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

In our latest offering, *A Woman of Two Worlds: Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte*, Curator Alexandra Deutsch literally “unpacks” Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte’s personal belongings in this intuitively sophisticated material culture biography of the woman whose seductive beauty and tragic marriage repeatedly pulls us back for another look and, ideally, a deeper understanding of the person behind the celebrity. This work expands Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte’s story and reveals the complex life of a romantic and rebellious young woman whose deep hurt drove her to the courts of Europe and who ultimately found comfort and satisfaction in her hard-won financial independence.

The Press’s titles continue the mission first set forth in 1844, of discovering and publishing Maryland history. We invite you to become a supporter and help us fill in the unknown pages of Maryland history. If you would like to make a tax deductible gift to the Friends of the Press, please direct your donation to Development, Maryland Historical Society, 201 West Monument Street, Baltimore, MD 21201. For additional information on MdHS publications, contact Patricia Dockman Anderson, Director of Publications and Library Services, 410-685-3750 x317 or panderson@mdhs.org.
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With this photograph we salute the National Park Service on its centennial, August 25, 1916. President Woodrow Wilson signed the bill mandating the agency “to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” The NPS manages more than a dozen historic sites in Maryland, among them the Assateague Island, designated a National Seashore in 1965. (A. Aubrey Bodine, Maryland Historical Society.)
Editor’s Notebook

“To Everything There Is a Season”

Welcome to Volume 111 of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, one that maintains the journal’s quality and also marks notable changes. With this issue, the magazine is no longer a quarterly and will be published twice a year, in combined Spring/Summer and Fall/Winter issues. These will be heftier, up to 160 pages from the average of 128, with more images, and additional new material posted to the website next year. The quality of the journal, however, remains unchanged, as does our one hundred and ten year commitment to publishing the best new scholarship and articles of general interest. As our history shows, this is not the first change to the publications mission.

The Maryland Historical Society’s first printed offerings included transcribed documents and select talks presented at the annual meetings, now grouped in the library as the “Pre-Fund Publications.” George Peabody’s generous $20,000 gift in 1867 prompted the name change to the “Fund Publications” and by 1883 supported the acclaimed *Archives of Maryland* series (noted by an early *MdHM* editor as one that “did more than anything else to give the society an honorable place among its sister societies and to win the approval of the historical world in general.”) In the early twentieth century, when the Peabody bonds decreased in value by 50 percent, the society reluctantly discontinued distributing free volumes to the membership. In 1905, the Publications Committee recommended a quarterly magazine as a practical solution, one modeled on the successful *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (1877) and the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (1893), respectively.

The following year editor William Hand Browne introduced the new publication, noting the venue as an appropriate repository for Maryland history essays and documents “of interest.” Browne closed with the belief that the new journal would “be of use and interest not only to members of the Society but to all students of American, and especially of Maryland history” — and thus it has, uninterrupted, through the past one hundred and ten years. And as we take this next step with volume 111, we thank you for your dedication to Maryland history and for your support of the *Maryland Historical Magazine.*
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The Politics of Landscape in Seventeenth-Century Maryland

JULIA A. KING, SKYLAR A. BAUER, and ALEX J. FLICK

In July 1689, a rebel force of 250 men calling themselves the Protestant Associators marched on the Maryland capital at St. Mary’s City, where they found Colonel William Digges, a son-in-law of Charles Calvert, the Catholic Lord Baltimore and the colony’s third proprietor, barricaded in the brick state house with 100 loyalists. Days earlier, the rebels had relayed rumors of a “Catholic plot” involving Indians intent on “mak[ing] haste and kill[ing] the Protestants before the shipp[s] come in,” using Baltimore’s delay in claiming William and Mary king and queen as a pretext for taking armed action. As the rebels “gained the Doores and windows” of the state house, the “Catholic” loyalists, reluctant to fight, “did surrender takeing with them their private armes and leaving the publick armes to the Protestants.”¹

With the state house secured, the Associators, whose force had grown to 700 or 800 troops with two cannon, began an overland march ten miles north to Mattapany, Lord Baltimore’s dwelling plantation on the Patuxent and the site of the colony’s arms magazine. Reaching the site, the rebels encountered a small force at the “place where the Government then was” and laid siege to the plantation. Within hours, the loyalists had capitulated and the Associators’ principal leader, John Coode, was operating a provisional government from “His Majesty’s Garrison at Mattapany.”²

After securing Mattapany, a rebel contingent was dispatched to Notley Hall, another of Baltimore’s plantations and residence of Colonel Digges, located on the Wicomico River some thirty miles west of St. Mary’s City. The site often served as a meeting place for the Maryland Council, particularly when conducting business with the Piscataway and other Indian nations. Before 1684, when the proprietor returned to England (permanently as it turned out), he and his family were often in residence. Now, having lost the state house to the rebels and unable to return to his
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home, they fled to Virginia, and the rebels put the dwelling into service as a prison until 1692, when both Notley Hall and Mattapany were returned to Lord Baltimore’s agents in Maryland. The 1689 Protestant Revolution, or Coode’s Rebellion as it is sometimes called, ended more than a half century of proprietary rule, an important moment in early Maryland history and the subject of considerable study.
Researchers concluded that Baltimore’s proclivity for appointing Roman Catholics and close relatives to various provincial and county offices revealed how the proprietor had failed to heed a rising resentment toward his policies. It was this resentment that fueled the 1689 rebellion, a coup by a “small group [of colonists] primarily intent on increasing [their] own power.” Additionally, John Krugler argues, the proprietor’s “aloof” and “authoritarian political demeanor” ignored “the likelihood that Catholic success [in Maryland] would almost certainly exacerbate Protestant fears and jealousy.”\(^4\)
More recent interpretations of the revolution expand on these views, adding that the 1689 rebellion and the many other struggles for political control taking place in the colony almost from the day it was established, while often considered as isolated or disconnected events, reveal the ongoing disagreements about what, in Maryland, constituted the legitimate foundations of government. As with English people everywhere, the “inhabitants of Lord Baltimore’s colony were working out some of the most basic problems of the seventeenth-century English polity.” From William Claiborne’s refusal to abandon Kent Island in the Chesapeake Bay in 1634 through Ingle’s and Fendall’s rebellions mid-century to the 1689 revolution, these and the other coups and rebellions that took place in seventeenth-century Maryland are best understood within a larger “British narrative of constitutional adjustment, conflict and change.”

Building on the work of earlier historians, this article considers the significance of the often-overlooked route the Associators took that summer. Certainly, it makes sense that the rebels would seize control of Baltimore’s plantations in their quest to replace the government with their own leaders, but they left the Jesuit and Indian settlements untouched. What, then, does the location of Baltimore’s plantations suggest about Calvert family efforts to establish their political authority in Maryland in the first place? How did the Calverts (and then their enemies) use the colony’s geography to “work out the problem” of establishing (or dis-establishing) their political legitimacy? A geographical focus, including the use of archaeological data, does not necessarily change earlier interpretations but it does enrich understanding of how the Calverts, no newcomers to colonization, used their knowledge of both geography and other expeditions and settlements to inform and shape the political realities of their colony.

That the Calvert family “tied political topography to [political] loyalty” is clear in their post-1665 efforts to re-develop St. Mary’s City and establish a network of port towns in the colony. The chronic absence of such settlements was not “the product of slow institutional maturity” in government but “the negotiated outcome of tense battles between the Calverts and their subjects over the distribution of power.” The second Lord Baltimore’s project to incorporate St. Mary’s City in 1667 was an attempt to create an “alternative political structure” for the purpose of “build[ing] loyalty” to the Calvert brand.” They hoped this new structure would encourage a commercial and civic community, “cultivating humanistic civic virtues that were the bedrock of English corporate identity.” Baltimore’s subsequent effort to designate a network of eleven
towns across the colony, all in locations where men loyal to the proprietor would control the nascent urban enclaves, was intended “to reshape the power structures in [Maryland]” in ways that politically benefited the proprietary family.6

By now it is a truism that Atlantic World history is as much a spatial story as it is a chronological one. It is also the case that “particular places” within the Atlantic can reveal the complicated richness of the colonial experience in a way that trans-national or global narratives cannot. Drawing on these two perspectives, this paper examines the relationship between geography and political authority as it was worked out in one particular place in the early modern Atlantic — proprietary Maryland. In addition to documents and maps, archaeological evidence offers important evidence about how the colony’s physical spaces were materially reconfigured into politically and symbolically meaningful places, and how these places were used to legitimize or challenge political authority. Comparing the observations from Maryland with evidence from Virginia and from Baltimore’s plantations in Ireland and Newfoundland reveals what historian Lauren Benton has described as “patterns of territorial unevenness” in the expansion of empire. Baltimore’s ongoing efforts to establish his authority in the Chesapeake were informed not just by his own previous experience and the experiences of others, but by conditions unique to Maryland. His responses to those conditions reveal the challenges a Catholic proprietor faced establishing authority in the seventeenth century and have left a legacy imprinted in the modern landscape.7

Although Chesapeake historians have most often looked to colonial capitals, including St. Mary’s City and Jamestown, or even to towns as important settings for engaging questions of political legitimacy, this essay shows that political authority, at least in Maryland, was also negotiated in the presumably everyday landscape of the plantation. When the Protestant Associators marched on Mattapany and Notley Hall after securing St. Mary’s City, for example, traveling over variably maintained roads and taking control of two well-populated plantations, they did so at no small cost to their effort. In fact, the rebellion’s leaders had planned the revolution in the halls of their plantation dwellings on the Wicomico, not far from Notley Hall. Coode and his followers recognized a fundamental point about seventeenth-century Maryland politics — proprietary power was physically and materially present not only in the capital or in the wished-for towns but among the plantations, where the majority of colonists did not have to travel far to observe or be reminded
of the Calvert family’s proprietary rights. Coode’s principal aim, seizing Baltimore’s power, required the rebel leader to also seize those physical spaces associated with the government.8

The Calvert family’s recognition of the importance of geography in the colonial project no doubt developed out of their longstanding interest in establishing plantations in Ireland and North America. Sir George Calvert (1579–1632), Cecil’s father, who would become the first Lord Baltimore (1625), was an early investor in the Virginia Company and the East India Company. In 1621 and 1623, he acquired land in Newfoundland through both purchase and a charter and, in 1625, two plantations in Ireland. He sold one of these plantations for land on the Irish coast at Wexford. The charter for Maryland was in preparation when George died. His son, Cecil, (1605–1675), the second Lord Baltimore, inherited all of these plantations and the final work on the charter. Cecil, who, surprisingly enough never visited Newfoundland, Ireland, or Maryland learned the importance of
hands-on management from his father. Although the Calverts did not maintain a constant presence on their Irish plantations, both Newfoundland and Maryland, it was clear, required otherwise.9

The manner in which the Calverts (and their enemies) used the landscape to achieve their ends differed from how the political landscape developed in Virginia, an interesting point in that the two colonies are often united under the rubric of the “Chesapeake” due to similarities in geography and climate. The observation is legitimate, but masks important differences beyond variations in soil types and in religion. The Calverts literally extended their presence through the development of plantation settlements that served as important political centers in their own rights. Long-term Virginia Governor Sir William Berkeley took the opposite tack, doing everything possible to focus his colony’s political activity at Jamestown.10

Baltimore’s authority in Maryland derived from the 1632 charter, conceived using legal instruments to reconfigure unknown or little-known territory, vesting agents such as Calvert with vice-regal powers in the appropriation and occupation of “remote and contested region[s].” The Crown, concerned with Dutch expeditions to what would become New Sweden and New Netherland, including Delaware Bay, making was a willing partner with the Calverts in the effort to put English subjects in the northern Chesapeake. The charter gave the Calverts “a more absolute lordship over Maryland than any granted to that date anywhere,” with Baltimore “[ruling] as a virtual monarch.”11

That, at least, was the written ideal. On the ground, implementation of charter directives came up against geography: the harsh and dangerous physical reality of colonial environments, especially riverine regions such as those found in the Chesapeake, not only demanded heavy investments in labor but created conditions that threatened political stability. Geophysical realities meant that settlement and political control never unfolded quite so seamlessly or rationally as promised by charters or depicted on maps and were shaped instead by often challenging, difficult-to-control topographic and local conditions, including the presence of indigenous populations, hostile European neighbors, and a Catholic proprietor ever intent on protecting his power. These natural and social environments with their difficult conditions and dangers fostered tensions and actions often interpreted as sedition or treason.12

Archaeological research aimed at locating and documenting settlements in Maryland beyond the capital and the few developed towns reveals the founding family used the landscape to assert their authority, control the political movements of their subjects, and create vassals of the local Indian
groups. They did this through political avenues offered by the corporate structures of the capital and of the towns and, more importantly for this study, through the plantations, including their own and those of their enemies.

The significance Cecil Calvert attached to inscribing his authority on the landscape is apparent on Augustine Herrman’s 1673 map, *Virginia and Maryland as it is Planted and Inhabited*. The map signified proprietary possession and authority through the marking and naming of places where the colony’s leaders met, including St. Mary’s City, Mattapany, and Notley Hall, among others. The map showed the counties, all but one (St. Mary’s) named after Calvert family members, and the towns (or would-be towns) the Calverts had designated in a 1668 proclamation. Charles Calvert assured his father that “the names of all yo’ Lordshipps Mannors [are] Inserted [in Herrman’s map] as you direct me.” Missing from the map were the names of Calvert’s enemies, including Thomas Gerard and Josias Fendall. That the Herrman map constructed a colony as Baltimore wished it to be was not lost on Marylanders, including those antagonistic to the proprietor. In 1676 the author of an anti-Baltimore screed sent to royal authorities complained that, through the placement of the family’s seal on the map, Baltimore “puts himself inequall computation with . . . the Kings Majesty in the great map of Virginia and Maryland, prikkinge himself distinctly in, and the Kings Majesty out[,] of Maryland.”

Maps, globes, and other instruments of representation allowed colonial administrators and political actors throughout the Atlantic world, including the Calvert family, to visualize their land claims on paper and to shape their actual form. For this reason, the Herrman map remains an important document for studying how geographical knowledge was produced in the Chesapeake. But, while the second Lord Baltimore, an absentee landlord, relied almost exclusively on maps and descriptions, his agents on the ground in Maryland, many of whom were his kinsmen, could see firsthand the extent of the family’s enterprise and its physical geography. Their presence was critical for marking the land, dividing it, naming it, and granting it on the proprietor’s behalf. And, of all Cecil Calvert’s relatives, perhaps none was more active in establishing himself in the landscape than Baltimore’s son and heir, Charles Calvert.

Charles Calvert (1637–1715) was born at Hook House, the Arundell family manor in Wiltshire, England, three years after the *Ark* and the *Dove* arrived in Maryland. Like his parents, Charles was a recusant Catholic. As a young man, he may have been sent to St. Omers, a Jesuit school located near Calais, to further his education. Charles possibly witnessed the 1643 siege of his grandparents’ nearby home by Cromwell’s forces (his grandparents had been staunch royalists). And, he surely witnessed the challenges his father experienced in the governing of Maryland. In particular, Charles would have been in his late teens when his father struggled in 1655 to wrest control of Maryland from a group of Puritan émigrés. Following the
restoration of proprietary government in 1658, the son, now twenty years old, would have then watched as his father’s new governor, a seemingly loyal Protestant named Josias Fendall, moved to abolish the Upper House of the Assembly and with it Baltimore’s power in the legislature.\textsuperscript{15}

The Calverts’ enemies often used Catholicism to undermine their position during these various coups and rebellions, in effect calling into question the family’s political loyalty in a Protestant nation. The conflated relationship between national and religious identity in England probably gave the Catholic Calverts a different perspective on the politics of space. The dissolution of the monasteries that began in the mid-sixteenth century, coupled with the physical destruction of church buildings had, over the course of but a few decades, effectively erased Catholicism from the English landscape, and penal laws had forced the practice of Catholicism into private and domestic spaces. Out of this reconfiguration of the confessional landscape, English Catholics developed a “politically charged attitude toward space” that lasted for the next hundred years. To be Catholic in this world meant political exclusion. The Calverts knew the cost from the experiences of the first proprietor whose conversion to the faith brought an end to his political career. Cecil Calvert attempted detaching religion from politics first in the 1633 directive he gave his brother, first governor Leonard Calvert, requiring “all acts of Roman Catholique religion to be done as privately as may be,” and again in 1649, when he asked the assembly to codify this policy in “An Act Concerning Religion.”\textsuperscript{16}

When Charles Calvert, who would remain Catholic to the end of his life, arrived in Maryland in 1661, the colony had been established for twenty-seven years. Through the next two decades, Charles worked to manage his family’s investment and lead the colony, first as governor and then, after his father’s death in 1675, as proprietor. As all of his relatives before him the third Lord Baltimore took up residence in St. Mary’s City, moving into a farmhouse known as St. John’s. But, unlike most of his kinsmen and with the support of his father, Charles, whose first wife had died in 1663, left the capital in 1666 for his new wife’s plantation at Mattapany, where he built a substantial brick dwelling house. After completing the house at Mattapany, Calvert started construction on a new dwelling at one of his interior homes, Zekiah Manor, while asking the assembly to build him yet a third house, also of brick, in Anne Arundel County.

Charles used his ability to maintain more than one household in Maryland to physically insert himself into the broader landscape, not unlike Cecil’s instructions to Augustine Herrman when finalizing his \textit{Map of Maryland and Virginia}. Calvert’s plantations and his travel between these sites, the capital, and other settlements provided him the opportunity to visually survey the colony in which his family had so heavily invested, and where, “in most places There [were] not fifty houses in the space of Thirty
Navigating these landscapes of dispersed settlement was, not surprisingly, time-consuming, costly, and potentially dangerous. Although the land is relatively flat with trails that crisscrossed the interior, numerous Chesapeake Bay streams, creeks, and tributaries dissect the coastal plain. Roads were in various states of repair, poorly marked, and sometimes impassable, and when those roads or paths led to the water’s edge travelers had to negotiate streams and creeks with uncertain bottoms. These challenges, plus the cost of travel, forced most colonists to live within a two- to five-mile radius of home. Planters and county justices with greater resources maintained contacts within a radius of about ten miles, and planter-merchants about fifteen to twenty-five miles. Calvert’s travels exceeded even that, sometimes taking him as far as fifty to a hundred miles from his dwelling at Mattapany, including to the Piscataway capital and New Amstel in New Netherland (Delaware).
Travel was also heavily freighted with social and political meaning. Travelers, as part of the landscape dynamic, marked time, identified territory, and transformed space into place. Calvert’s travels allowed him to survey the colony and the frequency, form, and style of his visits provided a visual and tangible reality to a narrative framing Maryland as Lord Baltimore’s colony. Rituals of welcome and farewell as well as practices associated with overnight accommodation further marked its social significance. This is especially important given that Calvert required the Maryland Council to meet in different locations, which it did on a far more frequent basis than the Virginia Council of State. From 1661 until 1689, 27 percent or 86 of the council’s meetings took place at locations outside St. Mary’s City, some more than a hundred miles away from the capital. The majority of the outside meetings (62 percent) took place at venues along the Patuxent, primarily Mattapany, and along the Wicomico (17 percent), primarily Notley Hall. Other meeting locations included Newtown, Portoback, Piscataway, and Spesutia. The procession of councilors summoned and the locations visited surely generated a narrative of Calvert authority and dominion.\(^{18}\)

When examined on the ground as well as in the documents, the Calvert strong-
holds of St. Mary’s City, Mattapany, and Notley Hall as well as a fourth, Zekiah Manor, reveal the family’s effort to extend their physical presence in tandem with the colony’s expanding settlement. A fifth location, a plantation owned by Josias Fendall, suggests how the proprietor’s enemies also challenged his authority through their own physical location and position within the landscape. Calvert’s response to Fendall’s actions dramatically illustrates how the Calverts literally eradicated their opposition and the memory of the opposition from the landscape, renaming and reshaping the revolutionary’s former plantation.

Following the Restoration in England, the work in Maryland to re-assert the Calverts’ authority began in 1661 when Charles Calvert arrived as governor. In St. Mary’s City, still the capital, the governor found a small settlement consisting of a cluster of houses, some better built than others but all of wood, a few ordinaries, and a “Country’s House” for holding meetings of the assembly. Plantation housing was not much better, propelling the Calverts on an ambitious and expensive plan for rebuilding their colony beginning with St. Mary’s City. Taking a cue from efforts in England to reorganize corporate charters and rebuild cityscapes, Charles’s father, Cecil, incorporated St. Mary’s City in 1667, appointing his younger half-brother, Philip Calvert, mayor along with six other aldermen. This was the same year that the Jesuits began construction of a brick chapel located at the east end of town. Less
than a decade later, in 1674, the Assembly authorized the construction of a brick state house at the west end of town, completed in 1676. Mayor Philip Calvert was planning his own brick dwelling in St. Mary’s, a 54-by-54-foot mansion known as St. Peter’s that was not completed until 1679 and may have rivaled Berkeley’s Greenspring at Jamestown. All three buildings at St. Mary’s were large, imposing brick structures, designed to stand out in a colony where Governor Calvert himself had described the architecture as “very mean and little, and generally after the meanest farmhouses in England.”

The Jesuit chapel and the slightly later state house were separated by approximately one-half mile, door to door, and midway between the two buildings was the capital’s town center, where a market, store, lawyer’s offices, and at least two ordinaries have been documented through archaeology. The relationships of these structures along with the network of roads in the town have led archaeologists to suggest that the layout represented sophisticated planning using baroque principles of design. With the church and state house anchoring opposite ends of the town, “the designers of St. Mary’s City were ensuring that both visitors and residents were aware of the power of the proprietary government and the Catholic faith of Maryland’s ruling elite.” Another perspective urges caution, arguing that “this grand design at St. Mary’s” was in fact emphasizing the centrality of the capital’s market, and not the
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chapel, in keeping with English corporate planning. In either case, the changes sug-
gest the family’s effort to remodel their capital and make it into an English town.20

Of the three brick buildings in St. Mary’s City, only the Jesuit chapel has been
explored archaeologically to any degree. Excavations there have revealed that the
structure had a tile roof and at least some of the recovered brick bore evidence of
Plaster applied directly to its surface, which archaeologists have interpreted as ornate
exterior plastering. The use of jamb and mullion bricks treated with a red limewash
unified and gave the building a more shapely form. And, the church probably had
a floor made of stone imported from Europe. The chapel was a grand building, and
one capable of commanding attention. It is the prominence of this chapel in the
capital that makes it what John Krugler described as a symbol of Catholic success
in the colony, representing an upending of Baltimore’s earlier 1633 proscription that
religious matters in Maryland should be kept “as private as possible.”21

The three brick buildings that went up in St. Mary’s, however, were only part of
the rebuilding campaign that the Calverts hoped would reshape the landscape across
the colony. Archaeological evidence recovered from plantation settlements associated
with the founding family suggests that brick construction was part of their effort to
not only refashion their colony’s capital but also the larger landscape. Conventional
wisdom has held that both the price and shortage of labor meant that even the
wealthiest and most elite colonists were forced into impermanent, earthfast structures
only a few steps improved from a tobacco barn. That dire situation has been revised
to acknowledge the incorporation of brick hearths and chimneys, wooden floors,
and glass windows in seventeenth-century housing. Full brick buildings, however,
remained rare with one important exception. The Calvert family used the perma-
nence (and cost) of brick construction to mark a “visual, structural, and symbolic
counterpoint to the wooden buildings that dominated the Chesapeake landscape.”22

As the Jesuits were building their chapel in St. Mary’s, and as plans for the state
house were developing, Governor Calvert was in the process of building his new
house at Mattapany, now his principal residence in the colony. Mattapany, often (and
mistakenly) represented as a rural or “country” home “ensconced in the wilderness,”
was in fact a large manor house of brick construction visibly situated at the mouth
of the Patuxent River, the same location where the Calverts had considered moving
the capital five years earlier. Baltimore no doubt understood the importance of river
drainages, and he and his son likely knew of contemporary discussions, some appear-
ing in printed form, about the importance of establishing a town or port on each of
Virginia’s rivers for the purpose of, as one writer put it, “reducing . . . [plantations]
into Towns.” If the Calverts could not convince the assembly to move the capital,
now located on a small river with poor access to the interior, or if lesser towns were
slow in developing, then they were prepared to establish ports on properties they
controlled and also where they lived.23

Mattapany was no impermanent frontier accommodation. Excavations revealed
a dwelling house measuring 25 by 50 feet in plan and supported by a continuous masonry foundation two feet in thickness. The house John Ogilby described as “brick and timber construction” was two stories over a fashionable raised basement with at least a portion of the cellar floor paved in tile and shelving against at least one wall. A central chimney heated two rooms on each floor, and an unheated lobby provided entrance for visitors. Fancy tin-glazed earthenware tiles decorated at least two hearths, most rooms were plastered, the windows were likely all glazed, and the roof was covered with Dutch pantile. Although a room-by-room inventory does not survive, one reference indicates that Charles Calvert had a portrait of his mother, Anne Arundell, hanging in the parlor. Large quantities of table glass, wine bottle glass (some with applied seals), and brass furniture tacks suggest the accoutrements for entertaining guests, including members of the Council when they met at Mattapany on dozens of occasions between 1668 and 1689. At some point, probably in the early to mid-1670s, a defensive log palisade was erected around the dwelling.24

In 1671 the governor, with his father’s consent, decided to locate the colony’s magazine at Mattapany and not at St. Mary’s. Legislation passed that year required funds to be expended “towards the maintaining of a Constant Magazine with Armes and Amunicon for the defense of this Province.” Although Calvert initially struggled to get the magazine established and stocked, records indicate powder, shot, and arms were dispensed just five years later. That year, 1676, with Calvert temporarily in England (now the third Lord Baltimore following the death of his father in 1675) and the colony in a state of unrest linked to Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia, a guard of thirty men was stationed at Mattapany to protect both the magazine and Calvert’s house. When the proprietor returned in late 1678, he brought 315 muskets, 101 carbines, 1 blunderbuss, 1,750 pounds of powder, and 6,400 pounds of shot to be stored in the magazine. Three years later his brother-in-law, Nicholas Lowe, petitioned the English Privy Council for permission to send 200 muskets, 100 carbines and “furniture,” 100 pistols and holsters, 100 saddles, 100 “ordinary” swords and belts, 9,000 pounds of shot and bullets, and 20 barrels of gunpowder. At least a portion of these materials went to Mattapany.25

The site also served as a required point of entry for ships trading in the Patuxent, where captains paid fees and government officials recorded voyages. With its magazine, council chamber, and standing as a port of entry, Mattapany had rapidly become an important political landmark in the colony. Visitors approaching from the plantation’s landing on the Patuxent or arriving by path from St. Mary’s City entered a busy settlement with a well-appointed, imposing, and fortified brick residence unlike any other in the colony and a separate compound housing the government’s military strength. And, while many planters relied on indentured labor for their tobacco crop, the family held a large number of enslaved Africans in the colony, many of whom lived and worked at Mattapany, a factor that further set the governor apart. Even the indigenous nations recognized the importance of that site. When the great men
of the Susquehannock decided, in 1674, to ask Lord Baltimore’s permission to settle in Maryland, they appeared unannounced at Mattapany, a visit which gave Calvert pause given that the Indians “Doe know that our whole Magazine lyes” at Mattapany.26

In 1672, probably as his building campaign at Mattapany wound down, Calvert told his father that he was now building a “country house” at Zekiah Manor, where he “resolve[d] to live in the Summer time.” No doubt the idea of a “summer house” would have appealed to Cecil Calvert, who would have been familiar with the English nobility’s use of such homes. Located deep within the interior of Charles County at the remote headwaters of the Wicomico River, Zekiah House also served as a safe haven from the coast. When Cecil warned Charles that he had heard rumors of designs on his son’s life and that his house at Mattapany was “too near the water,” Calvert assured his father he would remove to Zekiah House and “shalbe very Cautious of what shipps I goe on Board of”. He also intended Zekiah House, located along the “Carriage Road,” to serve a political function, and as such the Court of Chancery met there on at least one occasion. The house was used later in an unsuccessful effort to negotiate a peace between Maryland and “northern” Indians. Calvert’s purse, though, apparently could not support a summer house of brick, although he assured his father that, the following year (1673), he planned to build a second and entirely brick house on the manor for his son, “little Cecil.” And, as Charles reported to Cecil, Zekiah Manor was the one he “chose to begin vpon,” suggesting he had plans for the many other proprietary manors situated in each county.27

As Charles Calvert worked to establish a proprietary stronghold at the mouth of the Patuxent River and a presence in the interior, he was well aware of the real and potential challenges to the family’s authority found among the planters residing along St. Clement’s Bay and the Wicomico River. Here lived his father’s old enemies, Josias Fendall and Thomas Gerard, who had in 1660 conspired to abolish the Upper House in an effort to diminish proprietary power. Both men had been banished from the colony, literally removed from the landscape, but the Calverts did not enforce the punishment as long as both stayed out of politics, and, for a while, both complied. They were soon joined in their neighborhood by future Protestant Associator John Coode, who married into Gerard’s family. Calvert, knowing he needed to keep watch on these men and their supporters, cultivated Thomas Notley, a merchant who had immigrated to Maryland from Barbados in the early 1660s and settled on the east side of the Wicomico River at Manahowick’s Neck, later known as Notley Hall.28

Notley came to Maryland with a number of other Barbadians, including Jesse Wharton and Benjamin Rozier. Along with William Digges, the son of a Virginia governor, these men became a force in Maryland government. Three married the proprietor’s stepdaughters (Elizabeth Sewall to Wharton, Ann Sewall to Rozier, and Elizabeth to Digges following Wharton’s death) and also served the Council. Notley, a planter and merchant, earned Charles Calvert’s trust and favor while serving in the Lower House and was appointed deputy governor in 1676 while Baltimore was in
England. When the never-married Notley died without children in 1679, he willed his plantation and his possessions to Charles, now the third Lord Baltimore, who renamed the property Notley Hall and placed his stepdaughter Elizabeth and her husband William Digges in residence. Calvert maintained a presence on the Wicomico throughout both the Notley and Digges tenures as the Council met at Notley Hall on at least fifteen occasions. He later ordered a significant amount of shot and powder to be stored at the site after establishing the magazine at Mattapany, with military exercises carried out at "Notley Hall field."  

The plantations sat strategically near the confluence of the Wicomico and Potomac Rivers with a straight line of sight to the Virginia shore, and Notley assisted the government with the collection of shipping dues in the Potomac and with identifying merchant vessels potentially afoul of the law. In 1672, when the Swedish ship, _Burgh of Stade_, sailed up the Potomac in apparent violation of the Navigation Acts, the ship was seized and a court of admiralty convened at Notley Hall. Given that the Crown already had its suspicions about Baltimore's enforcement of the Navigation Acts and that the record does suggest a lax attitude on the part of the Calverts, the confiscation of this ship is significant. The _Burgh of Stade_ had ventured into Maryland waters at an opportune time for an economically pinched proprietary government.
attempting to remodel its landscape. Thomas Notley served as the attorney for the ship's captain, losing the case but benefiting handsomely when the court ordered
the captain to relinquish his cargo of 50,000 yellow bricks. With council member Benjamin Rozier, Notley took possession of the cargo and, archaeologists suspect, began his own construction campaign at Manahowick’s Neck.30

The house Notley built, using both the seized yellow brick and locally made red brick, was impressive by any measure, especially so for seventeenth-century Maryland, and served as an ideal accommodation for Council meetings. Unimaginably rich goods and furnishings packed the structure’s thirteen rooms, evidenced in a room-by-room inventory taken at the deputy governor’s death. The 1679 document lists a “Great Hall,” “Best Room,” and “Counting House.” The furnishings in the Best Room alone, including a fully outfitted feather bed and bedstead, were valued at 71 pounds sterling. Wide brick foundations discovered through both archaeology and a magnetometer survey indicate the house was a T-shaped structure of at least partial brick construction, possibly two stories in height and at least 1400 square feet (and possibly 1900) on the ground floor. The house had chimneys built of red and yellow brick, tiled hearths, glazed windows, and plastered walls. The “Great Hall,” or what was the council chamber, contained 22 leather and two “Turky worked” chairs, four tables—three covered in cloth—green “hangings,” and fireplace equipment. The walls were covered with a “Lookinge glasse” and three framed pictures, and a pewter cistern for rinsing dishes was also located in the Hall. Archaeological investigations have yielded fragments of fragile Venetian glassware, glass wine bottles, Dutch and English tobacco pipes, tin-glazed (“delft”) tablewares and fireplace tile, and German stoneware. Of special interest is an unusual brick drain originating at the dwelling and running at least 180 feet toward the river. This drain may suggest an early and unusual effort to dispose of domestic wastewater. Associated service structures included a kitchen, store, salt house, stable, and quarter. Notley enjoyed the services of five indentured servants, one believed to be Eleanor Butler, and 22 enslaved men, women, and children. Notley was one of the largest slaveholders at the time.31

Of all the places discussed here, Notley Hall was the most critical to the proprietor’s relations with the several Indian nations living in Maryland. Indeed, one of these nations, the Choptico, had their town approximately three miles upriver from Notley Hall. Twelve of the fifteen council meetings at Manahowick’s Neck concerned the colonial government’s relationships with the native groups, including the Piscataway, allies of the proprietor. Most issues had to do with the Articles of Peace and Amity signed in 1666 by the Maryland governor, the Piscataway, Choptico, and eleven other nations. These meetings often began with ceremonial exchanges of cloth, wild animal skins, peake (shell beads), and glass beads. At one meeting held in 1679, two Piscataway found guilty of murdering members of an English family at the head of the Patuxent River were sentenced to death and the execution carried out that evening on the premises with the tayac (leader), his great men, and the proprietor in attendance. Before the meeting was over, Baltimore, having asserted his legal jurisdiction over the Piscataway, informed the tayac that he and his great men could
now report to the magazine at Mattapany for the loan of guns they had requested.32

With these settlements, all well beyond St. Mary’s City, taking on political functions and meanings, travel became especially important for communicating proprietary authority. The material culture of this travel is suggested by both inventory and archaeological evidence. Thomas Notley, for example, owned an expensive “whole skirted saddle velvet seated, holsters 2 p stirrups and Leather 2 Cruppers & breast plates.” In 1682, when the Assembly was considering the posting of a guard at the magazine at Mattapany, the Upper House argued for pay rates to “Exceed the Ordinary Allowance … Considering the Quality they serve in,” with an expectation that the guard’s members “be more than Ordinarily well Accoutred.” An extensive collection of horse furniture, including plain and ornate leather ornaments and a spur, has been recovered from Mattapany, some from the area around Baltimore’s house and the majority from the area around the magazine. While only the very poorest colonists in Maryland went without a horse, the Calverts and their “Champions” used dress and horse furnishings to set themselves apart from the rest of the colonists when traveling between the capital and proprietary landmarks.33

St. Mary’s City, Mattapany, Zekiah Manor, and Notley Hall became well-known strongholds, the last three established after Charles Calvert arrived in the colony. These settlements were placed in locations that monitored river or interior traffic and activities, and included some of the most elite and fashionable architecture, sending a message about proprietary wealth, power, and authority, in particular to those who might challenge the colony’s leadership. Mattapany, Zekiah House, and Notley Hall provided places where the Maryland Council regularly made its presence known outside St. Mary’s. Expanding settlement in Maryland had already led the Calverts to create counties for the management of local business; but the loyalty of county justices appointed by the governor was not guaranteed. Calvert’s two plantations along with Notley Hall provided a more direct, better controlled proprietary presence and space for unquestionably loyal, and powerful, councilors to gather in the three most populated western shore counties along two of the region’s busiest and most important rivers.

The 1670s had started out well enough for the Calverts. Political tensions existed, manifested most often in complaints about the amount of taxes and fees the proprietor levied and, as always in Maryland, the extent (or limits) of Baltimore’s power as granted by the charter. But lines of disagreement were not set in the hard and fast way they would become, and even the Upper House, that included Charles Calvert, occasionally disagreed with him. Relations with Eastern and western shore Indians “seemed at least manageable,” following the 1666 negotiations that resulted in the Articles of Peace and Amity. Major building campaigns produced redevelopment work in St. Mary’s City that included a nearly finished brick chapel and plans for a brick state house, and Calvert was wrapping up construction on his brick house at Mattapany. The magazine at Mattapany was in process, as were efforts to establish
a network of towns loyal to the proprietor. Augustine Herrman’s map had been published and was, by 1673, in circulation, depicting these new towns and Calvert’s imprimatur across the landscape. Baltimore was even moving forward with building, of all things in this frontier colony, a “summer house” at Zekiah Manor. And, like Cecil, who had set Charles up in Maryland as governor, Charles Calvert was laying the groundwork for his own son, five-year-old “little Cis,” to have his own house built at Zekiah Manor, in brick, of course. Baltimore even went so far as to name his minor son governor when he was out of the colony, with Thomas Notley serving as deputy governor.34

Perhaps the most dramatic statement about how the second Lord Baltimore was envisioning his colony and his legacy is expressed in a portrait the proprietor commissioned about 1670. The proprietor, presumably in his English residence wearing a fashionable Persian vest, stands with his grandson, Cecil on a Turkish rug, the child attended by an enslaved African boy of 12 or 13 years. Baltimore is handing little Cecil a map of Maryland, the Potomac clearly depicted. Although this does not appear to be the map Herrman had recently produced for the Calverts, it does suggest the central role of maps in the England-bound Calvert’s world. The portrait is about space, or empire, tying together far-flung locations in the person of one Englishman, and it is also about time, or inheritance, as the older man symbolically hands off Maryland to his grandson. Equally important are the elements missing from the portrait. There is little evidence of the family’s religious faith, nor does the portrait convey any sense of the conflicts and struggles plaguing the Calverts since the colony’s founding over political control. No doubt Cecil Calvert, having spent the better part of his life focused on building the colony and protecting his charter rights, was at a point where he could imagine the project as a true and long-term family investment. In part, he may have owed this sensibility to the work his son, Charles, had done as governor.35

But there was trouble ahead, and it, too, would play out in part in the landscape. Critically, a depression in tobacco prices was creating hardship for most Marylanders, including, indirectly, Charles Calvert, who complained to his father about the high cost of building in Maryland. A proposal to cease growing tobacco for a year in an effort to drive up prices failed after extensive inter-colonial negotiations when Cecil Calvert, overruling his son and his chancellor, denied the proposal, concerned that the poorest planters would have suffered disproportionately. As money grew more scarce, Marylanders, who could not miss the building campaigns or the processions of the Calvert family and their councilors across the landscape, nor avoid the taxes and fees needed to sustain them, found little relief. The author or authors of “A Complaint from Heaven,” addressing royal authorities, claimed that excessive taxes were levied “onely to maintaine my Lord and his Champions in their prince-ship.” In 1674, the
assembly began to rein in the governor’s building projects when it refused to clear the carriage road to the summer house at Zekiah Manor. With the Lower House claiming the road’s repair was “unnecessary for the present,” its members effectively interrupted Charles’ effort to make use of the property and ended his plans to build a second house there for little Cecil. It also interrupted Charles’s plans for holding political meetings at Zekiah Manor.\(^{36}\)

A year later, in 1675, the Susquehannock, who had previously shown up at Mattapany in search of a place to settle in Maryland, ignored Baltimore’s directive to locate above the falls of the Potomac and instead located below the falls on the same creek as the Piscataway, their ancient enemy. A series of thefts and violent retaliations in Virginia that had little to do with the Susquehannock nonetheless ensnared them when colonial authorities came to believe the offenders had crossed the Potomac into Maryland and taken refuge in the Susquehannock’s fort. Five Susquehannock leaders were executed by the Virginia and Maryland militias under pretense of a parley, enraging the Susquehannock and triggering raids along the frontier that would play a precipitating role in Bacon’s Rebellion. While the Maryland English were largely spared the Susquehannock’s retaliation, their allies in the siege, the Piscataway, were not. For the next four years, then, Baltimore’s treaty obligations required him to provide ongoing defensive support for the Piscataway, Mattawoman, and other groups afoul of the Susquehannock, typically by providing the treaty parties arms from the Mattapany magazine.\(^{37}\)

In June 1676, Marylanders, economically stressed, spooked by Indian fears, and anxious about what was unfolding in Virginia, learned that Charles Calvert planned to limit the number of delegates sent to the assembly from four to two. He insisted the reason for the limitation was the costs to the country, but the pushback he received led him to table the plan, probably because he was also leaving for England in a matter of weeks. Significantly, one of his final acts was to instruct the colony’s residents to fortify their plantations, “fforasmuch as the province is dayly threatened to be invaded by the Indians.” In all likelihood, Baltimore did not have to tell frightened householders what to do on their plantations in order to protect themselves but, in so doing, it gave him an opportunity to warn against a different threat: “all masters of houses where such fforts shall be,” Calvert continued, shall not “entertaine any greater number then ten men able to beare Armes into any of their said fforts or houses,” or they would be “proceeded against as mutinous and Seditious persons gathered together with fforce.” Emphasizing these orders, he required all householders to record with the county justices the names of those members who could bear arms.\(^{38}\)

The resolution of Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia did little to abate Indian fears in Maryland. The Susquehannock and other “northern” or “foreign” Indians, often lumped together and generically called Seneca, continued to leave the English alone, even as they raided Piscataway and Mattawoman settlements. In accordance with
their treaty, Baltimore kept the Maryland Indians supplied with guns while trying to negotiate a peace with Indians whose identity he did not always fully know. The situation had become so bad for the Maryland nations that finally, in late June 1680, Baltimore directed the Piscataway to abandon their capital on Piscataway Creek and do what Calvert himself had done when he had felt threatened: move to Zekiah Manor and “there to seate themselves undr such ffortifications as they shall think fit to Erect for their Safe guard and Defence.”

Most colonists couldn't distinguish Indians of different nations, and the citizens of Charles County, site of the Piscataway homeland, felt particularly vulnerable. In 1678, they elected Baltimore's old enemy, Josias Fendall, to the assembly but the proprietor refused to sit him. Fendall, who had remained out of politics since he first betrayed the proprietor, now exploited the colonists' Indian fears and Baltimore's treaty obligations to provide arms to the Piscataway, encouraging and perhaps originating rumors of a Catholic-Indian alliance directed against the Protestants. The relocation of the Piscataway to Calvert's Zekiah Manor (also in Charles County) in 1680 undoubtedly inflamed the situation, and archaeological excavations at Zekiah Fort revealed that the Piscataway were indeed heavily armed. Large quantities of shot, gunflints, and gun fragments have been recovered from archaeological testing at Zekiah Fort. In particular, more gunflints have been recovered from Zekiah Fort than from many other seventeenth-century sites in Maryland, including the magazine at Mattapany. The Piscataway’s desperate circumstances forced Baltimore to dispatch his rangers to remain at and defend the new fort. Some of these rangers were Fendall's allies and likely reported the heavily armed Indians.

Fendall took advantage of the situation, teaming with John Coode and probably meeting with like-minded souls at Coode's plantation as well as at his own, all within a short distance of Notley Hall on the Wicomico. Later testimony, collected when Fendall was put on trial for “mutiny and sedition” for threatening to physically harm the proprietor, revealed that he also made use of chance encounters along roadways to inflame sentiment against Baltimore and warn of Catholic-Indian alliances. And, like so many others, he made use of the Potomac River and the opportunity it presented to escape the proprietor's jurisdiction. In this case, with a warrant out for his arrest, the fugitive brought his entire family to Nicholas Spencer's plantation at Nomini Hall in Virginia, only to be told by Mrs. Spencer to leave immediately as she “would not disobey my Lord Prop’y.” Fendall left, returned to Maryland, was subsequently arrested, tried, and, in 1681 found guilty — and a livid Baltimore permanently banished him from the colony.

The aftermath is particularly revealing in providing an understanding how Baltimore used the power and importance of landscape. After Fendall was found guilty and exiled from the colony, he sold his real estate in Maryland, including his plantation directly across the Wicomico River from Notley Hall. This property included a house that rivaled Notley Hall, with brick chimneys, plastered walls, and
glazed windows. The purchaser was none other than William Digges, Baltimore’s son-in-law, a Council member, and one of the Provincial Court justices that found Fendall guilty. There is nothing in the transaction to suggest that this was anything more than the sale of land by one individual to another. Nor is the price paid anything out of the ordinary. But, once the sale was closed, Digges immediately began erasing Fendall from the landscape. He renamed Fendall’s property Charles Town in honor of his father-in-law and began developing the property as one of the towns that would provide another politically loyal entity. Digges accomplished more than many town developers, creating lots and building an ordinary, stable, and townhouse. And, in what appears to be a final slap against Fendall, Digges never paid him for the property. The widow Mary Fendall was later forced to sue Digges for the money.42

Fendall’s departure from Maryland may have eliminated one especially vocal and even dangerous Calvert enemy, but problems remained, among them William Penn and the question of Maryland’s northern boundary. A second problem concerned the Crown’s interest in centralizing control of England’s colonies, including the collection of colonial revenues. Baltimore now had unwanted oversight as to how he collected fees and duties, driven by concern that the crown’s interest in Maryland shipping revenue had been poorly served for a long time. To deal with the first problem, Baltimore, as he had done so many times before, placed one of his relatives, a cousin by the name of George Talbot, in Cecil County near the Pennsylvania boundary line and then left for England, where he believed he could better defend himself against Penn’s claims. His departure, however, played a part in the escalation of the second problem. The king’s collector for the Patuxent, Christopher Rousby, whose famously poor relationship with the proprietor had already raised eyebrows in London, had taken up residence on a plantation adjacent to Mattapany where he could easily watch ships stopping at Baltimore’s property. And it was on a ship anchored in the Patuxent in 1684, with Baltimore in England, that Rousby was murdered by the proprietor’s cousin and counselor, George Talbot.43

Baltimore’s problems went beyond Penn, the Crown, and even the murder, and, since 1634, involved colonists who questioned and challenged the proprietor’s legitimacy. The wealthier critics resented their exclusion from proprietary favor and offices while others questioned the wisdom of placing a Catholic in a position of authority over Protestants. On his departure from Maryland in 1684, the proprietor had left behind a governor and set of councilors, the majority Catholic, including George Talbot, who collectively and individually made one ill-advised decision after another, including the aforementioned killing of the King’s collector. In 1688, Baltimore directed the Maryland leaders on celebrating the birth of the Prince of Wales, a controversial event in England given the heir to the throne would be raised Catholic. The exuberance of this event was followed by a failure in 1689 to proclaim William and Mary in a timely fashion. By the time of the Protestant Revolution, in
the summer of 1689, John Coode and his fellow Associates were able to marshal a significant number of planters who would take up arms against Baltimore, still in England, and his Maryland agents, mostly relatives, gathered at Mattapany.44

Yet, for all of the anti-Catholic rhetoric deployed against Calvert and his government, both before and during the uprising, the Protestant Associates appear to have left the Jesuit properties alone. If the Jesuit chapel at St. Mary’s was damaged or otherwise affected by the Protestant Associates, it was not noted in the surviving records. Indeed, the chapel remained in use in the capital for another fifteen years, revealing how “Catholic success” was only a problem when it was tied to Baltimore. The outlying Jesuit plantations, including St. Inigoes, Newtown, and St. Thomas, also do not appear to have been damaged or otherwise impacted by the Associates.45

Similarly, Zekiah Manor, where Baltimore had built his now abandoned summer house and where the Piscataway had relocated in 1681, was also left untouched, a remarkable point given how the Associates’ actions were bound up with those rumors of an impending attack on Protestants by the Catholics and their native allies. The Piscataway settlement at Zekiah was, at the time, within ten miles of the Charles County Court House and an easy day’s travel of English settlement. Further, the Piscataway’s troubles with the Susquehannock and other northern nations had been resolved in 1682 when the Piscataway were made part of the Five Nations Iroquois covenant chain, which should have given the Associates pause if they really believed the threat of a Catholic-Indian alliance. There is no record of any effort by the Associates to interact or otherwise engage the Piscataway during the uprising, nor any record that the Piscataway expressed any interest in or support for either the proprietary government or the rebels. Even after Baltimore’s government fell, the Piscataway continued at Zekiah Manor until sometime in the mid-1690s. Their departure appears to be related to the arrival of the new royal governor, Lionel Copley, and the settlement with the Calverts, with the Indians returning to their former capital at Piscataway. There they found their former lands now occupied or claimed by the English and, within a few years, the Piscataway as an organized entity left the area for an island in the Potomac that is today part of Frederick County.46

Historians blame Charles Calvert for creating the conditions that led to the Protestant Rebellion, tone-deaf to how his choices and actions were perceived, especially after the death of his uncle, Philip. This conclusion, as well deserved as it may be, tends to flatten and overshadow Charles’s efforts since 1661, erasing the work the son was able to accomplish, much of it with his father’s support and direction, during his quarter-century of on-site management. Instead, these accomplishments become evident in a geographical approach, revealing how the Calvert family, with Charles leading the effort on behalf of his father, was able to strengthen the capital at St. Mary’s, establish proprietary strongholds at the mouths of two key rivers (Wicomico and Patuxent) as well as in the interior, identify and control other strategic points,
including the Maryland-Pennsylvania and the Maryland-Virginia boundaries, and, to
the extent possible, neutralize or even eliminate the memory of Calvert enemies from the
landscape. Intentional or not, placing the magazine at Mattapany rather than at St. Mary’s
City separated the colony’s military arsenal from the public Catholic chapel, although
Baltimore’s enemies didn’t hesitate to rail against the magazine’s location at Mattapany.

Juxtaposing these projects with proprietary efforts to legislate towns, producing
an extraordinary map of the colony, and sitting for a richly symbolic portrait reveal
the actions the Calverts took to maintain Cecil and then Charles as “Absolute lord
and Prop’y of the Provinces of Maryland & Avalon Lord Baron of Baltemore.” As
knowledgeable and experienced students of colonization, Cecil and Charles Calvert
recognized the critical importance of on-site management and the use of geography
to minimize threats to their rule. Controlling not just river mouths through presence
and shipping ports but entire rivers (including the Potomac, the ownership of which
was called out in the Maryland charter), managing Native populations through both
trade and treaty alliances designed to provide a buffer for the English, emphasizing
on paper (i.e., Herrman’s map) the importance of proprietary settlements, building
fashionable and comfortable houses of brick that doubled as meeting spaces, and
securing the colony’s firepower with the person of Lord Baltimore reveals the lengths
to which the Calverts were willing to go to assert their charter rights. There would
not be any Sir David Kirke (as there had been in Newfoundland) to wrest control of
the absentee Calverts’ property and authority. Nor would there be only one Calvert
stronghold, allowing Richard Ingle to exile the Maryland governor to Virginia. This
is not to say that the Calverts’ campaigns were not intended to reinforce social dis-
tinctions and, as Cecil attempted to do with the portrait, position themselves at the
center of an expanding English empire. But, it does suggest the layered complexity
behind the Calverts’ motives in the settlement and governance of Maryland.

These findings also suggest differences between proprietary Maryland and royal
Virginia. Although leaders for both colonies were, after 1660, reacting to Restora-
tion events in England, the governments in the two colonies responded in different
ways. Berkeley’s focus remained almost exclusively on Jamestown, while the Calverts
aimed to establish family properties as described above. The Calvert properties were
non-corporate strongholds, where loyalty to the proprietor was not an issue. And
while Berkeley struggled to have brick houses built at Jamestown, the Calverts used
brick architecture to establish their claims and standing not just at St. Mary’s but at
their new plantations strategically located along important waterways. Berkeley was
intent on getting county leaders to build in Jamestown, and council meetings were
held almost without exception in the Virginia capital. By contrast, the Maryland
Council regularly met outside the colonial capital and the Calverts do not appear
to have insisted that colonists acquire lots and build houses in the capital. When
colonists antagonistic to Berkeley’s leadership wanted to challenge his authority, they
typically did so at Jamestown, with Nathaniel Bacon’s burning of Jamestown in 1676
the most well-known example. In September 1689, with Baltimore’s government out of power and the rebels working to set up a new one, the Associators created a committee for the “allotting, laying and assessing the publick leavy of this Province,” directing the committee to meet at Charles Towne, the town Baltimore’s son-in-law William Digges had established on Josias Fendall’s former plantation. Now, it was Baltimore’s turn to be written out of the landscape. When that committee met, its members were instructed not “to give or continue the former usuall title of the Lord Baltemore hitherto used in this Province in any publick Instrument doings or proceedings whatsoever but instead there of the names royall stile and title of King William and Queen Mary be for the future made use of and noe other.”

In 1692, Maryland’s incoming royal government consolidated and centralized its functions at St. Mary’s City. The magazine was relocated to the capital and the new governor moved into St. Peter’s, Philip Calvert’s large brick dwelling located on the eastern edge of the town. Mattapany and Notley Hall along with Zekiah Manor were returned to Lord Baltimore. The Maryland Council, now composed of royal appointees, resumed meeting again, with nine out of its ten meetings at St. Mary’s. Those meetings held outside the capital took place mostly north of the Patuxent, with councilors from those regions evidently complaining about the hardship of travel to St. Mary’s. When Governor Francis Nicholson arrived in the colony in 1694, he must have agreed that the colony’s expanding settlement and the capital’s relatively tiny river rendered St. Mary’s City inconvenient for many delegates to the assembly and he proposed moving the colony’s capital to Annapolis.

Although most interpretations of the move assign an anti-Catholic motive to Nicholson, and no doubt the governor was aware of the symbolism of his proposed move, in reality, the proposed move was nothing new. The Calverts had on a number of occasions considered moving the capital themselves in the direction of where Annapolis would be founded. In the 1660s, there had been discussion of moving the capital to the Patuxent, where Charles Calvert eventually established Mattapany, and, in 1683, to Anne Arundel County, where Charles Calvert had requested the assembly build him a brick house. Now, in 1694, a petition was circulated imploring Nicholson to reconsider and, of the seventy men who signed it, two names stand out: William Digges and John Coode. Their pleas went unanswered and, this time, Nicholson accomplished what the Calverts had not. In 1695, the governor’s agents began the overland process of moving all of the colony’s records north about seventy-five miles. The house at Notley Hall was soon abandoned and Mattapany was transferred to Sewall heirs. Proprietary rule was over, although the Calverts as colonial landlords continued to reap the benefits of Charles and Cecil Calverts’ work through the eighteenth century.
NOTES
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“We Will All Unite As a Band of Brothers”: The Hibernian Society and Sectarian Relations in Baltimore

TRACY MATTHEW MELTON

That you may long live the darling of the People, the father of your country, the firm friend, and advocate of civil and religious Liberty, is not only the devout wish of my heart but a primary object in my morning and evening sacrifice to the great God.

--Rev. John Glendy to Thomas Jefferson, 1801

“As to Maria Monk, I have not named her. It seems some of the holy fathers liked her better than Mr. [John] Hughes does. I never rest great principles on insulated cases. But surely it is very needless for any body TO INVENT stories about NUNNERIES AND MONASTERIES, while they are now demolishing them by THOUSANDS in Spain, &c. for THEIR CORRUPTIONS and OPPOSITION to the best interests of states; and when the blackest page of history is that which records their character.”

--Rev. John Breckinridge, 1836

On October 13, 1826, a turbulent movement began quietly, and with dignity, within the walls of the Second Presbyterian Church in Baltimore. Church members gathered for the installation of Rev. John Breckinridge as pastoral colleague of Rev. Dr. John Glendy, who had served since Second Presbyterian’s founding almost a quarter century earlier. Glendy was an especially beloved pastor but was seventy-one years old and in declining health. The ceremonies featured Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller’s sermon on “Christian Weapons not Carnal, but Spiritual.” A prominent Presbyterian clergyman, Miller was professor of ecclesiastical history and church government at
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the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey. He had taught both Rev. William Nevins, the pastor at First Presbyterian in Baltimore, and Rev. Breckinridge. Moreover, just a few years earlier, Breckinridge had married Miller’s daughter Margaret.3

Miller’s sermon hinted at the local movement that Breckinridge’s installation would ignite, focusing on the challenges that he would likely confront. “My dear Son,” he personally addressed his daughter’s husband, “both the language and the spirit of the text admonish you, that your ministerial work, if you be faithful in it, will be found a continual warfare; a warfare against all that is hostile in the heart of man to the pure gospel of Christ.” Miller contrasted the spiritual and carnal “weapons” that he might employ in this warfare. Spiritually he must rely upon the Bible: “As Protestants, as disciples of Christ, the Bible is, to us, the only infallible rule of faith.
and practise [sic].” Miller had long opposed High-Church practices that emphasized visible over invisible faith, and that he believed the Bible did not sanction—these were carnal weapons. Among those he specifically condemned were “the smoking incense; the worshipping toward the East; the bowings; the adoration of images; the purgatorial fire; the merit of bodily maceration; the celibacy of the clergy; the splendid garments; the holy days; the exorcisms; the processions, and all the endless array of superstition.” Although Miller opposed High-Churchism within Protestantism, and never mentioned Catholicism in his sermon, certainly the latter faith was the one he viewed as most guilty of carnal practice, and the one to which he obliquely referred.  

Miller only implicitly criticized Catholicism in this sermon, but he and Breckinridge, together with Robert Jefferson Breckinridge, the latter’s brother, and fellow
Theological Seminary student Andrew B. Cross would, over the next two decades, come to rank among the leading anti-Catholic controversialists and propagandists in the nation. Their backgrounds certainly provided a fertile environment for development of such attitudes. Anti-Catholicism had deep roots in American Protestantism, especially within Presbyterianism, which carried a “heritage of antagonism to Rome.” Miller claimed an American Protestant heritage that extended back to John Alden’s arrival at Plymouth Rock.

If anti-Catholicism was a living aspect of their Scots-Irish heritage, Glendy had long served as an exemplar of a more ecumenical impulse, one that had flourished briefly among United Irishmen during the revolutionary movement that culminated in the Irish Rebellion of 1798. He was diminutive but “singularly neat, even elegant, in his dress. His hair was thrown into artificial curls, and powdered as white as the snows of Mont Blanc.” A colleague later recalled, “Some of his sentences, which I still distinctly remember, were strikingly bold and beautiful. His utterance was rapid, his gesture abundant, and a sort of Irish glow pervaded his whole manner. It was evident that his style of preaching had not been formed on this side of the Atlantic.” In fact, a long series of developments had resulted in his exile in America.

His father Samuel Glendy had migrated from Scotland and settled in a village near Londonderry (Derry), where John Glendy was born in 1755. Since the early seventeenth century, Presbyterian Scots had sailed across the Irish Sea in large numbers. Initially they settled Ulster lands confiscated from native Irish Catholics and eventually other lands across the northern counties. Ulster had become patchwork land, where different regions contained widely varying populations of native Irish Catholics, Presbyterian Scots-Irish, and English Protestants (Anglican Church of Ireland) who had also settled there after their nation had established the military and political dominance that had also brought the Scottish Presbyterians. The complicated sectarian patchwork frequently generated turmoil and violence.

During the 1780s and 1790s, political agitation against British domination sharpened, and John Glendy became an active participant in the emerging United Irishmen movement. He had attended Latin school and then studied at the University of Glasgow, which for decades had served as the center of the Scottish Enlightenment. He returned to Ireland and became a Presbyterian pastor in the small farming community of Maghera, in County Londonderry (Derry), where many in his congregation worked as weavers in the Irish linen industry. Under the influence of the Scottish Enlightenment and the American Revolution, and then the French Revolution, the United Irishmen agitated for civil and religious liberty and furtively organized for rebellion. At Maghera, Glendy made himself a vocal supporter of the United Irishmen. In December 1792, the *Northern Star*, the movement’s Belfast newspaper, lauded Glendy as preaching with “distinguished abilities in a manly, disinterested and public spirited manner, having displayed with peculiar energy the signal interposition of heaven on behalf of the French Nation.” According to a local informer:
Glendy of Maghera is tainted with the blackest principles of revolution to King George III and all his loyal subjects in this Kingdom. His many sermons are but discourses containing treason. We know that he and many so-called members of his Meeting attended at Mass in full regiments of a rebel army out of the King’s peace. We have seen him on divers occasions with the Popish priest of Magherafelt in that union of the Romish Church, with whom he does conspire against this Realm.⁸

When the rebellion erupted in Ulster in late spring 1798, a ragtag rebel force assembled in Maghera but dispersed after two days in the field. The rebellion collapsed quickly in other parts of Ulster. Government forces had ruthlessly suppressed the United Irishmen in the years before the rebellion: arresting suspected rebels and searching widely for weapons. During its outbreak, and its immediate aftermath, the Irish population suffered a bloodletting that left tens of thousands dead. In Ulster, government troops and yeoman corps roamed the countryside burning houses, arresting suspects, and summarily executing many. In Maghera, soldiers hanged and beheaded two local men. Though Glendy denied any direct involvement in the rebellion, they burned his church and house and hunted him across the countryside. Presbyterian pastors had strongly supported the United Irishmen and dozens were imprisoned, exiled, or executed. Glendy made his way to Norfolk and then Staunton in Virginia, before settling in Baltimore on the advice of President Thomas Jefferson, who had become an admirer after the exiled pastor delivered a well-received oration on George Washington’s death.⁹

Several others escaping or exiled from Ulster during these years eventually settled in Baltimore, where a Scots-Irish mercantile community had already gained purchase. The new arrivals melded into this existing community, extending and developing personal ties, joining the First Presbyterian Church, entering business relationships, and cooperating in civic projects, including the Benevolent Hibernian Society, organized in 1803. Established Baltimore merchants as well as several exiled United Irishmen were among the society’s organizers and generally shared a commitment to civic and religious liberty with an especially deep commitment to working with local Catholics. The Benevolent Hibernian Society, later the Hibernian Society of Baltimore, long retained this ecumenical spirit, this faith in religious liberty and the ability of persons of different faiths to work together with a shared public spirit. The organization brought together leading merchants and politicians in an association perhaps as important for the ecumenical alternative it offered to old religious divisions and the religious hatred the Revs. John and Robert J. Breckinridge and Andrew B. Cross preached as for its stated purpose of aiding destitute Irish immigrants arriving at Baltimore.¹⁰
The Benevolent Hibernian Society

Irish benevolent associations already existed in a handful of American cities, providing a model for the Baltimore society and an early framework for the construction of the Irish networks that would ultimately play a large role in transatlantic relations between Ireland and Irish immigrants in America. The first benevolent association, the Charitable Irish Society, organized in Boston in 1737, but the most significant institutional development came in the wake of the American Revolution when high numbers of Irish emigrated from their homeland to the new United States.11

Dr. John Campbell White publicly headed establishment of the Benevolent Hibernian Society in Baltimore. The son of Presbyterian pastor Robert White, he had been born in Templepatrick in 1755 and worked in the 1790s as an apothecary in Belfast. J.C. White belonged to the United Irishmen and crossed the Atlantic in the aftermath of the 1798 rebellion. A February 1797 letter from White to Elizabeth (Craig) Oliver, the wife of Baltimore merchant Robert Oliver, offers a glimpse of his political ideology and his interest in America. He assured her that “we have but little reason to complain but that the political situation of the country is by no means comfortable, much jealousies subsist between the Governors & Governed, & we cannot by any means rest secure, even of our present situation, which affords but a slender protection to personal property or civil liberty.” He was looking to immigrate to America where “the inhabitants enjoy more political liberty than that of any other country with which I am acquainted & where a more extensive field is opened for the establishment of such a family as mine, than any of the European countries.”12

The letter also revealed an economic motivation and the importance of the transatlantic network established by almost a century of large-scale, Scots-Irish immigration to America. The previous July, White had “sent out” his second son John to Petersburg, Virginia, where White’s brother was a merchant. Advantageous proximity to Virginia and North Carolina tobacco fields had made the town a developing inland river port and since the Revolution “Ulster-born merchants [had] largely supplanted the Scottish factors who formerly dominated the tobacco trade.” White suggested that John would be well served to remain with his uncle for a period but then “should be somewhat acquainted with the business of some of the larger towns of America.” Perhaps Elizabeth Oliver could recommend him to her husband, whose “business pursuits” White had accurately learned were of an “extensive kind.” For the White family, like many other Scots-Irish families, emigration was not a blind leap but a deliberate act taken after a careful gathering of information and a diligent working of available local and transatlantic connections, even if the rebellion forced action.13

By January 1799, White wrote directly to Robert Oliver after recently spending time with the family, perhaps in Baltimore on his way to Petersburg. He now sought career advice from his prosperous new friend. His brother wanted him to remain in Virginia, but White eyed Baltimore. He had told his brother “that circumstanced as I was at present, I intended pursuing the medical profession & that Robert & John with
my advice, & assistance, should employ such money as I could at present command
in trade, either in the importation, & sale of linens, or in such other merchandise
as from experience & good advice would be thought advantageous.” His greatest
concern was the prevalence of yellow fever in northern ports and the risk that, as a
physician, he would face living and working in Baltimore. Oliver’s response is lost,
but White and his family soon moved to the port city and built close connections to
the local Scots-Irish mercantile community. He worked as a doctor and established
a trading firm with his sons. In October 1802, exiled United Irishman John Caldwell
Jr. wrote from New York to an old political associate in Belfast about their friend J.C.
White, claiming, “there is no Man of your acquaintance become a more enthusiastick
[sic] American than Doctor White, he has adopted their ways & manners & admits
he never felt real comfort & happiness to the degree he now enjoys—in the Land
he left—He is held in high estimation & what is extraordinary, by the very violent
Political People of both parties.”

Robert Moore, another United Irishman, associated with White in Baltimore.
In the early seventeenth century his Presbyterian ancestors had migrated from
Scotland to County Londonderry in Ulster where they operated as an iron manufac-
turer and merchant on Shipquay Street. Like many United Irishmen, he advocated
parliamentary reform, a broader franchise, and Catholic emancipation. In 1797, he
stood accused of taking the United Irishmen oath but disclaimed any understanding
that the society intended treason. His activities remained suspect, and he hurriedly
decided to leave in the wake of the rebellion. He made an arduous journey across
the Atlantic and arrived in Norfolk in November 1798. Rev. John Glendy, a fellow
exile, was certainly a shipmate.

Moore soon became enmeshed in a sensational American political controversy.
Federalists had passed the Alien and Sedition Acts in the summer of 1798. On Febru-
ary 9, 1799, Moore, William Duane, Samuel Cummings, and Dr. James Reynolds were
arrested in Philadelphia for a fight outside St. Mary’s Catholic Church. Duane was
publisher of the *Aurora* newspaper, a rancorous Republican Party paper, and Cum-
mings his printer. Reynolds fled Ireland to avoid arrest and became a controversial
advocate of Irish freedom. Political opponents linked him to the shadowy American
Society of United Irishmen. At St. Mary’s, the four men had sought signatures on a
petition to Congress to repeal the Alien Friends Act. They had scuffled with political
opponents in the congregation, and Reynolds had drawn a pistol. Their arrests and
subsequent trial became a political *cause célèbre* at a time when animosity between
Federalists and Republicans reached unprecedented levels. After the trial, Moore
traveled extensively through the mid-Atlantic region, evaluating business opportuni-
ties and making connections. He wrote about the Baltimore hinterland, “scarcely a
week passes without my seeing some of my countrymen who live in the Country and
keep stores who I formerly knew in Ireland and promise me business when I start.”
He sent for his son Samuel and later several other children. By September 1801, his
Baltimore venture, Robert Moore and Son, was advertising goods imported from Liverpool and Hull, including ironmongery and hardware.16

Moore’s friend George Douglas also settled in Baltimore. Douglas had established the London-Derry Journal in 1772. In 1795, Douglas “boldly announced that he had lived to see ‘three great events. First, the Revolution in America—next, the French Revolution—and, on this day, the subjugation of Holland by the irresistible power of the new Republic . . . What an awful lesson for princes and politicians.’” The two Londonderry friends were close enough that Moore’s family eventually gained possession of silver cups that local merchants had presented the newspaper publisher on his departure for America in 1796. In Baltimore, Douglas set himself up as a printer and stationer.17

Another exiled United Irishman, Presbyterian Rev. William Sinclair, came to Baltimore from County Down, and his career helps to illustrate the operations of the local Scots-Irish network. Managers of a lottery to create a college included Sinclair, J.C. White, Alexander Brown, and other prominent Scots-Irish merchants. Revs. Sinclair and Samuel Knox headed the short-lived Baltimore College, and the school’s most famous student, John Pendleton Kennedy, would use Sinclair as a model for Parson Chub in his novel Swallow Barn:

He was an emigrant from the Emerald Isle, where he suffered much tribulation in the disturbances, as they are mildly called, of his much-enduring country . . . The early part of his life had been easy and prosperous, until the rebellion of 1798 stimulated his republicanism into a fever, and drove the full-blooded hero headlong into the quarrel, and put him, in spite of his peaceful profession, to standing by his pike in behalf of his principles.

Alexander Brown, from Ballymena in County Antrim, came to Baltimore in 1800 on the advice of his brother Stewart Brown and brother-in-law Dr. George Brown, both of whom had migrated earlier. Establishment of the Benevolent Hibernian Society rested on the network created among these same Presbyterian Scots-Irish immigrants, many with strong commitments to United Irish principles.18

Organizers met in the summer and fall of 1803 at the public call of J.C. White. On October 8, they adopted a plan of constitution and elected officers, naming White as president, Thomas McElderry as vice president, George Salmon as treasurer, and George Douglas as secretary. They also created a committee staffed by Robert Moore, David Stewart, Stewart Brown, Hugh Young, Thomas Dickson, Nathaniel Thompson, and Dr. John Crawford. According to public notice, “Relief can only be obtained from the society by the following mode: A petition certifying that the petitioner, or petitioners, are proper objects of charity; to be signed by two members of the institution, and presented to the secretary; who will lay it before the committee for their consideration; and communicate the result to the petitioner or applicant.” The
First Presbyterian Church, c.1935. Many of the city’s leading merchants, of Scots-Irish birth or descent, founded and supported the church. This photograph is of the congregation’s third home, at the corner of East Fayette Street and Guilford Avenue (formerly North Street), built in 1790. (Library of Congress.)
society provided an organized means of transferring money from public-minded merchants to needy emigrants from their homeland and gave some structure to the informal Scots-Irish network that had evolved in the city.19

During this formative period in Baltimore history, the same individuals participated in almost every substantial civic-minded project and business venture, among them establishment of the First and Second Presbyterian Churches. The First Presbyterian Church had evolved gradually across the latter half of the eighteenth century as church members filtered into the city. In 1763, Rev. Patrick Allison accepted a call as pastor, and, in 1792, the congregation began to worship in a substantial new church. According to a church history, “Nearly all of the little group which first organized it, and most of those who subsequently joined them were merchants of Scotch-Irish birth or descent and they were the class whose efforts were mainly instrumental in building up Baltimore from a village of thirty houses in 1763 to a city with a population of over thirteen thousand in 1790.”20

Rev. Allison died in August 1802, and his congregation called Rev. James Inglis to replace him. Inglis’s call came by only a narrow margin over Glendy. The election had a political aspect. Inglis was close to Federalist Alexander Hamilton, and Democratic-Republican President Thomas Jefferson had recommended Glendy. “On the election of Dr. Inglis a colony went out from the church, and erected the Second Presbyterian Church, corner of East Baltimore and Lloyd streets, and called Dr. Glendy to the pulpit.” Another Presbyterian minister later recalled that “the friends of Glendy, being the Irish and warm democrats, went off and formed a second Presbyterian Church and while the Second Church was in its course of erection Mr. Glendy and his people worshipped in the First Church.” Managers of the lottery announced to
pay for Second Presbyterian’s construction included Thomas McElderry and Thomas Dickson from the Benevolent Hibernian Society, and John McKim Jr., with whom Robert Moore had stayed on his arrival in Baltimore.\(^{21}\)

The society left little record of its work over the first dozen years of its existence. The Napoleonic Wars in Europe and the American War of 1812, together with the serious disruptions in Atlantic commerce, made these tumultuous years in Baltimore. The city’s merchants energetically directed privateering operations and memorably confronted combined British ground and naval forces in September 1814. For exiles such as J.C. White and Rev. Glendy, the War of 1812 certainly recalled past difficulties and dangers. The British soldiers and sailors sailing up the Chesapeake fought for the same government that had hounded them out of Ireland. Now that government menaced them again. The Baltimore City Council appointed White to a committee created to fund the city’s defense, and many other members of the Scots-Irish merchant community actively organized defenses and took the field. Wartime conditions blocked large-scale emigration, and the numbers of Irish coming into Baltimore remained low. Nevertheless, the Benevolent Hibernian Society continued to operate, and White remained president, at least until the war. After, it reorganized, and its composition took a significant turn.\(^{22}\)

**The Hibernian Society of Baltimore**

The Benevolent Hibernian Society overhauled itself after the War of 1812. Among the most active founders, Robert Moore had died in 1807, Thomas McElderry and Thomas Dickson in 1810, and Dr. John Crawford in 1813. J.C. White was almost sixty and no longer took an active role in the society. In 1816, members changed the name to the Hibernian Society of Baltimore and approved a new constitution. Merchant
John Donnell briefly served as president but left office after he withdrew society funds without proper authorization. Merchant Luke Tiernan temporarily replaced him. Tiernan had come to America in the early 1780s and eventually involved himself in numerous public projects. He became a leading layman and financial figure in the local Catholic Church and a Catholic Cathedral trustee. As early as 1805, he had been on the Hibernian Society’s ruling committee with fellow merchants Moore, Dickson, and Stewart Brown. Tiernan was vice president at the time of his temporary election as president, and he returned to this office in subsequent years. Other Catholics also played active roles in the reorganizing of the Hibernian Society. William Gwynn, an attorney and publisher of the Federal Gazette, paid the $50 required for life membership on March 17, 1816 and authored the new constitution. Gwynn worked with George Douglas and John D. Craig to draft new rules for the society. He also joined Samuel Moore (Robert’s son) and Samuel J. Donaldson in drafting the society’s act of incorporation for the Maryland General Assembly, and with these changes increasing numbers of Catholics enrolled as members.

The society’s evolution occurred without controversy. Religious freedom had emerged as a landmark achievement of the new republic. The Scots-Irish emigrants and exiles that had involved themselves with the United Irishmen had generally supported Catholic emancipation. Many old Maryland families were Catholic, and social, political, and business interactions among Protestants and Catholics were unremarkable. Luke Tiernan, for example, collaborated regularly with Protestants in a wide range of civic and business ventures. Notably, voters elected him three times to the First Branch of the Baltimore City Council. He served as director of several banks and on the Committee of Safety during the War of 1812. In 1817, other society officers included Rev. John Glendy, chaplain; Stewart Brown, treasurer; Dr. George Brown, physician; and Samuel Moore and Thomas Kelso, managers. The next year John Oliver, Robert’s brother and business partner, became president. Stewart Brown and Dr. George Brown were brother and brother-in-law to Alexander Brown. Kelso was an Irish Methodist who proudly claimed that John and Charles Wesley had visited his family’s house during their Irish missions. He and his brother John had come to Baltimore and established a successful butchering operation.

The newly incorporated Hibernian Society organized “for the purpose of affording charitable assistance and advice to such emigrants from, or natives of Ireland arriving at, or residing in any part of the State of Maryland, as may be in want and deemed worthy.” Previously the society had resolved:

. . . that as soon as it is known that any vessel from Ireland with passengers has arrived at the port of Baltimore, it shall be the duty of two or more of the Board of Managers to visit the same, and to make strict enquiry whether said passengers have had justice done them during the voyage and whether any of them stand in need of such aid, as the society can afford.
Bylaws approved in March 1818 laid out the officials’ responsibilities:

The Chaplain shall perform the religious duties customary at the Meetings
of the Society; visit such sick or distressed persons as may be recommended to him by the President, or Managers; and perform such other duties as the Resolutions of the Society may recommend. . . . The Physician shall give his professional aid to such natives of Ireland or their children as the President, or any two Managers may recommend.25

The Hibernian Society’s responsibilities expanded greatly when John Oliver died in 1823 and left it $20,000 “for the purpose of establishing a free school in the city of Baltimore under their direction for the Education of Poor children of both sexes, one at least whose parents must be Irish and residing in or about Baltimore.” If an insufficient number of Irish children availed themselves of the school, then any poor Baltimore child could attend, “with this proviso that room must always be made when required for children of Irish parents and no distinction is ever to be made in the school as to the religious tenets of those that may apply for admission.”

The Oliver Hibernian Free School’s success is carefully recorded in the March 17, 1825 minutes.
(Maryland Historical Society.)
In this last proviso, Oliver perfectly expressed the ecumenicalism of the United Irishmen. Over the next year, the society took steps to open the new school, which became known as the Oliver Hibernian Free School. By 1825, the school committee reported 185 students in the male department and 170 in the female department. Of that number, 270 achieved punctual attendance.26

During these same years, Irish emigration underwent a significant shift. Changing conditions in Ireland and mushrooming employment opportunities in America resulted in an increasing Catholic emigration. In Ireland, commercialization, modernization, and Anglicization broke down traditional cultural barriers and opened new opportunities at a time when economic crises, political conditions, and rapid population growth created incentive for leaving. In America, canal construction and railroad building, together with expanding commerce and manufacturing, generated a large demand for labor. More Irish Catholics from isolated rural communities made for the port towns. During the two decades before the Great Famine (1845–1849), the Irish community in Baltimore became much more Catholic. Irish Catholics arriving in Baltimore found a robust Catholic Church and a free school that welcomed their children. Soon, neighborhoods across the city filled with Irish Catholics, and their institutions and social networks increasingly became important aspects of the local culture.27

Catholic influence in the Hibernian Society expanded. The Hibernians elected Bernard U. Campbell as secretary in 1824. Campbell was a respected bank clerk and, like Luke Tiernan, a well-known Catholic layman. He remained secretary until 1833, when he became a manager. Campbell actively recruited new members and contributed to management of the Oliver Hibernian Free School. Rev. Nicholas F.
Kerney replaced Glendy as chaplain in 1831. The aging pastor’s health had finally failed him, and he had gone to live with his sister in Philadelphia the previous year. Kerney, born in Ireland, completed his theological studies at St. Mary’s Seminary in Baltimore and, since 1826, had been at St. Patrick’s at Fell’s Point. His church’s location near the docks made it convenient for him to attend to arriving immigrants. Now, five years later, needy immigrants the Hibernians approached were met by a Catholic priest and not a Presbyterian pastor, a meaningful indication of the shifting nature of Irish immigration. Kerney died in February 1841, and his successor at St. Patrick’s, fellow Irishman Rev. James Dolan, also assumed the chaplaincy of the Hibernian Society — and Luke Tiernan’s son Charles served as a manager from 1830 to 1838.

Hibernian Society members carefully followed developments in Ireland and used their Baltimore relationships to work for greater freedom and prosperity there. At their anniversary meetings held on St. Patrick’s Day, they toasted Irish heroes and poets. Especially celebrated were the heroes of the rebellion of 1798, and Robert Emmet’s rebellion in 1803. In 1821, Col. Samuel Moore, Robert’s son, toasted “The memory of [William] Orr, of Emmet, and all other Irish patriots, whose blood was shed for the emancipation of their enslaved country.” Another year, Dr. Benjamin Dickson toasted, “The Reverend Dr. Glendy, our venerated Chaplain, like Emmet, and other illustrious of Ireland, a sufferer in the cause of liberty.” Catholic emancipation remained a cause for those with United Irish ties and sympathies, and for Catholic members. The society raised their glasses to emancipation, which “would be the dawning of freedom to Ireland, and a victory obtained by religion and liberty over intolerance and despotism.” In 1822, the society gathered at a special meeting “to take into consideration the present distressed and impoverished state of numbers in certain districts in Ireland, and to devise means for their relief.” A catastrophic Baltimore fire squelched this movement, but over the next few decades the society and its members served as an established network for those interested themselves in Irish developments.

In 1828, local Irish formed the Irish Emancipation Society of Maryland to aid Daniel O’Connell in his stirring campaign for Catholic emancipation in Ireland. The society met in the Oliver Hibernian Free School. Luke Tiernan was president, and James Reyburn, another Hibernian, secretary. A few years later, Reyburn would replace B.U. Campbell as the Hibernian Society’s secretary. Several Hibernians—including Rev. Kerney and Col. Samuel Moore—served on the ward committees that collected money for O’Connell’s movement. As the cause neared its successful conclusion, the Hibernians drank to John Pendleton Kennedy’s toast, “O’Connell and the British Parliament—Daniel in the lion’s den. God send him a safe deliverance.” And also to the toast of an ailing Rev. Glendy, “Erin as she should be—Equal, civil, political and religious Liberty, in Church and State, to all her sons.” After O’Connell secured emancipation from the British Parliament, the Emancipation Society turned over its remaining funds to the Hibernian Society.
If the active role taken by Presbyterians Moore and Glendy in the struggle for Catholic emancipation provided living evidence of a United Irish legacy, Irish and American developments also had a more prickly side. In Ireland, sectarian hostility had intensified during the political movements in the last decades of the eighteenth century. The roughest conflict was between loosely connected associations that rallied as the Catholic Defenders and Protestant Peep o’ Day Boys. In 1795, Protestants organized the Loyal Orange Order and swore to protect Ireland against Roman Catholicism. Irish Catholics formed rival Ribbon Societies. Evangelical Protestantism and a resurgent Catholic Church, together with O’Connell’s mass campaign and a concomitant growth of Irish Catholic nationalism, ensured that sectarian issues would remain contentious. In America, the surge in Catholic immigration from Ireland and elsewhere stirred a latent anti-Catholicism. In Baltimore, development of this anti-Catholicism occurred within the context of networks and cultural attitudes that the local Irish community had established.

Religious Controversy

Religious freedom allowed people to practice whatever faith they desired, and a developing Baltimore, with a population that included individuals from numerous nations and numerous faiths, provided a wealth of alternatives. The 1831 city directory listed forty-three churches. In addition to Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, and African Methodist churches, worshippers also attended German and English Lutheran, Dunkard, and Quaker churches. Most people maintained their church affiliations through their lifetimes, but conversions were not exceptional. Although individual conversions troubled church officials, most agitating were concerted efforts to win converts. In the 1820s and 1830s, sectarian rivalries in Baltimore intensified. To a large degree, these rivalries simply conformed to larger British-American trends. After all, Protestants on both sides of the Atlantic were adopting a “crusading” attitude, and the fledgling Oxford (Tractarian) Movement ultimately resulted in a significant number of Anglican-to-Catholic conversions. They also had important local dimensions.

Much turned on the structure and composition of local Catholic and Presbyterian Churches. By 1831, Catholics primarily worshipped at five churches: the Cathedral, St. Peter’s (Pro-Cathedral), St. Patrick’s, St. John’s (German), and the chapel at St. Mary’s Seminary. The Sulpicians at the seminary played an important role in educating priests, including Hibernian Society chaplain Rev. Nicholas Kerney. They also performed parochial responsibilities, administered the archdiocese, and conducted St. Mary’s College, the city’s preeminent collegiate institution. Leading merchants, other businessmen, and professionals enrolled their sons at St. Mary’s College. The school accepted Protestant students, and from 1829 to 1834 its president was Rev. Samuel Eccleston, S.S., who had converted from the Episcopalian Church while a
student at the school. In 1834, Eccleston became archbishop of Baltimore.\textsuperscript{32}

Presbyterians also worshipped at five churches: the First, Second, and Third Presbyterian Churches, as well as two others, the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church and the Church of the Covenanters (Reformed Presbyterian). Third Presbyterian struggled to establish itself during these years. Rev. John Mason Duncan was pastor at the Associate Reformed Church. He had applied to the Baltimore Presbytery after a union of national Presbyterian organizations but was rejected after he declined to profess to the required creed. In the years after, Duncan engaged in public controversy with Miller, who had provided the theological grounds for the argument against him. Duncan had a sizable congregation but, as a result of his independent stand, lacked daily influence among his fellow Presbyterian ministers. The Covenanters had a much smaller presence. They were “almost exclusively Scotch or north of Ireland people or their descendants.” According to a later description, “Their mode of worship is simple to severity; the church is devoid of steeple, bell, or organ, no instrumental music is tolerated in the services, and only the psalms of David are sung.”\textsuperscript{33}

As a result, Miller’s former students held a prominent place within the Presbyterian community in Baltimore. Nevins was at First Presbyterian (1820–1835) and John Breckinridge at Second Presbyterian (1826–1832). Nevins, born in Connecticut, graduated from Yale College and then spent three years at the Theological Seminary at Princeton. In 1820, he had replaced Rev. James Inglis at First Presbyterian. Breckinridge belonged to a family with extraordinary connections to the American Revolution and Scots Presbyterianism. Born near Lexington, at the family’s Kentucky
plantation, his maternal relations included members of several leading Virginia families. His father John Breckinridge had been a close political associate to Thomas Jefferson and had served as a U.S. Senator and then as U.S. Attorney General in Jefferson’s second term. Nevins and Breckinridge's churches had large congregations, and many of the most prosperous Scots-Irish mercantile families attended them.

First and Second Presbyterian experienced a revival in the late 1820s. Nevins and Breckinridge established “a Bible Class embracing a large number of young men of both congregations, most of whom subsequently became subjects of the revival in 1827.” The revival “infused fresh life into the churches, animated and encouraged the ministers and gave a new impulse to the cause such as it never before received. Sunday Schools, Prayer Meetings, and Tract Visitations were established in various parts of the city.” At the same time, though, Catholicism was visibly expanding, and religious officials of the different denominations kept an accounting of converts gained and lost and fretted over the bottom line. Miller himself complained about Catholics “continually boasting of the number and importance of their converts.”

In Baltimore, the Cathedral and St. Mary’s Seminary and College offered grand provocations to those inclined to distrust Catholicism. The pomp of the Cathedral household and large clerical gatherings annoyed distrustful Protestant church leaders. St. Mary’s students and their Sulpician teachers made regular rambles through the city and surrounding countryside, seemingly to flaunt Catholic aspirations. To Miller and his students, these Sulpicians at St. Mary’s were the crux of the threat. Miller warned:

When the Papists are flooding our country with their ecclesiastics, their books, and their periodical papers; when they are sagaciously erecting seminaries of imposing and highly popular character, in many districts of the United States very imperfectly, if at all, furnished with sounder ones of equal reputation; when they are artfully opening these seminaries to students on cheaper terms than most others can afford, and in some cases insidiously offering to receive Protestant children into their literary institutions free of all charge; when it is notorious that one great object of the seminaries in question is to extend and facilitate the work of making proselytes to the Papacy . . . I must say, if they are not serious and awakening in their aspect, I scarcely know what ought to be so deemed.

Miller's students closely followed his teaching. “So they come from Ireland, France, Italy and all those countries, male and female, to educate us,” Nevins wrote, “But what strikes me with wonder, is, that when they get here, they are all for educating Protestant children. . . . Common sense suggests that there must be a motive for making this distinction, and shrewdly suspects it is proselytism.” The Protestant Association of Baltimore, under the guidance of John Breckinridge's brother Robert
declared, “There has been a prevalent disposition to commit the education of Protestant children to the several orders of the Romish priesthood, while the celibacy of their clergy has given them an advantage in respect to the price of tuition, which nothing but a combined effort of all the Protestant denominations can possibly counteract.”

A purported request from a female member of the Second Presbyterian congregation to John Breckinridge in July 1831 initiated a series of religious controversies involving Miller and his students. Breckinridge later claimed a Catholic had given her some strictures on the Scottish anti-Catholic novel *Father Clement*. Breckinridge had provided another book in answer, but the unnamed woman had requested that he make a written reply himself, primarily because “it was in some sort triumphantly demanded as impossible.” Breckinridge published a response in the August and September 1832 issues of *The Christian Advocate*. “As your pastor,” Breckinridge wrote, “it is my duty and my privilege to do all in my power to aid you in arriving at a knowledge of the truth, and in repelling attacks on our precious faith.” He then answered the points made in the strictures and offered to debate Catholic priests and bishops on the topic.

Rev. John Hughes, a Philadelphia priest, took up Breckinridge’s challenge. Hughes had been born in County Tyrone in Ulster to a Catholic farming family. Like Dr. J.C. White, the Hughes family had economic and political motivations for emigrating. The family faced financial embarrassment, and Patrick Hughes, John’s father, “reflected that in the political scale a Catholic farmer ranked below a Protestant beggar.” John later recalled that when he was fifteen, Protestant Orangemen had assaulted him: “Five bayonets were pointed at my breast; but when I told my name, the men let me go, saying, ‘All right; we know his father.’” The family settled in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, and John attended college and seminary at Mount St. Mary’s in Emmitsburg, Maryland. He became an effective priest and an accomplished Catholic builder. He was perhaps one of the priests Miller had in mind when he complained of Catholics reveling in their conversions. Shortly before engaging in the controversy with John Breckinridge, Hughes wrote his mentor, “Within two weeks there have been ten who applied to me for instruction to be admitted into the C. Church—all respectable, one an extensive merchant.” A natural pride and combativeness urged him into the breach when Catholicism came under assault in America. On October 3, Hughes wrote Breckinridge, “Now sir, I am equally ready to accept this challenge; let it only be conducted in a spirit of Christian charity, and of sincere inquiry after truth.” Somewhat portentously, Glendy died the next day at his sister’s house in Philadelphia.

After much wrangling, Breckinridge and Hughes agreed that they would exchange letters that would be published in *The Presbyterian* and *The Catholic Herald*. Hughes told a friend of his hopes:
The opportunity of placing my letters under the eyes of certainly not fewer than 30,000 Protestant readers is too precious to be allowed to escape unimproved. I do not pretend to say that it will make many converts; but the perusal of them now may be the destruction of prejudice in some minds; and the first seed, reflection, and still more affictions of the heart, may ripen into actual conversions when I and my letters shall have been forgotten.

The discussion, though, degenerated into personal attack and a cataloguing of past atrocities. By the time it got underway, John Breckinridge had left Second Presbyterian to become Corresponding Secretary and General Agent of the Board of Education of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The exchange began with Hughes assigning responsibility for Christianity’s fracturing to “private interpretation” of the Bible. “The Bible alone, or the Bible operated upon by private interpretation,” Hughes argued, “has given rise to all the heresies that exist.” Breckinridge replied that “the system which includes an infallible living judge of controversies, to guide us in matters of religion, and to regulate not only faith, but worship and morals, ought not to be corrupt in its tendency or tolerate corruptions in morals and manners.” He then charged that corruptions not only existed but also were admitted. He also expressed repugnance for Catholic doctrine regarding the Holy Eucharist: “It is also abhorrent to true religion not to say every reverent feeling, that a priest can make his God, then sacrifice him, then give him to the people, then worship him, and then eat him.” The Holy Eucharist would remain a subject of attack by the Baltimore Presbyterian clergy.

The Breckinridge-Hughes controversy ceased toward the end of 1833 when the former left town but resumed a year later when the Union Literary and Debating Institute of Philadelphia took up the question, “Is the Roman Catholic Religion, in any or all its Principles or Doctrines, inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty?” The two clergymen agreed to a series of debates on that question, and a parallel one asking if Presbyterianism was inimical to civil and religious liberty. Little mutual respect and civility remained. Hughes’s biographer observed that the published versions did “not give an adequate idea of the strong language used on both sides; for when the speeches were prepared for the press they were, by mutual consent, considerably modified.” In preparation for publication, Hughes declared, “I was born under the scourge of Protestant persecution, of which my fathers, in common with their Catholic countrymen, had been the victims for ages.” In the debates, he had carried “the war into the camp of the enemy” and had taught “one of the ablest representatives of that Presbyterian combination, which is attempting to destroy the civil and religious reputation of Catholics, that if any denomination of Christians are to be expelled for the crime of persecution, it would be the lot of Presbyterianism—to march first.”

The language was often personal and slashing. Hughes questioned Breckinridge’s honor for “corrupting the integrity, and altering the language of his witnesses, for the
patriotic purpose of blackening the reputation of Catholics, and helping a desparate cause.” In a veiled reference to Breckinridge’s current position, Hughes charged, “The only denomination that have itinerant haranguers on pay, who go about like roaring lions, for the express purpose of stirring up the people against Catholics, are the Presbyterians.” Hughes brought Breckinridge’s mentor and father-in-law, Rev. Dr. Miller, into the debate. Miller had provided the introduction to *A History of Popery*, published under the name “A Watchman” two years earlier. Referring to “Romanists,” Miller had written:

> And now that Protestants have been compelled, in fidelity to their master in heaven, to gird on their armour [sic], and to lift the weapons of consecrated warfare; I trust they will never be laid aside, until every family and individual in our land shall be distinctly put on their guard against the character and design of these foes of God and man.

Harking back to Breckinridge’s installation at Second Presbyterian, he urged, “Our weapons must not, like theirs, be ‘carnal,’ but ‘spiritual.’” Hughes mocked the “venerable Professor” and asserted, “that it is impossible to find in so small a compass a larger quantity of condensed malignity, slander, and sanctimoniousness.” In response, Breckinridge took up the charge of Catholic clerical immorality, which became a sensational national topic after publication of *The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk*. Speaking of convents:

> We proved in the oral debate . . . that they had uniformly been prisons to the inmates, and generally brothels for the priests; that every nation almost of Europe which had tried them, had been sorely injured by them in vital respects, especially by the astonishing immoralities which they systematically propagated among females and priests.41

In Baltimore, Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge took up leadership of the anti-Catholic cause. When John Breckinridge had gone to Philadelphia, his brother had replaced him at Second Presbyterian (1832–1845). Three years later, Nevins died and was followed at First Presbyterian by Rev. John C. Backus (1836–1875). Nevins had been a more temperate anti-Catholic controversialist than John Breckinridge. During the Breckinridge-Hughes controversy, a very ill Nevins published letters on Catholicism in the *New York Observer*. He generally focused on doctrinal differences and was only glancing in his mockery. Like Breckinridge, he criticized convents, but gently so. “All I contend for is, that the whole concern of convents is unscriptural. Those who inhabit them may be as pure as any who live outside; and so I shall believe them to be, until I have proof to the contrary.” He seemed to protest Miller’s and Breckinridge’s excesses. His successor, Backus, had also studied at Yale College and the Theological Seminary at Princeton. Once again, Miller again came to Baltimore
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to preach at the installation of a former student. He told the church members that they would not be asked:

. . . to idolize ministers. Far less do we ask you to surrender your consciences into their hands, or to regard them as the only authorized expounders of the word of God, and the only medium of intercourse and of grace between God and man. . . . On the contrary, against all such idolatrous deference to ecclesiastical authority and power . . . I would solemnly warn you.

However, Backus largely distanced himself from the anti-Catholic controversies. 42

Robert Breckinridge, in contrast, was an anti-Catholic firebrand. Suspended from the College of New Jersey, he graduated from Union College and then embarked on a legal and political career before entering the ministry. After studying briefly under Miller at the Theological Seminary, Robert came to Baltimore. In 1835, with Rev. Andrew B. Cross, he established The Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine from a series of lectures. Rev. John Gildea, a Catholic priest who had studied at Mount St. Mary's and St. Mary's Seminary, had interrupted one of the lectures “in a manner which nothing but the forbearance of my friends, prevented from receiving its merited reward.” Soon after, the Baltimore Gazette published an editorial disputing the charge made in one of the lectures that Catholics controlled the press. The new magazine appeared soon after. 43

Robert Breckinridge’s magazine was stridently anti-Catholic in tone and content. In the wake of an August 1834 attack on the Ursuline convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts, it carried a sensational story about the Carmelite convent in Baltimore. A man and five women coming from an evening Methodist meeting reported hearing cries coming from the Carmelite convent on Aisquith Street. Their statement suggested that a struggle had ensued, and then silence. The magazine story linked the incident to the riot in Charlestown, salaciously hinting at sexual improprieties among the priests and nuns:

If all the past, in all ages and countries, does not prove, that these nests of unmarried women, under the despotic secret control of unmarried men, are sure to be places, for which they are fitly contrived—of all cruelty, licentiousness, and wretchedness.

The author suggested Archbishop Eccleston offer some explanation of this incident and some deaths that may have occurred among the Carmelites, requested the government to regulate or even suppress convents, and called on the community:

. . . to frown upon such establishments. . . . Children ought never to be sent to their schools; young ladies ought to be sedulously kept from the influence of
nuns and their confessors; and the whole public mind so informed, that every poor girl should know what a place and a fate she is seeking, where she sets her face, towards these abodes of sorrow.44

That same month, May 1835, the magazine announced formation of the Protestant Association of Baltimore. Organizers sought to sustain “the doctrines of the Reformation” and arranged for an inaugural meeting at the lecture room of Rev. Robert Breckinridge’s Second Presbyterian Church on April 25. Among the group were Breckinridge, Cross, Rev. Ira A. Easter, John Kelso, John N. Brown, and J. Harman Brown. Kelso and the Brown brothers had close ties to the Hibernian Society. Kelso had been the Hibernian president since replacing Luke Tiernan, a Catholic, in 1833. The Browns were Stewart Brown’s sons and Alexander Brown’s nephews. Stewart Brown had helped establish the Hibernian Society and had served as treasurer until his death in 1832. The Brown family had enormous influence within the local Presbyterian Church. Stewart Brown had been on the ruling committee of First Presbyterian from 1807 to 1832. John N. Brown was an elder of First Presbyterian and J. Harman Brown later served as an elder of Central Presbyterian. The appearance of Stewart Brown’s sons among the organizers of a Protestant association, with anti-Catholic agitators such as Breckinridge and Cross, was a measure of the challenge to the city’s United Irish ecumenical spirit.45

Robert Breckinridge orchestrated events. At the inaugural meeting, he stated the Protestant Association’s purpose and proposed a statement of principles that the attendees approved. The statement of principles affirmed freedoms of religion, speech, and the press, and emphasized the Bible as the Protestant rule of faith:

The Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, we fully receive, as containing the only proper and sufficient rule of man's faith and practice; and the great doctrines of the Cross of Christ as taught therein, and contended for by the leaders of the glorious Protestant Reformation, we hold to be the only true foundation of all temporal and eternal felicity.

As for Catholicism:

Deeply convinced, that the doctrines and practice of the Roman Catholic Church as a system, are hostile to these truths, and incompatible with the proper exercise of these rights; this Association will make it one of its principal duties, to disseminate with all Christian liberality, correct and full information in regard to such doctrines and practices.

The association elected Thomas Kelso as president, Nevins as a vice president, Breckinridge as corresponding secretary, and Cross as librarian. Brothers John and Thomas Kelso thus concurrently headed the Hibernians and Protestant Association.46
Opposing Catholicism, rather than promoting Protestantism, seemed the Protestant Association’s purpose. An address published in Breckinridge’s *The Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine* the following December expressed a familiar stance toward the ancient faith. “That the Romanists have skill and cunning to contrive the necessary plans of operation will not be denied; and that they act in concert to establish the universal domination of their Church cannot be controverted, if we allow them to be honest in the opinion, that out of their pale there is no salvation.” Their schools and seminaries were means to a purpose. Like other suspicious Protestants, they connected these institutions to a broader conspiracy:

This effort of the Romish priesthood we have reason to believe is aided by the secret support of the despotic governments of Europe, who look upon this country as the nursery of those liberal political principles which have shaken their thrones to their foundation, and who have no hope of destroying our civil institutions, but by assisting the Roman Church in the design of substituting popery for Protestantism.47

The Maryland State Bible Society became another facet of this local movement. The Baltimore Bible Society, established by 1810, counted Rev. James Inglis, Rev. John Glendy, John Kelso, and Dr. John Crawford among their members. The society formed part of a larger evangelizing Protestant movement and with its female auxiliary furnished Bibles to local institutions and citizens and to other groups beyond. Bible societies formed across the state and in 1833, a state convention held at First Presbyterian in Baltimore resulted in formation of a new Maryland State Bible Society. A primary purpose became restoration of the Bible to public schoolrooms and the society appointed Rev. Robert Breckinridge, Rev. Ira A. Easter, and J. Harman Brown. These three men also helped organize the Protestant Association, another part of their larger campaign against Catholicism. They reported, “The Bible is the only, the all-sufficient and the divine rule of the religious faith and obedience of mankind. It alone teaches us what we are to believe concerning God, and what he requires us to do.” In the United States, this had been universally agreed but “a fearful declension has now occurred.” To restore “the English Bible as a reading book” in the public schools, they advised communication with local and state authorities. In Baltimore, the Commissioners of Public Schools agreed to add the Bible to the list of books for use in the schools, although they also directed that students not be compelled to use it. “And that the Doway [Douay] Bible be introduced for the use of any children whose parents or guardians request it.” The last provisions were meant to satisfy Catholic citizens concerned about Protestant evangelizing in the public schools. The fact that members of the Protestant Association, including the well-known Rev. Robert Breckinridge, had headed the Bible Society project certainly gave credence to any concern.48
Breckinridge’s anti-Catholic efforts put him in the Baltimore Criminal Court on charges of criminal libel. In November 1839, his magazine charged, “The County Alms House, has been converted not only into a papal Mass House—but into a papal prison.” That October, Mathias Stazer, a German Catholic, had been confined in the almshouse for two days. According to Breckinridge, Stazer had sought guidance from a Protestant minister. “His priest heard of it; told him his wife was dead; sent him to the Alms House to see about her burial, and wrote a line to the papal keeper, lately put over the institution, that the man was mad—and must be confined!” The grand jury indicted Breckinridge and Cross for libeling James L. Maguire, the keeper at the almshouse. Breckinridge’s standing and the divisiveness of the issue ensured avid public interest in the outcome. According to a report, “A number of circumstances have combined to invest this trial with more than ordinary interest . . . and the deep interest felt may be judged by the fact that the courtroom has been daily crowded almost to suffocation, by an anxious multitude.”

The criminal indictment outraged Breckinridge. “If upon this case, a jury of our country will say we have uttered what is false—and have done so maliciously; then indeed, it will be time for the sentinels on the watch-towers of truth, to tremble.” He took special offense at the *Baltimore Sun*’s notice of his presentment. The newspaper incorrectly confused the presentment with an indictment, and it immediately followed the statement on Breckinridge and Cross with notice of an indictment of a “colored man” for assisting runaway slaves. Breckinridge thought juxtaposition of their names with a “colored man” was an intentional slight. He suggested that they had been libeled, not Maguire. To affirm his reputation, he appeared in the Baltimore courtroom accompanied by two U.S. Senators—John J. Crittenden, a close family friend, and William C. Preston, his wife’s brother. Crittenden, appointed U.S. attorney general the following year, was on Breckinridge’s defense team. “The duties of friendship,” an account of Crittenden’s remarks recorded, “had brought him here to stand in the cause of one whom he had known from boyhood, and whom he had proved by years of association—an hereditary friendship descending from their common ancestors who had met together in the western wilderness.”

Testimony provided a rare glimpse into daily conversations among local Protestants who felt especially distrustful of their Catholic neighbors. The original report regarding Stazer had apparently resulted from neighborhood rumors, spun up into evidence of a dark conspiracy. William Davis reported that Stazer was troubled and that, at the German’s request, he had gone to get Rev. Daniel McJilton, a Methodist minister, to pray with him. Stazer turned up at the almshouse soon after and gained admittance after he seemed despondent and allegedly threatened suicide. His wife was already there. Davis told the story to John McKane who, like Davis, attended the Fourth Presbyterian Church. He also told Caleb Owen whose father David repeated the story to Breckinridge.

Breckinridge discussed the issue among friends at the Baltimore Presbytery and
McKane testified that he heard Breckinridge talking about Stazer’s case. Rev. George D. Purviance of Fourth Presbyterian said that he had also heard Breckinridge mention it “in a loud tone of voice” and told him “that it was a matter of common report in the western part of the city.” The Second Presbyterian pastor then directed McKane and Purviance to investigate further. Purviance was unable to do so, but McKane gathered several friends to accompany him. They spoke to William Davis but could not find Stazer. Testimony indicated that Davis had concocted the most lurid part of the story, that a priest had written a note to have Stazer confined. Davis clearly distrusted Catholics and a friend testified that he had told him of the incident. During the conversation, as they walked down the street, they had come across some men working on the Pratt Street railway. “Davis supposing them to be Catholics, stopped the conversation until they had crossed Pratt street, and then resumed it.”

On the stand, Davis admitted concocting the story that a priest had intervened with Stazer, “Do not know that he received a line from the priest, but said that the priest might send one because it was a notion of my own—it was a foolish notion; never heard that the priest had sent a note; no indeed, I never did, it was a supposition of mine altogether.”

The jury could not agree on a verdict, and Breckinridge failed to find the exoneration he sought and, in the aftermath, grew increasingly irritated. The following issue of his magazine included "A Little Defence of Our Church; and a Little of Ourselves." The article had nothing to do with the libel case but displayed an aggressive pride in his family history. He carefully detailed his family’s deep connections to Princeton and the most important figures in Scottish Presbyterianism. In the next issue, he provided a full record of his trial. He stopped publishing the magazine but came out with *Papism in the XIX Century*, a compendium of his confrontation with Catholicism over the previous six years. Perhaps most illustrative of the depths of Breckinridge’s hatred and fear was in his description of a tour of the Baltimore Cathedral. He described in detail the underground vaults and argued that hidden ones existed below those open to public view. The Church held its victims here and committed atrocities against them. If he ever disappeared he wanted his friends to search the foundations of every Catholic institution in the U.S. He was not afraid of death:

> But the long midnight of a living death, with all the fierce array of torture, starvation, parching thirst, incessant mockings and scourgings; such as men of the same religion and same spirit, governed by the same feelings and the same morality with those who denounce us, have inflicted on better men than we are, for the very things that we are daily doing; these things we would avoid, if such were the will of God.

Breckinridge’s wife Ann (Preston) died in 1844, and he left Baltimore the following year, going first to Pennsylvania and later to his native Kentucky.
A Band of Brothers

Developments in Ireland and America bled into the affairs of the Hibernian Society. Sectarianism and rural conflicts over land, rents, and tithes generated violence across the Irish countryside. Daniel O’Connell campaigned for Catholic emancipation and repeal of the Acts of Union, politicizing and nationalizing the overwhelming Irish Catholic majority that had long remained subordinate to the Protestant Ascendancy. A rising rural population and transformation of Irish culture fueled a swelling Catholic emigration, culminating in the enormous exodus during the Great Famine and the decades after. In America, arrival of masses of Irish Catholics created opportunity for religious, cultural, political, and economic conflict. In Baltimore, the anti-Catholic efforts of the “Presbyterian combination,” often working in unison with Methodists and other Protestants, drove distrust in a community that was becoming the residence of many of these Irish Catholic emigrants. Nowhere was this more evident than at Second Presbyterian, whose founders included exiled United Irishmen, and whose pastors came to preach sermons, engage in controversies, lead revivals, lecture widely, and publish nationally, all with a harshly anti-Catholic tone.
The Oliver Hibernian Free School flourished through these decades. By 1830, the Hibernian Society was holding its annual meeting at the school, and the meeting and awards ceremony for the students became a regular feature of St. Patrick’s Day in Baltimore. Controversy arose, however, over the use of the Bible and in March 1839, the Hibernians considered an attempt “made by certain individuals to introduce into the Schools [male and female] as a Class Book the Holy Scriptures.” A few weeks later, the school committee’s report on the subject revealed concern among Irish Catholics over reading of the Bible in the classroom:

It will be recollected by some of the members of the Society, that several years back and at a period when the Schools were in a flourishing condition, that the Holy Scriptures were introduced as a Class book, the consequence was, that in a very short time indeed, the Schools were reduced to mere skeletons as regarded members, and it was not until the Book was withdrawn from use, that any approach to an increase of scholars took place.

The committee heard from the teachers that orders to use the Bible “were given in the most peremptory manner by Mr. John Kelso, seconded by Mr. Hu. Boyle on their own responsibility.” John Kelso and Hugh Boyle, members of the Maryland State Bible Society, were engaged in the campaign to place Bibles in the public schools.54

Col. Samuel Moore, embracing the ecumenical spirit of his United Irishman father, headed opposition to the effort. A Moore family historian noted that correspondence showed “the extraordinarily tolerant nature of their religious outlook.” Samuel Moore married Margaret Hughes, daughter of a Baltimore brick manufacturer, and took up that business and became extremely active in Baltimore affairs. Moore took the strongest position against adoption of the Bible at the Oliver Hibernian Free School. Minutes record that he:

... opposed and would again oppose, as being contrary to the spirit and intention and in direct violation of the provisions of the bequest of the late much lamented John Oliver, by whose munificence the Schools had been founded, by creating a distinction in the Religious Tenets of those who may apply for admission.

Moore successfully blocked the Kelso-Boyle bid to get the Bible into the Hibernian school, but the controversy over the Bible issue clearly caused division within the Hibernian Society. The only contested election recorded in society minutes during this period occurred in 1840 when Moore defeated Kelso for the presidency.55

That same year, the Hibernians confronted a rumor that a Protestant boy had been denied admission to the school and appointed a committee to investigate the matter. The committee found the man responsible who claimed that he had heard it from the boy’s mother, whose name he would not give. The boy’s rejection had allegedly occurred almost a decade earlier. The committee reported that it entertained
“the sincere hope, that no attempt of this kind will be made, and that we will all unite as a band of brothers merging all religious differences in the cause of benevolence and looking with a single view to the relief of our common countrymen.” In 1842, the *Baltimore Sun* affirmed that the hope was being realized at the Free School:
Here is nothing of religious sectarianism—nothing in either the books, the teachers, or the manner or matter of the instructions, to offend the biases or the prejudices of any parent or guardian. The children of the Catholic and the Protestant mingle here, together with those of the Hebrew; and the consequence is, that the beneficence of the founder is the more widely dispensed.”

The contested 1840 Hibernian Society election offered some indication of the interlocking ties among the city’s large merchants, church officials, and local political leaders. Politicians gravitated to a society that offered so many important connections to substantial figures with important roles in a wide range of private and public activities. President Samuel Moore was a leading Democrat in South Baltimore. Vice president William Gwynn was one of the best-known Catholic laymen in Baltimore and an influential newspaper publisher. Chaplain Rev. Nicholas Kerney and his successor Rev. James Dolan shepherded the Catholic community in East Baltimore. Manager John McColgan belonged to a well-off Catholic family and was a member of the Cathedral Fund Association, formed the year before to complete the Cathedral and retire the debt. His brother Edward was a priest at Piscataway and later built St. Peter’s Church in West Baltimore. Manager Hugh Jenkins was a prosperous flour merchant and a member of St. Paul’s Protestant Episcopal Church. Manager James Grieves represented East Baltimore in the city council. Manager James O. Law became mayor in 1844, and Gwynn’s fellow vice president, Jacob G. Davies, was elected to the same office in 1846 and 1848.

The Hibernian Society not only played a significant role in Baltimore politics but, until the Civil War, leaders of local Irish-American movements routinely tapped the Hibernian network in building their own organizations. Baltimore Hibernians had been deeply involved in efforts to support Daniel O’Connell in his successful campaign for Catholic emancipation and in the early 1840s similarly involved themselves in his campaign to repeal the Acts of Union. Local Irish founded the Baltimore Repeal Association in February 1841 “to aid Ireland by all legal means consistent with the happy government under which we exist, and whose free institutions we duly appreciate.” The local Repealers chose Col. Samuel Moore as president and Hugh Jenkins and Edward Boyle as vice presidents. Boyle had joined the Hibernian Society in 1837, and he became a Hibernian manager the month after the Repealers made him a vice president. Moore was a Presbyterian, Jenkins an Episcopalian, and Boyle a Catholic, whose son Francis became an influential priest in the archdiocese of Baltimore. Hibernian ecumenicalism carried over into the Repeal Association.

The following fall, Moore caused controversy when he resigned the Repeal Association presidency. He and Dr. B.M. Byrne, for several years the society’s physician, had traveled to Ireland, where they had met with Daniel O’Connell. O’Connell was notorious for his sharp language, and equally so for his refusal to duel, the result of an earlier match that resulted in his opponent’s death. In their conversation, Moore
took exception to published comments in which O’Connell had criticized the United Irishmen for resorting to force, and characterizing them as miscreants or fools. Moore admitted speaking “with some feeling on this subject.” O’Connell asked Moore if he knew any of the United Irishmen, and he gave the names of some Dubliners. The “Emancipator” then pressed the Baltimorean whether he knew any of the Ulster United Irishmen and whether they were Presbyterians. According to Moore:

Yes, was my reply; all of them, within my recollection at this moment, were Presbyterians, and several of them Presbyterian clergymen; and all of them actuated by the purest motive to obtain Catholic emancipation; and in their endeavors to obtain it, not a few of them lost their property, and many of them their lives; and all of them were ready to sacrifice both, for the emancipation of their Catholic brethren.

Moore claimed O’Connell then asked him to name them, “which I promptly did, by naming the Rev. Mr. Porter, Mr. Orr, Rev. Mr. Glendy, Rev. Mr. Goudy [Gowdy], and the Rev. Mr. Sinclair.” He concluded with “the name of my late beloved and venerated father.” At that point, O’Connell, perhaps feeling Moore would demand satisfaction on a dueling field for the paternal insult, ended the conversation. Back in Baltimore, Moore disclaimed reports he had sought to engage O’Connell in a duel, rather, he only wanted to give him an opportunity to explain his statement. When
O'Connell failed to do so, Moore determined that he could no longer accept him as the head of the Repeal movement.59

The Baltimore Repeal Association respectfully accepted Moore’s resignation and rallied behind O’Connell. Michael R. McNally, exiled in France as a result of his own role in the rebellion, and thus personally included in O’Connell’s condemnation, defended O’Connell, “who surrounded as he was by snares, watched as he was by the bull dog, England, could not, with safety to himself or success to the cause of Ireland, have applauded the patriots who, from ’93 to ’98, attempted to obtain by force the rights which O’Connell had in part obtained by peaceable means.” Hugh Jenkins succeeded Moore as president of the Repeal Association, which continued to raise money for the Irish movement until the spring of 1845 when O’Connell gave stout support to the British government in its dispute with the United States over Oregon and Texas. His remarks alienated Irish-American Repealers who could not countenance attacks on their adopted government. With the Irish repeal movement already in shambles, the Baltimore association, and others in the United States, folded up. That July, Moore died at Molenan House, a family property, near Londonderry in Ireland.60

Within months, potatoes began to rot in the Irish soil. Baltimoreans immediately grasped the potential catastrophe of the coming famine. On November 27, 1845, the Baltimore Sun published a call for Irish-American assistance:

...the eye of the heart turns instinctively to the fellow countrymen of the sufferers, in this land of plenty; a land in which they have generally found a liberal recompense as the reward of their industry, and in which many of them have prospered far beyond the measure of their original expectations. ... They gave liberally to the cause of repeal, and they will hardly now refuse their aid to the cause of humanity; nor need it be feared that those of this country, ‘native, and to the manner born,’ who united with them in the former movement, would hold back in the present case, should a relief movement be made.61

Relief efforts, though, only accelerated the following year, after the Irish potato crop failed again, and the situation in that nation became desperate. Hugh Jenkins, who had succeeded Moore as Hibernian president, directed Baltimore's Irish Relief Fund. A native of Waterford in Ireland, Jenkins's Hibernian ties and his successful career as a flour merchant made him the ideal person for the responsibility. Ward committees collected money in neighborhoods across the city. In February 1847, the Holliday Street Theatre hosted a Grand Relief Ball for the Poor of Ireland. The ball’s executive committee included William Pinkney Whyte, James O. Law, and Peter A. Kelly. At the time, Law and Kelly were Hibernian Society treasurer and secretary. The other committees included Mayor Davies, Hugh Jenkins, John McColgan, and dozens of other Hibernian members. The ball raised several thousand dollars. St.
Paul’s Episcopal Church, which Jenkins attended, collected several hundred dollars for Irish relief. John McColgan turned over $200 collected by his brother Rev. Edward McColgan at St. Peter’s. According to newspaper reports, the local Irish Relief Fund had cash or pledges for $10,000 by spring. Much of the money was used to purchase corn and cornmeal, wheat and flour for shipment to Ireland. Some was sent directly to Dublin for food purchases there. Many donations came in kind.  

The crisis washed ashore in Baltimore that April. Three ships—the Hampden, Richard Anderson, and Rio Grande—arrived in the city carrying sick and dying passengers fleeing the famine in Ireland. The Hibernians built a structure at Canton for the sick, and society officers, managers, physicians, and the chaplain, Rev. James Dolan, went among the passengers and arranged care for parents and children. Jenkins reported that “such scenes of misery and destitution existed amongst those people, set to arouse not only the deepest sympathy of the human heart, but also called upon every true Irishman to come forward and give his aid and assistance to these unfortunate people.” Dolan described the Hampden as arriving “freighted with human misery and death. Six of her passengers died at sea, and there are about sixty more on board, languishing with fever and destitution. Alas! Alas! For unhappy Ireland! Is it not dreadful to know that avarice, ambition and misrule should thus breed death?” Two Hibernians died caring for those aboard these ships. Dr. Charles Maguire died in May and James O. Law, the former mayor, in early June. At the society’s annual dinner the following year, members drank to Maguire, who stood “by the bedside of the afflicted emigrant—a duty which he most faithfully performed on all occasions,” and to Law, “Who died a martyr in his efforts to ameliorate the condition of the suffering sons of the Emerald Isle.”  

Over the next few years, the Baltimore Hibernians offered their support for the Young Ireland uprising. The Friends of Ireland organized to aid the Young Irelanders and arranged to send payments to leader Devin Reilly, in Dublin. In August 1848, several members served as officers at a mass meeting sponsored by the new association. The Resolutions announced:

Whereas, the people of Ireland, awakened, after centuries of oppression, to a conviction of the injustice done them . . . are boldly proclaiming that their rights shall be maintained, even at the hazard of their lives, and that the hour has arrived when meek-eyed patience yields her throne to the stern goddess of justice, and the martyr kisses no longer the hand of the tormentor, but wrests from his grasp the blood-stained sword, to wreak his vengeance on the startled foe.  

After the uprising collapsed, the Hibernians embraced the exiled leaders, including William Smith O’Brien, John Mitchel, and Thomas F. Meagher. The same ecumenical spirit that had characterized Hibernian initiatives also animated their Young Ireland movement. Mitchel was the son of a Presbyterian minister, O’Brien
an Anglican, and Meagher a Catholic. In 1851, local Irish American leaders held a grand demonstration in Monument Square demanding the U.S. government intervene on behalf of the exiles. The following year, Hugh Jenkins penned a letter to Meagher on behalf of the Hibernian Society, congratulating him on his escape from Van Diemen’s Land (Tasmania) and inviting him to a public dinner in Baltimore. When Irish exile Patrick O’Donohoe, who had also escaped Van Diemen’s Land, visited Baltimore, Hugh Jenkins and Michael R. McNally greeted him. In 1854, John Mitchel lectured at the Maryland Institute on the invitation of the Hibernian Society. The Young Irelanders spawned the nationalist and republican Irish movement of the subsequent decades.

The United Irish Legacy

The Great Famine transformed Irish ethnic identities in Baltimore. In the decades before, broad changes in Ireland and America had caused the relative trickle of Irish Catholic emigrants to grow into a stream. The famine swelled this stream, turning it into a flood that continued almost unabated for several decades. Presbyterians and other Protestants came also, but the Irish-rooted population in America became more rural in origin, more Catholic in faith, and more Irish in language and culture. During the first half of the nineteenth century, Irish immigrants of different faiths and cultures had embraced an Irish identity. They organized as Hibernians, emphasizing their common Irishness, and celebrated St. Patrick together. But an expanding Catholic institutional structure and increasingly elaborate social networks in Baltimore, and in other American cities, enabled development of a distinctly Irish Catholic culture rooted in Ireland’s tempestuous history and present transformation, and shaped by American circumstances. Sectarianism in Ireland and religious controversies in America, playing out in an environment where social status carried real psychological and economic value, and where the number of generations separating Scots-Irish emigrants from Ireland was on average greater than the number separating Irish Catholics from Ireland, led to different perspectives, and different attitudes among Irish Americans, Catholic and Protestant. In 1847, when the Episcopalian president of the Hibernian Society, Hugh Jenkins, spoke of “every true Irishman,” he could do so with confidence that he would not be understood as meaning “every true Irish Catholic.” In coming years, though, Irish and Irish Catholic would become near synonyms.

Descendants of Scots-Irishmen, and more recent Presbyterian and Protestant Irish immigrants, claimed a “Scotch-Irish” identity that emphasized a Calvinistic religious attitude and a spare, commonsensical attitude and aesthetic that they contrasted with a more sensuous and indulgent Catholicism. It embraced hard work, simplicity, and democracy. The Scotch-Irish identity revealed itself in Baltimore biographies published in the decades after the Civil War. In 1871, Brantz Mayer characterized Alexander Brown as being of “hardy North Irish stock” and Francis Burns of “hardy
Scots-Irish stock.” Similarly, Alexander Kirkland was born in County Tyrone, the son of “a farmer of the sturdy Scotch-Irish race settled in the north of the island.” The following decade, J. Thomas Scharf described Sidney Buchanan Brown, the sister of Mayor George William Brown and granddaughter of Rev. Patrick Allison and Dr. George Brown, as belonging “to the same Scotch-Irish race from which her husband is descended.” Of course, her grandfathers had not seen themselves as Scotch-Irish. Allison had been pastor at First Presbyterian, and the contest between his congregants over his successor had led to Second Presbyterian’s foundation. Dr. Brown had been a member of the Baltimore social network that welcomed United Irishmen like Dr. John Campbell White, Robert Moore, George Douglas, and Rev. William Sinclair—and had joined them in the Hibernian Society.66

Most significant among these United Irishmen was their ecumenical spirit. For decades, they preached and practiced religious freedom and a respect for differing religious beliefs. The Hibernian presidents included White, a Presbyterian; John Oliver, a Presbyterian; Luke Tiernan, a Catholic; John Kelso, a Methodist; Samuel Moore, a Presbyterian; and Hugh Jenkins, an Episcopalian. Jenkins held the office until his death in December 1863. Three months later, the Hibernians elected as his replacement, Daniel J. Foley, a Catholic merchant and the brother of two well-known Catholic priests (and later bishops), Revs. Thomas and John S. Foley. The Hibernian officers and membership displayed a similar diversity of religious backgrounds. In 1844, when the manager of the Bible Society publicly suggested that the Oliver Hibernian Free School had a Catholic orientation, Hugh Jenkins sought to show that it was “not under sectarian management” by the simple expedient of providing a list of society officers.67

This ecumenicalism provided an important cultural strand in a city where anti-Catholicism was also a disruptive and dangerous cultural legacy. The danger peaked through the 1830s and 1840s and especially after 1854 when an alliance between nativist American Party politicians and neighborhood gangs controlled local and state government. Running counter to the resultant social fraying were interwoven connections that brought together individuals from different religious faiths. Many of these connections had developed through routine intercourse between neighbors, friends, schoolmates, business associates, and family. Others were more institutionalized. Protestants and Catholics often served together in private associations and local government. And they worked together at the Hibernian Society to aid destitute Irish immigrants and educate their children at the Oliver Hibernian Free School. The membership, and those attending its annual St. Patrick’s Day dinner, included numerous business and political leaders, many of whom would be actively involved in the public debates of the era, and in encouraging peaceful relations among a diverse community with deeply rooted animosities.
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On the evening of September 30, 1885, members of the Colored Advisory Council crowded into Baltimore’s Douglass Institute to discuss the upcoming mayoral election. “We have upon us a political campaign,” the organization’s president, Joseph E. Briscoe intoned, “the most important for years. Our action,” he continued, “will determine our political status for many years to come.” The council first organized in 1878 and although its founders intended the group to be non-partisan, they had heretofore largely supported the Republican Party. In the wake of the Civil War and Reconstruction, African Americans across the nation invested their hopes in the party of President Abraham Lincoln, the “Great Emancipator.” But by 1885 things had changed in Baltimore, changes years in the making. African Americans had long clamored for more than token recognition from the city and state GOP. But their pleas had long gone ignored and the collective patience of an ascendant group of black radicals had run thin.¹

The events of late September 1885 stand as the breaking point. During the Republican primaries, African Americans attempted to gain representation in the party’s state committee. Even by late nineteenth-century Baltimore standards, the 1885 Republican primaries resulted in bedlam culminating in pandemonium during the evening of voting day. Most of the upset surrounded the thorny issue of race. After a black man defeated a white candidate in the ninth ward, the white aspirant quickly re-nominated himself in a different precinct, challenging another African-American hopeful. Although the Baltimore Sun played coy, it appears that white primary attendees intimidated the beleaguered black candidate into withdrawing from the contest. In the sixteenth ward, African American voters had to scrape tooth and nail for representation. When one attendee declared equality with whites, and then demanded representation on the Maryland Republican Party’s central committee, he triggered a prolonged verbal battle. After much debate, the Republican leadership finally assented, only to see many whites leave the hall rather than pledge their support to candidates that would allow blacks to serve. Nor were white Republicans reticent about employing a bit of subterfuge. In the city’s fifth ward, party loyalists shifted the primary’s location to an “obscure corner of the Seventh Ward,” to limit black participation.²
A little over one week after the primaries, Briscoe looked over his audience at the Douglass Institute and railed against the party that had consistently failed black Baltimoreans. “Our political condition has grown from bad to worse,” Briscoe exclaimed, “until the treatment of the colored people by the so-called Republican Party of Maryland has become a byword and a reproach which can no longer be tolerated by any intelligent or self-respecting colored man.” For Briscoe the time had come to look beyond existing political parties in the hope of bringing amelioration to the plight of African Americans. Many shared his sentiments. By the end of the speech, Briscoe told his audience that, “I am, as I have always been, for my race against all political parties.” That evening the Colored Advisory Committee ordered their members to break with the party of Lincoln by organizing clubs “with a view of rebuking the republican bosses.” Even Republican loyalists, like the venerable Isaac Myers, could see the writing on the wall. Myers—Baltimore’s leading black activist, labor leader, and loyal Republican—later gave his assent to the idea of African-American voters turning their backs on the Republican Party.3

African Americans’ rebuke of the Republican Party represented only one of the ways that black activism was changing in 1880s Baltimore. For black Baltimoreans, these years represented a crucial period when a new set of community activists slowly emerged to challenge not only racist white policies, but also established community leaders who had seized the mantle of uplift with the fall of slavery. Baltimore’s black radical activists, many of whom had recently arrived in the city and had experienced the horrors of slavery in their youths, disavowed a gradual approach to change and agitated for far-reaching transformations that they felt were promised as a result of Reconstruction. Men such as Harvey Johnson, Joseph S. Briscoe, H.J. Brown, and P.H.A. Braxton pushed them in new directions. Rather than pursuing a path of reform that relied wholly on self-improvement, unionization, and fealty to the Republican Party, black radicals attacked inequality through independent political action, the pulpit, and eventually through the courts. These new activists broadened the parameters of community action, created spaces within their churches, and incorporated the concerns of women, children, and men into a program of racial uplift. The scope of their efforts, in turn, opened up political agitation to women who would figure prominently. The fight for representation in electoral politics—heretofore the focus of most black activism in the 1870s—would subsequently be only one aspect of a larger fight. In many ways it became a minor part of the struggle.4

This is the story of the intellectual and political fracturing of Baltimore’s black community in the early 1880s, lamented in the New York Age a decade later as a “serious lack of unity.” Such fracturing is deserving of more historical attention. In too many cases, the “African-American community” is treated as a monolithic bloc, particularly in discussions of politics, in both historical analyses and modern political discourse. Like Baltimore’s white, working-class community, the “black community” was economically, politically, and socially diverse. It is much more ac-
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accurate to describe Baltimore’s black population as politically, economically, generationally, and religiously stratified. This was particularly true in the 1870s and 1880s. Recently, historians have established that this period produced a proliferation of strong community activism among African Americans. The legacy and meaning of Reconstruction still hung in the balance. The battles fought by Baltimore’s black radical activists against African-American moderates and segregationists helped shape the city’s race relations and offered new directions in political reform movements.5

Frederick Douglass cast a long shadow in the city of Baltimore throughout the 1860s and 1870s. Although the famous abolitionist had long since left the city, his legacy continued to influence black reformers both in scope and in style. As black Baltimoreans attempted to secure their rights, and adjust to post-Civil War realities, Isaac Myers rose to prominence as the city’s leading African American activist. Born in Baltimore in 1835, he spent the early part of his life working as a caulker on the city’s waterfront. His experience as a free black waterfront laborer working in a slave state shaped his political beliefs and social activism. From at least the 1850s, Myers steadfastly believed that unionization and self-improvement provided the path to citizenship and racial uplift. After the Civil War, Myers added loyalty to the Republican Party as another important aspect of his reform agenda. In the wake of emancipation, he helped organize an African American labor conference that eventually led to the formation of the National Colored Labor Union. He continued working through the 1860s and 1870s, forming alliances with white laborers and the white Republican establishment, as well as promoting a series of ideas to advance the black community economically. In a statement that neatly encapsulated Myers’ point of view, he once told an audience, “The colored man will not enjoy equal rights with the whites until they are mechanics and merchants of means. Then the men put their prejudices in their pockets.”6

Throughout the latter half of the 1860s and 1870s, black activists in Baltimore followed Myers’ lead by primarily seeking amelioration through the Republican Party. This strategy hinged on the belief that steadfast loyalty, and black male votes, would ensure that Republicans served the city’s African American community. This strategy failed as the city’s Republicans remained impotent and disorganized and showed little inclination to fully incorporate blacks into Baltimore’s political, social, and cultural life. Aside from a few token positions in the party hierarchy, and a scant number of federal positions, the two major parties in Baltimore effectively blunted black power without resorting to discriminatory legislation. Despite these shortcomings, Myers and many black activists consistently clung to this strategy throughout the decade.7

While Myers counseled patience and conciliation during the 1870s a burgeoning group of black activists grew increasingly impatient. In 1872, a young minister named Harvey Johnson moved to Baltimore and changed the shape of city activism. Unlike Myers, Johnson was born into slavery in Fauquier County, Virginia. It is unclear when he gained freedom and if asked about his life as a slave he replied, “I can only
think of it with a righteous indignation.” He said little else about his bondage but the experience profoundly shaped his later life. In 1868, twenty-five year old Johnson found his calling in the church and moved to Washington, D.C. where he enrolled in Wayland Seminary. Four years later he moved to Baltimore and accepted a pastorate at the small Union Baptist Church. With a congregation of 250 members, Johnson's move hardly attracted any notice.
Through the next decade, Johnson's influence became a driving force in racial politics and profoundly shaped the city and African American activism for years. One contemporary biographer best captured Johnson's energy and determination. "I have met with men more learned and of longer experience," wrote A.W. Pegues, "but I can recall no one more earnest, more thoroughly devoted to what he believes to be his duty, more aggressive, broadminded, and fearless than Rev. Harvey Johnson." The new pastor stepped quickly into the spotlight, articulating his frustration with the glacial pace of reform. At a meeting to discuss Republican mismanagement of the Freedman's Bank, which cost numerous black Baltimoreans their savings, Johnson exclaimed, "When the commissioners talked to the colored men who had been duped, telling them to have patience, it was sheer nonsense on their part."8

Under Johnson's watch, the small church grew exponentially. By 1875 Union Baptist's membership nearly quadrupled to 928 and by 1887 exploded to some 2,200 parishioners — the largest black church in Maryland. More importantly, Johnson's church became the epicenter for a proliferation of black churches across the city and state in the 1870s and 1880s. By 1877 they had established four Sunday Schools, sent four members to Seminary and established a mission at Westminster, Maryland.9

The churches not only marked a growing Baptist movement in the city but also helped sow the seeds for a more aggressive form of activism. At each of the affiliated churches, Johnson's political allies served as ministers, helping to broaden the reach and appeal of his more radical agenda. In early February 1878 twelve members of the Union Baptist Church formed the Calvary Baptist Church. A little more than a year later, the parishioners of Calvary Baptist called on Patrick Henry Alexander (P.H.A.) Braxton to serve as their pastor. Like Johnson, Braxton hailed from Virginia and was born into servitude during the dying days of the antebellum South. With the fall of the Confederacy, Braxton worked in the “stave business” before serving as a county constable. In the interim he studied law and eventually secured a job in the United States Custom House in Low Cedar Point, Virginia. It was here that Braxton converted to the Baptist church and was commissioned to preach. When Braxton arrived in Baltimore he took over the reins of a ten-member church that met in a carpenter shop and within two years began collecting funds for construction of a proper church and increased the membership to 125.10

One of Johnson's allies also helped build Sharon Baptist Church in 1882. Church founder William Moncure Alexander was another Virginian who met Johnson as a young man in the 1870s. Inspired by his example, Alexander enrolled at Wayland Seminary before returning to Baltimore in 1882 to found Sharon Baptist. In total, at least fourteen churches and eleven ministers sprung from Union Baptist Church and Johnson's mentorship.11

The network of Baptist churches that spread across the city and state furnished important public spaces in which African Americans could congregate, plan, commiserate, and carve out a collective identity in the city. They functioned "as a discur-
sive, critical arena—a public sphere in which values and issues were aired, debated, and disseminated throughout the larger black community.” By the 1880s, Baptist churches in Baltimore augmented the political space that was offered through the black owned and operated Douglass Institute. The Union Baptist Church, for instance, hosted temperance meetings, political gatherings, and celebrations to honor legal triumphs. Sharon Baptist Church, under Alexander’s guidance, furnished space for an African-American school and in the 1890s began to publish the *Baltimore Afro-American* newspaper. At the Calvary Baptist Church, blacks gathered for meetings and to hear speeches about a variety of topics. Calvary hosted rallies for public education, political agitation, and women met there to plan mission work.12

The church also served as an important site of fraternization for black Baltimoreans in the late 1870s and early 1880s. In the years following the Civil War, the city attracted migrants and strangers, particularly African Americans. According to one estimate, Baltimore’s black population swelled by 12,000 during the 1860s, added another 14,000 in the 1870s, and then 25,000 during the 1880s. By 1890, the African American population in the city stood at approximately 77,000, up from the 28,000 blacks who lived in the city just three decades earlier. In many ways, the
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*Black activists met at the Douglass Institute in 1879 to discuss celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Fifteenth Amendment. (Maryland Historical Society.)*
church's ministry reflected the changing demographics of the city: Johnson, Braxton, and Alexander all hailed from nearby Virginia. As African Americans poured into the city from the Virginia and Maryland countryside, there is little doubt that the church served as a space to meet neighbors, become acquainted with the city, and seek assistance (financial as well as spiritual) if necessary.13

Although Myers remained the most prominent black reformer in Baltimore in the 1870s, the political climate was changing just below the surface, as Johnson, Braxton, and Briscoe (among others) laid the groundwork for a new era of activism. It was during these years that Johnson began his first forays into political and social activism. In 1876, James H. Wolff and Charles S. Taylor, two aspiring attorneys, attempted to open a practice at the Douglass Institute. While impossible to say with certainty, not much is known of their motivations, it is likely that they hoped to use their efforts as a test case to challenge Maryland's law prohibiting African Americans from the state bar. The two men soon attracted notice and the state courts prohibited them from practicing. It is not clear whether the men knew Johnson or coordinated their actions with him, but he immediately sprung to their defense and began a fund-raising effort to get their case tried before the court of appeals. Although Wolff and Taylor eventually lost their case, Johnson continued his efforts to get black men admitted to the Maryland Bar.14

By the end of the 1870s, tensions in the black community became increasingly public. On March 26, 1879, black Baltimoreans gathered at the Douglass Institute to discuss how best to commemorate the ten-year anniversary of the Fifteenth Amendment, its current meaning, and the state of equality in Maryland and the nation more broadly. In many ways the meeting offered a glimpse into the new political realities emerging in Baltimore's black community. One of the items on the agenda was a resolution asking the city's black churches to help celebrate the anniversary of the amendment's passage. During the discussion, one of the attendees objected to the proposal on the grounds that it was too political and that comment opened up a wider debate on the floor.

One of the more outspoken attendees that evening was Dr. Henry Jerome (H.J.) Brown. Unlike Johnson, Braxton, and Alexander, Brown had deep roots in the city. A self-described radical, Brown was an uncompromising advocate for equality throughout his life. The debates surrounding the commemoration of the Fifteenth Amendment certainly resonated for one who had struggled in the late 1860s to ensure that African Americans gained voting rights after the conclusion of the Civil War. During Maryland's Reconstruction, Brown took a leading role at the Colored Border States Convention that sought to organize black Republicans in Maryland, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Missouri in the fight for racial equality. He was also involved in various political meetings to ensure support for Reconstruction efforts. By the end of the decade, Brown's efforts had succeeded. In 1870 he served as one of the principal organizers, and master of ceremonies, for
the enormous parade (which attracted over 20,000 spectators and participants) celebrating the Fifteenth Amendment's ratification in 1870.¹⁵

Ten years later, however, Brown wondered if the promise of Reconstruction had been squandered. After listening intently to the debates about the Fifteenth Amendment, he rose to speak and informed the gathering that he would not want to celebrate the adoption of the amendment as it had not been, according to the Baltimore Sun, “practically carried out in the Southern States, where even in his native Maryland he and men of his race cannot go to the polls without risk of assault and violence.” Brown’s remarks sparked a firestorm. Myers cautioned patience, noting “What is delayed is not lost.” Others echoed Myers’ sentiments. Leonard Trehorn stated that Baltimoreans should not postpone celebrating just because blacks farther south could not vote. Lastly, Lemuel Griffin felt it appropriate to celebrate the amendment two days after Easter, crediting the amendment with resurrecting the political fortunes of African Americans. The debate quieted down and the group adopted the resolution to commemorate the amendment, with just one dissenting voice (most likely that of Brown).¹⁶

The debate on this resolution reflected not only the growing split in Baltimore’s black community but also the beginning of a more general transition in activist leadership and thought. Men such as Myers counseled patience and fealty to the Republican Party despite years of disappointment. Others, such as H.J. Brown, increasingly voiced their frustration with the lack of progress toward true equality. Brown and his supporters quickly lost patience and were less willing to wait on the sidelines hoping that white political parties would advance the cause of equality.

By the early 1880s, many black Baltimoreans had grown tired of Myers’ leadership and organized for political redress through other means. In January 1880 a group of “dissatisfied Colored Republicans” held an indignation meeting at the Douglass Institute to protest their status in the Republican Party and the lack of any patronage jobs. Brown in particular railed against the party and African Americans’ lack of equality. At one point in his speech, he claimed that black voters, who he asserted made up 2/3 of the party were relegated to the status of “dromedaries and pack-horses for their white allies.” Brown called upon black Baltimoreans to organize for effectual representation and by the end of the evening the atmosphere became so tense that a fight almost broke out when one member of the audience tried several times to interrupt him — a foreshadowing of the following year’s events.¹⁷

The next year black Baltimoreans, including Harvey Johnson and representatives from various churches, called a statewide convention to demand that some offices in the Republican Party be reserved for African Americans. The March 1881 convention proved radical, the tensions more palpable than the previous year. After nominating a temporary president, the floor exploded into a cavalcade of commotion as some attendees clamored for full representation in the Republican Party. The more radical contingent also demanded that at least half of state government jobs be awarded to
blacks and that current state department heads be removed from office. The group
grew quiet for a short time, until Brown’s supporters insisted he deliver a speech.
The *Baltimore Sun* reported, “So much excitement ensued that speech making was
declared to be ended.”

By the end of the evening the schism growing in the black community became
even more apparent. During the convention the “committee on resolutions” had
retired to formulate their platform. When they finally returned to the stage it be-
came clear that the committee could not reach an agreement and instead presented
a “minority” and “majority” report. The “minority” report, which was ultimately
rejected, called on the convention to appeal to President James Garfield to make
“competency rather than color the test for office” and further recommended that any
current officeholder who did not adhere to such a policy be removed at once and
replaced with “men who are free from race prejudice.” Myers delivered the more tepid
majority report, “That we renew our fealty to the great national republican party, and
that our thanks are due to his Excellency James A. Garfield, President of the United
States, for the liberal policy toward our race as expressed in his inaugural address of
March 4, 1881.” While the majority statement complained about the lack of federal
jobs granted to blacks in Maryland, the authors did not directly address the core is-
sue. Rather, they minimized the racial component, claiming it was local in nature.

By 1882 Baltimore’s radicals had gathered significant momentum. Although
they had not yet been successful in forcing substantive change in the Republican
Party—and indeed faced substantial pushback from more conservative blacks—
they continued to organize and force issues about inequality into wider discussion.
Throughout the year, Johnson, Brown, and Briscoe organized political meetings to
discuss a variety of issues and formed organizations to affect change outside of the
traditional parties. Johnson presided over a May meeting to “discuss the conditions
and grievances of the colored people of Maryland, to put them on guard against the
tricksters who have duped them for twenty years past, and to organize in strength
and unity,” prompting attendees to form the Order of Regulators. That August, city
residents organized the “colored advisory council” to “promote the interests of col-
ered people politically and in other respects.” These organizations only existed for a
short time and experienced limited successes. Their advent, however, marked black
activists’ initial efforts to incorporate a wider vision of equality that went beyond
political parties.

With the formation of the “Order of Regulators” and the “colored advisory
council” radical activists took a step away from Myers and the Republican Party.
Across the city, a substantial number of citizens were also questioning the role of
partisan politics, especially given the Democratic Party’s dominance in the city gov-
ernment. With a slate of judicial elections on tap in November, some called for an
“independent judiciary movement” in an effort to wrest control of the courts from
the hands of the Democratic machine that controlled judicial appointments. Given
the relationship between the Democrats and black voters, it is not surprising that black radicals were attracted to and supported the movement. The Colored Advisory Council noted the need for drastic change, “colored citizens have been murdered with impunity by roughs, who were allowed to escape punishment by the patent process of ‘packed juries.’” Briscoe further pointed out, “We have not been able to obtain justice in the present courts of the city, for when a person enters these courts as an alleged criminal his very color has more than once sealed his doom.” Finally, H.J. Brown also weighed in, claiming that the independent movement represented “an exciting and impending public crisis” and a “fight of the people against the corruptionists.”

The year stands as an important transitional time for black radicals. New leadership emerged, chiefly Johnson and Briscoe, and new organizations such as the Order of Regulators and The Colored Advisory Council. Certainly, the split was important and real. The occasional, vocal arguments that punctuated black political meetings testified to this fact. Many, white and black, opposed to the emerging leadership felt threatened, among them Frederick Douglass, who initially criticized the leaders of the black radical faction in Baltimore. In a speech delivered in Denton, Maryland, he chastised them for abandoning the Republican Party. Denigrating the radicals as men who “strutted around with cigars in their mouths” he told his audience that, “Ingratitude would be a dangerous thing, for when we cut loose from the party that gave us freedom we give notice that whatever the democratic party should do would excite in us no gratitude whatever.” He then dismissed the independent movement as “nonsense.” But focusing solely on the divisions developing within the community misses the larger import of what was happening in the early 1880s. Myers’ self-improvement program was essentially two pronged — political advancement through fealty to the Republican Party and economic advancement through entrepreneurship and unionization. Although he recognized structural inequalities in the law and in social relations, he counseled patience and respectability. Myers narrowly focused on traditional understandings of families that envisioned men as the breadwinners and means of advancement. He rarely discussed gender inequity and likely assumed that women would simply benefit by community uplift programs.

Across Baltimore, however, new community activists and everyday citizens laid the groundwork for a more expansive program of reform that reached beyond partisan, electoral politics. These reform efforts encompassed men and women, community and politics. Men and women established fraternal societies, new churches, and activist organizations to help with community uplift. African Americans across the city founded a series of newspapers—like the Vindicator—that spread political news written by black journalists. By the mid- to late 1880s, Baltimore had a number of short-lived newspapers in the early to mid-1880s, including the Vindicator, the Star, The Colored Citizen, and the Baltimore Beacon. The papers—both secular and religious—were read and probably shared and discussed in workplaces, churches, and homes throughout the city. Together the building of community institutions,
newspapers, and churches helped engender a sense of cohesion in a city that had become home to vast numbers of newcomers. It also helped establish a black political voice free from the influence of white editors. These papers mirrored the more militant and activist stances in the churches, particularly the Baptist church. Noting the changes, Jeffrey R. Brackett, a contemporary historian and social worker, reported that, “The piety and zeal of the old-time minister is everywhere respected, but the one on whom his mantle falls, who has been well educated and looks to the future rather than from the past, will not be satisfied until his people have all possible opportunities for better living.”

Radicals also espoused rhetoric that went far beyond issues of political representation and unionization. Most stood unafraid to address structural inequalities and level critiques at white authorities regardless of political parties. For example, in 1883 at a convention of independent Republicans, Briscoe told the attendees that they did not owe “allegiance to any party that would not advance the educational and political welfare of the colored men.” He then listed ways in which black voters had helped the Republican Party but received little in return. In other cases, Briscoe reminded his audience that the rights of African Americans were at stake, not simple partisan politics, they were not “called in the interest of the republican or the democratic party but in the interest of the colored race.”

Yet, by far the biggest difference in the radicals’ agenda rested on how they attacked issues affecting the entire community, not just working and voting males. By 1883, some in the radical faction were already casting a wider net. One of their earliest targets was the so-called Maryland “Bastardy law.” Dating back to 1781, the law originally protected all “free women” from abandonment by giving them the right to bring criminal charges against a child’s father and force him to pay an $80 a year stipend. But in 1860 the Maryland legislature amended the law to exclude African American women. Speaking at an August 1883 convention Briscoe, according to the Baltimore Sun, “denounced” the law for failing to “protect the virtue of colored females.” Others went even further. The Reverend P.S. Henry not only assailed the bastardy law but also denounced the city’s policy of not admitting black lawyers and not hiring black teachers in the public schools. For Henry, the answer to these problems existed outside the realm of partisan politics and his statement on the matter foreshadowed the development of black protest in the years ahead, “The churches are taking hold of the question, and soon it will spread to every section. I do not counsel secrecy in our manner of dealing with this subject, but if oath-bound societies are necessary to its success let us have them. Again, I repeat,” Henry finished, “we want to have our sons admitted to the bars of our courts, we want colored teachers in the colored schools of this city, and we want the virtue of the colored women protected equally with that of the white.”

Whether he knew so at the time or not, Henry charted the course for black radicals in the coming years. With the groundwork laid between 1880 and 1884,
Baltimore’s new leadership embarked on an ambitious program that marked the beginning of the first full-fledged post-Reconstruction movement in the city. The radicals distanced themselves from the Republican Party, created their own organizations, and examined a host of issues affecting the community at large. The question that loomed large was what steps to take next. Although they had not yet undertaken any reform efforts nor directly challenged the white power structure, the time arrived in 1884.

Black radicals first turned their attention to reforms in the city’s legal structure, a prudent decision. If reformers wanted to move beyond electoral politics they needed advocates in a prejudicial court system that barred them from participation. Since 1867, African Americans could not practice law in Maryland and in some cases could not serve as jurors. Courts selected jurors from two separate lists, “white male taxables” and the poll books. Since the poll books contained the names of many African Americans, counties simply used the former list to populate their jury pools.27

In 1884 and 1885 two court cases demonstrated both the efficacy of using the courts to address inequality and also the perils of a discriminatory justice system. The first of these cases stemmed from a day trip aboard the Sue, a steamer that plied the waters between Maryland and Virginia during the late nineteenth century. In August 1884, four black Baltimore women, Martha Stewart, Winney Stewart, Mary M. Johnson, and Lucy Jones, purchased first-class accommodations on the Sue for a trip to Virginia. As the evening progressed and the women grew tired they attempted to retire to the first class sleeping cabin they had reserved. As they made their way to the rooms, the steamer’s employees refused to allow the women entrance, instead offering them “first class” accommodations reserved for blacks in another part of the ship. The women refused and in protest stayed up all night in the ship’s saloon.28

The incident on board the Sue and the subsequent lawsuit is a forgotten moment in the fight for equality in the United States. When mentioned, historians have been content to note the case’s similarities to the more famous Plessy v. Ferguson and acknowledge its forerunner status in relation to later civil rights cases. This retelling of events, while basically correct, downplays or neglects the complexity of the case, the motivations of the libellants, and the shrewdness of Baltimore’s black activist community. From the extant evidence, it is clear that the women acted deliberately and it is possible, even probable, that Harvey Johnson was involved in the case from the outset.29

The four women arrested were all parishioners of Johnson’s Union Baptist Church and knew from experience that they would likely to be barred from the white first-class cabin. The judge noted in his trial summary that, “On previous trips on the same steam-boat, [the women had] been denied access to the after cabin.” More importantly, the women knew from firsthand experience that the conditions in the “colored” first class cabins were not comparable to the white cabins, a key point in their eventual lawsuit. In their testimony the women noted that the cabin, “Was of-
fensively dirty; that the mattresses in the berths were defaced; that the sheets were wanting or soiled, and that there were no blankets and no conveniences for washing.” The women also claimed that access to the colored first class cabin was obstructed by the presence of cattle. They remained demure and respectable, a fact the judge noted. Rather than loudly protest their treatment the women simply refused to relocate to the “colored” first class cabin, and took up quarters in the ship’s saloon. As black females, their presence in the white male space of the saloon must have been remarkable. The women likely knew that their femininity and respectable manner would make for a stunning contrast in the rougher, male space of the ferry’s saloon.30

Johnson, and presumably the women and other activists, also recognized that the case spoke to the foundations of black inequality in the post-Reconstruction period, a time when race relations “were an unstable interlude before the passing of these old [slavery] and new traditions [legal equality] and the arrival of the Jim Crow code and disfranchisement.” Although Johnson was not a trained attorney he read widely, especially tracts concerning the Constitution and the Reconstruction amendments. Johnson firmly believed that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments were of paramount importance to the prospects of achieving equality. He was also
certain that the Constitution held the keys for achieving equality. The problem, in Johnson’s estimation, was not with the laws as written but with the interpretations of the statutes on the books.31

For Johnson, the case went to the heart of further defining the contested legacy of Reconstruction. Already, the Supreme Court had begun to dismantle some of the protections of the “Reconstruction Amendments,” particularly in the “Slaughter House Cases” and Hall v. DeCuir, the latter of which figured prominently in the steamer Sue case. In 1872, a steamboat company operating in Louisiana and Mississippi denied an African American woman named Josephine DeCuir the right to sit in a “white dining hall.” DeCuir sued the ship’s captain, John Benson, for violating an 1869 Louisiana state law that ensured equal accommodations. When the case eventually reached the Supreme Court, the Justices ruled that the state law was “an inappropriate regulation of interstate commerce.” The ruling, in effect, denied states the right to pass laws that prohibited racial segregation on interstate carriers. Nevertheless, questions still remained. In delivering his concurrence to the Court’s verdict, Justice Nathan Clifford set the stage for later battles over segregation on public transportation. Since, according to Justice Clifford, Congress had not passed legislation dealing with segregation on interstate travel the carriers needed to rely upon a common law understanding of “reasonableness.” The ruling in the case, especially Clifford’s justification, limited the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause and set the stage for future attempts at segregating public transportation.32

The steamer Sue case sought to challenge the implications of Hall v. DeCuir. The verdict, handed down by the District Court judge spoke to the case’s deeper implications. On the first point, the case concerned a simple question of “fact,” whether or not the ship’s operators provided equal accommodations to the women in the “colored” first class cabin as those white women enjoyed. The second, and thornier, issue concerned the question of law and the case grew more muddled. Since, as the court noted, the steamer plied waters between two states the jurisdiction defaulted to the federal government. In 1884, Congress had still not acted on legislation regulating separation by race on public transportation, leaving ship operators free to impose “reasonable” restrictions, an outgrowth of Hall v. DeCuir. “Reasonableness,” however, remained an unsettled legal matter. Black radicals thought they had a solution. In their treatise, Justice and Jurisprudence, the Brotherhood of Liberty examined 1870s and 1880s legal cases pointedly asking “how can that proposition (reasonableness) be determined otherwise than by ascertaining, whether or not the rule or regulation complained of conforms to the organic laws of the nation?” The answer to the question could be found in the Fourteenth Amendment.33

The court rendered a bittersweet decision. African American activists undoubtedly hoped that the case would challenge Hall v. DeCuir and restore the Fourteenth Amendment. Instead, the judge noted the difficulty in determining the “reasonableness” of regulation but deferred to previous rulings concerning whether segregation
violated the Fourteenth Amendment. The judge then decided to only determine if the steamboat provided the women with equal accommodations. “The separation of the colored from the white passengers,” the judge wrote, “goes to the verge of the carrier’s legal right, and such a regulation cannot be upheld unless bona fide and diligently the officers of the ship see to it that the separation is free from any actual discrimination in comfort, attention, or appearance of inferiority.” The court reaffirmed the right of the steamboat operators to provide separate accommodations but only if they were equal. The only salvation was that in this regard, the judge found the Sue to be lacking. Therefore, on the grounds that the women received unequal accommodations, he ruled that the steamboat operators could not enforce racial separation, a narrow ruling that fell far short of challenging Hall v. DeCuir. Despite the disappointment, the case provided black activists with a legal victory and a way to directly challenge segregationist policies — a first step but bigger victories remained on the horizon.34

If the suit against the Steamer Sue produced mixed results, the verdict in a second case (delivered just weeks later) proved more beneficial to black Baltimoreans. For over a decade, radicals had been intermittently fighting to see an African American attorney admitted to Maryland’s Bar. Then, in March 1884, a Baltimorean named Richard King unsuccessfully petitioned the U.S. Senate claiming that the exclusion of black lawyers was in violation of the Constitution. Like their efforts to bring suit against the Sue, the quest to get African Americans admitted to the bar had wider implications for the community. King linked the exclusion of black lawyers with other injustices occurring in the city and state. He noted, for instance, that trades unions excluded black men and women and that city public schools barred black teachers. As a result, the Baltimore Sun reported, King claimed that, “The colored people are not treated as American citizens in Maryland.”35

Although King’s efforts ultimately failed, he garnered positive press coverage and introduced the issue of black legal inequality into the public discourse of the city’s newspapers and the Baltimore Sun came out in strong support of admitting blacks to the Maryland Bar. In an editorial that playfully poked fun at lawyers’ lack of morality, and congratulated Maryland’s progress since Reconstruction, the paper stated that, “The law has no right to keep a colored man from earning his bread in any honest way he may see fit, provided that he shows himself able to meet the requirements imposed on all other classes of citizens.” The Sun then remarked that, “The law as it stands formed only one part of a system that has passed away, and which no one wishes to bring back.”36

Despite the Sun’s optimism, the “system that has passed away” had hardly vanished. Black radicals knew that the courts were the lynchpin holding up the structure of inequality and they had plans on pursuing a more aggressive legal approach. When they once again took up efforts to get a black attorney admitted to the bar in early 1885 they had a foundation and some public support to launch their efforts. In February, Charles S. Wilson sought to gain admittance to the Maryland Bar. There
is no doubt that the Wilson case was important as he and his supporters cobbled together more than $200 to try the case. After he appeared before the Supreme Bench of Baltimore in a preliminary hearing, a number of prominent Baltimoreans in the legal community voiced support for the admittance of black lawyers. Baltimore's Mayor, Ferdinand Latrobe, publically supported Wilson's efforts, proclaiming that, “all restrictions on the freedom of citizenship should be removed.” Latrobe was far from alone in this matter. Judge Charles E. Phelps termed the exclusion of African Americans from the bar as a “relic of barbarism.” Wilson also received support from many of the city's daily newspapers and once again the Baltimore Sun led the charge, calling on the state to end the exclusionary practice. “Sooner or later all restrictions on the freedom of citizenship must disappear, and there is no reason why the legal profession should be the last to recognize the inevitable.” The Baltimore American also backed Wilson's efforts.

On February 14, 1885, Wilson's attorney, Alexander H. Hobbs, appeared before the Supreme Bench of Baltimore to argue the case. Hobbs' arguments in favor of his client's admission revealed the stakes. He contended that the Maryland law excluding African Americans from the Maryland Bar violated the Fourteenth Amendment. Specifically, Hobbs cited the first section of the amendment which read, in part, “no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” As the amendments placed the races on an equal footing, Hobbs maintained, blacks could not be excluded from liberties that whites enjoyed and he further pointed out that states could not pass laws in conflict with federal policy.

In many ways, the stakes in the Wilson's case matched those in the steamer Sue trial. On the one hand, Wilson's suit could serve as a test case to determine whether the courts offered a viable vehicle to shape city race relations. Already, the Sue case demonstrated that direct action through the courts at least held the potential to affect legal change quickly and more efficiently than political agitation. If the judges decided that state laws could not discriminate against blacks because of the protections laid forth in the Fourteenth Amendment, black radicals could then begin to chip away at other social injustices. If African Americans could gain admission to the bar, black activists would also have the benefit of having attorneys dedicated to fighting inequality in future actions.

On March 19, 1885, the court announced their verdict and citing numerous precedents sided with Wilson. The decision read, in part, that “To deter any class of citizens from its membership is not only to prevent their engaging in a lawful calling, but, in the language of the Supreme Court, tends to degrade and stigmatize the whole class by depriving them of a privilege which all other citizens possess and of the equal protection of the law.” The Baltimore Sun immediately celebrated the
verdict in an editorial published the next day as “in keeping with the progressive sentiment of the age.” For black radicals, the verdict in the Wilson case was a heartening victory and served to validate their strategy of attacking inequalities through the legal system. Legal action provided a more direct avenue where activists could more easily control the process of reform. Rather than appealing to white politicians who often brushed aside their concerns, disregarded the black community, or simply pandered to African Americans for votes, these activists could spearhead efforts to obtain equality.39

As 1885 ended, black protest had clearly moved in new directions. Although many African Americans in Baltimore continued investing hope in the political process and the Republican Party, radicals focused their efforts on a new path. The steamer Sue trial and Charles S. Wilson’s suit pointed black activists in the direction they would follow through the remainder of the 1880s and early 1890s. Both, in varying degrees, revealed the potential in pursuing equality through the legal system. With these two victories, Baltimore’s reformers intended to capitalize on that momentum to ensure African Americans a chance of a fair hearing.

On the afternoon of June 2, 1885, Harvey Johnson called upon four of his fellow clergymen (and veterans of civil rights agitation in the city), William M. Alexander, P.H.A. Braxton, J.C. Allen, and W.C. Lawson to meet at his home. By the end of the evening the men had formed the United Mutual Brotherhood of Liberty, formulated a constitution, and devised a strategy to expand the rights of African Americans and ensure that the legacy of Reconstruction would not be one of failure. Given its members’ backgrounds in the church, it is not surprising that the Brotherhood of Liberty combined a Christian vision of justice with the ideals of the United States. In the preamble of their constitution, they proclaimed that, “It is a Scriptural truth that God has made of one blood all nations of men” and then added “it is equally true, according to the Declaration of American Independence, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.” But it was the steamer Sue and Wilson cases that gave black radicals the momentum to try and effect further changes. “The favorable termination of these important cases,” William M. Alexander later wrote, “prompted and hastened the organization of the Brotherhood of Liberty, as the most effective medium through which the laws in Maryland and other States repugnant to the interests of the colored people could be most speedily expunged.” Despite its short existence, 1885–1901, formation of the Brotherhood was a pivotal moment in the history of black activism in Baltimore and throughout the United States. Although the organization’s founding did not even register a mention in the Baltimore Sun, its influence resonated for the next two decades.40
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Helen Keller, with wounded Maryland soldier George Calvert at Evergreen, home of the Red Cross Institute for the Blind, 1918-1920. (Detail, Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP148.46.)
The Maryland Military Homefront during World War I

DEBORAH L. HARNER

As cultural institutions around the world commemorate the centennial of the Great War, the Maryland Historical Society prepares for a new museum exhibit on the arrival of the \textit{Deutschland}, a German merchant submarine that visited Baltimore in July 1916 as the war raged in Europe. Although the United States remained neutral during that long-ago summer, the country did depend on specialized items such as German high-quality concentrated dye. The submarine docked in the harbor unloaded tons of rubber, nickel, and dyestuffs as Maryland citizens and businesses mobilized the area’s strong industrial base to support European wartime efforts. The federal government considered Baltimore strategically important based on the waterways, railways, and location to Washington D.C. Private companies such as Bethlehem Steel, Baltimore Drydock and Shipbuilding, and Maryland Shipbuilding Company expanded their operations. Almost a year after the \textit{Deutschland} visit, the United States declared war on Germany on April 6, 1917. War efforts quickly extended into the counties and Camp Meade of Anne Arundel County, Aberdeen Proving Ground and Edgewood Arsenal in Harford County, a gunpowder plant in Cecil County, and an airplane plant in Hagerstown all opened within the year. Sixty-two thousand Maryland men served in the military, almost half of whom participated in the Selective Service program.

This photo essay commemorates the war efforts of Marylanders who served both in Europe and on the Maryland homefront. All photographs are part of the Maryland Historical Society library collections and are available to the public.

*for more on the \textit{Deutschland}'s visit to Baltimore, see John Emond and Robert Pratt, “War comes to Baltimore: the Voyage of the Deutschland,” \textit{MdHS News} (Spring 2016): 6–11. Mr. Emond and Mr. Pratt are members of the Maryland Historical Society’s Maritime Committee and contributors to the upcoming exhibit.*
Camp Meade

In 1917, Camp Meade in Anne Arundel County was created by an Act of Congress as a training site for infantry and battalions. It also housed a depot brigade and a remount station. More than 400,000 soldiers and 22,000 horses and mules received training at Camp Meade during World War I. The most famous troop was the 313th Infantry Regiment, known also as “Baltimore’s Own” because of the large number of men from the city. The 313th was part of American Expeditionary Force (AEF) and saw action in France during the Meuse-Argonne offensive, September to November 1918. The AEF remained in Europe after the armistice to maintain the terms of the agreement, returning to the States in June 1919. Twelve hundred

“When the 313th arrived” (GPVF Forts – Camp Meade Miscellaneous Collection, ca. 1917-1918.)
soldiers of the 313th were wounded in battle and seventy-eight men eventually succumbed to their injuries. (Two hundred twenty-three soldiers died on the battlefield.) Battle injuries were not the only threat to soldiers’ lives. Typhoid fever was also a serious illness for soldiers battling in trenches with poor sanitary conditions. In 1909, American soldiers could receive voluntary typhoid inoculation. By 1911, the armed forces mandated that American soldiers receive the vaccination to prevent illness and possibly death. The 313th received vaccinations before leaving for Europe.
**Camp Holabird**

Camp Holabird in southeast Baltimore was founded in 1917 as the first motor transport training center and depot for the US Army. Soldiers received initial training at Camp Holabird, but the camp’s major purpose was to receive, repair, store, and prep all vehicles going overseas, including those used by the American Expeditionary Force in France. Most of the buildings were razed after the war ended, but the War Department used the campus for vehicle repair, transport, and testing, a Quartermaster Training School, and after WWII, a Counter Intelligence Center.

*WWI Infantry at Fort Holabird.* (Baltimore City Life Collection, MC6392.)
U.S. Army General Hospital #2

In 1917, Fort McHenry, the site of the famous Battle of Baltimore during the War of 1812, took a new role as U.S. Army General Hospital #2, the largest receiving hospital in the United States. Specially equipped and staffed to receive newly injured soldiers in need of an initial diagnosis or treatment, the site held over 100 buildings, 3,000 beds, and a staff of 900 men and women who served as doctors, nurses, medical corpsmen, and aides. Twenty thousand wounded or sick soldiers were treated at U.S. Army General Hospital #2 during World War I.

Civilian doctors and nurses from local hospitals also worked at the hospital which eventually shifted its focus from a receiving hospital to a surgical one, leading to major medical advances in neurosurgery and plastic surgery. A new rehabilitation program taught wounded veterans skills that helped them after their medical release. This is one the first rehabilitation programs created for wounded American veterans and included classes on metal work, carpentry, short-hand, and typing.

Some of the following photographs were taken by Eugene McFee, a staff photographer for the Baltimore American before WWI. He joined the army in 1919 and served as an x-ray technician at U.S. General Hospital #2. His photographs depict soldiers returning from the battle front and recovering from wounds and illnesses, as well as staff members helping soldiers with their rehab. The last soldiers to be released from medical care at the hospital at Fort McHenry occurred in 1923. The buildings that consisted of U.S. General Hospital #2 were torn down in 1927.

Assembly outside the historic section of Fort McHenry in U.S. Army General Hospital #2. (PP32.554 McFee Collection)
Military exercises at U.S. Army General Hospital #2 outside Fort McHenry.
(PP32.559 McFee Collection.)
Soldiers weaving baskets with a nurse at U.S. Army General Hospital #2.
(PP32.576 McFee Collection.)
Group portrait inside a hospital ward at U.S. Army General Hospital #2
(PP32.521 McFee Collection.)
Soldiers gambling with cold hard cash during some downtime at U.S. Army General Hospital #2. (PP32.579 McFee Collection.)

Nurses posed for a group portrait in U.S. Army General Hospital #2. (PP32.592 McFee Collection.)
Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind

The Red Cross Institute for the Blind was established in 1917 to help soldiers who lost their vision during the war. Mrs. T. Harrison Garrett loaned “Evergreen Jr.” to the government for the Institute, and neighboring land was used from the Kernwood estate. More buildings were constructed for classrooms, activities, and barracks. Soldiers learned new skills such as typing, Braille, massage, and bookbinding. They also participated in recreational activities such as music and dancing and received famous visitors, including General Pershing and Helen Keller. The institute closed in 1925 with Evergreen Jr. returning to the Garrett family. Most of the buildings were razed or used by Loyola College (now Loyola University) in the 1920s.

Mrs. T. H. Garrett loaned Evergreen Jr. to the government to use as a facility to help veterans who were blinded during their military missions. (Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP148.2.)
Veterans and their guests enjoyed the garden at Evergreen as part of their rehabilitation. (Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP1483.)
Men practiced their typing skills in class. (Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP148.18.)
Veterans learned weaving skills to make or repair baskets, hammocks, and chairs. (Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP148.20.)

Men took woodworking classes in the on-site workshop. (Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP148.24.)
Above: Men built an addition to the Evergreen campus.
(Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP 148.27.)

Below: Veterans also learned a variety of farming skills, including poultry-raising.
(Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP148.35.)
Wounded soldier, George Calvert, was accompanied by Helen Keller, Polly Thompson, Anne Sullivan Macy, Col. Bordley, and Charles Campbell for a walk on the Evergreen campus.
(Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP148.46.)
Above: General Pershing visited the Institute and addressed students and staff of the Institute. (Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, PP.148.48.)

Below: Men participated in anatomy classes as part of the curriculum to enable them to become massage therapists. (Evergreen Red Cross Institute for the Blind, P.148.52.)
With this first issue of volume 111, we bring back a staff favorite, John Gilman Darcy Paul’s charming recollection of Montebello. We first discovered this lyrical gem in 2003–2004 as we geared up for the one hundredth anniversary of this grand old journal. The Publications Committee worked through every volume looking for the articles that best represented Maryland history and the history of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*. This article first appeared in volume 42 (1947). The following biographical note is taken from the commentary that accompanied this piece in the Centennial Edition, volume 100 (2005): 428–433.

“John Gilman Darcy Paul (1887–1972) grew up at Woodlands, a country estate in Waverly just north of Baltimore—a child’s walking distance from Montebello. Descended from founding families of New England and the Chesapeake, he attended local primary schools and then moved on to Harvard. Paul returned home and enrolled at the Johns Hopkins University where he studied literature and languages. His post-university career included a position on the editorial staff of the Baltimore Sun (where his desk sat next to H. L. Mencken’s), attaché to the American legation in Guatemala, and later as private secretary to the American Minister of Buenos Aires, John Work Garrett, grandson and namesake of the former Baltimore and Ohio Railroad president. During World War I, the American Embassy called him to Paris. Afterward, Paul devoted his time to writing local history and to supporting the area’s cultural institutions. The memorials and tributes written after his death enumerate scores of causes to which he contributed his time, talent, and financial support. He wrote, in 1948, that “since settling down in Baltimore . . . I now find, with some surprise, that I am President of the Board of Trustees of the Baltimore Museum of Art, trustee of the Johns Hopkins University . . . trustee of the Peabody Institute, vice-president of the Maryland Historical Society, etc., etc. . . .” Paul’s lyrical prose entices the reader into the story in much the same way that Montebello’s fanciful aura lured that curious young explorer over its threshold. The tale, from the pen of one well-schooled in literature and languages, is told with confidence and an unabashed love of the subject.”
Montebello: Home of General Samuel Smith

J. GILMAN D. PAUL

One day recently there appeared in the Maryland Historical Society the portrait of a beautiful white house. It was fading into the limbo that awaits all old photographs, but the festive, composed symmetry of the building, brought out against a background of great trees, still projected itself powerfully from the frame. You could call it a villa, in the full European sense of the word; but there was something about the unruly texture of the surrounding foliage, the look of the summery furniture in the porches, that made you realize this was a charming exile in the American wilderness.

To at least one person who saw it that day, the picture brought across the years a sense of something more than familiar. It was the neatness, the whiteness, the warmly inhabited look that threw him off the track for a moment and kept him from realizing at once that this was none other than the mysterious deserted house in “Garrett’s Woods,” close to his home, that he had known from his earliest years. “Montebello” it was called. Its stucco walls, at that time, were streaked with huge weather stains, its windows were like dead eyes; but in spite of this the old house had a dauntless gayety, proclaiming its courage and high breeding in language that even a child could understand. In spite of half-hearted efforts to keep them boarded up, the doors usually stood open to any chance trespasser, and so this small boy grew to know every inch of the echoing interior, by day and by night. In the shadows of what had been a stately dining room, he deeply relished the oval sweep of the walls; or, stepping out through a shattered window to the roof of the living room, he shared with a thousand noisy bumble bees the flowers of a great white wisteria that was methodically wrecking the delicate wooden railing. Looking out through the tangle of the vine, he could see the distant city of Baltimore, already advancing in a relentless tide of two-story houses that was soon to overwhelm the site of the old house and its majestic company of white oaks.

These reflections, personal and sentimental as they are, might seem to have no place here; but as often happens, the enthusiasms one fancies to be one’s private property are the familiar companions of many others. So it was with Montebello. It emerged, in conversation, that there still live old ladies who had driven out to the house with their parents to call “while the Garretts lived there”—the epoch when the photograph was taken—and are ready and willing to tell what they remember of it.
Others, more numerous, got to know it when, as students at Bryn Mawr School, they went out from town to play basket ball near the old stone stables that served for a time as gymnasium. Amateur snapshots emerged from hiding; scraps of woodwork piously salvaged from the wreckers unexpectedly appeared. A number of persons, thinking of Montebello as the loveliest old house in Maryland, commended it to the attention of the new-born Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities and were shocked to learn it had been destroyed thirty years ago. In view, therefore, of this unexpectedly lively interest it seems fitting to pay a salute to the old house before the photograph has wholly faded and while there remains a small group of people who remember it with affection.

In that stirring period just after the Revolution, Samuel Smith, builder of Montebello, stands out as easily the most engaging and powerful figure in the Maryland scene. Like so many of the men who helped forge Baltimore's financial and commercial might at the turn of the century, he was of Scotch-Irish ancestry; unlike many of them, however, he peered eagerly beyond the walls of his wealthy father's counting house at the greater world abroad, and in 1772, a young man of 20, set out on three wanderjahre in Europe which were to have a deep influence on his life. Returning home just before the outbreak of war with England, he plunged joyously into the conflict, acquitting himself brilliantly, winning the rank of Brigadier-General and forming a taste for military life which was to stand his fellow citizens in good stead on occasions to come. Even before the war was over his immense vitality, turning here and there for outlets, led him deep into the complexities of national politics and land speculation, while at the same time he set about the business of founding a family by marrying Margaret Spear of Baltimore in 1778. So prosperous were his affairs by 1792 (he was then an incorporator of the Bank of Maryland and a dominant figure in the State's iron industry) that we find him laying plans for building town and country residences in the best taste of his time. Parcel after parcel of land was acquired on the high ground north of the city, where the City College now stands, and the County Assessment records of 1799 state that "on this [General Smith's] property is the beginning of a most elegant brick dwelling house." “Black Heath” was the name then borne by this estate of 473 acres. Tradition has it that the General, a great admirer of French military prowess, rechristened it in honor of Marshal Lannes’s victory over the Austrians at Montebello in 1800.

In a scholarly essay published in the Architectural Review of November, 1909, Mr. Laurence Hall Fowler lays every subsequent student of Montebello under deep obligation. In it he calls attention to the fact that Homewood, Charles Carroll’s famous house, was probably under construction before Montebello was finished, and that “the resemblance between the detail of Montebellow [sic] and that of Homewood, not only in the scale and character of the moldings, but even in the design of individual features, is very close—indeed, much closer than can be entirely explained by
the fact that they were contemporaries. It seems almost certain that the same men must have executed the work at both places.” In this regard, however, contemporary documents do not help us out of the realm of conjecture. We now know, from the correspondence of Charles Carroll of Carrollton with his son, that Homewood was built by a man named Edwards after designs by Charles Carroll the younger. We also learn from Griffith’s *Annals of Baltimore* that General Smith’s town house on Water Street was built in 1796 “on a plan furnished by himself and executed by Messrs. John Scroggs, Robert Steuart and James Mosher, builders.” It would seem likely that the same firm was employed on the building of Montebello, started only three years later. The theory that General Smith was his own architect finds support in the daring and original character of the man, who did not hesitate to depart from the accepted contemporary type of country house with a central building connected by one-story passages to lower wings on each side, as exemplified by Hampton, Belvedere, and Homewood.

In this connection, a most interesting bit of research is contributed by Mr. Fowler, who notes that “at Strabane, Ireland, the birthplace of General Smith’s father, there is a villa which, as shown in an old 18th century architectural book now in the library of the Maryland Historical Society, quite decidedly resembles Montebello—certainly a striking coincidence, if nothing more.”

About 1800, then, we find General Smith, his wife (“a beautiful and imperious woman”) and their many children installed at Montebello, which William Wirt must surely have had in mind when he described the country homes of that neighborhood. “The sites of the houses are well selected,” he wrote, “always upon some eminence, embosomed among beautiful trees, from which their white fronts peep out enchantingly; for the houses are all white, which adds much to the cheerfulness and grace of this unrivalled scenery.” A glance at the accompanying illustrations shows that Montebello was not a bumptious house. The detail, inside and out, was most delicate and knowingly used; there are none of the devices commonly employed to impress the visitor. Instead, the designer depended for his effects on subtle touches such as the harmonious relation of the rounded ends of the high rear part of the house to the reentrant curves by which the porches flank the one-story front section. Perhaps the most interesting room was the oval dining room, constructed with a reckless expenditure of masonry, which, according to Mr. Fowler, was more elaborately finished than the others, with French furniture of exceptional workmanship, a fine marble mantelpiece from Italy, and on the walls two handsome portraits of the General and his wife by Gilbert Stuart. All these well-thought-out details were not lost on the distinguished visitors from Europe who were entertained there as General Smith became more and more deeply involved in National and State affairs. The chronicle of his occupancy of Montebello is a happy and interesting one. As years and honors were laid on him, he seems to have made a truce with the forces of mental and physical
disintegration, for at the age of eighty-three, he was called by the despairing citizens of Baltimore to suppress the great Bank Riot of 1835. Shortly after this he was elected Mayor of the City, holding this office almost until his death, in 1839.

The General’s son, John Spear Smith, first President of the Maryland Historical Society, now took over at Montebello, sharing it with his mother until her death in 1842. Of his affection for it we get some reflection in a letter written in May, 1839, to his daughter Mary: “It is hard to be kept in town this beautiful weather, and that too when Montebello is in all its glory—strawberries ripening, flowers in bloom, the lawns fresh mowed.” However, the estate was soon to be sold to the Tiffany family, of whose occupancy few memories seem to have survived. Toward the end of the Tiffany regime a portentous figure appeared on the scene in the shape of John W. Garrett, president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, who built himself a country home on a higher, more dominating ridge north of Montebello. Mr. Garrett was a close friend of Johns Hopkins, whose home, Clifton, lay nearby, east of the Harford Road. It is known that the two men discussed intimately the plans for the University that Mr. Hopkins was to found, and it is not unlikely that the purchases of land made by Mr. Garrett at this time had some relation to these plans. Among the tracts assembled in this huge acreage was Montebello, which stood for years untenanted until it came to life for a short time as the summer home of Mr. Garrett’s son, T. Harrison Garrett, before he moved to Evergreen on Charles Street Avenue.

Montebello was never again occupied as a home. After the elder Mr. Garrett’s death, his landholdings were divided among various heirs, the white villa falling to the share of his daughter, Miss Mary Garrett, well known as a pioneer in the struggle for equal rights for women. Miss Garrett was a close friend of the President of Bryn Mawr College, the redoubtable Miss M. Carey Thomas, and we are fortunate in having the record of a visit paid by these two ladies to Montebello—a visit fraught with disastrous consequences for the old house.

The story is told by Mr. J. Alexis Shriver, a former officer of the Maryland Historical Society, which owes much to his abounding energy and tireless spirit of research. Mr. Shriver in 1907 was deeply interested as purchasing agent in a projected electric railroad from Baltimore to the Susquehanna, the right of way of which would pass directly through the Montebello estate. After some correspondence Mr. Shriver was informed by the owner, Miss Mary Garrett, that she wished to see for herself the course of the proposed railroad, and that she would meet him at Montebello on such and such a day, accompanied by Miss Thomas. Mr. Shriver, who drove out from Baltimore in a closed carriage, was at the place of rendezvous well ahead of the two ladies, who finally appeared in a victoria, wide open to the summer air.

After discussing the matter of the right of way at great length, their attention turned to Montebello, beautiful even in the last stages of dilapidation, and they gingerly entered it through the shattered front door. As they passed from room to room, avoiding fallen plaster and holes in the floor, Miss Thomas was moved to
increasingly vigorous expressions of distaste, based rather on fear that Miss Garrett might become liable for damage suits than on regret for the sad condition of an architectural masterpiece. The appearance of some coarse graffiti scrawled by boys on the living room wall brought matters to a head, and Miss Thomas declared with finality, “Mary, this house must be pulled down.”

“Yes, Carey dear, I think you are right,” replied Miss Garrett, and orders for the wrecking were given then and there to the Irish overseer who was going along with the party. Mr. Shriver tried to stand between the old house and destiny, but to no avail. Seeing the cause was lost, he pointed out that much of the delicate woodwork was still intact and should be preserved for study, to which Miss Thomas crisply replied that anything worth salvaging would be sent to Bryn Mawr. As they came out of the doomed house, it became evident that an afternoon thunderstorm was about to pounce. There was a rapid issuance of orders by Miss Thomas, and the last Mr. Shriver saw of the two ladies they were heading for Baltimore in his closed carriage, leaving him to meet the storm in the victoria. To Baltimore’s everlasting architectural loss, the orders for wrecking Montebello were carried out shortly after this visit, and the house was leveled a few years before the property, as a whole, was sold for real estate development. What a moral can be drawn from this in favor of the new Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities! The woodwork minus the mantels, which had all been removed (or stolen) was not sent to Bryn Mawr, but was stored in an old greenhouse nearby, where it was destroyed by fire. Of Montebello, nothing tangible survives save a few scraps of woodwork in the collection of the Baltimore Museum of Art, and in private hands.
Books in Brief

Bob Arnebeck’s *Slave Labor in the Capital: Building Washington’s Iconic Federal Landmarks* examines the experiences of slave laborers during the founding of the nation’s capital. Arnebeck describes the work conditions and daily lives of the slave laborers in an attempt to remember those often forgotten nameless men, women and children held in bondage.

The History Press, $19.99

Edward G. Longacre’s *The Early Morning of War: Bull Run, 1861* is a thorough study of the first major battle of the American Civil War. While Longacre examines the military aspects, his interpretation also includes new thoughts on the battle’s political and social significance throughout the Civil War.

University of Oklahoma’s Press, $29.95

*The C & O Canal Companion: A Journey through Potomac History* by Mike High is now available in a second edition featuring updated maps and lodging information in the C & O Canal National Park. This guide offers history buffs and outdoor adventurers of all levels advice on the best ways to enjoy the park, its history, and its natural wonders.

Johns Hopkins University Press, $24.95

*Travels through American History in the Mid-Atlantic: A Guide for All Ages* by Charles W. Mitchell blends current travel experiences with primary source research concerning significant events and the people involved to create a unique travel guide.

Johns Hopkins University Press, $24.95

*Knights of the Razor: Black Barbers in Slavery and Freedom* discusses the unique role of African American barbers dating from the American Revolution to World War I. This social history examines the creation of the barber shop, racism in the relationships between black barbers and their white clients, and the leadership roles that successful barbers filled in their communities.

Johns Hopkins University Press, $24.95

*The Middle Atlantic League, 1925-1952: A Baseball History* by William E. Akin examines minor league baseball in small industrial towns from Pennsylvania to Ohio. Class C baseball thrived during the first half of the twentieth century, peaking during the Great Depression and slowly dying during the post-WWII years.

MacFarland & Company, Inc., $35.00
Lincoln’s Autocrat: The Life of Edwin Stanton by William Marvel re-evaluates one of the most powerful men in a turbulent era in American history – the Civil War and Reconstruction. This biography examines Stanton’s policies and his use of power as Secretary of War.

University of North Carolina Press, $35.00

Jacksonland: President Andrew Jackson, Cherokee Chief John Ross and a Great American Land Grab by Steve Inskeep examines the American seizure of native lands in the south. He follows the story of two powerful men: the Cherokee chief who challenged the American president and fought a legal battle all the way to the Supreme Court and the American president who seized land.

Penguin Press, $29.95

Sean Condon’s Shays’s Rebellion: Authority and Distress in Post-Revolutionary America explains the hardships that led Massachusetts farmers to rebellion by examining political and economic challenges that the newly created state of Massachusetts faced shortly after the American Revolution.

Johns Hopkins University Press, $19.95

Fierce Patriot: The Tangled Lives of William Tecumseh Sherman by Robert L. O’Connell is a comprehensive biography of an extremely complicated larger-than-life man. O’Connell structures the book so the reader can easily maneuver through the many stories of Sherman the soldier, Sherman the embodiment of Manifest Destiny, and Sherman the man.

Random House, $18.00

The Civilian War: Confederate Women and Union Soldiers during Sherman’s March by Lisa Tendrich Frank examines the effects of the destruction and chaos that Union troops impressed on Southern women during Sherman’s famous, or infamous, march through the South. Tendrich argues that while the intended effect was to intimidate powerful women in the slaveholding south, in reality Southern women resented Union troops for what they deemed inappropriate and unnecessary destruction of personal property.

Louisiana State University Press, $42.50

The Papers of James Madison, Presidential Series, Volume 8, July 1814-18 February 1815, edited by Angela Kreider, J. C. A. Stagg, Mary Parke Johnson, Anne Mandeville Colony, and Katharine E. Harbury, contains transcripts of some of the most important correspondence of Madison’s presidential career when the British in the Chesapeake Bay region slowly encroached on the nation’s capitol during the War of 1812.

University of Virginia Press. $85.00
Maryland History Bibliography, 2015: A Selected List

ANNE S. K. TURKOS and ELIZABETH CARINGOLA, Compilers

From 1975 on, the Maryland Historical Magazine has published regular compilations of books, articles, and doctoral dissertations relating to Maryland history. The following list includes materials published during 2015, as well as earlier works that have been brought to our attention.

Bibliographers must live with the fact that their work is never finished. Please notify us of any significant omissions so that they may be included in the next list. Send additional items to: Anne S. K. Turkos, University Archives, 2208 Hornbake Library, University of Maryland, College Park, Md. 20742.

Previous years’ installments of the Maryland History Bibliography, and the full version of this year’s, are available online. Please visit http://www.lib.umd.edu/dcr/collections/mdhc/ for more information about this database and to search for older titles on Maryland history and culture.

GENERAL


AFRICAN AMERICAN


“Spy, Nurse, Cook, Commander.” American History, 50 (June 2015): 8. [Harriet Tubman]


Wagers, Kelley. “‘How Come You Ain’t Got It?: Dislocation as Historical Act in Hurston’s Documentary Texts.” African American Review, 46 (Summer-Fall 2013): 201-16.


AGRICULTURE


**ARCHAEOLOGY**


**ARCHITECTURE AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION**


“Saving History.” *Early American Life,* 46 (August 2015): 58-59. [home of Jonas and Anne Catherine Green in Annapolis]


**BIOGRAPHY, AUTOBIOGRAPHY, AND REMINISCENCES**


Middleton, Arthur Pierce and Henry M. Miller. “‘Mr. Secretary’: John Lewgar, St. John’s Freehold, and Early Maryland.” *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 110 (Spring 2015): 49-81.


[John Wilkes Booth]


[ Mendes Cohen]


COUNTY AND LOCAL HISTORY


Butler, Christopher N. *Historic Frederick County: The Story of Frederick & Frederick County*. San Antonio, TX: Historical Society of Frederick County/HPNbooks, 2015.


_ Shoreline_, 22 (July 2015): 8-12.
Ports, Michael A. *Baltimore County, Maryland, Marriage Licenses: November 2, 1846 to November 29, 1851*. Baltimore: Clearfield, 2015.

Ports, Michael A. *Baltimore County, Maryland, Marriage Licenses: May 2, 1832 to September 14, 1839*. Baltimore: Clearfield, 2015.

Ports, Michael A. *Baltimore County, Maryland, Marriage Licenses: September 14, 1839 to October 31, 1846*. Baltimore: Clearfield, 2015.


Whetzel, Dan. *Allegany County, Maryland: A Pictorial Sports History, the Early Years to the 1930s*. n.p.: n.p., 2015.


**ECONOMIC, BUSINESS, AND LABOR**


Cofield, Rod. “Inn, Tavern or Ordinary?” *Chronicles of St. Mary’s*, (Summer 2015): 26-27.


Lutz, Paulette. “Clark’s Hardware Celebrates 170th Anniversary of Service to Howard County.” *The Legacy*, 52 (Summer 2015): 1, 7.


**EDUCATION**


ENVIRONMENT

Kalb, David M. “Sika deer introduction, population genetics, and their competition with white-tailed deer.” Ph.D. diss., University of Delaware, 2015.

Lazarus, Rebecca Saul. “Contaminant exposure, food web transfer and potential effects on ospreys (*Pandion haliaetus*) in Chesapeake Bay.” Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, College Park, 2015.


Livie, Kate. “*Chesapeake Swan Song Exhibition Opens April 11, 2015*.” *Chesapeake Log*, (Spring/Summer 2015): 5-6.


**FINE AND DECORATIVE ARTS**


Manca, Joseph. “‘C. Peale Painted This in London in 1768.’” *American Art*, 29 (Fall 2015): 90-103.


**GEOGRAPHY AND CARTOGRAPHY**


**HISTORICAL ORGANIZATIONS, LIBRARIES, REFERENCE WORKS**


**INTELLECTUAL LIFE, LITERATURE, AND PUBLISHING**


**MARITIME**

Cooper, Dick. “A Little Boat with a Big Name and a Bright Future.” *Chesapeake Log*, (Fall 2015): 19-21.


MEDICINE


**MILITARY**


Hall, Mary T. “‘Tat They Cause Constant Watch and War’: The Utilization of the Militia in the Maryland Palatinate from 1634-1646.” *Chronicles of St. Mary’s*, (2014): 3-10.


Knott, Steven W. “Lee at Antietam: Strategic Imperatives, the Tyranny of Arithmetic, and a Trap not Sprung.” *Army History*, 95 (Spring 2015): 32-40.


**MUSIC AND THEATER**


Valdez, Jessica R. “‘This is our city’: Realism and the sentimentality of place in David Simon’s ‘The Wire’.” *European Journal of American Culture*, 34 (September 2015): 193-209.

**NATIVE AMERICANS**


**POLITICS AND LAW**


---

**RELIGION**


Riordan, Timothy B. “‘To Excite the Devotion of the Catholics’: The Use and Meaning of Catholic Religious Medals in the Colonial Period.” *Historical Archaeology*, 49 (no. 4, 2015): 71-86.


---

**SOCIETY, SOCIAL CHANGE, AND POPULAR CULTURE**


TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION


Hesser, Phillip. “All Aboard for Fox Creek—The Early Years.” Shoreline, 22 (July 2015): 4-7.


**WOMEN**


Joseph L. Arnold Prize
for
Outstanding Writing on Baltimore’s History in 2016
Submission Deadline:
February 16, 2017

Thanks to the generosity of the Byrnes Family In Memory of Joseph R. and Anne S. Byrnes the Baltimore City Historical Society presents an annual Joseph L. Arnold Prize for Outstanding Writing on Baltimore’s History, in the amount of $500.

Joseph L. Arnold, Professor of History at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, died in 2004, at the age of sixty-six. He was a vital and enormously important member of the UMBC faculty for some three and a half decades as well as a leading historian of urban and planning history. He also played an active and often leading role with a variety of private and public historical institutions in the Baltimore area and at his death was hailed as the "dean of Baltimore historians."

Entries should be unpublished manuscripts between 15 and 45 double-spaced pages in length (including footnotes/endnotes). To submit an entry address a new e-mail message to:

- baltimorehistory@law.umaryland.edu
- attach the entry as a document in either MS Word or PC convertible format.
- illustrations must be included within the main document.

There will be a “blind judging” of entries by a panel of historians. Criteria for selection are: significance, originality, quality of research and clarity of presentation. The winner will be announced in Spring 2017. The BCHS reserves the right to not to award the prize. The winning entry will be posted to the BCHS webpage and considered for publication in the Maryland Historical Magazine.

For further information send a message to baltimorehistory@law.umaryland.edu or call Garrett Power @ 410-706-7661.