through child-like curiosity. In one instance, during the Battle of Antietam, Maguire is tasked with filling canteens. He notices blood appearing in the water in the stream, and his attention is drawn to a dead soldier. He explains how the man died not as someone facing his mortality but more as a child with a morbid curiosity who cannot look away.

However, Maguire’s memoir does more than provide a view of the American Civil War through the eyes of a child; it gives the reader an understanding of wartime medicine. Throughout the memoir, Maguire discusses how the lack of food, poor water
sources, and fatigue from marching affected the soldiers and how the new Union medical system, featuring ambulances and field hospitals, assisted sick and wounded soldiers. In one experience, while on the march to the Battle of Antietam, Maguire notes seeing fatigued and sick soldiers being met by the rear-guard medical corps. He describes how the surgeons evaluated the soldiers on the march and placed them into ambulances if necessary. Maguire’s story expands beyond the battlefield treatment of soldiers, which he discusses in detail at the Battle of Antietam. He spends most of the latter part of the memoir telling the story of his time working in a permanent military hospital built in Baltimore.

Maguire gives a detailed account of Hicks U.S. General Hospital in Baltimore, including a layout of the hospital, the responsibilities of the staff, and how the military hospital system in the United States was organized. While much of this content is not groundbreaking, Maguire’s narrative gives a personal view of witnessing death and traumatic injuries, both physical and mental, within the wards of a general hospital. He further shows how he learned to cope with what he saw. However, there is one area where Maguire’s diary provides a different understanding of Civil War medicine and psychological trauma from battle. Maguire discusses one particular soldier called “Jack,” who was known for skipping around and having mood swings. Maguire states that Jack “was enlisted as an imbecile or became after enlistment through sickness” (59). This addressing of the effects of the war on mental health is not common in diaries from the time. However, it shows the emergence of post-traumatic stress disorder in battlefield medicine.

The Civil War Memoir of a Boy from Baltimore: The Remembrance of George C. Maguire is an insightful diary for those studying the Civil War and Civil War medicine. It provides the reader with a perspective of the Civil War through the eyes of a young boy, which is not seen very often. Furthermore, the piece provides an in-depth discussion of Civil War medicine. Nevertheless, this text should be read carefully. George Maguire wrote this account of his life as a 14-year-old in the Civil War when he was 43 years old. As a result, his stories about his experiences may be exaggerated. Although one cannot challenge his words, one should be careful in believing the stories in their entirety. That said, this is a worthwhile and easy read for those interested in the Civil War.

Alexander H. Lothstein
Maryland Center for History and Culture


Time of Anarchy accelerates the trend in recent scholarship of revising assumptions about Bacon’s Rebellion, putting the Susquehannock, Maryland, and Virginia at the center of the maelstrom that formed what Matthew Kruer calls “the time of anarchy,”
1675–1685. The result is a penetrating and original view of Native and colonial developments along the Chesapeake and further out, transcending the conceptual limitations imposed by state borders and archives.

Kruer begins by comparing Susquehannock and British cultures. The Susquehannock valued consensus and balance, emotional calm and mutual goodwill, which (paradoxically) drove them to start mourning wars and adopt torture of captives. The British emphasized hierarchy from subject to sovereign, grounded in patriarchal norms, enforced through fear yet “expressed through an emotional language of love” (19). Through the mid-seventeenth century, as the English began to spread through the Chesapeake region, the Susquehannock forged alliances with key colonists, fought off Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) assaults, and absorbed refugees from other Native groups. With Restoration in the 1660s, the new Royal governors of Virginia and Maryland sought to treat Native peoples as part of a multiethnic empire, with rights similar to those of colonists, even as the increasingly bitter conflicts between elites and “ordinary” settlers increasingly targeted Indians.

Kruer highlights the significance of rumors alongside Native wars and internal colonial conflicts as causes of Bacon’s Rebellion. In the winter of 1674–1675, Haudenosaunee raids forced the Susquehannock to find refuge on Maryland’s “frontier,” alarming the colonists. When some Doegs took a hog from a Virginia farmer, local militia attacked a Susquehannock village along the Virginia/Maryland border, and a month later men from both tribes began raiding farms in the area. In early September, Maryland dispatched militia to confront Susquehannocks, leading to the murder of Native delegates and a wave of revenge raids. As rumors that the royal governors favored Indians over settlers began to “fracture the structures of authority” (71), Bacon’s militia besieged an Occaneechi fort and killed many, beginning the Time of Anarchy. The shattered Susquehannock split: some remained to gain revenge, while other groups left the Chesapeake, including many who went to the Haudenosaunee, where they joined kinfolk already present. Conflicts rippled through the Chesapeake colonies, with anger at official corruption and domination of wealth made worse by the stagnating tobacco economy and (especially in Maryland) fears of a Catholic international conspiracy (125). As Virginia’s Governor Berkeley and Maryland’s Lord Baltimore sought to protect Native allies, Indian hating became the heart of the conflict.

After that uprising failed, the royal commission that came to settle the mess sought to renew Virginia’s links with local Indians and, in a 1677 treaty, gave them protections and status as subjects of the British king. That same year, in a huge conference, the Haudenosaunee ended their long conflict with the Lenapes and extended their Covenant Chain to Maryland and Virginia. But those treaties did not end the wars and chaos ensued, as in 1681 Susquehannocks began to lead Haudenosaunee raids against Indigenous enemies in Virginia and Maryland. For four years, these raids generated fear in the region. It was in those circumstances that slavery surged, for Indigenous captives as well as “imported” Africans. Thus, Kruer notes, “the plantation complex and system of racial subordination . . . took shape amid a war against Indigenous pow-
ers that the English could not control, reflecting the fragile grasp of embattled patri-
archs” (219). The anarchy ended in 1682, apparently because the Susquehannock had
finally gained sufficient revenge, though not before William Penn drew the lesson that
his nascent colony needed to be grounded on solid good relations with that and other
Native nations.

*Time of Anarchy* presents a fresh and powerful account of this critical stage in the
development of the region between the Chesapeake and the Ohio Valley, focusing on
the rarely-studied Susquehannock nation—one of the most significant Native groups
at the time—analyzing their alliances, conflicts, and migrations, while also delving
into the relevant internal developments and politics of Maryland and Virginia. Within
this narrative, Kruer offers new interpretations of significant elements, observing that
Restoration governors sought to forge a multiethnic empire that included Natives as
“citizens,” pointing to how that probably intensified settlers’ dislike of their governors.
The most comparable work is probably James Rice’s *Tales from a Revolution* (2012),
although Rice, unlike Kruer, deliberately followed tradition by focusing on the conflict
between Bacon and Berkeley while also discussing the significant roles of different
Indigenous groups in events. Kruer plumbs more deeply than Rice into the details of
developments by focusing on the critical decade of 1675–1685 even as he notes the
long-term effects of changes set in motion during that time.

*Anarchy’s* strengths go beyond its distinctive approach. Kruer’s detailed endnotes
demonstrate his impressive, extensive use of Maryland State Archives and other pri-
mary sources; discuss fascinating details not included in the narrative; and proffer
questions and topics to explore in the future. The many maps, all drawn for the book
by William Keegan, provide useful visualization of Susquehannock influence and
movements as well as important places in the story. While this book’s appeal to gen-
eral readers and undergraduates may be limited, due to its detailed and sophisticated
nature (although it is highly readable and fascinating), its unique approach and power-
ful interpretation make it a must for graduates and faculty working in early American
topics.

Daniel Mandell
Truman State University, Emeritus

*How the Suburbs Were Segregated: Developers and the Business of Exclusionary Housing,*
Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Paperback, $30.00.)

In *How the Suburbs Were Segregated*, winner of the Urban History Association’s 2021
Kenneth Jackson Prize for the best book in North American urban history, Paige
Glotzer profoundly shifts our understanding of early suburban development, expand-
ing a line of inquiry initiated by scholars like David M. P. Freund and N. D. B. Con-
nolly. As one of the latest offerings from Columbia University Press’s Studies in the
History of U.S. Capitalism series, launched in 2013, the book’s major contribution is
its exposure of the long-distance investment streams that funded exclusive turn-of-the-century subdivisions like Baltimore’s Roland Park. In addition, Glotzer skillfully deploys Cedric Robinson’s theory of racial capitalism to explain how white developers ingrained racist assumptions and practices into the very process of suburbanization, and then disseminated these widely over the succeeding decades, civil rights gains notwithstanding.

Glotzer opens with an analysis of the four hundred individual British investors in the company that bankrolled the development of Roland Park through one of its subsidiaries, revealing American suburbs as “nodes in a global circuit of capital” (6). Economic historians have explored international investment in American farm mortgages, extractive industries, and ranching, but this is the first study to examine the phenomenon through the lens of suburban development. The resulting infusion of capital enabled firms like the Roland Park Company (RPC) to formulate their plans more deliberately and incorporate aesthetic flourishes that appealed to their well-to-do, native-born white clientele. It also drove the company’s pursuit of “methods to guarantee returns year after year” (50), in other words long-term profitability, by placing restrictions on land use and building design, as well as banning purchase by African Americans even as the legality of racial restrictions remained in dispute. Unbeknownst to the company when it launched Roland Park in 1891, a Black family already owned a plot in the middle of their planned subdivision, and a historic African American settlement, Cross Keys, bordered their initial holding located in the semirural fringe north of the city. Glotzer recounts how the RPC proceeded to erect physical and legal barriers insulating Roland Park from its surroundings, even as white residents exploited their Black neighbors for domestic labor, appropriated common water resources, and discharged their sewage into Cross Keys. The company and its affluent residents later used their political and social power to secure preferential access to Baltimore’s sewer grid and engineer the surrounding area’s annexation to the city in 1918. During the 1920s, the RPC resorted to “exclusion files” as a means to block “undesirable” ethnic whites from purchasing its properties.

Glotzer does an excellent job of toggling back and forth from the local, to the city, to the national level, and beyond, diligently tracing corporate genealogies and individual biographies to illustrate the uncanny reach of the RPC’s influence. This came largely through the National Association of Real Estate Boards (NAREB) founded in 1908, on whose committees RPC executives served in prominent roles, and through their subsequent appointment to positions with federal New Deal, wartime, and postwar housing agencies. Glotzer unearths the racist culture on prominent display at annual NAREB conventions, which typically included elaborate minstrel shows. The organization amended its code of ethics in 1923 to forbid sales to racial and ethnic minorities it believed could prove “detrimental” to property values, plus avidly promoted exclusionary zoning and racially restrictive covenants. “Through NAREB, developers institutionalized and sold these [racist] assumptions as expert knowledge” (147), she concludes.
Throughout the book, Glotzer demonstrates racial capitalism to have been quite malleable and even potentially self-contradictory—notably so in the case of Baltimore mortgage banker and developer James Rouse who went on to advise the Eisenhower administration regarding urban renewal. Rouse styled himself a racial liberal, promoting housing code enforcement and rehabilitation to improve living conditions in the city’s African American neighborhoods. At the same time, he displaced Black residents for redevelopment projects having virtually all-white occupancy. But in one instance, Glotzer too rigidly applies her racial capitalism frame in a way that distorts the historical record. The Home Owners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC) was a New Deal agency that refinanced the mortgages of nearly a million struggling homeowners, and which also made a now-infamous set of “security” (redlining) maps rating the investment-worthiness of neighborhoods in more than two hundred US cities, using explicitly racist and xenophobic language. After a pathbreaking analysis in which she brings to light the incredible extent to which NAREB—and RPC-connected individuals specifically—successfully influenced HOLC policy, Glotzer makes the common misassumption that HOLC used its redlining maps to deny its refinancing loans. As shown by historian Ocean Howell, this is actually impossible because HOLC made these maps after it had already issued all those loans. Even Kenneth Jackson some forty years earlier came to the conclusion that HOLC had made the vast majority of its loans in its lower-rated (i.e. redlined) neighborhoods, including to African American homeowners, as demonstrated by geographer Amy Hillier, among others. Scholars noting these facts should not be chided as trying to “absolve” (151) HOLC for its racist practices—rather, the agency’s record is better understood as yet another example of racial capitalism’s malleability and potential to manage internal contradictions, an insight that could be usefully paired with Glotzer’s incisive analysis of HOLC’s other legacies like its 1938–1940 Waverly rehabilitation pilot project.

*How the Suburbs Were Segregated* is a tour de force which offers a sobering explanation for why racial inequality is so thoroughly ingrained in our country’s housing history. It is also certain to drive productive conversations in the still-evolving historiography of suburban history and federal housing policy.

Todd M. Michney
Georgia Institute of Technology


Brad Meltzer has written thirteen novels, four works of non-fiction, roughly thirty historical biographies for young readers, and superhero fiction for DC Comics. He hosts “Brad Meltzer’s Lost History” on the History Channel. Meltzer’s fourth work of non-fiction, coauthored with Josh Mensch, tackles an episode that has gained re-
cent currency among a handful of historians and conspiracy theorists—that assassins were gunning to send President-elect Abraham Lincoln to an early grave as he passed through Baltimore en route to Washington in February 1861 for his inauguration.

A graduate of Columbia Law School, Meltzer is not a trained historian, which is not to say he cannot write good history. His coauthor, Josh Mensch, is a writer, director, and producer for television who holds a graduate degree in journalism from Columbia University. Both acknowledge research and historical support from biographer Walter Stahr. Meltzer’s reputation as a writer of thrillers is clear throughout the book, as many chapters (all of which are two to four pages) end with a cliffhanger signaling impending excitement just ahead—“don’t stop, Dear Reader!”

A synopsis of what is now known as the “Baltimore Plot”: Samuel Felton, president of the Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore Railroad, hires a Chicago detective, Allan Pinkerton, to investigate threats by southern sympathizers to sabotage rail lines between Philadelphia and Baltimore. Pinkerton stations several agents in Baltimore, where they don disguises and aliases to infiltrate meetings of men who claim to be part of a plan by southern partisans to murder Lincoln as he changes train stations in the city.

The mysterious leader appears to be Cipriano Ferrandini, a Corsican barber who plies his trade at the city’s Barnum’s Hotel. Pinkerton and his agents gain the confidence of the plotters and learn their plans. Pinkerton and others convince Lincoln and his handlers to pass through Baltimore the night prior to his scheduled daytime arrival, and the President-elect arrives safely in Washington.

It is a titillating story with code names, clandestine meetings in saloons, intelligence obtained at a brothel, a clever female spy who outwits her marks, and an agent later hanged by the Confederates as a spy. It is a high-velocity race against time as those protecting Lincoln work tirelessly to stay a step ahead of murderous conspirators, all as the nation hurtles toward a civil war.

But what credence does this plot warrant? Was it as extensive as Pinkerton and others have claimed? Civil War historian James McPherson asserts that “An assassination plot probably did exist; the danger was real.” Leading Lincoln scholar David Donald describes the change in travel plan to avoid Baltimore during the day as “a sound and reasonable decision.” Michael Burlingame, another Lincoln scholar, believes that “Lincoln may have overreacted to a threat that was perhaps exaggerated, but given the bloody history of Baltimore mobs . . . his decision seems to have been a reasonable precaution.” Lincoln himself was never entirely convinced of the danger and later regretted his decision to slip through Baltimore in the middle of the night.1

Though threats likely emanated from numerous individuals and militia companies in Baltimore during the fall of 1860 and early months of 1861, Pinkerton’s own claims refute the logic of his assertions—intelligence gathered by his agents that 2,000 men were involved strikes this reviewer as preposterous, as does the selection of a triggerman chosen by ballot in a clandestine meeting of twenty men. Any serious assassination plot must involve as few people as possible, and selecting a shooter via random balloting defies common sense. The contention that a non-native English-speaking hotel barber was the ringleader of an extensive, murderous plot with no evident central organization is dubious at best. Though braggarts readily shared information with Pinkerton’s team, little was verified, and no one was investigated or charged with a crime, though in January 1861 a Congressional House committee attempted to learn what was afoot prior to Lincoln’s journey.

But logic and reason need not stand in the way of a good yarn, and Meltzer tells this one in the style of a thriller that fans of his novels will recognize. Much of the story alternates between Philadelphia and Baltimore as Pinkerton’s agents and Lincoln’s men coordinate in the dead of night to get the President-elect safely to Washington. Meltzer’s examination of Pinkerton’s elaborate deployment of his agents in multiple cities, their coded communications, false names, and nocturnal rendezvous is a page-turner, despite the known outcome.

The topic deserves a more nuanced discussion, as Meltzer falls victim to the persistent but inaccurate trope that Maryland was full of secessionists and southern sympathizers, when in fact it was a pro-Union slave state with many Unionist slaveholders. Meltzer appreciates that context is vital to understanding history’s complexity, but the 53 pages devoted to Lincoln’s early life are overkill. Readers wanting to learn more about that will find better sources, while those keen to get at the plot can start on page 54 and the accounts of the 1860 national party nominating conventions. The present tense used throughout the book will cause teeth-gnashing in some readers, though this narrative device does give a sense of “you are there” immediacy (while also slipping into past tense, as on pages 249 and 297). The book relies on references to primary and secondary sources, though spot-checking reveals errors: page 41 cites a reference to Ronald White’s *A. Lincoln* from page 21 when the reference appears on page 319; citations on pages 48 and 49 from Burlingame’s *Abraham Lincoln: A Life* are incorrect; and a reference on page 55 to Douglas Egerton’s work, *Year of Meteors*, is off by a page, to cite several examples. Reader beware.

*The Lincoln Conspiracy* dissects an event in American political history that, absent new evidence, will have no resolution, and Meltzer concedes as much. Readers will no doubt enjoy debating this incident over pints of ale, though they should bear in mind

---

that Pinkerton’s contention that 2,000 men were allegedly in on this plot belies the claim in the book’s subtitle—that “the Secret Plot to Kill America’s 16th President” was not much of a secret at all.

Charles W. Mitchell
Baltimore, Maryland


James Collins Johnson was born into slavery near Easton, Maryland, in 1816. He escaped in 1839, leaving his wife Phillis behind, and he made his way to Princeton, New Jersey, then home to a sizable free Black community. His owner, Philip Wallis, came hunting for him four years later. A local jury upheld Wallis’s claim to Johnson and ordered his return to bondage. Instead, a white benefactor, Theodosia Prevost, stepped in to purchase Johnson from Wallis for $550 and freed him—a well-calibrated solution for the town’s conservative disquiet over slavery. It took several years, but Johnson paid her back. He lived for nearly sixty years in Princeton, becoming a fixture of the college scene, a homeowner and family man, and the target of racist jokes told by Princeton students. In telling his story, the Princeton Fugitive Slave offers one of the few biographies of a Black person associated with an American university in the nineteenth century.

A professor of law and a Princeton graduate, Lolita Buckner Inniss carefully reconstructs Johnson’s life in as much detail as the historical record allows. Unlike Frederick Douglass, a more famous fugitive from slavery on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, Johnson never wrote his own autobiography. Various members of the Princeton community wrote about him, though, so aspects of his story entered into the historical record secondhand, like the students’ used clothing and furniture that he sold to make a living. Inniss does some admirable archival sleuthing to trace Johnson’s movements and activities, and she situates the various phases of his life in a thick cocoon of historical context that helps the reader to understand what was going on around Johnson and the choices he and others connected to him made.

Johnson was one of hundreds, even thousands, of Marylanders who escaped from slavery. Most remain unknown. Recent scholarship on William Still’s memoir of the underground railroad through Philadelphia has called attention to the many escapees from Maryland who passed through his station in the 1850s. According to William Kashatus’s tally of 943 runaways identified in Still’s memoir, half came from Maryland, and many traveled at least part of the way by water, as Johnson did.3

Although Johnson never said what triggered him to flee, Inniss suggests that the appeal of freedom in the North, the threat of sale, and the intensifying pressure on free people of color in the state might all have been part of his calculations. (Indeed, just a year before Johnson made his way to Princeton, the Jesuits who ran Georgetown sold roughly three hundred black Marylanders to the Deep South. I wonder if Johnson had heard about it.)

*The Princeton Fugitive Slave* shows that it is a mistake to draw too sharp of a contrast between Maryland and New Jersey. Maryland was a slave state with a large free Black population, while New Jersey was a free state that nevertheless had a small number of slaves and near-slaves up to the Civil War. Legally, Johnson remained Wallis’s property in New Jersey until he was purchased and manumitted. Free Black people in New Jersey did not fare much better than they did in Maryland; they were suspended in a kind of civic limbo between captive and citizen there, too. But Princeton’s Black community made its presence felt. One reason why Wallis may have been willing to sell Johnson to Prevost was because Princeton’s Black community made it known that they would not allow Johnson to be returned to slavery without a fight—a sign of things to come. This was the community that Paul Robeson would be born into at the end of the century; Robeson’s father was the minister of the Witherspoon Presbyterian Church in Princeton.

A central problem in telling Johnson’s story is the absence of his own self-authored voice in the historical record. The problem is not limited to the fact that he never wrote an autobiography or memoir that could provide insight into the texture of his own experience, although stories based on interviews with him were published. It also manifests itself in the pivotal moment in the book, the 1843 trial to decide Johnson’s legal status. Inniss explains that “there is no detailed account of the evidence presented in court, of the precise language of the parties, or the words of the court’s ruling” (69). Even if the case had been fully reported, moreover, New Jersey’s ban on “negro testimony” prevented Johnson from speaking on his own behalf. This state-imposed legal disability offers another example of the hardships Black people faced in the free North—one that had a powerful impact on historical record.

A recurring detail in the stories about Johnson that circulated at Princeton was that he stuttered. This, too, symbolizes Johnson’s lack of voice. Princeton students and alumni professed affection for Johnson, but they also regarded him with contempt and condescension, calling him “Jim Stink” and teasing him about his stutter. It may be more than a coincidence that many advertisements for fugitive slaves identify escapees as having a stutter. Perhaps that pattern of speech was part of the persona adopted by some Black people to signal their servile position in the presence of white people and, in so doing, survive.

Adam Rothman
Georgetown University
The title of this book speaks volumes.

How did a white police officer come to get arrested, indicted, tried, convicted, and jailed for the death of a Black man, Daniel Brown? The answer reveals just how complex and occasionally nuanced American society could be when it came to race, class, and ethnicity. True, this one case does not prove the point. But it certainly lays important groundwork.

Baltimore was a violent city. Not unusual for a nineteenth-century American city that had grown and diversified beyond the pleasure of its native-born population. In 1861 it became the city where arguably the first real bloodshed of the Civil War took place when 700 soldiers of the 6th Massachusetts Volunteers were attacked and forced into a deadly firefight by a pro-secession, pro-slavery mob.

Prior to that, Baltimore had been the site of frequent nativist riots against Irish, Germans, and African Americans. The city elected a Know-Nothing mayor, Maryland a Know-Nothing governor. The state voted for the pro-slavery southern Democrat John C. Breckenridge in 1860 and by 1875 was busy segregating Black from white. Violence against Black people was commonplace and never punished. But that is just part of the city’s violent history. Irish, Jews, and other “New Immigrants” suffered, too, though not nearly to the same degree.

Gordon Shufelt’s deep research and splendid presentation provide a detailed account of Baltimore’s contentious history. “Daniel Brown’s case is unusual in that agents of the criminal justice system responded promptly and stayed with the process through all the steps necessary to get the charges before a jury” (3), explains the author, who is a retired attorney and administrative law judge, and writes with authority and precision. An all-white jury convicted the officer and a white judge sentenced him to five years in jail.

The patrolman in question was an Irish immigrant named Patrick McDonald. His victim, Daniel Brown, was a migrant from Maryland’s Eastern Shore. Both men were in their mid-to-late thirties. Both fled oppressive circumstances for a better life. For Brown it was the poverty and half-life born of racial oppression. McDonald’s family joined the thousands fleeing the Irish Potato Famine. Brown married and prospered; that is, he and his wife became servants of wealthy whites, which gave them social standing and a more comfortable standard of living. McDonald was apparently something of a street tough who sought advancement through the police force. The paths these men took were not unusual.

Also not unusual, both became ensnared in the complex web of America’s roiling racial, social, and ethnic conflict. Brown’s death was part of a pattern of racialized police brutality that continues to this day. At the same time, McDonald had been
discriminated against for his Catholicism and his ethnicity. Additionally, much of Baltimore held the police force in open contempt because its officers often served as henchmen for those in power, be they Know-Nothings or Democrats, beating heads alongside such gangs as the Plug Uglies, Blood Tubs, or Butt Enders.

The over-riding factor, though, was the close relationship Brown, his wife, and their friends had with wealthy and influential whites. The Browns lived in the white neighborhood where they worked, in a small house on a rear street, in effect behind the white dwellings. As Shufelt points out, this mimicked the paternalistic relationship between white masters and their enslaved Black house servants, who were only as safe as white attitudes permitted.

In Daniel Brown’s case, even going along to get along earned him no safety. McDonald was sent to investigate a noisy party at Brown’s house. Owing to their devout Methodism, there was no alcohol or dancing at this going-away party for a friend. McDonald, however, insisted the party was a cakewalk for which Brown had possibly charged admission.

A shouting match between Brown and McDonald developed. McDonald took offense at Brown’s “surly” attitude and clubbed him across the head. Then, over pleas from Brown’s wife, McDonald charged into the house and shot the man in the head, exclaiming, “Yes, I will shoot him, the black son of a bitch” (115). As Brown lay bleeding, he added cruelly, “Let him die” (116). None of these facts were disputed.

Owing to the connections Brown and others had to influential whites, McDonald was arrested shortly thereafter and indicted for murder.

As Shufelt stresses, what drove this case onto its unusual path was the fact that the witnesses to the murder “worked in wealthy white citizens’ homes and were accepted by their employers as trustworthy servants” (122). These whites, he warns, held familiar racist attitudes toward African Americans, “but they also saw them as subordinates who accepted their place within the city’s racial hierarchy.” When one combines this paternalism with the widespread mistrust of the police and lingering dislike of Irish “papists,” an explanation emerges.

But the story does not end there. The jury found McDonald guilty of manslaughter, not first-degree or second-degree murder, as it could and should have.

The judge sentenced McDonald to five years in the city jail despite statutory law requiring the sentence to be carried out in the state penitentiary. On these dubious grounds, the Court of Appeals reversed, and McDonald walked free less than a year later. The white jury was not willing to convict a white man for the willful murder of a Black man. The judge’s perhaps intentional sentencing mistake, and the legally sloppy reversal by the Court of Appeals, reflected a profound racial ambivalence, even in this situation.

Protests that Daniel Brown “was shot down like a dog” (128) had no impact. In the end, Shufelt concludes, a bit too generously, “Officer McDonald’s attack on Daniel Brown was seen, not as racist violence, but rather as aggressive policing that disturbed
the peace and security of all citizens’ homes” (123). And one might conclude that the unusual case was not quite so uncommon after all.

Howard Smead
University of Maryland, College Park
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