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Enlightened Marylanders: Scientific Interests of pre-Revolutionary Times

ELAINE G. BRESLAW

Experimental science and material phenomena were major concerns of eighteenth-century people, part of the great intellectual revolution of that era that upset so many of the traditional assumptions about man and the universe. The new scientific interest was partly a result of Isaac Newton’s seventeenth-century discoveries, popularizing the idea that humans could actually comprehend the workings of the universe. The world need not be mysterious and unknowable any longer, the assumption being that nature moved according to predictable laws that could be discovered through an inductive method. The resulting knowledge, as thoughtful people knew, would not only aid in understanding the universe but could be used to slay the dragons of superstition and ignorance. New discoveries would improve life while promoting human happiness, the major concern of that era. In the years before the Revolution, educated Marylanders did not ignore the dictates of those beliefs and they too were caught up in the desire to understand their natural environment, improve on it, and contribute to the world’s knowledge.¹

Early curiosity about the natural world prompted attempts to collect and classify all plants and animals in the known world. Individual phenomena were listed in the hopes of discovering the eternal principles. The very variety and newness of America’s natural wonders encouraged Americans to contribute to this scientific knowledge. By the mid-eighteenth century an Anglo-American community dedicated to natural history was in existence and formed the nucleus of a mostly amateur scientific community in America. Lord Baltimore’s colonists were also caught up in that eighteenth-century passion to understand natural phenomena. They too contributed to the knowledge of the new kinds of flora and fauna. It was to Henry Callister of Maryland’s Eastern Shore, “a vast multitude of curiosities,” that could entertain the world with its newness.²

The story of the collection of those natural wonders in Maryland begins in the late seventeenth century. The Reverend Hugh Jones had been appointed to a vacant Maryland parish through the efforts of the English natural history circle that wanted to find a sinecure for a naturalist of their own ilk in that part of the world. Their choice was a fortunate one and in 1697 Jones made his first two contributions of the unique

The author is a retired professor of history from Morgan State University and the University of Tennessee (Knoxville). Her most recent publication is Lotions, Potions, Pills, and Magic: Health Care in Early America (New York: New York University Press, 2012).
insects and plants to the Royal Society. At about the same time, William Vernon, an Englishman, and David Krieg, a German physician, travelled to Maryland to satisfy their curiosity firsthand about the botanical wonders of this part of the world. After living in the colony for several years they returned to Europe with a collection of several hundred previously unknown plants. Their discoveries did not go unnoticed by the local population and others took up their own collections.

Upper-class Maryland society included several of Peter Collinson’s American correspondents and disciples. Collinson, an English Quaker merchant, had been instrumental in stimulating the interest of Americans in collecting species for the purpose of classifying them. As early as 1720 Collinson had his contacts in Maryland send him examples of local plants and animals that they knew were unknown to the Old World. Richard Lewis, a poet and teacher in an Annapolis school with eclectic scientific interests, sent Collinson specimens of local insects together with a detailed description of their nests. The larger scientific community recognized Lewis’ scientific observations, and his essays on birds later appeared in the Transactions of the Royal Society in London. Among Collinson’s other southern correspondents was the Eastern Shore matron Mrs. Henrietta Maria (Tilghman) Robins Goldsboro of Talbot County. From 1720 until 1754, first as Mrs. Robins and then as Mrs. Goldsboro, she kept Collinson informed of the wonders and disasters of the natural world in Maryland. She sent him seeds of the yucca plant and a hummingbird with unusual red feathers that she thought would “entertain” him. He was delighted both by the fact that the bird survived the passage and the “singularity of the Red Feathers [that] has not been observed before.” Collinson in return sent her European roots and bulbs for planting to see if they flourished in the New World soil.

Other Marylanders worked independently to publish significant works on natural history. Henry Callister, the Eastern Shore merchant who arrived from England in 1752, impressed by the “Vermin of various sorts and sizes,” in

**Thomas Gilpin (1728–1778) lived near the head of the Chester River where his studies of crop destruction led to publication of the first work identifying American locusts. (Maryland Gazette, February 23, 1759.)**
his new home, collected and transported those specimens. His observations of local birds resulted in the publication of a work on the swallows of Talbot County. He also exchanged a steady stream of seeds with his English correspondents along with advice on how to preserve them for shipping. “They must be well dried,” he wrote. On the other hand, when his brother prepared to send Henry specimens of field daisies, lilies, and blue bells among others, none of which was native to Maryland, the roots, he advised, had to be preserved in a box of mold. Callister, to his friends a “Botanist, Florist, Philosopher, Musician, etc,” also wrote two long articles on insects for the Maryland Gazette, probably the earliest entries on entomology to appear in print in America.  

Thomas Gilpin, son of a wealthy Quaker family of the lower counties, settled at the head of the Chester River in Maryland where he began his “philosophical” studies — observations that resulted in a history of the American locust in which he differentiated other varieties from the annual. In addition he attempted to aid the developing wheat industry by experimenting with methods of destroying the eggs of the wheat fly. His early observations on the nature of that pest led him to describe it as similar to the cyclical locust, opening new avenues of experimentation and insect control. Gilpin sent reports on his work to the Maryland legislature, printed handbills, and presented papers to the Philosophical Society in Philadelphia.

At about the same time that Gilpin was studying insect pests, Benjamin Banneker was observing the lesser-known seventeen-year locust. He remembered the first year that locusts appeared in his rural Baltimore community in 1749, when he was seventeen years old, and then noted that they reappeared in 1766 and again in 1783. At that point he predicted another appearance in 1800 (after seventeen years). He described their life cycle in his hand-written journal commenting that the female perforated branches of trees to lay her eggs and when

Benjamin Banneker (1731–1806) also studied locusts, concentrating on the seventeen-year variety. (Benjamin Banneker’s Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia Almanac, for the Year of our Lord, 1795 [Baltimore: Printed for John Fisher, stationer, 1795], Maryland Historical Society.)
the branch broke and fell off, the eggs were buried in the ground to lay dormant for seventeen years. Banneker’s curiosity was not unusual for his time but his humble background, a self-taught grandson of a slave, living in a very rural setting prevented early recognition of his talents.7

It was not theoretical knowledge that appealed to these provincial naturalists but, like most other Americans, it was the utilitarian application of science that absorbed them. In a planting society, agriculture took precedence and men such as Gilpin, and their work, were most welcome. One other unidentified experimenter kept a notebook describing various trials using different kinds of manure for fertilizer. The farmer noted that when he planted clover and buckwheat to alternate with tobacco fields and other products such as peas, collards, and potatoes the tobacco yield was higher. Another planter, William Diggs of Prince George’s County exchanged grafts of trees with George Washington in an attempt to improve their production. Jonas Green published extracts on flax culture in the Maryland Gazette, taken from essays published by the Dublin Society for the Improvement of Husbandry, Agriculture and other Useful Arts, suggesting an American sensitivity to practical science in the British Isles. William Goddard stated in the first issue of his new Baltimore newspaper that a primary purpose of a weekly paper was the dissemination of information stemming from native experiments in “agriculture and every branch of Husbandry.”8

John Beale Bordley, a product of Maryland provincial society, was to organize the first American agricultural society in the post-revolutionary period. He had shown an early interest in improving local agricultural techniques and was familiar with the works of the American botanist, Jaret Eliot, and the English agriculturalist, Arthur Young. After reading Jethro Tull’s Horse Hoe Husbandry Bordley was inspired to embark on agricultural reform. He followed Tull’s direction and then experimented with different methods of fertilizing. Interested in such diverse activities as fruit growing, stock raising, and farmhouse construction, Bordley experimented with different methods of rotation on a model plantation established without the aid of slave labor, an early anti-slavery decision. The results of his experiments, initially printed on broadsides and fastened to trees for his neighbors, were later included in his book of essays. According to Rodney True, Bordley was “a veritable apostle of agricultural progress,” carrying to America the latest experiments in agricultural reform from England and publishing the results of his own experiences for his fellow Marylanders.9

Other sciences did not necessarily receive the same amount of attention as agriculture. As in the other American colonies, the physical sciences—chemistry, astronomy, physics—known at the time as “natural philosophy” had only a few followers in Maryland. There is some evidence to suggest that many colonists were aware of current developments and were contributing to general knowledge, even if the understanding was superficial. Richard Brooke, for instance, was especially interested in astronomical actions. He sent his weather observations to London to be published in the Transactions. His observations have the distinction of being the first such observations made
using a meteorological instrument. The work of John Winthrop, who came closest to being a professional scientist in America, was certainly appreciated in Lord Baltimore’s colony. The Maryland Gazette kept its readers informed of Winthrop’s work. On April 30, 1761, the newspaper noted the New Englander’s comments on the transit of Venus near the Sun.10

A variety of other amateur scientists delved into different facets of natural philosophy. Francis Holland, a Maryland lawyer, kept a notebook dealing with a variety of

---

Attorney Francis Holland (1745–1795) kept notes on a variety of topics, among them comments on the history of mathematics and the alphabet. (Francis Holland, notebook, MS.451, Maryland Historical Society.)
matters. Interspersed among commentaries on the law and legal forms, wars and battles, and assembly activities, were his notes on references to the movement of sound, the velocity of wind, a history of mathematics and the alphabet, and various technological discoveries. Thomas Godfrey, an amateur Maryland astronomer, sent information regarding a forthcoming eclipse to Bradford’s *Journal* in Philadelphia. In the rural Baltimore area self-taught African American Benjamin Banneker liked to tinker with mechanical objects long before his interest in astronomy that led to his creation of almanacs in the 1790s. His youthful curiosity and skills sparked an interest in clocks and after studying the inner workings of a watch he built a wooden clock that struck the hours. This was in 1753 when few clocks or watches were available in the colony. For his neighbors, it was a wondrous object.11

Also of curiosity locally as well as to the fossil collectors in Europe were Thomas Gilpin’s investigations of the marine life in Chesapeake Bay and his discovery of fossil shells on both shores. Gilpin’s interest in science had been stimulated by a trip to England in 1753 where he saw the operation of a steam pump. In his later life while in Philadelphia, he was involved in a scheme to build a canal and connect the Delaware Bay with the Chesapeake.12 His interests in improving life on earth did not rest with agriculture but rather to the practical application of science.

Electricity also attracted great general interest. In 1749, the *Gazette* reported that a gentleman with an “electrical machine” had made some interesting experiments in Annapolis. Again in 1753 the paper announced a demonstration of how electricity worked. Another proponent of Benjamin Franklin’s discoveries hoped to attract a crowd to his lecture advertising that electricity was “a simple, homogeneous, subtle fluid, lodged in the vacuities of all bodies, and that it is the same as lightning, but not for that reason inconsistent with the principles of natural or revealed religion.”13 The lecturer’s suggestion that science and religion were compatible was a common assumption at the time.

**Natural Law and the Clergy**

There was as yet no dichotomy between men of the cloth and the men of science. Clergymen generally assumed there could be no disagreement between the discoveries of science and their religious beliefs. They were inheritors of the influence of seventeenth-century science, increasingly confident in the Newtonian intellectual belief that reason and religion functioned in harmony because scientific thought supported an orderly divine universe. The Maryland clergy from the educated classes in England and Scotland easily concurred with those assumptions as the most versed in physical Science and were particularly interested in furthering the cause of science in the new world.14 Itinerant scientist Archibald Spencer is a case in point.

In 1743, Spencer first appeared in the colonies with a series of lectures on “Experimental Philosophy,” starting in Boston and travelling southward. His lectures had awakened Benjamin Franklin’s original interest in electricity and unlike other itinerant
lecturers of his day, Spencer was a well-trained product of Edinburgh University with a medical degree — not a quack. He had assisted Dr. Thomas Cadwalader in preparation of his Essay on the West-India Dry Gripe, on the treatment of lead poisoning caused by distilling rum through lead pipes. He also lectured on physiology and diseases of the eye and maintained close contact with the other men of science in the colonies.15

Four years later, in a quest for a sinecure, Spencer unsuccessfully sought the chair of mathematics at William and Mary College. His rationalist views of religion were apparently too radically deistic for the more conservative Virginia academic community. Undaunted, he returned to England where he was ordained as a priest in the Church of England that same year and was rewarded with a Maryland parish.16

The new clergyman was immediately absorbed into upper-class intellectual circles where his talents were appreciated. Dr. Alexander Hamilton welcomed him into his Tuesday Club and greeted him as “a person famous all over America for his great skill in Natural Philosophy and Free Masonry.” They had met briefly in Philadelphia in 1743 while Hamilton had been traveling through the northern colonies. The doctor at first was pleased to renew his acquaintance with the scientist-priest and invited him to assist another clergyman-scientist, a Dr. Jowers, in an analysis of the nature of insects. Spencer supplied a detailed description of the “polybus” which multiplied asexually but his contribution proved too pedantic for the urbane Hamilton’s taste. They had a falling out and Spencer shifted his allegiance to another social group, but one devoted more to drinking than learning, The South River Club. Their disagreement did not affect Spencer’s reputation as a scientist and he continued to conduct public scientific demonstrations in Annapolis.17

Another versatile clergyman with a scientific bent was the Talbot County parson, the Reverend Thomas Bacon. A close friend of both Dr. Hamilton and the naturalist Henry Callister, Bacon was familiar with most of the important scientific developments of his day and shared this knowledge with his friends. Callister for instance owned a microscope, but Bacon’s library contained a volume on the use of the instrument. Both men made their treasures available to the other and to their friends. Bacon also owned surveying instruments although he himself was not a large landowner and he found use for a protractor and a magnet of sufficient proportion to be worth fifteen shillings.18

Bacon had accumulated a substantial library by his death in 1768 that included more than 225 volumes of 150 titles of which at least one-third were on medicine or science. Some of his books on “Experimental Philosophy” and “Physick” had been acquired from Archibald Spencer’s estate (Spencer had died in 1760) and therefore reflect his colleague’s interests as well. Among the more important works in the library was Newton’s Principia as well as books by Newton’s Newton’s popularizer and outstanding interpreter, John Desaguliers; several works on mathematics (both algebra and Euclid’s geometry); and a copy of Thomas Rutherford’s work on “Natural Philosophy,” which was probably his 1754 Institutes of Natural Law. Bacon also collected the papers of the leading scientific societies of Europe: five volumes of the Royal Society’s Philosophical
Transactions and nine volumes in French of the French Academy of Sciences’ Memoirs. Both were important sources for the dissemination and encouragement of scientific and medical discoveries.19

Medicine as a practical art was especially important because of its potential contribution to the quality of life. Good health was essential for any society. The Maryland Gazette catered to this concern for the improvement of health and published articles and letters relating to the cure of diseases and medical discoveries abroad. One such piece reprinted an article from the Universal Chronicle on Boerhaave’s accomplishments (the most influential Dutch physician of the day). Richard Brooke, a Maryland physician, submitted an article in 1762 on the treatment of hydrophobia (rabies), a serious problem in the Southern colonies. The following year a J. Sprigg sent a letter to the editor quoting a passage from Boerhaave on the lack of effective remedies for rabies. Another noted the experiments of Dr. Robert James of London in the use of mercury, which had been described in the Philosophical Transactions. Dr. William Shippen of Philadelphia considered the Maryland Gazette a likely organ through which to attract students to his “course of Anatomical Lectures” intended “for the Improvement of young Gentlemen, now studying Physic and Surgery in America.”20

Dr. Richard Brooke was one of the more prolific Maryland writers on medical and scientific subjects. He had several essays published in the Transactions of the Royal Society on inoculation and weather. He had also submitted an article to the British Gentleman’s Magazine on the popular subject of lightning rods and another giving a “Receipt to destroy lice in children’s Hair.” In 1752 he reported on a patient of his, a young girl, who had a pimple on the roof of her mouth that grew and broke with no pain. Brooke’s remedy to prevent the regrowth of the pimple at first was to give her “several gargles and doses of salts without success.” Upon discovering that the girl drank no liquids he recommended that she drink water every day and that effectively cured her.21 Whatever the value of such remedies, Maryland along with other British colonies was a part of the eighteenth-century Atlantic community in the exchange of medical information.

Dr. Alexander Hamilton’s arrival in the colony in 1737 added another physician to that group of men concerned about public health and the natural world. Like Brooke, he was especially interested in plants that had some medical use. Soon after arriving in Maryland he sent seeds of local plants back to his cousin Robert Hamilton, a Scottish physician in Glasgow. He explained that he did not know the botanical names of the plants and was not sure of whether they were already known to the medical world. One of them called locally “poke” he described as “a species of the Mechoaian, the root is a Sharp purger, Something of the nature of the Jalap.” The leaves he thought were not as an effective a “purger” and were used mainly as a food, “for greens to eat with meat.” He also sent specimens of a plant called “Jamestown weed.” That plant he described as poisonous and of a “narcotic or stupifying nature” used by the Indians during puberty rites. Just one of his letters sending specimens to Scotland exists but
he notes a continuous correspondence and an offer to send some seeds of trees in the future. While traveling through the colonies in 1744, Hamilton looked for samples of the ginseng plant, known for its creative powers universally. In spite of its reputation, Hamilton wondered if it had any greater value than other drugs.22

Of great concern in the colony was the possibility of a smallpox epidemic. The disease had ravaged the middle colonies in the mid-1730s, hitting Philadelphia especially hard. Epidemics in the area subsided after 1738 and then reappeared in 1745 slowly moving south from New York and appearing in Maryland in June of 1747. The fear of the “infection” was so great that many in the Maryland Assembly were excused from their attendance in Annapolis that month.23

The only possible protection against the disease was the potentially dangerous therapy of inoculation that had been first tried in Boston in 1721. This involved injecting someone with the live smallpox virus in the form of pus from a sick victim. The injection actually caused the disease although usually in a milder form for reasons unknown even today. The procedure seldom resulted in death but the patient was contagious while undergoing inoculation. Isolation of patients was essential to prevent an epidemic. There was no understanding of the cause of the disease or how inoculation worked. It was general knowledge, however, that once infected, the patient acquired life-long immunity just as though he or she had contacted the disease “the natural way.”24

Many doctors opposed the use of inoculation partly because of the danger of an epidemic, others on moral grounds, and some because it did not coincide with traditional ideas regarding illness. Even those who approved of the procedure debated about how to treat the patient, what kind of food or medications to recommend, where to inject the substance, and how much bed rest was necessary. Inoculation would remain controversial until the end of the century when it could be replaced by vaccination, the injection of the cowpox virus that did not carry the potential danger of contagion but also did not convey life-long immunity.25

It is likely that doctors in Maryland did inoculate their patients during that 1747 epidemic. With an awareness of the dangers, doctors in Annapolis helped to establish a hospital in that town a few years later to quarantine such patients. The hospital was
widely publicized and the Gazette encouraged the general public to make use of that facility to protect against spreading the disease. The process was vindicated when during the winter of 1756–1757 one hundred people were inoculated in Annapolis and all survived. Among those who caught the disease the “natural” way, one out of six died. A widespread epidemic in 1765 motivated Dr. Richard Tootell to offer inoculations to the poor at no cost. 26 Although there seemed to be general acceptance of the procedure as a public health measure in Maryland during those years, the colony was not immune to the controversy over the use of inoculation. The colony’s leading intellectual, Dr. Alexander Hamilton of Annapolis, played an important role in vindicating the procedure and in the process offered a philosophical defense of research, experimentation, and free inquiry as essential to the enlightenment of all people. 27

The incident that led to Hamilton’s contribution began in Philadelphia. In 1751, an age without regular outlets for the dissemination of medical information in early America, Hamilton’s friend and fellow student in the Edinburgh medical school, Dr. Adam Thomson had dared to publish a pamphlet in Philadelphia. The treatise supported his particular method of treating inoculated patients that included the use of mercury, antimony, and quinine as preparation for the procedure and of bleeding and purging afterwards. The pamphlet, A Discourse on the Preparation of the Body for the Small Pox: and the Manner of receiving the Infection also questioned the competence of many medical men in Philadelphia who lacked academic training, suggesting that they were quacks who did not have the ability to understand the value of inoculation. The pamphlet antagonized the medical establishment and several writers retaliated in a letter campaign in the Philadelphia and Annapolis newspapers attacking Thomson’s reputation. 28

Dr. John Kearsley was particularly upset because many of those practicing medicine in Philadelphia had learned their craft as his apprentices and did not have any additional academic instruction. He viewed Thomson’s commentaries as a personal affront. In a detailed refutation of Thomson’s pamphlet, Kearsley attacked Thomson for what he considered the sheer vanity on the part of an inexperienced researcher who had no right to foist his unproven method on a gullible public. In the process of refuting Thomson, Kearsley also denied that there could be a specific cure or preventive method for any one disease. Hamilton was incensed by the unfair attacks on his friend and appalled by the apparent ignorance of the Philadelphia medical establishment that could oppose what he thought had become a proven acceptable practice to control smallpox. 29

Although little recognized today, Hamilton’s defense of Thomson was, at the time, an important scientific contribution to the debate over inoculation and experimental medical treatments. It was widely read and disseminated throughout the colonies. After Dr. John Perkins of Boston read the pamphlet he wrote to Benjamin Franklin of his pleasure “to see good Dr. Thomson so well defended by his generous Friend, Dr. Hamilton.” As a result of the publicity from Hamilton’s intervention, Thomson’s procedure became known as the “American method” of inoculation and was adopted in many colonies. 30
Benjamin Franklin (1705/06–1790) supported his friend Dr. Adam Thomson’s controversial work on inoculation. (Small Prints, Maryland Historical Society.)

Hamilton defended Thomson’s actions on the grounds that the method worked and no evidence had yet appeared to show that it was “hurtful” to patients. Nor was it contrary to nature. What was natural, Hamilton argued, was always helped by the
application of scientific discoveries. Trees were pruned, Hamilton noted, and fruits grafted to improve the strain so that vegetables and flowers were made better. By the same token, Hamilton asked, why can’t “the Animal Frame, by the Art of Physic be freed from approaching morbid alterations and Accidents?” He continued to argue that any such improvement in the human condition worked with nature rather than against her injunctions. He criticized Kearsley for rejecting the idea that there could be a specific cure for any disease, pointing to the Dutch physician-teacher, Boerhaave who considered the search for “specific” as a more effective approach to the eradication of disease than that of a universal palliative.31

In response to Kearsley, Hamilton offered not just a defense of Thomson’s procedures but also an extended dissertation on the importance of free inquiry, a major feature of enlightened thought. Scientists in particular, he argued, needed the freedom to investigate and the freedom to publish results, to be skeptical of accepted practice. Because scientific knowledge was cumulative and not static, it was essential to encourage experiments and make the information available to the public. In a direct attack on Kearsley who had objected to anyone questioning his authority, Hamilton declared that the acquisition of such knowledge should not be limited by the voice of authority or tradition. If the knowledge of men like Thomson, “were to lie inactive and Idle because greater Wits and abler men had writ before them on the same Subjects,” then Hamilton noted, “the Improvement of all Science would be at a Stand.”32

Thomson’s action to communicate was prompted by what Hamilton thought was the highest purpose, “to do Service to the Public.” In what was one of the most important aspects of enlightened thought, Hamilton asked, “Can an Author exercise his Wit and Pen to better Purpose than for the Health and Welfare of Mankind.” Humanitarian concerns loomed large in Hamilton’s mind and were an important premise of eighteenth-century inquiry. At the same time, he was reminding his audience that progress in science and thus the improvement of life on earth required an open mind.33

Dr. Hamilton obviously was not alone in these beliefs. Those intellectual leaders in colonial Maryland, both lay and clerical, such as Spencer, Bacon, Gilpin, and John Beale Bordley, and the others mentioned above reflected a confidence in the ability of man to create a more comfortable society that would benefit from science and experiments. They eagerly contributed their knowledge and skills to the European thirst for information about the New World’s natural treasures. They could agree that progress for human society required the destruction of authoritarian control of thought. Marylanders like other enlightened people recognized the necessity of freedom to investigate and experiment, and the importance of sharing their knowledge. They considered themselves part of the global attempt to understand and control the natural world for the benefit of mankind. Such attitudes toward science and a belief in a rational universe fit comfortably with the enlightened ideals of an eighteenth-century world. Lord Baltimore’s province was no exception to those goals.
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“Fresh Air and Cheer:” The Origins of Camp Louise in the Settlement House Movement of Baltimore’s Jewish Community

BARRY KESSLER

One day in 1921, three Baltimoreans set out to visit a potential site for a summer retreat that would serve the city’s immigrant Jewish women. Ida Sharogrodsky, a social worker, and Lillie Straus, a philanthropist, had pleaded with Lillie’s husband, Aaron, one of Baltimore’s wealthiest merchants, to consider purchasing an old hotel in the Catoctin Mountains they envisioned as an extension of the social service work they were doing in East Baltimore. Midway on the seventy-mile trip, Aaron Straus seized on the pretext of a storm to turn back, but the ladies were undeterred, and once they arrived, the enchanting view of forested hills and fertile valleys overcame his reluctance. The story of the three founders’ trip has served as the origin myth of Camp Louise, which matured from a vacation spot for working women to a traditional Jewish girls’ summer camp and is still operating almost a hundred years later. It is a charming tale, retold over generations by camp alumnae and counselors, staff and community leaders. But the actual history of how Camp Louise emerged from Baltimore’s Progressive era efforts to aid, acculturate, and assimilate immigrants is more complex and in many ways more interesting.¹

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Baltimore and the nation faced the twin pressures of industrialization and immigration that gave rise to enormous challenges as well as critical opportunities for the city, and for its Jewish community in particular. As it addressed itself to the plight of recent arrivals from Eastern Europe, this community was animated by a reformist, progressive ideology designed to Americanize new arrivals. Leaders found their most tangible success in the form of settlement houses run by its charitable organizations. Camp Louise emerged from these settlements and from the similarly reform-minded fresh air movement of the early 1900s. As a result, the social, psychological, educational, and moral goals of the settlement movement would underpin Camp Louise’s very existence. Camp was to be first of all conducive to

Barry Kessler is an independent historian and curator who writes about ethnic identity, recreation, and reform.

¹
Earliest known photograph of Camp Louise’s first home, c.1921–1922. The “White House” and grounds, formerly the Melvue Hotel, proved an ideal location. Young women in bloomers or skirts play racquet games on the lawn amid what appears to be construction debris. Others lounge on the broad porch, in rocking chairs, and perched on the railing. A rustic gateway constructed of unfinished branches proudly frames the entry. Note the camp name at the top of the arch. (Pack 18.004, Jewish Museum of Maryland.)
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¹ The author is an independent researcher and writer. This article is based on his forthcoming centennial history of Camp Airy and Camp Louise.
physical and mental health, offering respite from incessant industrial labor and from the congested, unsanitary modern city. For immigrant Jews, a stay in rural Western Maryland would also expose them to prototypical American pastimes and landscapes, and teach them virtues of self-sufficiency, civic duty, and enterprise that would draw them into the American mainstream. Camp Louise would thus closely match the settlements’ prime function — to transform young immigrants into productive American citizens by enveloping them in a wholesome, healthful, uplifting, and caring environment.

**Baltimore Roots**

For the founders of Camp Louise, its pastoral site stood as the antithesis of The City, the metropolis from which they set forth on that stormy day in 1921. Baltimore was America’s eighth largest city; a great, throbbing industrial engine; one of the country’s busiest ports of entry for immigrants; and a bustling import-export entrepôt. Bristling with wharves, its sixty-one mile long shoreline looked like the maw of a shark swallowing an arm of the Patapsco River. Effluent belched from smokestacks and drainpipes year-round, soiling the air and water. In summer, furnace-like heat scorched the city for weeks at a time, turning Baltimore into a hothouse of disease and discomfort.

Radiating out from the harbor were ethnic ghettos, vibrant but often squalid tracts of row houses where immigrants and other poor workers lived. Toiling long hours, often in harsh conditions, their labor fueled Baltimore’s manufacturing and commerce. The influx of immigrants to fill these jobs had been at full tilt for over a century. A core of English, Scots, Irish and Germans saw the arrival of African Americans from the American South and whites from Europe in ever-larger waves, eager for entry to the American ideal of middle-class comfort. Boatloads of the poor and hungry landed on Baltimore’s shores; while many boarded trains for the West, many stayed. Heavily represented among them were Irish, Germans, Poles, Czechs, and Jews.

Because Jews arrived in two major streams of immigration, a sharp split divided native-born Jewish-Americans, who identified as “German” Jews, and the immigrant community of eastern European or “Russian” Jews on the other. For many years distrust and misunderstanding marked relations between these groups, and each supported its own congregations, clubs, schools, and social service agencies. Aaron and Lillie Straus in many ways epitomized the “German” Jews, while Ida Sharogrodsky represented the “Russian” immigrant community. Just as these two communities were starting to meld, the Strauses and Miss Ida (as she would be known at Camp Louise) found in each other sympathetic and congenial partners whose common purpose and philanthropic vision overrode differences in country of origin, cultural outlook, and social position.²

Aaron and Lillie Straus exemplified what Baltimore called the “uptown” community: the merchant class of native-born Jews. Born in the United States to parents
Many of Baltimore’s wealthy Jewish families lived in Eutaw Place and belonged to the city’s “uptown” congregations. (PPr.9.1. Maryland Historical Society.)

who had migrated primarily from central Europe decades earlier, they were thoroughly assimilated into American culture. By the late nineteenth century, they dominated Baltimore’s thriving garment industry, its retail sector, and its department store district, where Jews owned many of the city’s fabled emporia. Their homes lined the leafy streets on either side of Eutaw Place, a boulevard modeled after Berlin’s “Unter den Linden” that led northwesterly from downtown to Druid Hill Park, Baltimore’s new showplace. Amid these mostly three- and four-story brick townhouses were the mansions of merchant-princes, elegant social clubs, and the five magnificent “Temples” that housed their congregations.

Over the decades in which they prospered, assimilated, and raised a generation of native-born Americans, Baltimore’s German Jews had coalesced into a tight-knit community. Then in the 1880s and 1890s, a wave of immigrants from southern and
Eastern Europe crashed on Baltimore’s shore, among them an estimated 41,000 Jews fleeing the pogroms and persecution of czarist Russia. How to respond? The newcomers must be acknowledged as co-religionists, and therefore given aid, but their alien culture, uncleanness, and rank poverty frightened and repelled the native-born. Highly ambivalent, Baltimore’s established Jewish community took up collections, established an Emigrant Aid Society, and attempted to settle newcomers in agricultural colonies or in the West. But the immigrants gravitated to East Baltimore, living in cramped, overcrowded tenements, working long hours for low pay in the garment industry, and setting up a welter of new synagogues, schools, and landsmanshaftn [mutual aid societies based on town of origin].

To Serve the “Working Girls”

Some native-born Jewish women responded to the influx of immigrants through women’s organizations such as the National Council of Jewish Women, raising funds, sewing clothing and linens, or caring for crippled children, philanthropies that had grown out of the women’s club movement in the nineteenth century. As women redefined their “domestic sphere” to encompass the poor children and struggling women of the city, their clubs took on charitable purposes beyond the home. Settlements, pioneered in New York and Chicago by such nationally known reformers as Jane Addams and Lillian Wald, multiplied in American cities in the 1890s, peaking in the 1920s. They generally brought unmarried native-born Americans, especially women, to inner-city locations to live among the poor and alleviate their problems through personal service. Settlements aimed at improving public health, averting juvenile delinquency, building good citizens of the future, and acculturating or “Americanizing” immigrants. To meet these goals, they offered a range of classes and programs, including some of the country’s first playgrounds, kindergartens, and maternal health clinics. Some focused on district nursing, others on youth development, legal aid, or teaching English. But they all shared a critique of modern urban life as degradingly anonymous, impersonal, and needing reform. By the early twentieth century, Baltimore could boast twelve settlement houses in various poor neighborhoods, operated under a wide range of auspices.

Americanization was a national as well as a Jewish priority during the early 1900s. The urgency of rapidly converting masses of immigrants into Americans — speakers of English and holders of “American values” — arose in response to a wave of nativism that swept the country in the early twentieth century. Middle America, overwhelmingly of Northern European stock, reacted against the hordes flooding in from southern and Eastern Europe. Fearing immigrants’ perceived alien ideologies and non-Protestant religions, many Americans saw chaos and anarchy looming. Nativism spanned a spectrum that ran from the Ku Klux Klan, who vilified Catholics and Jews as well as Blacks, to those who worked in Congress to restrict immigration solely to skilled, literate Northern
Activist and reformer Jane Addams (1860–1935) pioneered settlement projects in the earliest days of Progressive-Era public health care for mothers and children. She opened Hull House in Chicago with Ellen Gates Starr, prompting community leaders and philanthropists in other cities to establish similar programs. (undated, Library of Congress.)

Europeans. For those seeking to counteract nativism, a good strategy must have seemed to be to infuse the immigrant with the American spirit of democracy, civic duty, and enterprise along with fluency in English.5
In Baltimore’s bifurcated Jewish community, “German” Jews had good reason to favor, promote, and fund Americanization efforts. Beyond the religious imperative to help the poor through *tzedakah* [Hebrew: charitable giving] and a sense of common fraternal roots, they stood to benefit directly from the “Russian” immigrants’ assimilation. No matter how polished, comfortable, and acculturated they were in America after two or three generations, they could still feel the sting of anti-Semitic comment and exclusion. Whatever their personal feelings about the masses of humanity arriving at their shores, unable to speak English and professing a Judaism that bore little resemblance to their own decorous version, native-born Jews knew that they could and would be tainted by association with their impoverished, uncouth, and visibly shabby co-religionists. The sooner the “Russians” could look and behave like Americans, the less “German” Jews would be subject to the overflow of derision and hostility emanating from nativist quarters.

In 1890 the city’s “uptown” Jewish women organized the Daughters in Israel, one of the first new groups to rise to the challenge of East Baltimore’s Jewish poor. It took as its motto, “Love thy neighbor as thyself.” As in the settlement movement generally, it walked a fine line between assistance to those in need and the push to Americanize. Modeled on a recently founded Protestant women’s effort called the King’s Daughters, it was dedicated to self-improvement and service to the poor. Like the Christian women, Daughters in Israel originally structured itself as an umbrella organization composed of bands of ten, each tasking itself with a different branch of “personal service.” Several of the bands conducted “friendly visiting” of the poor, while others set up sewing circles to provide them clothing; one of the bands began a “Working Girls Club” and another started a dress-making class. They established a “Fresh Air Fund” in hopes of being able to send sick children to the country during the summer. Within about a year, they organized a club for Russian “working girls,” which they claimed was offered on a basis “of complete equality,” with an “utter lack of anything approaching patronage in word, manner or deed.” If true, this was remarkable for its day – and must have required a high level of self-conscious awareness of the dangers of a condescending attitude.6

Lillie Straus was among the early members of the Daughters in Israel, first appearing in the records as treasurer in 1899, ten years after her arrival in the city. Born Lillian Meyer in 1871 in St. Louis, Missouri, she had come to Baltimore at age eighteen as a newly-wed. For the wife of a prosperous merchant, Lillie was personally frugal to the point of inviting censure for her lack of interest in fashion or shopping. But she delighted in anonymous giving; stories survive of how she managed to slip cash to a poor mother or bring a box of clothes to a school for discreet distribution to children. Lillie’s nature made her stand out among her cohort as a truly compassionate philanthropist, seeming “to possess an intuitive sense about those who were in real distress, [and] gave willingly and generously.” At Daughters in Israel, Lillie contributed extra money for scholarships for the girls and “for Treats, including Theater parties, picnics, anniversary dinners, etc.”
Lillie Straus guided the couple’s philanthropy
(1993.059.043, Jewish Museum of Maryland.)

In 1913, she donated “clothing of one girl, ice cream and cake for large party books, clothing, furniture, Hanukkah party, with prizes and gifts for each girl.” Lillie was deeply and personally invested in the Daughters in Israel, and had gained a reputation as a kind-hearted and magnanimous contributor.7

As Lillie and Aaron’s wealth grew, it was Lillie who was always credited with guiding the couple’s giving. Indeed by the early 1920s they had entered the ranks of Baltimore’s wealthiest families, and with no heirs, were in a position to practice large-scale philanthropy. During the World War, the Strauses had suppor Baltimore Hebrew Congregation’s Sup paras for Jewish servicemen stationed around the city, and they led in giving to their synagogue throughout their lives. Lillie Straus was among the community leaders who founded the Central Scholarship Bureau in 1924 to distribute funds to Jewish youth for vocational training (subsuming Daughters in Israel scholarship moneys), and was “ever ready to provide funds to further opportunities for our boys and girls.” The Boy Scouts and Associated Jewish Charities were among the many organizations the Strauses supported.8

This largesse was based on Aaron’s extraordinary business success. His story was not one of rags to riches: like many of his generation, Aaron Straus built on his father’s rise to prosperity. Born in 1820 in a small town in Bavaria, Martin L. Straus had migrated to the United States in 1845. Two years later, he married Babette Wasserman, from the same German-speaking province. Martin took up the clothing trade, succeeding admirably. By 1870 he was a wholesale clothier whose substantial home stood in the heart of Baltimore’s retail district, near the corner of Howard and Lexington. Within a few years, Martin Straus opened the furniture and carpet store at the corner of Howard and Fayette Streets which was to be the foundation of Aaron’s fortune.9

Two of his sons, Max and Meyer, assisted their father as clerks, but when he died in 1891, it was Aaron, age twenty-seven, who assumed control. Aaron had attended Public School #1 and then Baltimore City College. At twenty, Aaron, still living at home on
Lexington Street, clerked at the Monumental Furniture Company just a few blocks from his father’s store. Two years later, he moved to St. Louis with his brother Max to manage the Straus-Emerich Outfitting Company. The company was listed as a “time payment house,” where furnishings were sold on installment, a highly profitable way of doing business. It was in St. Louis that Aaron met and married Lillie Meyer, like himself the child of German-Jewish immigrants who had entered the middle class.10

Returning to Baltimore with his new bride, Aaron threw himself into building up the family furniture business on Howard Street, expanding the store with a capital investment of $20,000. And he branched out, too: as early as 1903, he was among the incorporators of The Hub Furniture Company in Washington. Soon, by purchasing first one and then many local chains of stores, Straus transformed his business into one of the nation’s largest retail empires, with furniture, clothing and jewelry stores that stretched from New England to New Mexico. “Reliable Stores Corp.” as this conglomerate was called when it was incorporated in Maryland in 1925, expanded to eighteen stores in fourteen cities during the 1920s. In 1926 net sales broke the $10 million mark; by 1929 profits exceeded $1.15 million.11

How did Aaron Straus succeed so spectacularly? One can point to his character, comprised of his reputation for integrity and his relentless pursuit of efficiency, his obsession with self-education and considerable personal warmth. Aaron also combined personal frugality with broad generosity to others. Many recall his refusal to tolerate a slur against African Americans, pointing to a penchant for fairness and humanitarianism. But Aaron Straus was also in the right place at the right time: his business career spanned perhaps the most auspicious period for commerce in American history. The United States became an economic powerhouse during the 1890s, spreading its influence around the globe. It was an era of consolidation and rapid growth throughout the business world. As railroads standardized track gauge and asphalt-paved highways spider-webbed rural landscapes, reliable transportation networks carried heavy consumer goods to large and small towns throughout the country at much lower cost than before. New nationally regulated telephone, mail, and banking services enabled business owners to centralize management control over geographically widespread enterprises. Economies of scale were suddenly possible across a wide spectrum of industry and business.

Baltimore had emerged as a commercial hub over the previous decades, and its entrepreneurs were well positioned to take advantage of the evolving national infrastructure. The 1853 completion of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad through the Appalachian Mountains to the Ohio River had already opened up western markets, expanding the city’s economy and offering opportunities to wholesale and retail merchants. In addition, the city had become the primary market center of the American South, which was experiencing an economic boom in the wake of Reconstruction.

Jews, coming from a long tradition of commerce, were poised to benefit from America’s openness. The United States was a country with a relatively fluid social structure, whose culture elevated the successful businessman to high status regardless
of the place or conditions of his birth. Here Jewish merchants created new commercial niches, expanding the contours of trade through the department store, far-flung peddling routes, and a host of other innovations. In doing so, they forged a vital role for themselves in an America obsessed with commerce.12

It was also a perfect time to be selling furniture. Technological advances in machine tools, paint, and textile manufacture lowered production costs of wooden and upholstered furniture, while middle-class Americans across the country saw their buying power increase dramatically in the boom times between 1890 and 1930. And, as they responded to new ideals of comfort and home life promoted by magazines and other popular media, they were willing to invest much of this new buying power in home furnishings.

What is more, the installment system and the chain store concept, two key elements of Aaron Straus’ business, were well timed for extraordinary profitability. Lucrative installment sales brought in a high percentage of Reliable’s income. By selling “on time,” installment merchants were essentially financing their customers’ purchases. Their businesses were not merely stores, but in effect banking operations as well. Profit came not only from the mark-up of the goods sold, but from interest payments that accrued rapidly on the unpaid balance. And the chain store concept was reinventing (disrupting, as we would say today) markets in almost every category. Tobacco, candy, bakery, clothing, shoe, hat, drug, and department stores all succumbed to its economies of scale and money-saving efficiencies. Moreover, the chain store idea was seen as “thoroughly American” and thoroughly modern in its application of “scientific management [to] retail merchandising.”13

While Aaron Straus was dedicating himself to commerce, Lillie threw herself into her involvement with the Daughters in Israel, which had begun intensive settlement work. In 1895, they opened a house in a rented building at 1111 East Baltimore Street that included “a kindergarten and a day nursery, a working girls’ club, a dressmaking class, mothers’ meeting, and a circulating library.” Each circle, or band of ten, focused on one of the programs at the house. They continued to add clubs and programs to assist East Baltimore girls and women, in particular those who were on their own, and thought to be especially vulnerable to becoming “wayward girls.” Typically laboring on piecework in sweatshops for meager wages, these young women often struggled to find decent housing. By 1897, Daughters in Israel was soliciting donations for a Working Girls Home with lodging for a modest subsidized rent of $2.00 a week, or no rent at all for a time if necessary. The idea was to provide “the comforts of a refined home in place of the cramped quarters amid vicious surroundings in which so many are compelled to live.” According to a contemporary account, it was one of the first homes of this type to be set up in the United States.14

In 1899, the Daughters in Israel, with Lillie Straus as their treasurer, purchased a house at the corner of Aisquith and East Baltimore Streets to expand the Working Girls Home. There, twenty girls “without parents or guardians” could be given “a real home life as far as possible.” Each girl had her own bed, wardrobe, and table, “the
bedsteads are iron, with iron springs.” A maid tidied and aired the rooms, because the residents needed to leave early for work, but not too early to enjoy a breakfast of “fish or eggs, and fruit… every day in summer.” The girls took a supper of meat “and three vegetables” at the Home; they could eat dinner there if they worked nearby, but otherwise received “a box of cocoa [to] prepare something warm for [their] midday meal.” Residents enjoyed weekly excursions “down the bay” in summer and a weekly evening to receive “their girl and men friends,” with cake and either lemonade or chocolate, depending on the season. The home had a “directress” and a housekeeper, as well as an attending physician, Dr. Flora Pollack, who for many years served as president of Daughters in Israel.15

During the year 1910, twenty-six young women, ages fourteen to twenty-nine lived at the Daughters in Israel Home; all but six were Russian-born, and most had been in America only a few years. They worked as seamstresses, buttonhole makers, shirt-makers, and stenographers, with one cigar-maker and two department store saleswomen. The “happy home-like atmosphere” of the facility was attributed to the personality of Dora Weil, a forty-five-year-old Marylander of German-Jewish descent. The following year, Daughters in Israel enlarged the home with an additional building of twelve rooms, one of which served as a “hospital.” A gymnasium was fitted up in the basement one night a week. By 1915, the Home could accommodate forty-four at once. Of the fifty-six who boarded during that year, one fourth were below sixteen years of age, and all but one earned $5.00 or less per week. Many girls, however, were taking a dressmaking course in hopes of increasing their earnings. In 1918, sixty-eight young women paid a total of about five thousand dollars in room and board over the year.16

The Working Girls Home was clearly not just a place to live: it was also a form of acculturation, with the all-important goal of making upstanding American citizens of the new immigrants. The Home gave Daughters in Israel the opportunity to experience the benefits of a sanitary and wholesome environment, one in keeping with American middle-class values. Dora Weil mused in print: “If we do spoil them for dirty homes with lack of all privacy and accustom them to regular homes and regular meals at a clean table, we have accomplished something.” The girls’ regimen included daily housekeeping work so they could eventually manage a modern American household, and they received weekly lectures by a Reform rabbi to introduce them to an Americanized style of Judaism.17

After the turn of the century, Daughters in Israel and its younger male counterpart, the Maccabean House, fell under the same charitable federation, which pressed for consolidation of their overlapping settlement work. In 1909 the two organizations merged, forming the Jewish Educational Alliance, commonly known as the JEA — except that Daughters in Israel continued on, its mission now confined to the management of the Working Girls Home. Hundreds of East Baltimore youngsters and their families flocked to the JEA’s two settlement houses for a myriad of activities and programs, including lectures, concerts, vocational training, infant and maternal
In 1909, Daughters in Israel and its younger male counterpart, the Maccabeau House joined to form the Jewish Educational Alliance. They offered activities and programs, including lectures, concerts, vocational training, infant and maternal hygiene, gymnasium instruction, a printing shop, a penny bank, English, art and craft classes, a nursery school, a Sabbath school, and numerous clubs “for literary, social, and athletic purposes.” (1999.231.302, Jewish Museum of Maryland.)

A flag ceremony, consistent with the founders’ zeal for patriotism and Americanization, became a beloved part of every day at Camp Louise. Campers vied for the honor of carrying and presenting the colors. (Pack 18.008.)
hygiene, gymnasium instruction, a printing shop, a penny bank, English, art and craft classes, a nursery school, a Sabbath school, and numerous clubs “for literary, social, and athletic purposes…. And Lillie Straus was among the Daughters in Israel who took on active roles in the JEA leadership as well. She sponsored the JEA’s sewing school, which attracted an average of two hundred children twice a week. She sat on the JEA’s “Physical Culture” and “Clubs and Classes” Committees, and chaired the Kindergarten and Day Nursery Committee.18

Social worker Ida Sharagrodsky and philanthropists Lillie and Aaron Straus founded Camp Louise in Western Maryland for the benefit of Baltimore’s unmarried Jewish working girls. Fully funded, the program allowed these young women the opportunity to escape the summer heat of the city for two weeks of “fresh air and cheer.” (1993.059.043, Jewish Museum of Maryland.)
Giving of herself to aid the Jews of East Baltimore had become Lillie Straus’ lifeblood. As she continually extended herself to meet community needs, collaborating with like-minded women, Lillie participated as fully as possible for a married woman. Although she did not leave a written record of her feelings about the immigrant world, as did her contemporary Henrietta Szold, her similar, direct involvement with their personal and communal welfare invites comparison. Szold encountered an intellectual cadre of that community and helped them establish, in 1889, the first night school to teach English and civics to the newcomers. Szold wrote about how she found their company energizing, how it rejuvenated and shaped her own commitment to the Jewish people. For both women, supporting the immigrants brought them a sense of solidarity, active engagement, and common cause that gave meaning and structure to their lives. Neither had children,
whose care would demand fulltime attention. Women's work, as it was then defined, provided both of them an outlet for their prodigious energy, their caring souls, and their hunger for personal fulfillment.19

Within that circle of reform-minded Jewish women focused on aiding the downtown immigrant community, Lillie had certainly crossed paths with Ida Sharogrodsky for years before their 1921 automobile jaunt. But their backgrounds could hardly have been more different. Ida's parents, Hirsh and Mary Sharogrodsky, had brought their family from Kiev to America in 1897, when Ida was ten years old, settling in Baltimore with six of their eight children. By age twenty-three, Ida was employed as a button-hole maker in the clothing industry. Her father was a coal dealer; a younger sister clerked in a department store, a fairly typical immigrant family.20

Dissatisfied with factory labor, Ida got a job at the JEA in the 1910s, where she might well have met Lillie Straus. If the JEA fueled her aspiration to be a social worker, one of the few professional careers then open to women, she might have been frustrated by the lack of formal study available — or might not have been able to afford full-time schooling in any case. So, she left Maryland for the opportunity to train under a pioneer in Jewish social work, Dr. Ludwig Bernstein, superintendent of the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Orphan Asylum in Pleasantville, New York. “Ranked as one of the foremost child care experts,” Dr. Bernstein introduced the “cottage system” to provide orphans with a more family-like setting within the huge institution which housed them, “stressing individuality as much as possible” for the hundreds of children under his aegis. As a “cottage mother,” Ida underwent an intensive training course and met daily with the superintendent and his staff. This was superb preparation for the career she was to undertake in Maryland. Bernstein’s compassionate approach would have intuitively connected with the sensitive and warmhearted Ida, and it informed the rest of her life’s work.21

By 1917, Ida had returned to Baltimore as a full-time social worker, taking on the formidable task of “Agent,” effectively the executive director, of the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society (YLBS). Unlike the Daughters in Israel, made up of native-born “uptown” women, this charity was started in 1901 by “a small group of working girls” themselves. As Agent, Ida managed the organization’s budget and supervised the provision of relief, personal service, and maternity care to its clients, keeping careful records of how many girls and families were referred, and for what reasons. She remained in that position throughout the history of the organization.22

In 1908, the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society had been among the eight organizations in the “downtown” community which came together to form the United Hebrew Charities. This was the second Jewish federation in town, the “uptown” agencies having organized under the umbrella of Federated Jewish Charities in 1906. The birth of these federations was part of a nationwide wave of charitable reorganization, in both Jewish and general philanthropy, which sought to reform the gathering and distribution of charitable funds for greater efficiency and pro-
“Fresh Air and Cheer:” The Origins of Camp Louise

Ida Sharogradsky inaugurating Camp Louise’s new water system with Abel Wolman, the distinguished Baltimore Jewish pioneer of sanitary engineering, c. 1925–1929. As the executive director for more than fifty years, Miss Ida’s influence pervaded every aspect of camp. In one anecdote after another, she is described as living out her philosophy of finding the good in everyone, caring deeply for everyone she came in contact with, and demonstrating selfless modesty. (Pack 18.003, Jewish Museum of Maryland.)
fessionalism. United Hebrew Charities and Federated Jewish Charities themselves merged in 1920 to form the organization known today as The Associated: Jewish Community Federation of Baltimore.

Affiliation with United Hebrew Charities sharpened the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society’s mission: instead of distributing general relief, it was to focus solely on services to girls and young women. For a girl who “needs guidance” or “supervision,” the Society would appoint a “Big Sister” or “Friendly Advisor.” Should these steps fail, she would be placed in an asylum for insanity, “feeble-mindedness,” unwed motherhood, or delinquency. The Society soon came to specialize in “maternity work,” which Ida described in a 1917 report: “When we find that a family is too poor to meet the additional expense of a confinement we secure medical attention for the woman, supply her with the proper nourishment, place a caretaker in the home and send a baby outfit. . . .”

“Good Food, Fresh Air, and Cheer”

It was at this juncture that momentum was building to extend the benefits of a country vacation to East Baltimore’s immigrants. Influenced by national reform movements, Baltimore’s Jewish community was seeking means to offer the “downtown” poor relief from the “congestion, noise, dirt and foul air” of the ghetto. While other agencies were involved, Daughters in Israel and the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society assumed the primary responsibility for providing women and girls the “good food, fresh air and cheer . . . away from the city,” that could preserve or restore their health. As leaders of these two agencies, Lillie Straus and Ida Sharogrodsky would necessarily collaborate. They soon found themselves starting “a vacation home for working girls” in the Blue Ridge Mountains of western Maryland.23

The therapeutic value of fresh air had long been established. America’s wealthy elite summered at rural retreats, country houses, and hotels, and Baltimore’s “uptown” Jewish community soon joined them. A movement to draw middle-class Americans to the untrammeled countryside for active outdoor pursuits was well underway, with resorts in the mountains and at the seashore attracting thousands of newly mobile citizens. This marked the widespread adoption of the concept of the American vacation.24

Efforts to give the poor relief from summer’s sweltering heat went back decades as well. Baltimore’s renowned public park system grew out of that impulse, and various charitable agencies offered city-dwellers excursions to groves, beaches, and Bay resorts. As the concept of the vacation became ingrained in the American psyche in the early twentieth century, more and more benefactors aimed to provide country getaways to the poor, and to institutionalize the practice as a community function. As early as 1885, the Children’s Aid Society of New York opened a summer home for tenement children that “welcomed some four thousand of the poor little wasted population.” Incorporated in 1892, New York’s Jewish Working Girls’ Vacation Society was soon sending “the girls who live in the crowded East-side and down-town
districts, over-worked and under-fed” to two houses, one in the mountains and one by the sea, for summer respite.25

Baltimore’s Jewish community, under settlement auspices, sponsored a summer encampment for the first time in 1908. That year, the Maccabeans rented a house in Gwynnbrook where over six hundred people, including convalescents from the hospital, were said to have “enjoyed a vacation of a day or more,” even sleeping outside in army tents lent by a benefactor. The following summer, the same agency found “a beautiful country house… airy and comfortable… directly on Roland Lake…” with a “railroad station at the front door.” A piano and a phonograph enlivened evenings with singing and dancing. Up to forty people could stay at one time, and two hundred would come out on Sundays with picnic lunches. Around five hundred families “drawn from factory, store, and hospital” enjoyed “two weeks of fresh air … entirely under Jewish supervision and absolutely Jewish in act and spirit.” For lodging and meals that included “rich milk” from the Hygeia Dairy and “the freshest of eggs,” they paid what they could afford, averaging two dollars a week. This “partial charity” gave a “self-respecting person and honest wage-earner . . . an opportunity to enjoy a vacation in perfect keeping with his pocket-book.”26

But hundreds more “were begging for fresh air and the privilege of spending several days in God’s own country, away from the noise and crowdedness of the hot city and their uncomfortable homes.” In 1911, the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society, which had been sending a small number of convalescents out of the city during the summer, “pay[ing] their board at country places,” shifted gears and opened a country home of its own. They rented a property called “Paradise Farm” in Catonsville, a western suburb, which “consisted of ten acres of ground with a substantial house . . . a lovely, rolling piece of land with an abundance of shade trees.” In collaboration with the Hebrew Benevolent Society, the Young Ladies Benevolent Society cared for “the sick, convalescent, and debilitated” who required “some bracing up, or else otherwise they might collapse.” Seventy-two people stayed in “tents . . . erected on the lawn.”27

The idea of a permanent “Country Home” under Jewish auspices in Maryland took hold. “After several years’ careful consideration and experiment,” in 1914 the Hebrew Benevolent Society bought Paradise Farm as the site for such a home, which continued to be run by the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society. The purchase gave officials hope that “a few weeks’ rest in the summer will have a pronounced and beneficial effect upon [people’s] health, and thus dependence can in a measure be prevented.” In keeping with its charitable purpose, it was operated on an egalitarian basis, where “those who cannot afford to pay are furnished with board free and are allowed all the privileges the others enjoy.”28

The following year, 130 working girls including convalescents and “girls on the verge of nervous breakdowns,” enjoyed time at Paradise Farm. The contingent included fifteen or sixteen from the Working Girls Home in East Baltimore, marking the start of official contact between the Daughters in Israel and the Young Ladies’
Lillie and Aaron Straus, c. 1925–1929. This philanthropic couple transcended the status of financial sponsors and committed to personal involvement with Camp Louise from the beginning. (1993.059.004, Jewish Museum of Maryland.)
Benevolent Society. Notably, both agencies were founding members of the Federation of Jewish Women’s Organizations of Maryland, a forum set up in 1916 to facilitate coordination among its constituents. One can imagine leaders of both groups, Lillie Strauss and Ida Sharogrodsky among them, discussing possibilities for collaboration at its first meetings.29

But Paradise Farm did not seem to provide the working girls of East Baltimore enough opportunity for inexpensive but wholesome vacations in the country. Deciding to work together, Ida and Lillie started a project that would in a few years give birth to Camp Louise. And excellent models were at hand: in all likelihood, they were aware of both the Jewish Working Girls’ Vacation Society in New York and of a closer and very comparable facility: the “Vacation Lodge” in the Blue Ridge Mountain area of western Maryland. Opened in 1890 for “women dependent on their own exertions for support” by three Baltimore society women, it had grown into an independent nonprofit, the Cooperative Workers of Baltimore. Sixty women could enjoy two-week vacations “on a budget of less than $25,” with tennis, croquet, bridge, and bowling. Hiking and horseback riding were available nearby. The only catch? One had to submit a “reference from a clergyman” for admission. Jewish girls did not seem to be welcome.30

And so the following summer, Daughters in Israel and the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society sponsored their own “Vacation Camp” in the Blue Ridge Mountains. A “directorate of twelve ladies,” six from each agency’s board, managed the project. Daughters in Israel contributed $100 and the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society chipped in $263.23. The camp opened on June 25, 1916, at “Berkeley Heights . . . a delightful summer cottage at Buena Vista,” a stop on the Western Maryland Railroad. A typical boardinghouse in an ordinary summer mountain resort, it was the seed that would germinate and grow into Camp Louise.31

“We have been anxious to put through a thing of this sort for some time,” said Dora Weil. “There is a great need for a place where Jewish girls may spend their vacation at small expense and at the same time render them entirely independent.” Weil was to manage the house on behalf of the sponsoring agencies, and to supervise the forty young women who could vacation there at any one time. She gushed with enthusiasm about the preparations that had been made: “We have gotten quantities of pretty cretonnes and other inexpensive little touches to make the place as cool-looking and home-like as possible…. There are the most wonderful porches and grounds. Oh! The girls will simply revel in them. And of course we’ll provide every possible amusement – tennis and all.”32

Plans for the joint project did not firm up until the beginning of June, so there could not have been much advance publicity. Yet during that first nine-week season 175 guests stayed at the vacation home, forty-two at a time. Most of them vacationed for two weeks, but some for longer periods “by advice of physicians.” Eight volunteer counselors, young unmarried women most likely recruited from the Daughters in Israel, “gave one or two weeks each to help entertain the girls,” and “Miss Flora Gump gave up the entire summer to help this new work.”33
Camp Louise used this waterfront on Lake Royer by special arrangement with the Maryland National Guard’s Fort Ritchie, shown on the opposite shore. (1993.059.035e and Pack 18.010, Jewish Museum of Maryland.)
For a second season in the summer of 1917, the Berkeley Heights house was not available, so the organizations rented a slightly smaller house, not far away, called “San Mar.” “Attractively situated,” San Mar was a “cottage of fifteen rooms, with modern improvements.” By June 29, just before opening, one hundred “prospective vacationists” had already registered. They were promised “various means of entertainment . . . including tennis, croquet, swimming, and dancing to phonograph music.” Just as important, the vacation home charged only a nominal fee, and even that was waived for those girls who could not pay. Moreover, “no discrimination was made between the paid and unpaid guests, and the poor girl mingled with her more opulent sister.”

At its end, the second season was accounted “an even greater success than the first year.” San Mar had accommodated 175 girls, about thirty-five per week, “packed in wherever an extra cot could be placed.” They had enjoyed “nutritious and wholesome” food that was “strictly ‘kosher.’” Of the nine counselors, two had returned from the previous season; one of the new counselors was Rebecca Sharogrodsky, Ida’s younger sister. Ida herself came up to San Mar House on weekends, when she would break away from her work with the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society to assist Dora Weil with administrative details. She loved being with the girls, “walked with them, pointed out things they didn’t know, wildflowers, the beauty of the mountains.”

That it was so over-subscribed is one measure of the success of the “mountain venture” that the two agencies had undertaken. Reportedly, “the house was filled from the day we opened, and we had to turn down many applicants for lack of room.” Donations flowed in to support the “summer vacation work,” thirty-three separate donors contributed to Daughters in Israel the first year. Perhaps even more valuable was the girls’ own eagerness to support the project and their desire to establish it as a “permanent vacation home,” rather than relying on rented quarters. They even staged a minstrel show to kick off a fund to purchase such a location.

The vacation house of Daughters in Israel and the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society became an annual feature of the Jewish communal landscape. The agencies rented San Mar House each summer until 1921, when it was no longer available. With Dora Weil’s departure from Daughters in Israel, it seems Miss Ida, as Agent of the YLBS, assumed a larger role in the “summer work” of the two organizations. She may have felt overwhelmed by the task, as she placed an advertisement for a fulltime camp manager in early 1921:

“WANTED: Intelligent woman with executive ability to take charge of a Vacation Camp for Jewish working girls in the Blue Ridge Mountains, Md., during July and August. Address Ida Sharogrodsky, 2223 Eutaw Place, Baltimore.”

Whether she found someone to step in temporarily is not known, but Ida herself served as executive secretary of Camp Louise from that point until her retirement in 1973. Most likely it was Miss Ida herself, a highly “intelligent woman with executive ability” who, in the absence of a suitable candidate for the job, took charge of Camp Louise.
A Permanent Location

Aaron Straus could spot a good deal when he saw one. He had built his fortune on acquiring businesses that were undervalued, picking them up at bargain prices. And now the Blue Ridge Mountain region centered around Pen Mar was in decline. Real estate values had been falling since the 1913 fire that destroyed the Blue Mountain House, the area’s largest and most glamorous hotel. Its heyday appeared over: the elite and middle classes were increasingly drawn to seashore vacations, and the automobile, while still not available to the masses, was opening a wider choice of destinations to those who could afford it.\(^{38}\)

When Miss Ida spotted the defunct Melvue Hotel on one of her solitary rambles around the mountains, it constituted, in fact, an especially good deal. The building, a small hotel of the type that grew up near railroad stations on mountainsides within an hour or so of every major East Coast city, appears not to have been in use for about eight years. Apparently built soon after the Anders family purchased the property from the Cascade Land and Improvement Company in 1898, the hotel opened in 1900, at the peak of Pen Mar’s popularity as a resort. It attracted vacationers from Baltimore and Washington into the 1910s, their arrivals noted in newspaper society columns. Advertisements trumpeted the hotel’s “home comforts, airy rooms, [and] pure water,” as well as its “huge verandas and beautifully shaded lawn.” At over 2,000 feet elevation, “on the crest of the beautiful Blue Ridge Mountains,” it commanded a view of Lake Royer.\(^{39}\)

Lake Royer was one of two small bodies of water that the Buena Vista Ice Company had created in 1901 by damming a small spring in order to harvest natural ice. In summer, guests of nearby hotels could enjoy swimming and boating on the lake, as the company had brought in sand for a beach and built bath houses. Swimming races were held. But by the time the dam that formed the lake broke in 1916, the widespread mechanical manufacture of ice had undercut the market for natural ice. The company did not deem it worthwhile to repair the dam, so Lake Royer sat dry. Without its appealing view, the Melvue failed to attract visitors and closed to the public. Aaron Straus could not have known that in 1926 the Maryland National Guard would acquire the ice company’s land and rebuild the dam, filling the lakebed as a source of active recreation and natural beauty again.\(^{40}\)

In September 1921, the Strauses signed a sales contract for the Melvue Hotel and two acres of land with Emma Anders, the widow who had owned the property since her husband Charles’ death in 1906. The following May and July, they bought two additional lots amounting to eight acres. Was this purchase the beginning of Camp Louise as its origin story implies? Well, yes and no: the vacation camp of Daughters in Israel and the Young Ladies’ Benevolent Society continued to operate in the same way, for the same clientele, simply shifting to a more spacious location: “at least 200 may spend the summer.” But there seems to have been a real
After just two seasons, Camp Louise contracted with local carpenters Thomas Eyler and Walter Olsen to build “rustic and esthetic” bunks. Miss Ida believed the cabins “simulated” tree houses. Bessie Katz, who came to Louise in 1930, remembered the bunks as “crude, open-air log cabins with screening. It was very cold at night, but hot during the days.” (Pack 18.005.)

qualitative difference: no longer reliant on a rental that might not be available, the sponsors could apply their resources to improving the facility and offering a strong program. Ida and Lillie could dream about perfecting a summer home for the girls of East Baltimore that would give them genuine relief from their toil and the harsh surroundings of their daily life.41

On May 1, 1922, Miss Ida wrote to previous guests of the Girls’ Vacation Camp with the “good news: . . . We have been presented with a wonderful hotel, on a ten acre site. . . . From now on, at ‘Camp Louise,’ we will have . . . every comfort imaginable, from individual beds to electric lights.” The letter enthuses about the new facility, its “parlor
big enough for the dances you always enjoyed, but for which you prayed a larger space; a library with plenty of books and magazines; large airy porches completely surrounding the house." The dining room, "big, cheerful, and spacious," would continue to feature plenty of "well prepared, wholesome food . . . on the same strictly kosher basis we have always maintained." For recreation there will be tennis, "basketball, volley ball, and hand ball." And "best of all an open-air fireplace for toasted marshmallows, popcorn, hot dogs, and out-door picnics."42

The stage was now set. On June 22, twelve young Jewish working women arrived from Baltimore on the Western Maryland Railroad: the first to enjoy respite and recreation at Camp Louise. As Camp Louise developed over the subsequent nine decades, it became independent of its founding organizations, and split off a male counterpart, Camp Airy, a few miles away. Both camps shifted their focus to younger girls and boys, emerging as brother and sister summer camps with traditional programs of sports, social activities, fine and performing arts. The Strauses, known to all as Uncle Aary and Aunt Lillie, devoted themselves to camp, where they functioned as surrogate grandparents to thousands of children over the years. After their fiftieth anniversary in 1939, they
moved out of a room in the old Melvue Hotel, known to “Louisers” as the White House, into a cottage up the hill, where they spent every summer until they passed away in the 1950s. As executive secretary, Miss Ida animated the soul of camp through her compassion and her understanding of the immigrant girls’ needs. Eventually she came to live and work fulltime at camp, shaping it according to her philosophy — “live simply and think high.”

43

The values that its founders drew from their Progressive, reform-inspired social service work took root and flourished. While settlement houses are no longer sites for uptown and downtown communities to work together for the uplift of the poor, or machines for Americanization, the ideology that drove them lives on in the way Camp Louise has served Jewish girls in the mid-Atlantic region for most of a century. This spirit is as much a part of Camp as the historic White House on the edge of the mountain or the cool breeze through the trees at sunset.
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Large pagoda-like structures welcomed visitors to the park. (Carlin's Park Entrance, undated, Lydia Livingston Keys, MC8813-8, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
Carlin’s Park:  
“Baltimore’s Million-Dollar Playground”  

LARA WESTWOOD

On August 13, 1919, John J. Carlin advertised the opening night of his latest business venture — an amusement park he billed as “Baltimore’s Million-Dollar Playground.” Liberty Heights Park only featured a carousel, “Dip the Dips,” and a few other rides, but major plans were underway. He promised that his park when completed would be “an amusement resort of the finest and most modern type, a park which would surpass anything hereto attempted in [Maryland] . . . .”1

Liberty Heights Park, later known as Carlin’s Park, started out as a dance hall in the growing Park Circle neighborhood. Carlin had initially intended to expand his residential community on Reisterstown Road on the Gittings family’s former estate “Ashburton,” but the project languished. Instead of losing money on the vacant portion of the property, in 1916 the real estate developer constructed the hall, believing that if it failed to make money he could just tear it down and reuse the lumber to build houses. However, the dance hall was so successful that he built a larger venue in the following year.

By 1919, Carlin decided to add more attractions to complement the dance hall and began construction on the amusement park in April. He could not, however, meet the August deadline because of his ambitious plans. Carlin envisioned a truly grand attraction complete with pagodas, Japanese Tea Rooms, sunken gardens for outdoor dancing, a casino, and a “pretentious” movie theater. The park would also feature “an immense and imposing coliseum” and “a massive natatorium, a concrete Swimming Pool one thousand feet long, fashioned after the baths of ancient Rome, and encircled with a wide beach of velvety sand in which bathers can frolic to their hearts delight!”2 And these were just the beginning of Carlin’s plans.

Carlin’s was not the only amusement park in the Baltimore area. The state’s first amusement park opened in Montgomery County in 1876 to attract visitors to the Cabin John Bridge Hotel and featured a carousel and a scenic railway. Streetcar and steamboat companies also opened amusement parks across the state to boost business. Weekend ridership on trolley lines lagged, prompting the streetcar companies to offer a fun destination at the end of the line. Carlin’s Park neighbor and biggest competitor,

Lara Westwood is the Special Projects Archivist, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society.
Gwynn Oak Park, opened in 1894. Nicholas Smith and William Schwartz purchased the land to build houses but the neighborhood lacked a trolley line. The developers realized that this would be detrimental to sales, so they formed the Gwynn Oak, Walbrook, and Powhatan Railroad. The park, which started as a lakeside picnicking pavilion, would bring visitors and potential homeowners to the area on the new streetcar line. As owner, the Baltimore Traction Company added more attractions. Vaudeville acts performed at the park and dances were held in the pavilion in the early days, but the addition of three rollercoasters — the Big Dipper, the Little Dipper, and the Wild Mouse — made the park famous. Bay Shore Park, owned by the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, opened in 1906 under similar circumstances. Located along the Patapsco River in what is today North Point State Park, Bay Shore became a tremendously popular destination, earning the nickname “Baltimore’s Atlantic City.” The numerous rides and bathing beach could be reached by a convenient, scenic trolley ride and the park also hosted boat and seaplane races that never failed to bring in crowds.

Stiff competition required continued expansion, renovation, and innovation. In 1920, Carlin’s engaged A. Carl Hulsey to build a rollercoaster named the Mountain Speedway that quickly became the park’s most notable attraction. Twenty cents bought visitors a two-and-a half-minute thrill ride — and if the adrenaline rush proved too much, the company provided chairs on the platform, along with “smelling salts and a pitcher of ice water for the ladies.”\(^3\) The Coliseum Funhouse, also opened in 1920, provided a unique entertainment experience. Park patrons who entered the attraction were treated to more rides and games. Every season, new rides and attractions were added or refreshed, and the improvements attracted large crowds. In one warm weekend in May 1921, the park had nearly 20,000 visitors and Carlin’s continued to grow into the 1930s and 1940s. From teacups and swings to shooting galleries and milk bottle tosses, there was a ride or a game to delight everyone.

Always the enterprising businessman, Carlin knew he needed more than new rides to bring in regular customers. Shows, such as vaudeville acts and musical performances at the arena, and dance marathons were scheduled throughout the year. Opera companies regularly performed at the open air theater. In 1923, silent film superstar Rudolph Valentino twice visited the hall on his dance exhibition tour. The events, featuring dance competitions and beauty contestants, drew enormous crowds. The *Baltimore Sun* reported nearly 5,000 people, mostly women, attended the first dance in May. Admirers mobbed Valentino as he left the stage at the end of his performance, but he did choose to return to Carlin’s in June, albeit this time with his wife. Boxing and wrestling matches were held at the Fight Arena, which opened in 1924. Big name brawlers brought in the crowds. In 1931, Carlin also opened Iceland, the city’s first indoor ice skating rink. A ballroom, once the site of a four-month-long dance marathon, was turned into a rink with a 1,200 person seating capacity to promote winter attendance. The arena hosted ice skating shows and from 1932–1942, the Baltimore Orioles ice hockey team. The Eastern Amateur Hockey League team won the league championship in 1940, and 11
players went on to play in the National Hockey League. The team disbanded when many of the players enlisted to fight in World War II. The rink became the home ice for the Baltimore Blades, later the Clippers, from 1944 to 1949. Local school teams and the United States Coast Guard Cutters also played at Iceland.

The park’s ambitious scale eventually took its toll. Ticket sales did not always offset the colossal cost of maintenance to keep the buildings and rides in working order. In 1935, city officials temporarily closed the Green Palace, the sports arena, as it no longer met code. Too many changes to the building’s original structure created serious fire hazards. Similarly, the boxing and wrestling venue was built without obtaining proper permits. Fires and accidents also plagued the park. Several settlements were paid out in injury cases. The Mountain Speedway was involved in two serious accidents. In 1945, a stalled car got stuck on the tracks and was rear-ended by another car, sending several people to the hospital. No one was seriously hurt as happened in the previous year, when a woman was thrown from the coaster and killed. She stood up on the ride for added thrill, as many daredevils had done before, but this time, tragedy struck.

Fires occurred regularly at the park. On September 30, 1937, an astonishing ten-alarm blaze nearly destroyed the entire park with losses totaling almost $300,000. The fire proved so devastating that city officials banned Carlin from rebuilding wooden structures on the property out of concern for the safety of the neighborhood. Despite all of these issues, he threw a grand twentieth anniversary party in June 1938 and opened an Olympic-size pool the following summer.

As with most Baltimore businesses, Carlin’s Park maintained a policy of racial segregation. Although the park contracted African Americans to fight at the arena, play music at the dance hall, and likely work at the park, they could not partake in the park’s amenities. In 1951, black members and their families of a local chapter of the Union of Automobile Workers were denied entrance on their planned family outing day. The union that sold the tickets to members claimed ignorance on the policy, and “The disappointed ticketholders cashed in their tickets at 50 cents each and left quietly.”

Carlin’s intrepid commitment kept the park afloat. After his death in 1954, the park passed to one of his daughters, but fires in 1955 and 1956 decimated the grounds. The Midway and Iceland were burned beyond repair, and the cost was too great to rebuild. The grounds remained an entertainment destination. The pool remained open through the 1960s. A drive-in movie theater with spaces for 1,800 cars was built over the ruins of Iceland, and stayed open until 1978. Today, Carlin’s Industrial Park sits atop one of Baltimore’s most beloved amusement parks.
The carousel was one of the first attractions at Carlin’s Park. It operated on the grounds until 1958 when it was mistakenly destroyed during the construction of the drive-in theater. (Carlin’s Park, July 1, 1941, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(2)-L, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
In 1929, the Circle Swing ride was revamped into Lindy Planes in honor of Charles Lindbergh. (“Roland Brave,” Carlin’s Park, June 5, 1938, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(1)-D, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

The park’s two rollercoasters were tremendously popular rides. The Philadelphia Toboggan Company built the Dip-the-Dips coaster in 1919. Carlin’s Park (Racer Dip, undated, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(3)-A, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
Both rollercoasters, the Dip-the-Dips and Mountain Speedway, featured tunnels before the lift hills to add to the thrill. (Carlin’s Park, undated, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(3)-E, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

An Olympic-sized swimming pool surrounded by a sandy beach opened in 1938. (Carlin’s Park, July 1, 1941, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(2)-D, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
The park regularly hosted “Kiddie Days” with special events for young visitors. (Carlin’s Park, June 5, 1938, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(1)-H, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

The Coliseum Funhouse was filled with additional rides, such as these swings. (Carlin’s Park, June 5, 1938, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(1)-F, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
ABOVE: Improvements were ongoing at the park. Bug was added in 1929, along with a host of other new attractions to bring in customers. (Carlin’s Park, undated, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(3)-K, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

RIGHT: The dozens of rides and games at the park meant there was something for everyone. (Carlin’s Park, July 1, 1941, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(2)-E, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
Over the years, Carlin added more and more kid-friendly attractions, such as this train and a playground. (Carlin’s Park, undated, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(3)-B, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
A human-sized hamster wheel attracted many fun seekers. (Carlin’s Park, June 5, 1938, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(1)-C, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

Bumper cars were a park favorite. (Carlin’s Park, July 1, 1941, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(2)-I, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
A park patron tries out the air blowers in the funhouse. (Carlin’s Park “Fun House,” 1938, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(t)-A, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

Carnival games could be played throughout the park and in the Funhouse. (Carlin’s Park, undated, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(j)-H, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
The merry-go-round was a perennial park favorite. (Carlin’s Park, undated, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(3)-I, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)

Visitors peer at their distorted reflections in the Hall of Mirrors. (“Roland Brave,” Carlin’s Park, June 5, 1938, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(1)-K, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
A host of sideshows, such as this circus, enticed visitors to the park. ("Roland Brave," Carlin’s Park, June 5, 1938, A. Aubrey Bodine, B348(1)-P, Baltimore City Life Museum Collection, Maryland Historical Society.)
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In 1847, James Murray and Henry R. Hazlehurst opened their business at the Vulcan Works on the south side of Baltimore Harbor under the lee of Federal Hill. (Library of Congress.)

DAVID W. WOODDELL AND ROBERT E. PRATT

The legacy of James Murray and Henry R. Hazlehurst is astonishing in breadth and depth. Their buildings, vessels, and machinery were built to last, including the steam tugboat *Baltimore*, launched in 1857 for the city of Baltimore. That vessel, the first iron hulled boat built in the harbor, remained working for more than seventy years. The number of buildings they built of national importance that remain on the National Register of Historic places is also a clear indication of the quality of their workmanship. And yet, today, no photographs of the two men exist. They are footnotes to history, when they should be remembered more fully for their excellence and innovation.

When James Murray and Henry R. Hazlehurst came together in 1847 in Baltimore to form Murray & Hazlehurst at the Vulcan Works, they each brought to the partnership decades of experience and expertise in practical civil engineering. Early in their careers they witnessed and assisted in the birth of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad (B&O). At the Vulcan Works in Baltimore, on the south shore of the harbor under the lee of Federal Hill, the partners built some of the best machinery the city produced.

**Henry R. Hazlehurst (1815–1900)**

Hazlehurst had his professional start working for his first cousin, Benjamin H. Latrobe, Jr., (who became his brother-in-law a few years later). Latrobe was the civil engineer surveying and planning the newly formed Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. He took young Henry under his wing to mentor him in the practical engineering of railroading.¹

Hazlehurst first joined Latrobe’s survey corps in 1831 at Ellicott’s Mills at age sixteen as his father had recently died and left few resources to support the family. These infant years of the railroad engineering demanded on-the-job training with intensive personal study at night to learn the new profession. With cousin Benjamin to guide his learning Hazlehurst served as an assistant, and then was promoted to “calculator,” an important
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but laborious position requiring mathematical calculations of loads and stresses. Finding he had time in the day after finishing his calculations, Hazlehurst volunteered to help with other engineering tasks and rapidly became a skilled surveyor, and proved to be an able cartographer.²

It was while serving under Latrobe’s survey crew that Hazlehurst met James Murray, who was just as new to the business. Together, the two young men served on the B&O survey crew in 1833, working between Baltimore and Washington, DC. By that time, Latrobe had been appointed principal assistant engineer of the B&O. The survey parties went into the field for several months at a time, but spent their winters in Baltimore, drawing maps and engineering plans, and making the many calculations that were required to plan the routes and infrastructure needed to build a railroad. In the following year, Hazlehurst and Murray were both promoted to assistant engineer as the survey turned westward from Ellicott City to Point of Rocks, and then toward Harper’s Ferry.³

In 1834, Hazlehurst was again working for Latrobe, along with James Murray and others, surveying the rail line for the Baltimore & Port Deposit Railroad (B&PD),
between Baltimore and the Susquehanna River. The men set out in mid-winter, taking the field for seven weeks of very inclement weather, surveying about fifty miles. The B&PD railroad began operations in 1835, reaching Wilmington in 1837, and Philadelphia in 1838 before changing the name to the Wilmington & Baltimore Railroad. The Newkirk Monument, just outside of Philadelphia, lists B. H. Latrobe as Engineer, and Henry R. Hazlehurst as assistant engineer of the railroad. 4

Curiously, Hazlehurst’s map of the B&PD, drawn in 1834 and lithographed for the public, was so accurate that his son, George B. Hazlehurst, who was a crack railroad engineer, used the map forty-five years later when he resurveyed the line for the B&O Railroad. Returning to the B&O, Hazlehurst drew a map used in the Sixth Annual Report of the Chief Engineer of the B&O, showing the proposed routes reconnoitered from Cumberland to the Ohio River. Hazlehurst was promoted to division engineer, taking charge of the engineering on a “division” of the rail line that extended from Harper’s Ferry to Sir John’s Run, northwest of Berkeley Springs. 5

During that time, Hazlehurst lived in Martinsburg, and then later in Cumberland, Maryland, where he built a house on Washington Street and lived with his family. He participated in building branch lines to various coalmines in the area, and then with money saved, he opened his own foundry and machine shop in Cumberland. The young engineer watched for additional opportunities and in 1847 gained appointment as one of three directors responsible for the repair and maintenance of the National Road in
Maryland. The job did not occupy much of his time as was also deeply involved in the engineering business at the Vulcan Works with James Murray.\(^6\)

**James Murray (1812–1895)**

Born in Maine in 1812, James Murray “completed” his education in 1829–1830. Yet, as with Hazlehurst, Murray’s engineering education was on-the-job training after he went to work for Latrobe. He later wrote:

> The amount of information possessed in this country, with regard to the subject or railways and railway machinery in 1829 and 1830, was exceedingly small. According to the best of my knowledge, there was no railroad in operation at that time, except perhaps the Quincy Railroad in Massachusetts. There was a deputation sent to England by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, to obtain information respecting the subject of railroads. Numerous experiments were also made under the direction and at the expense of the company, by persons in their employment; and among the persons engaged in making such experiments for the company, was Ross Winans.\(^7\)

Murray became a protégé of Ross Winans, eventually going into the railroad's engine works at Mount Clare where he learned and then made locomotives after surviving the rigors of field surveys in the wilds of Virginia. In 1834, the survey party, including Murray and Hazlehurst, endured seven weeks of rough, cold, and wet winter weather in the field.\(^8\)

Murray also worked with the survey crew of the Baltimore to Port Deposit Railroad up to the Susquehanna River, during which time he was away from the B&O. In early 1838, he returned and was placed in charge of repairs and construction of the railways, as an assistant to Latrobe. That same year he worked on obtaining enough timber to rebuild the main line from Ellicott’s Mills to Harper's Ferry — an ambitious assignment as the railroad needed millions of board feet of wood of several different varieties.\(^9\)

By the age of twenty-seven, Murray worked up to Master of Machinery of the B&O, with offices at Mount Clare in Baltimore. He later recalled, “In 1839, the superintendence of the department of machinery was added to my other duties.” That job had previously been held by the inventive genius, Ross Winans, who had known Murray well for two years but had known of him since 1831. At least one source suggests that Murray was an unofficial apprentice in the Winans shop at Mount Clare. Murray’s relationship with Winans, and with his sons, Thomas and William, remained through Murray’s life.\(^10\)

Latrobe encouraged innovation and experimentation and trusted his talent for recognizing good people. One such individual Murray favored was Wendal Bollman, a skilled carpenter in western Maryland. In 1837, Murray hired Bollman as foreman of bridge construction. Bridges were needed in great numbers to cross all the ravines,
In 1837, Wendal Bollman, a carpenter by trade, developed the iron truss bridge. The bridge shown here is at Savage Mills, Maryland is on the National Register of Historic Places. (Library of Congress.)

streams, and rivers of the Allegheny Mountains. With the encouragement of Murray and Latrobe, Bollman developed the iron truss bridges for which he is justly famous. Many Bollman truss bridges were manufactured in Baltimore at the B&O Railroad shops at Mount Clare, when Murray was Master of Machinery. Bollman eventually became Master of the Road for the B&O, responsible for all engineering and construction of the rails, bridges, and right of way. Today, a Bollman truss bridge is preserved and maintained at Savage Mills, Maryland. It is on the National Register of Historic Places in honor of the bridge-maker’s skills.¹¹

Murray’s job as master of machinery included giving “directions in regard to the construction of every class of their machinery, the running gear of railroad cars included, . . . the repairs and management of all the machinery. The supervision of the machinery department during that time (1839–1847) was under my control.”¹²

In 1842, without doubt, he was one of two men in charge of the November rail excursion to show the mayor and city council of Baltimore why the city should invest $3 million in the B&O. The company needed the funding to finish building the railroad westward, including redoing some portions that could be improved. The rail jaunt, with Murray in command of the engine and logistics, and another man in charge of the social wrangling of so many politicians (and at least one journalist), was a rousing success. The train rolled westward complete with its own brass band, the Independent Blues Band in a car of its own. Taverns, hotels, and private residences along the way
provided refreshments and the group stopped for short line visits to coal and iron mines. Traveling this way, according to the Sun’s correspondent was dusty, rainy, warmish, or downright cold, depending on the day. November weather in western Maryland is a chancy thing.13

By 1845, Murray’s skills included designing and building the first steam engine built at the B&O Mount Clare shops in Baltimore. Murray wrote about the engine, which he named the “Mount Clare”:

This engine was designed by me and built in the B&O Company’s shops. The object being to remedy certain defects relative to the valve gear and to the position of the spur and pinion wheel of the Winans geared locomotive at a time when we still had but little else than two and one-quarter by five-eight inch flat bar rail on a wooden string piece between Baltimore and Harper’s Ferry and feared to introduce larger wheels and greater spread of wheel base than had previously been determined practicable.14

In 1847, the B&O finished construction of the engine roundhouse at Mount Clare. The Sun gave the new construction a glowing review, including crediting Murray with the design and architecture of the engine works, which stood just to the southeast of the more well known passenger car roundhouse that stands today as the B&O Railroad Museum. The building was “a polygon of sixteen sides, each of which is a doorway of sufficient capacity of a largest class locomotive.” A roundtable stood at the center, allowing the engines to come and depart from the building from any door. Some sources have claimed that Murray’s roundhouse was the first built anywhere in the world.15

Murray’s fame and a reputation for excellence was not lost on the railroad’s directors. When Thomas Swann resigned as president of the B&O in April 1853, Murray was considered for his replacement. But by then, he was deeply involved in his partnership with Henry Hazlehurst. The talented engineer was also reportedly a social butterfly and his name appeared often in the pages of the press as a supporter of charitable and social events. According to George Hazlehurst, Murrayspent lavishly on entertainments.16

In 1841, Murray’s toast at a St. Patrick’s Day dinner appeared in the newspaper:

Railroads – The ground they cover prepared by Irishmen, the rails laid by the sons of Erin – their industry is at the bottom and the top of American enterprise, and they are always as ready to defend American rights, as they are their own.17

He spent money in support of the education of Baltimore’s workingmen. Murray was one of the directors of the Maryland Institute for the Promotion of the Mechanic Arts, to provide training for the workingmen of Baltimore. It was a school of design, mechanical arts, and sciences. Joshua Vansant was president; Edward Needles, and James Murray were vice presidents. Henry Hazlehurst was appointed one of the managers
in January 1848, and the following year were named directors of the Institute, with about twenty other prominent citizens. Classes were held at night so that workmen already employed could attend and learn new skills. Between 1848 and 1857, Murray was named often as a participant and manager of the Maryland Institute. He sometimes served as judge for the annual competition of arts, crafts, and machines.18

Murray & Hazlehurst were also financial supporters of the Floating School in Baltimore Harbor, a maritime training school for young men. The school was held on the Ontario, an old sailing ship that had been retired from service, giving the place to learn and practice seamanship skills.19

Murray & Hazlehurst

In June 1847, notice of the partnership between Murray and Hazlehurst appeared in the Baltimore Sun. It was the first of many mentions of the partnership in the Sun, as well as in many other newspapers. The company became known in the professional engineering community for the excellence of their machinery and castings. For instance, in 1853, Haswell’s Engineer’s and Mechanics Pocket Book, 5th edition bragged that Murray & Hazlehurst’s Vulcan Works endorsed the publication.

Notice and funding of their work appeared in the Congressional Record for such projects as the twin engines for the U.S.S. Susquehanna. They were regularly hired by the Navy, by the State of Maryland, and by municipal governments such as Baltimore and Philadelphia; and as far away as Brazil. Steam engines were their specialty. The more complex and advanced, the better they liked them. Murray, it was said, was a “scientific engineer,” known for precision, and possibly over-engineering. But their products were built to last, and many of them endured well past normal expectancy. The partners had taken over the former Watchman engine factory at the Vulcan Works, on the south side of the basin in Baltimore’s harbor, just down the hill on the northern side of Federal Hill as it curved around to the east.20

Coastal navigation in the mid-nineteenth century was important for commerce. The federal government, under pressure from ship owners and their insurers began to look for ways to make passage up and down the coast safer. Murray & Hazlehurst profited from that effort when they received government contracts to build stronger lighthouses that
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Biloxi Lighthouse, architectural drawing, 1847. On March 3, 1847, Congress authorized $12,000 for the construction of a lighthouse at Biloxi, Mississippi. The Treasury Department awarded the contract to the Baltimore foundry of Murray and Hazlehurst to build an iron lighthouse for $6,347 (2017 value is approximately $179,000.) (National Park Service.)

the lighthouse was restored, and was the subject of a commemoratice postage stamp, as a survivor of Hurricane Katrina. This lighthouse was also notable for its female lighthouse keepers, who kept the light going for seventy-four years.21

In 1852, Murray & Hazlehurst manufactured the iron piles for the screw-pile lighthouse at the Seven Foot Knoll, in Baltimore Harbor near the mouth of the Patapsco River. Screw piles were another innovation Murray & Hazlehurst introduced to Baltimore. The firm built other lighthouses, too, but the Biloxi lighthouse is the only one that remains. The Confederate army, denying service to the Union Navy, destroyed Murray & Hazlehurst’s lighthouse on Bodie Island, North Carolina, built in 1858–1859.22

In 1852, Murray & Hazlehurst manufactured the iron piles for the screw-pile lighthouse at the Seven Foot Knoll, in Baltimore Harbor near the mouth of the Patapsco River. (Library of Congress)
James Murray, Henry R. Hazlehurst, and the Vulcan Works, 1847–1860

Locomotives and Rail Cars

With Murray's expertise in building locomotives, the firm received contracts from the B&O and other railroads for such engines. In February 1850, they constructed a specialty engine for the B&O of thirty tons that ran between Bolton Depot and Calvert Station, replacing the horses that had been pulling the passenger and freight cars up the heavy grade in North Street.

In 1854, they built a powerful 4-4-0 "Dutch Wagon" style locomotive for the B&O. Engine No. 208 weighed twenty-eight tons, with 60" diameter drivers, and cylinders 15"x20." In 1861, Stonewall Jackson's army captured the locomotive at Martinsburg but in 1865 the engine returned to the B&O where it remained on the roster of active engines until 1871.

In 1857, the firm built a powerful locomotive named the "Pittsburgh" with eight wheels, weighing twenty tons. Special temporary tracks had to be laid up Sharp Street to Lee Street, and then to Howard Street to join with existing track. From there the "Pittsburgh" ran on the North Central Railroad's line to the Connellsville, Pennsylvania Railroad.

In 1853, leveraging Murray's extensive experience, the firm built 400 rail cars with removable dividers to accommodate livestock or merchandise. Four years later, cast double radius wheels of patented design, constructing them directly at the Mount Clare car works. A national financial crisis impacted most businesses and families but the B&O had a Nasmith hammer the firm could employ for the heavy work. The Baltimore Sun reported that wheel construction put many men back to work.

Fire Engines

Steam fire engines were new when Murray & Hazlehurst built one for the city of Baltimore in 1858 for the Washington Hose Company, on Barre Street near Sharp. The engine weighted 4,000 pounds, and cost $3,000. The company had its own foundry, and was famous for the skill of their castings. Christened "Home," it was the first engine of its kind produced in Baltimore.

The fire company had a parade and reception in honor of receiving the new steam engine and then placed it on Monument Square for the public to see, with hundreds of individuals coming to look and ask questions. "Home" was only the second steam fire engine of its type introduced into Baltimore and boasted the ability to burn wood, in addition to attached tender "capable of carrying half a cord of fuel."

The engine was decorated with a number 13 suspended in a frame at the front under the lantern, and the name, "Home" in gilded letters, with names of the builders. The engine's primary paint color was a light yellow. Following the exhibition in the square, a parade formed, complete with members of the Washington Hose Company, and the Independent Blues Band proceeding down Fayette Street to Gay, Baltimore, Fremont, Hollins, Lombard, Sharp, Conway, Hanover, Eutaw, Canton,
Howard, and to Barre, where the company had their engine house. Hundreds lined the streets to watch and cheer.  

The following year the company added another engine, this one named “Thomas Swann” in honor of the former president of the B&O Railroad, and later mayor of Baltimore. The fire engine was built for the Columbus fire company in Baltimore and took a trial run at Mount Vernon Place where it threw a horizontal stream of water 232 feet along Charles Street. A perpendicular stream was directed toward the Washington Monument, reaching the statue on the monument, 192 feet above. “If no other good resulted from the trial, the washing to which the marble shaft was subjected, and which it greatly needed, will compensate for the time expended by those having the matter in charge.”

That same year they built two steam fire engines for the city of Pensacola, Florida, and one for Mobile, Alabama. The following year, 1860, they built a fire engine and tested it in Monument Square, where it threw water through an inch and a quarter hose for 285 feet, which would have allowed the water to pass over the tallest building in Baltimore at that time.

**Steamboats and Engines**

Murray & Hazlehurst produced one of the longest lasting, and most famous iron hulled tugboats on the east coast of the United States, the steam tugboat *Baltimore*. Built on contract for the city of Baltimore in 1857, it was the precursor to, (and some say the model for), the steam tug *Baltimore* built by the Skinner shipyard in 1906, which remains
In 1857, Murray & Hazlehurst built the first Baltimore tug at their Vulcan Works in Baltimore Harbor. Skinner Shipbuilding built the second steam tug Baltimore in 1906 on the south side of the harbor. Today, the 1906 Baltimore is owned by the Baltimore Museum of Industry, and is a National Historic Landmark.

The 1857 tug remained active for more than seventy years and featured a cast iron hull. The same year the Baltimore was launched, Murray & Hazlehurst also built and launched a similar iron-hulled tugboat called the Major Henry Brewerton.

Insurance underwriters quickly recognized the role tugboats played in keeping harbors safe. “We look upon the tugs as an almost indispensablerequisite to the harbor,” an article in The Sun reported in April 1857, “and the wonder is, since their efficiency has been proved, how our mercantile interests have done so long without them.”

But the firm was even more famous for its naval constructions. They received international fame for building the massive engines for the steam frigate U.S.S. Susquehanna. The engines were considered landmarks in naval engineering and remarkable for their size and type of construction. Designed by C. W. Copeland and built in Baltimore, the engines traveled on barges to Philadelphia. The castings were massive, the cylinders seventy inches in diameter, with a stroke of ten feet. The enormous engines received international attention in the press and the drawings were reproduced in textbooks of marine engineering.

The ship launched in 1850 after years of work, with the firm’s engine and boiler specialist Henry Sides in charge of placing the machinery on board at the Navy Yard. The Susquehanna was one of Commodore Matthew Perry’s feet that visited China and Japan and more than a decade later, during the Civil War, served in the Atlantic Blockading Squadron.
The Vulcan Works of Murray & Hazlehurst collaborated with various shipbuilders in Baltimore, including that of John A. Robb & Company. The firm built the first oscillating steam engines in the U. S. for the steamship Republic, with a hull that Robb designed and built. “The diameter of the cylinders will be fifty-four inches, and the stroke of piston twenty-two inches. As this will be the first vessel built in this country provided with the oscillating cylinders, considerable anxiety is experienced by the scientific community as to the ultimate success of the principle.” 33

In 1850, the Vulcan Works built two oscillating engines for the steamship Monumental City. Each cylinder was forty-four inches in diameter, with three-foot stroke of piston producing 400 horsepower. With them they constructed two tubular boilers, nine feet seven inches wide, twelve feet four inches high, eleven feet long containing about 1,500 feet of heating surface. John A. Robb & Co built the ship, a steam propeller vessel of 185 feet in length, 750 tons burthen, with a four-blade propeller, each blade had a twelve-foot diameter with a twenty-five-foot pitch. Built for Captain Norris, and intended for the Pacific trade, the ship never returned to Baltimore. The Monumental City is credited for being the first steamship to cross the Pacific Ocean but unfortunately wrecked on the Australian coast. This historic shipwreck remains protected today under the watchful eye of the Victoria Archaeological Survey. 34

Work with John A. Robb & Company went so well that later on, Eliakim T. Robb went to work for Murray & Hazlehurst as chief draftsman. He was a valuable member of the firm, and helped train candidates for the Navy’s Engineering Corps. The drafting room of Murray & Hazlehurst achieved a well-deserved reputation for fostering engineering candidates for the Navy. 35

In 1850, the company built engines for a 220-ton packet steamer built to run between Baltimore and the Patuxent River. The following year they built engines for the steamer Belvidere to replace the burned Columbus for the Powhatan Steam Packet Company. The Belvidere was 225 feet in length, and about 850 tons burthen. The engines had 50-inch cylinders, with 12 feet stroke. Cooper & Butler built the hull under the watchful eye of John S. McKim, William Heald, and J. Brandt, the company’s agent. Designed for the Richmond to Petersburg run, Lewis Parrish served as captain. Hundreds attended the launch, and enjoyed an abundant reception. The same year, Murray & Hazlehurst built two engines of sixty-horsepower each for the new steamer, the Bertha Harrassowitz, designed for the “Spanish Main” to St. Thomas, a side-wheeler with a very sleek design, “almost as sharp as a knife” at 135 feet long, and about seventy-five tons burthen. The contracts continued to roll in for new engines as the steam continued to replace sailing vessels. Work in 1852 included a twelve-horsepower engine made for the steam packet President. After delivery, Captain Petrie ran the ship through the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, from Cumberland to Georgetown at the speed of six miles per hour. 36

Not all of the projects were successes. Perhaps the most controversial project was for the U. S. steam frigate Princeton. They built the engines and boilers under the exacting specifications of the Navy engineers, but the engines were poorly designed,
and compared with other ships of her class, the vessel could barely move through the water. Scheduled to leave the harbor in mid-October to sail with the Asian squadron for Japan, the ship was help back. Murray & Hazlehurst was ultimately held harmless and in 1852 received the contract to rebuild the *Princeton*'s engines and boilers under a different design.\(^{37}\)

In 1854, the new steamer *Kent* was under construction at the John S. Brown & Company yard. Murray & Hazlehurst built the engine, a lever beam, “of the most approved construction.” She was 160 feet in length, of about 270 tons, and was intended for the Eastern Shore line under Captain G. S. Sturgeon, owner and commander.\(^{38}\)

That same year the company built engines for a ferryboat, the *City Block*, slated to run between Federal Hill and the City Block. Built by John S. Brown, the vessel had an unhappy career. The ferry was not a successful venture and ultimately came back to owners Murray & Hazlehurst, who then sold it — but the boat caught fire and was totally destroyed while on the way south.\(^{39}\)
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*In 1857, Murray and Hazlehurst built the steam engine and side wheels for the George Peabody.*

(Reserved for Congress.)

In 1857, Cooper & Butler built the hull of the steamer *George Peabody*, 235 feet length on deck, 1025 tons burthen, for the Powhatan Steamboat Company. Murray & Hazlehurst built the beam engine for the *Peabody*, and the side wheels. “The engine is supplied with a celebrated Sickles’ cut-off, the title derived from the fact that it prevents the steam from escaping from the cylinder whilst the piston-rod is traversing its chamber. The saving of fuel by this application has been proven to be equal to one-fifth of the whole quantity used.” The wheels for the *Peabody* were made of wrought iron, thirty-two feet in diameter and nine-feet wide, with twenty-six arms plus three furnaces, with boilers that Murray designed.\(^{40}\)
Another government contract went to Murray & Hazlehurst in 1859, to build two boilers and two engines for the U. S. S. Dacotah, a steam sloop of war. The vessel was a twin propeller, with two 400-horsepower engines, and two boilers weighing forty tons each. Unlike the Princeton, the Dacotah was a fast vessel, and considered a great success.\(^{31}\)

During those years, the company repaired and replaced many engines and boilers for existing vessels, including for the Powhatan, a steamer that ran between Washington and Baltimore; repaired the engines of the steamer Georgia; replaced the boilers on the Herald, for the Bay Line; repaired the engines and boilers of the Osceola; overhauled the engines and boilers of the North Carolina; placed a new boiler in the Pocahontas, of the Powhatan Steamboat Company; replaced the shaft of the Champion; repaired and maintained the Hercules, Tiger, and Ajax for the Baltimore Steam-Tug Company; built new engines for the Adelaïde; overhauled the engines of the Kent and had the famous steamer Baltimore, on the screw dock, replacing the propeller so the ship could resume its merchant voyages between New York, Baltimore, and Havana, Cuba for owner, M. A. Mitchell.\(^{42}\)

Iron bridges were another of the firm’s specialties. In 1848, they had the contract for Baltimore’s Fayette Street Bridge, made of iron using an inverted arch. Murray & Hazelhurst built the iron drawbridge over the Jones’ Falls in 1852, at Block Street, made of iron and masonry. They built the drawbridge of the Light Street Bridge in 1856, based on a plan by Latrobe. That bridge was sometimes known as Crisp’s Bridge. Brazil ordered several iron railroad bridges in 1858, which were shipped to Rio Janeiro on the ship Washington Booth.\(^{43}\)

The Vulcan Works

The Vulcan Works grew to a substantial property, with many buildings, steam engines to power the machinery used in manufacturing the engines, boilers, and other items the company produced. The company had its own foundry on the premises, which itself gained substantial notice in the press for its innovations and sometimes massive sizes of the castings. The Vulcan Works of Murray & Hazlehurst employed hundreds of workmen, and contributed in many ways to financial prosperity in the city.\(^{44}\)

The Machine Shop, Foundery (sic), Blacksmith Shop, and Offices cover the square between William and Johnson St., on the east and west, and Hughes and Armistead lane, on the north and south…. The Boiler Shop, fronting on William street, and includes the Pattern Shop, Grinding Shop, Car Shop… There is a water privilege on the basin, to the west of the last lot (opposite and north of York Street) affords the establishment a water front of 230 feet in all. On the water lot is an Iron Crane, for placing and removing boilers and heavy machinery, capable of hoisting fifty tons ….\(^{45}\)
The partners were public-spirited men, serving on boards and commissions throughout their careers. Murray assisted the water commission in Baltimore studying sources of clean water for the city’s planned water supply. Both men sat on the board of directors of the Maryland Institute for the Promotion of Mechanic Science, a school for machinists, engineers, and other practical professions. They also fostered and encouraged training of apprentice engineers in their own Vulcan Works, helping more than a dozen young engineers pass the rigorous exams to become “passed engineers” for civilian and Navy employment. One of those men, Fred McKean later became Chief Engineer of the Navy.

Murray & Hazlehurst were together at the Vulcan Works for just thirteen years, until they dissolved the partnership in July 1860. Despite the many handsome contracts they ran out of money, in part because James Murray lived an extravagant lifestyle and ultimately left Hazlehurst to pay off the debts.

In July 1860 the Daily Exchange reported “Dissolution of Partnership, The partnership heretofore existing between James Murray and Henry R. Hazlehurst, under the firm of Murray & Hazlehurst, has been dissolved.” Henry R. Hazlehurst remained at the Vulcan Works, in partnership with their former general manager, the boilermaker William D. Wiegand. As Hazlehurst & Company, the business was one of three the Navy approved to work on government vessels in Baltimore during the Civil War. They remained in business until 1878, eventually selling the company to H. A. Ramsay.  

Henry Hazlehurst remained active in many civic affairs, including the first government of Ellicott City and in 1881 was among those who proposed the formation of a board of health for Howard County and was elected to serve on that board. He also held membership on the board of the Patapsco Female Institute, where his daughters attended school and ultimately stood with those who voted to dissolve the school and surrender its charter in 1890.

Hazlehurst was among those from Ellicott City who formed the Patapsco Gas Light Company of Ellicott City that same year:

for carrying on the manufacture of, or procuring, or collecting gas or inflammable (sic) air, and preserving, using and distributing the same, as the means of lighting the public and private houses, factories, streets, lanes, alleys, and other places in the village of Ellicott Mills, and its precincts, or for carrying on any manufacture necessary for converting to useful purposes the product of any substances which may be employed in making or procuring gas, and for disposing of the same . . .  

Henry R. Hazlehurst died in Baltimore, at the home of his son, George Blagden Hazlehurst, on February 21, 1900. He left three living children. Hazlehurst, born on March 2, 1815 in Abingdon, Oxfordshire, England, arrived in the United States with his parents four years later. They lived at Salem, New Jersey, close to the Hazlehurst summer estate. His grandfather was Isaac Hazlehurst, Jr. (1742–1834) of Philadelphia and
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New Jersey. Merchant and banker, Isaac was a leading citizen in his own day, backing the currency issued to support the Continental Congress and the Continental army. Isaac and his brother, Samuel, provided funding for the first ships of the colonial navy and armed merchant vessels that supplied the Continental army with much needed provisions and arms.

In 1844, Hazlehurst married Ellen Dall Thomas, a daughter of Dr. Allen D. Thomas of "Dalton," Howard County, Maryland. In 1847, she delivered a healthy baby girl, Ellen Thomas Hazelhurst, but fell ill and died six days later. Hazlehurst remarried in 1852, to Elizabeth Virginia McKim (1828–1887), a daughter of David Telfair McKim and they had six children. Henry and Elizabeth lived most of their married lives together in the twenty-room mansion that Henry designed and built in 1857 just outside of Ellicott City, on land that was given to them by his first wife's father, adjacent to the Thomas property. The mansion, called "Lilburn" remains today, and is considered one of Howard County's premier historic properties, situated on fifty acres overlooking the Patapsco River at Ellicott City.

In 1900, following his death, the I. O. O. F. (Independent Order of Odd Fellows), who had bought the property from the estate, sold the family mansion and extensive grounds at an auction — "A magnificent mansion, containing 20 rooms and has water throughout. Tenant Houses, Laundry, Hothouse, Icehouse, Carriage House, Stable and Barn, Servants' Quarters, etc."

Also in 1857, Hazelton built "Lilburn," a twenty-room gothic mansion in Ellicott City, Maryland. (author photograph, 2018.)
When the partnership dissolved in 1860, James Murray left the country and went to work for his longtime associates, Ross Winans and sons, Thomas and William. He departed for Russia in August to fulfill an engineering contract on the Tsar of Russia’s railroad between St. Petersburg and Moscow. Once there, Murray was one of two principal superintendents (G. W. Whistler was the other) under the overall direction of the Winans brothers and never returned to the United States. After the Russian contract, he moved to London where he worked for William L. Winans and lived with him for twenty years as close associate and confidant of one of the wealthiest men in the world.51

The annual testing of Winans’ operating steam engine water models became a thing of wonder for Londoners and England’s marine engineers, but Winans discontinued the public showing of his test craft after a series of failures and ridicule. One English journalist described the effort of Winans who devoted:

. . . a portion of his great wealth to making bizarre experiment in naval architecture. It is currently rumored that the ‘cigar ship,’ upon the construction of which he had already expended not less than 500,000 pounds, without bringing it to perfection, is soon likely to be completed so that a glass of water will be conveyed upon the cabin table across the most boisterous ocean without a drop of the liquid being spilt.”52

Despite the opinion in the U. S. that the cigar ships were a failure, they were more successful when it came to the European models of the famous spindle-shaped vessels the Winans built, promoted, and tried to patent. From 1877 onward, Murray worked for Winans, who was by then said to be the richest man in the world. Murray lived in England, in London’s fashionable Kensington neighborhood, where Winans had his substantial mansion.

Murray died in London, March 29, 1895 at the age of eighty-three. His obituaries said two daughters, both married to U. S. Army officers, and a son survived him. James Murray and Henry R. Hazlehurst were innovative and thorough in their work, leaving little room for error. Their machinery and engineering lasted decades, and in some cases, remains with us more than 100 years after it was built. Baltimore, a city of working men, engineers, machinists, and shipyards should be proud of the legacy of the two engineers. And yet, they have passed into relative obscurity. Few people recall the extent of what they built for, and from Baltimore. 53
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Francis O'Neill standing in the main reading room with the Passano-O'Neill Historic Index File.
(Maryland Historical Society.)
“underbelly”: from the Deepest Corners of the Maryland Historical Society Library

The library’s bi-monthly blog, “underbelly,” is among the society’s most popular online features. Launched in September 2012 staff, historians, research fellows, and patrons contribute articles inspired by treasures found in the rich and textured collections of manuscripts, photographs, prints, books, and ephemera in the library’s holdings. As of this writing there are close to 200 posts on the website, some of which will be featured here in coming issues. For more Chesaapeake Bay stories, and access to the full archive, visit www.mdhs.org and follow the “blogs” link on the home page.

The Passano-O’Neill Historic Index File

Written by Eben Dennis, October 18, 2012
Updated by Deborah Harner, March 1, 2018

The most valuable resource for studying the buildings of Baltimore is not Google Maps—in fact, it is not online at all. It is an index card collection of historic structures now known as the Passano-O’Neill File that lives in the H. Furlong Baldwin Library at the Maryland Historical Society. Edited and overseen by Francis O’Neill, a reference librarian who began working in the MdHS library in 1980 (the year this writer was born), the file is comprises of over 40,000 entries. If you walk into our library and hear the antiquated clacking of a typewriter, you are hearing the sound of Mr. O’Neill at work on the most richly detailed catalog of our city’s geographic history. Alongside Francis Scott Key’s Star Spangled Banner, the Paul Henderson Photograph Collection, the William Stone Engraving, and the McKeldin-Jackson Oral History Collection, the Passano-O’Neill File stands among the most valuable gems in our collection.

Eben Dennis is a former Special Collections Archivist and Deborah Harner is Associate Editor of the Maryland Historical Magazine and Special Collections Librarian at the Maryland Historical Society.
Eleanor Phillips Passano (1870–1949), a library volunteer at MdHS, worked on the card file from 1935 through 1940 connecting family names to specific properties in Baltimore and the surrounding counties. This became the Passano Historic Index File. Over the course of the next 50 years, this file remained dormant. As the years passed, what was once a rich source of information became less and less useful; modern researchers had become chronologically detached from the family names previously associated with the buildings decades before.

By his fifteenth year at the MdHS library, O’Neill had noticed the waning use of the Passano File. More importantly, however, he recognized the informational value and research potential of the resource. In 1995, O’Neill began the process of reorganizing the Passano File according to geographical location rather than family name, linking the cards to a permanent physical space. Most importantly, he once again began updating and adding index cards, giving the Passano File a whole new life. In 2013, the file was renamed the Passano-O’Neill Historic Structures File to honor his and Passano’s work and dedication. The collection is currently five percent larger than five years ago when this article was posted on the “underbelly,” the MdHS library blog.

The Passano-O’Neill File is arranged geographically in the sense that it is alphabetical by street address. As you flip through the typed index cards, you physically travel east and west or north and south through Baltimore’s streets. Through address changes, fires, and demolitions, each index card describes the history of the buildings, estate, or neighborhoods that have existed at the modern address of the geographic space. Each card also contains further references to photographs, articles, and books about the structures.

Since the formal title is the Passano-O’Neill Historic Structures File, and structure is a somewhat vague term, O’Neill needed to settle on a definition. For convenience and practicality’s sake, O’Neill defines a structure as “anything you can go in and out of.” Thus, parks, neighborhoods, and cemeteries, accompany the buildings and city blocks. When asked how monuments fit into this scheme (being for the most part solid structures), he matter-of-factly responds, “I have a different file for those.”

While the majority of us get dumbfounded, overwhelmed, and are eventually numbed by the waves of information that constantly flow past us, Francis O’Neill narrows his scope. He casually filters, plucks, and types up information about the city
as it changes around him. Luckily for those who venture into our library with a little curiosity, he makes it available for our use.* The file is open open to researchers from 10:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. Wednesdays through Saturdays. Ask for Mr. O’Neill.

As an example, I’ve photographed the cards for 2001–2003 Druid Park Drive from the file. These five cards contain detailed information about the location, as well as references to other books and articles in our library.

Eben Dennis

Examples of Historic Structures Information

Library references to the histories of the buildings at 2001–2003 Druid Hill Drive. (Maryland Historical Society.)

* Index card count derived from a mathematical formula that relied heavily on the width of my finger
Reference materials used to compile the history of 2001–2003 Druid Hill Drive. (Maryland Historical Society.)
*T-shaped school house on the site, 1877.* (G.M. Hopkins C.E., Baltimore: Map of the City of Baltimore, Maryland, 1877 [Philadelphia: G.M. Hopkins, C.E., 1877].)

_Baltimore County Public School #5, Woodberry._ (13th Annual Report of the School Commissioners of Baltimore County to the Commissioners of Baltimore County, 1862: Baltimore: J. W. Bond, 1863.)
From the early years of settlement to the nineteenth century, formal education for Maryland children remained tuition based for all but a very few. The colonial Assembly attempted to support one free school in each county, first with a tax on imported liquors and another that mandated schoolmasters provide no-cost instruction to poor children. Based on the English system of privately endowed institutions providing a classical education to upper-class children and subsidizing a few charity pupils, legislative appropriations to private academies angered farmers and poor people who resented paying to educate rich men’s sons. The article that follows has its origins in the “Proceedings of the Board of Visitors of the first free school in Queen Anne’s County, showing actions taken in regard to masters, courses of study, property, etc.,” 1723–1791. In 1911, Editor Louis Henry Dielman published this piece in the Maryland Historical Magazine.¹

School visitor John Reed, last scribe for the Queen Anne’s County Free School, may have doodled this smoking gentleman. (Queen Anne’s County Free School Minute Book, inside front cover, MS.684, Maryland Historical Society.)
First Free School in Queen Anne’s County

EDWIN H. BROWN, JR.

On the south side of the public road leading from Centreville to Queen Anne’s town near where the road branches off, which leads into Tilghman’s Neck, there stood in 1724 a building “35 feet long, 20 feet wide and 10 feet pitch, between the floor and roof proportionable, the walls of good well burnt bricks, well laid in mortar 18 inches to the water table, then 14 inches up to the top of a square and the gable end 9 inches, with a large fire place below and a small one above,” with “a door proportionable in the side with good hinges and lock and key and a window in the top of it.” There were “two sliding windows in each side and one at the gable end of good square glass with good frame shutters, hinges, weights and pulleys;” the “two windows in each gable end, one above the upper floor and the two domant [dormant] windows” on the south side “were of good diamond glass . . . all of the said windows were in proportion to the said building.” The joists of the house were “9 inches and 4, and the rafters 4 inches and 5, the floor laid with well-seasoned plank, the upper floor planed on both sides and ribbitted.” “The joists were planed and struck with a board on the lower edge.” The house “was well shingled with good cypress shingles” and “the eves were cornished and had large boards at the gable ends.” “The inside of the walls and chamber above” was “well plastered and white washed.” “A pair of suitable stairs” were “on one side of the chimney and a closet on the other.”

This building was the first free school house in Queen Anne’s County and was built by one John Salisbury, who was to be paid one hundred pounds therefor and to “use such timber and fire wood on said school as necessary.” The persons who authorized the building of this house were appointed under an act of the Assembly passed in 1723 and were known as the Visitors of the Free School of Queen Anne’s County.2

The first visitors were Rev. Christopher Wilkenson, Richard Tilghman, Samuel Earle, Sr., William Turbut, Augustine Thompson, Edward Wright and Philemon Lloyd, and by law were made a body politic and given the power to appoint their successors in office, and to make all by-laws, be no ways contrary to the royal prerogative nor to the laws and statutes of England and Acts of Assembly of the province or to the canons.

The author was a member of the Maryland Historical Society in 1911 when he transcribed the records of the Queen Anne’s County Free School and submitted this paper to the Maryland Historical Magazine.
and constitutions of the Church of England by law established.” The visitors of this school were the leading men of Queen Anne’s County during the colonial period, and among the scholars were the forefathers of many of the prominent men since. Among the masters were several who gained worldwide distinction in their chosen walks of life. To those therefore who are interested in the history of this State it will be well worth the while to study the history of this school as told by the minutes of the meetings of the visitors, which we are glad to say have been wonderfully well preserved.

The first meeting of the visitors was held on December 27, 1723. Within a very short time thereafter a tract of land containing one hundred acres “situate on the south side, of the main road that leads from Queenstown to Chester Mills” was purchased from one Richard Tilghman. It was on this tract of land that this school house described above was built. Under the power conferred by the Act of the Assembly the visitors were the masters, “who were not allowed to grow tobacco on the school property, and were to be members of the church of England and of pious and exemplary lives and capable of teaching well the grammar, good writing and the mathematics if such can conveniently be got.” The first person, who attempted to fill the office, which required so many qualifications was David Davis. He was appointed on Jan. 16, 1724, and obliged “himself to teach ten scholars such as said visitors shall think fit, English, Latin, writing and Arithmetic, in consideration of the sum of 20 pounds current money of Maryland.”

It seems that the visitors appointed from time to time a certain number, as they might think best, of children to be taught by the master. He was allowed, however, to take other scholars, whose parents and guardians had to pay a small tuition, which belonged to the master. In addition to this, he could try to eke out a precarious existence by cultivating the few acres of cleared land which belonged to the school farm. The scholars appointed by the visitors were known as “foundation scholars.” Just how
many of these there were it is impossible to tell, as we find reference to these scholars by name only twice. From these however, we gather the following names: Edwin Griffin, son of William Griffin; Edward Brown, brother of John Brown; Nathan Wright, son of Katherine Wright, widoe; William Kent, son of Robert Kent; Weatthon Reed, son of Weatthon Reed; James Farraday, brother of John Farraday; Charles Emory, son of John Emory; Edward Tucker, son-in-law to Solomon Wright, Sr., Charles Wright, son-in-law to Mr. Robert Jones and Edward Downes, son of Charles Downes; Michael, son of Wm. Turbutt; Nathan, son of Mr. Edward Wright, high Sherif of Queen Anne’s County; William, the son of Wm. Handrett; Solomon Wright, the brother of Thomas Hynton Wright; Anne Lily Heath, daughter of Ann Heath.

Very early in the life of this school, difficulty was experienced in getting the foundation pupils to attend, for we find many notices to the parents and guardians of these pupils requiring them to show cause why the pupils were absent from school. Whether this was due to the lack of appreciation of education for itself, or on account of the social or political condition of the county, we cannot say. Possibly it may have been on account of the hours for school and the close and careful attention given the scholars by the visitors. These gentlemen considered going to school a serious business and would allow nothing to interfere with it if they could possibly help. They required that the “hours of teaching from the 1st of April to the last of September be from 7 o’clock to 11 in the morning and from 1 o’clock to 5 in the evening and from the last of September to the 1st of April, from 8 o’clock to 11 in the morning and from 1 o’clock until 4 in the evening.” We find no mention of vacations or holidays until May 19, 1775. At that time, it is ordered that the “vacation shall commence as follows: one week before Christmas and continue on the day after the 12th day; on the Thursday before Easter and Whitsuntide and continue one week after each and also half Saturday from 1st of May until 1st of November, and all Saturdays the first of the year and all Sundays in the year.” The visitors considered it not only their duty to look after the mental welfare of the pupils but also the moral. Because one of the assistants “taught dancing two days a week in the school house which the visitors apprehend must necessarily tend to the hindrances of teaching reading, writing,” &c.—they threatened to discharge the master.
Upon one occasion the “visitor observing the scholars shooting at marks with guns had them called together and admonished and ordered them not to bring guns to school again and also in their presence order the master to have strict attention to them during their playtime, and to punish any who shall be catched contrary to this order.” At the same time “observing most of the scholars pronounce badly” they “order the master to be particularly attentive to make them express their words and syllables as distinct and clear as possible” and they “advise and admonish the scholars to use their utmost endeavors to break themselves of the bad habit which they have heretofore contracted in uttering their words in a thick confused manner.”

Mr. Davis was master of the school for nearly three years when he was succeeded by Mr. William Killion, who was “capable of teaching writing, arithmetic and grammar so as to understand the Latin bible.” He held this position until his death which occurred in 1737, at which time the visitors passed an order “in favor of widow Killion.

Charles Peale (1709–1750), father of esteemed artist Charles Willson Peale served as a free school visitor. (Minute book, 68.)
that her servant Thomas Davis, who was an usher to Mr. William Killion, continue to teach said school.” Evidently the usher was an indentured servant.

The position of master was filled in rapid succession by Edward Killion, Patrick Hackett, and Charles Peale. The latter was the father of the great American painter, Charles Willson Peale, celebrated as a painter of portraits, among others one of Washington and as the founder of a museum of natural history in Philadelphia, which was the first of the kind in the United States. He left Queen Anne’s County school to become the master of the Free School in Kent County. On July 14, 1744, Hamilton Belle was admitted as master and remained until 1747, at which time the Register was ordered by the visitors to “send an advertisement of the school vacant to Mr. Green, printer in Annapolis to be put in the Maryland Gazette,” which advertisement is in the following words, viz: “Whereas there is a vacancy for a master in Queen Anne’s County School, any person properly qualified upon applying to the visitors will meet with such encouragement as the law relating to free schools will support them in. Signed by order Nathan Wright, Register.”

In response to the advertisement Mr. Rolph Elston applied to be admitted as master “but being incapable of teaching navigation and surveying the visitors did not think proper to admit him.” In a short time thereafter the position was filled by Thomas Johnson, who is “given a salary of twenty pounds current money and is promised an addition of ten pounds upon behaving well.” Alexander Thompson followed Johnson and held the school until he died in 1752. From that time until 1755 the school was without a teacher. During this time a “Mr. Kerr offered himself as a master, but the visitors being of the opinion that he is not properly qualified refuse to admit him.” One “James Cosgrase also applied and his application was accepted but requested time to consider.” He evidently did not like the looks of things for he did not appear at the time appointed. On February 1, 1755, Rev. Alexander Malcolm was admitted as master of the school, and remained such until May 1759 when he was ignominiously deposed. During the incumbency of this gentleman the history of the school was a very stormy one. The visitors had their troubles as evidently did the scholars, for at one time there was only one pupil in the school.

Rev. Mr. Malcolm evidently had business in other parts of the province for the trouble between him and the visitors seems to have started by his continued absence and inattention to the school. Shortly after he had been admitted as master he put Quinton Malcolm in charge of the school. This Mr. Malcolm was the dancing master and was the cause of the downfall of his father. The history of the entire trouble is told fully in the minutes of the visitors. It is so quaintly and interestingly told that we can do nothing better than let them speak for themselves:

“The visitors finding that notwithstanding their resolution of the sixth day of August, 1756, that if the number of scholars which has hitherto been uncommonly small be not considerably increased by the end of the present year they
shall look upon the continuing his present salary any longer as a misspending
the public money, with which the Rev. Mr. Alexander Malcolm the master was
then made acquainted. There is not at present nor has been for some time past
above one scholar belonging to the school, nor is there any probability there will
be many more while he remains master, Thinks it their duty to dismiss the said
Mr. Alexander Malcolm from being any longer master of this school as they are
satisfied such his want of scholars must have proceeded from his not giving due
attendance on the said school, or application to the instruction of the scholars;
and of this the visitors informed the said master, but the said Mr. Alexander Mal-
colm alleging that he expects a considerable number of scholars very shortly the
visitors think proper to permit him to remain as master until their next meeting
on the fifth day of June next.”

“JULY 15, 1768, the visitors in consequence of their resolution and in consideration
that Mr. Quinton Malcolm the person chiefly employed by Mr. Alexander Malcolm
the master in teaching scholars of this school is at present a dancing master and ap-
ppears not to be a person of pious and exemplary life and conversation and in further
consideration that the said master’s advanced age and infirmities and the duty of his
functions will not permit him to give the necessary attendance do determine to remove
said Alexander Malcolm from being any longer master and do acquaint him therewith
and do demand of him possession of said school and of the books and instruments
thereto belonging which he, the said Mr. Malcolm refuses to give.”

“MARCH 1, 1759: As the visitors find there are no scholars belonging to the school
which appears to them to be owing to the non-attendance and mismanagement of
the present master resolved to remove said master from the school on the first day of
May next being the end of his year with which said master being present was made
acquainted (Mr. James Holliday dissents).”

“MAY 5, 1759: Pursuant to a resolve of the 1st of March last the visitors de-
mand of Mr. Alexander Malcolm possession of the school together with the books,
instruments, maps, charts and globes thereto belonging which said Mr. Malcolm
refused to give. The visitors then requested to inspect the books and instruments
to which Mr. Malcolm consented, and upon inspection found the several books,
maps, charts and globes as delivered to said Mr. Malcolm on his admission into
the school as master, except a Gunters Quadrant and Peartree and a book called
“Moxom on the Globes.” The visitors again demand possession of the school which
is still refused by said Mr. Malcolm. The visitors then proceed to put the books and
goods of Mr. Malcolm’s out of the school house and deliver said books at the door
of the dwelling house of said Malcolm which books said Mr. Malcolm received or
permitted his family to receive into said house. The visitors then acquainted Mr.
Malcolm that they incline to let him stay on and use the plantation belonging unto
the school until Christmas next, paying a reasonable rent to which Mr. Malcolm
replied when rent was due they the visitors would have a right to demand it. On Mr. Malcolm’s still refusing to deliver the key of said school house door the visitors nailed up said door and adjourned.”

Rev. Alexander Malcolm was allowed to remain in the dwelling although affairs were still unsettled. In a short time thereafter the visitors elected him a member of their body. This brought on an animated correspondence but did not settle the dispute, which was not settled until the death of Mr. Malcolm. The correspondence is as follows:

“Gentlemen: Being acquainted with your designed meeting on Wednesday next, I would have waited upon you, had I not been obliged to set off this day for Annapolis, and can’t be home until the end of the week. I presume the design of your calling upon me (which I expected more than a year ago) is to have my answer to what you proposed as to my qualifying for a visitor. Tho I have no reason to be fond of the employment, yet would not decline an office wherein I thought I could be useful: But it would be inconsistent for me to become a member of your Society, before the account between us is settled. There is a years salary due me preceding the first of May 1759 (when that extraordinary transaction happened of your illegal violence in turning my books out of the school house and nailing it up)—As to the possession I kept of the dwelling house; I had a legal right to it, unless they are grossly mistaken who know these things better than I do; and am told that I have a just claim for the salary, the year following, tile I voluntarily gave up the possession and to several articles disbursed by me before the school was shut up. But as I love peace and am averse to differences, as to keep up and widen the indecent coldness and distance too observable betwixt us occasioned by this affair, I am willing to drop ale pretences, except to the years salary before May 1759; To which I can’t conceive there lies any objection; If you’d do me justice in this we shall release one another; and when you think fitt to have another meeting (which I wish were at furthest Wednesday next week, because after that I sett out upon a longer journey) I’le wait upon you: In the meantime I desire you would leave for me with Mr. McKinnon an answer to what I have here proposed, That I may know what I have to do—I am Gentlemen, Your most humble servant, Sept. 28, 1761. (Signed) Alexander Malcolm.”

“Upon consideration of the matters mentioned in the aforesaid letter, the visitors acquaint Mr. Malcolm that they do not look upon themselves justifiable in paying him any salary more than to the fifteenth day of June 1758, agreeable to an offer formerly made him and entered in the Register; and further acquaint him that they do demand a reasonable rent for the houses and plantation belonging to the said school from the said fifteenth day of June tile the time he gave up the possession thereof; upon which said Mr. Malcolm sayd, he denied the payment of any; and turned about and left the visitors in a very abrupt manner, not affording an Opportunity for anything further to pass between them.”
During the latter part of the controversy Daniel McKinnon was master. He was followed by William Kean, who was to teach the Latin and Greek languages and “to promise as soon as possible a person suitable to teach reading, writing, arithmetic and the common branches of the mathematics.”

Mr. Kean evidently was a sporting gentleman and lived a life that required more pounds than his modest salary as school teacher put at his disposal. He makes large debts and leaves the county, is dismissed as master but is finally reinstated, upon the following terms as set forth by the register.

“The visitors considering that Mr. Kean has closely applied himself since their last meeting has now got lodging in a sober family and has indented himself to serve Messrs. Anthony McCullough and Nathan Samuel Tyrbutt Wright until by his salary as Master of this school he shall satisfy all his creditors by which means there will be such check upon him as the visitors are in hopes will restrain him from running into any immoralities he may be prone to and the visitors being persuaded that the said William Kean may be greatly useful as master of the said school, provided he can restrain himself determine still to continue him master upon the terms on which he was admitted.”

John Doherty was the next master and remained for only one year, when on April 23, 1767, Luther Martin was admitted as master for one year and is to be paid twenty pounds lawful currency. Martin paid very little attention to the school for it was during his incumbency that the boys became too free in the use of the gun and fell into bad habits about their pronunciation. He was publicly reprimanded in the presence of the scholars. He remained for about two years, just when and why he left is not known, because the page which would, and possibly did contain this information, is torn in half and part removed from the book. It is said that Martin spent most of his time in drinking and finally left the county because his attention to a daughter of a prominent planter was very objectionable. This Martin is Maryland’s great lawyer and the one who defended Aaron Burr.

Mr. Joseph Potter is the last master before the Revolution, and he seems to
have made a great success of the school. He was first admitted with the usual salary of twenty pounds and a promise of more if the school flourished. This it evidently did, as we find an entry showing an increase to thirty pounds. The last colonial meeting was Nov. 13, 1776 at which time the visitors adjourned to meet at Queenstown the Thursday in November Court. This meeting was not held and we find a blank in the proceedings during this stormy period. Owing to the unsettled conditions of the country the school evidently was closed and from the records we gather that it was not reopened until after the surrender of Cornwallis in 1781. The first teacher after the Revolution was Alexander Irwins who was appointed “at a salary of forty pounds Spanish milled dollars at 7-6 each per annum, he running the hazard of the money being in the treasury at the end of the year.” Mr. Irvins evidently found he was running great hazard of the money being in the treasury for he remained only about a year.

A teacher was then advertised for and the following was sent to a “Wm. Hemsley,” Esq., with the request to have him insert and continue it for four weeks in the Pennsylvania Journal: “Whereas a master is wanted in Queen Anne’s County free school, any gentleman who can teach the English, Latin and Greek languages, reading, writing and arithmetic will meet with encouragement by applying to the visitors of said school; 100 acres of land belong to said school about 60 whereof are under good fence with a good dwelling house 40 x 22 feet, two rooms below stairs and as many above, a cellar under one half of the house and two small out houses besides the school house which is large and commodious, situate in a thick settled neighborhood where are a good number of children. Signed per order Dec. 11, 1782. Edward Downes, Register. The invitation did not seem to bring any master for in 1785 “Mr. Clayton is requested to write a letter of invitation to a Mr. McGraw of Baltimore town to take charge of the school.” Mr. McGraw did not come and one Mr. Wm. Rogers is admitted as master.

The support of the school as derived from the original act was from some moneys already in the hands of the treasurers of the Eastern and Western Shores. In addition to this, money was raised by laying “an additional duty of 20 shillings current money per poll on all Irish servants being Papists, to prevent the growth of popery by the importation of too great number of them into the province and an additional 20 shillings per poll on all negroes imported into the province.” The County made a levy for the support of the school and certain fines when collected were due the school. Among these were the fines for killing deer and the fines imposed for a white person marrying a colored person. If these fines were not paid the persons guilty were sold and the money derived from the sale was paid the school.

It is interesting to note the line of study prescribed by the visitors, and if they insisted that all the books which they order be used, there is no wonder they found it difficult to procure competent teachers and keep them. They seem to have insisted upon a mathematical education being given the scholars and purchased books for an extensive course in the subject.
The visitors allocated generous funds for educational supplies such as books, globes, and scientific equipment. (Minute book, 33.)

“Resolved on Sept. 18, 1730 the visitors purchased of Mr. Bodingsfield Hands a circumforontor with a ball socket, a brass protractor to the same radius, protracting scale and a book called the practical surveyor, and on the same day further resolved to purchase of Bodingsfield Hands Brown’s quadrant in box wood, a book called the “Use of the Triangular Quadrant,” Gunter’s Sector in Brass, Universal Ring, Dyal in Brass, a Protracting Scale for which they agreed to allow the said Hands 25% on the first cost, the said Hands procuring from some proper person.
in England a certificate of costs of such instruments and books. Also ordered the following books: Davis Quadrant, The Arches and Venar, to be of boxwood and the other part or limbs of Brazil or some other heavy wood. A store staff four feet long and three crosses of light colored woods, large nocturnal of boxwood for both bears, Gunter’s scale of boxwood, a sliding Gunter two feet long when shut, commonly called “Seth partridges sliding rule” to be made of boxwood and the edges to be filled with mathematical lines; a dyalling scale of boxwood, a mathematical scale of boxwood, two feet long; a pair of globes, the diameter whereof not to exceed fifteen inches nor less than twelve inches. Whole art of navigation by Capt. Hani. Newhouse; mariners compass rectified by Mr. Wakely, Parson’s Arithmetick, Wallis’ Algebra, Scarborough’s Euclid, Theosophis Spericks, Gregory Astronomy, Caswell’s Trigonometry, Streets Caroline Table, Mercator’s Chart and Plaine Chart for the whole world. Treatise on Dyalling, a pair of long steel point compasses and a pair with three points, Mollineux’s Dioptricks, Wells’s Geography and Map.”

“May 15, 1742, a bill of exchange of James Holliday, treasurer of Eastern Shore, for nine pounds, two shillings and seven pence sterling was sent to James Buchannan, merchant in London for the purchase of the following books; Greek books, Dr. Samuel Clark’s Edition of Homer’s Iliad, Dr. Well’s Edition Diomysius Geography, Leusden’s Greek Testament cum versione Latina; Eoman Classics in poetry, Horace, Virgil, Terrances Comedies, Ovid’s metamorphisis.

“Roman Classics in prose: Sallust of the Jugerthine Wars and Cateliniyes Conspiracy, Caesar’s Commentaries, Lucius Florus Epitome of Roman History, Tully’s Oration Select, Dr. Wells’s Maps Ancient and Modern, Robertson’s Greek Lexicon, The Cambridge Dictionary, Dr. Kennett’s Roman Antiquities, Dr. Potter’s Archaeology, two volumes.” The books to be well bound, lettered on their backs, and on their covers to be inscribed the words “Queen Anne’s County School.”

The last master of the school was appointed March 17, 1787, and was Thomas Wright. With what success he met we are unable to say, for from this time on the struggle of the school for an existence seems to have grown very acute. Part of their land was taken possession of and enclosed by Robert Wilson; a lawsuit was instituted; and great difficulty was experienced in getting any money with which to pay a master and keep the school in any condition. Finally as a last resort, the visitors appealed to the General Assembly in the following manner:

“Gentlemen: As differences have arisen upon the extension of the lines of our free school land and other matters relative to the said school, which, to have to determine in a course of law will be very expensive and tedious, and our finances are illly suited to, and as they can be well adjusted by arbitration, or the lines be settled in the mode pointed out by a late Act of Assembly for ascertaining boundaries, but conceiving we do not possess powers adequate to those ends; we
request you will move and use your endeavors for a law to enable the visitors of this free school to refer any matters of difference they may have to the determination of man and to avail themselves in their corporate capacity of the aforesaid act of Assembly, if they should apprehend those measures or any of them proper. We are, Gent. V&c.”

This did not bring the desired result. Whether this was on account of the lack of interest or because the visitors of the free school of Queen Anne’s County were not as good “lobbyists” as are the visitors of the schools and colleges of today, we cannot say. The aid needed did not come. The Legislature passed an act creating an Alms House and directed the Visitors of the Queen Anne’s County school to turn over to the Trustees of the Alms House all of the school property.

On May 12, 1791, we find the following minutes: “Messrs. Charles Blake, Arthur Emory, Richard Bennet Carmichael and John Hindman met at the house of Edward Downes and delivered to Mr. Charles Blake one of the Trustees of the poor of said county, all the books, records and other documents respecting the property of said school.”

*Additional drawings in the minute book, these recorded at the close of business, May 12, 1791 when the trustees turned over all of the free school’s property to the newly created Queen Anne’s County Alms House.*

REGISTRARS: December 27, 1723, James Knowles / April 23, 1724, Richard Tilghman / March 25, 1729, William Killion / February 22, 1737, Richard Tilghman / October 28, 1740, Lambert Wicks, Jr. / April 28, 1742, Charles Peale / February, 1743, Nathan Wright / February 13, 1773, James Earle / May 9, 1781, Edward Downes


NOTES


2. Proceedings of Board of Visitors of the first free school in Queen Anne’s County, showing actions taken in regard to masters, courses of study, property, etc. (MS.683, Maryland Historical Society.)
Final entry in the free school minute book, May 12, 1791 (Minute book, 135.)
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ANNE S. K. TURKOS and ELIZABETH CARIGNOLA, 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 2017, 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
Special Collections and University Archives
4130 Campus Drive
3210K Hornbake Library
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Previous years’ installments of the Maryland History Bibliography are now searchable online. Please visit https://www.lib.umd.edu/dct/collections/mdhc/ for more information about this database and to search for older titles on Maryland history and culture.

GENERAL


AFRICAN AMERICAN


Baptiste, Nathale. “‘They Can’t Kill Us All’ Ferguson, Baltimore, and a New Era in America’s Racial Justice Movement.” Nation, 204 (February 27, 2017): 35-37.


“Harriet Tubman, a new look.” Civil War Times, 56 (June 2017): 8.


Perry, Tony C. “In bondage when cold was king: the frigid terrain of slavery in antebellum Maryland.” *Slavery & Abolition*, 38 (March 2017): 23-36.


“Tubman Gets Her Due.” *Civil War Times*, 56 (February 2017): 49.


AGRICULTURE


Hurry, Robert J. “Christmas Turkey for the President (How St. Mary’s County Gave Him the Bird).” Chronicles of St. Mary’s, (Winter 2017): 11-14.


ARCHAEOLOGY


Uunila, Kirsti. “Field session’s Calverton Site has early history.” ASM Ink, 44 (May 2017): 1, 7.


ARCHITECTURE AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION


Morris, Rebecca. “Holly Hill.” Anne Arundel County History Notes, 48 (Summer 2017): 4-5.
“Prince of a County, September 24, 2017, at 2 P.M.” Then & Now, 46 (October-December 2017): 1-5. [Don Speed Smith Goodloe House]


BIOGRAPHY, AUTOBIOGRAPHY, AND REMINISCENCES


“George Returns to England.” A Briefe Relation, 37 (Summer 2017): 1, 5.

Himmelheber, Peter. “Milburn Brothers Query Answered 25 Years Later.” Chronicles of St. Mary’s, (Summer 2017): 31-32.


“The Kid.” “The Mall.” Baltimore, 110 (June 2017): 120. [Brad Canfield]


Newton, Brent Evan. “A Newcomer to Maryland Discovers His Deep Family Roots in the Old Line State.” *Chronicles of St. Mary’s*, (Fall 2015): 3-10.
Woodburn, Pat. “Addendum: How Donnie Hammert Got His Name.” *Chronicles of St. Mary’s*, (Fall 2017): 5-6.

**COUNTY AND LOCAL HISTORY**

“Prince George’s County Tidbits.” Then & Now, 46 (July-September 2017): 6.
Wilson, Harold O. “The Saving of Kent Island.” Isle of Kent, (Summer/Fall 2017): 3-5.
ECONOMIC, BUSINESS, AND LABOR

“The Beginnings of Something Big.” *Glades Star*, 13 (December 2017): 53i-35. [Oakland Hotel]
*Bugeye Times*, 42 (Summer 2017): 1-5.

EDUCATION

“Chasing the American Dream: The Formation and Legacy of Freedmen Schools in Prince George’s County, Maryland, 1866-1870.” Then & Now, 46 (July-September 2017): 1, 4.
Kershner, Seth. “‘The New Beachhead is in Secondary Education’: Campaigns Against Junior ROTC in Baltimore.” Peace & Change, 42 (July 2017): 436-64.
ENVIRONMENT

Maietta, Christine Elizabeth. “Soil Microbial Processes and Community Structure in Natural and Restored Tidal Freshwater Wetlands of the Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, USA.” Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, College Park, 2017.


**FINE AND DECORATIVE ARTS**

“The Artist.” *Baltimore*, 110 (June 2017): 111.


**GEOGRAPHY AND CARTOGRAPHY**


Himmelheber, Peter. “Southfield Farm, St. Mary’s County, MD.” *Chronicles of St. Mary’s*, (Fall 2015): 25-27.


**HISTORICAL ORGANIZATIONS, LIBRARIES, REFERENCE WORKS**


Ricks, Jessica. “Models of the Past.” Chesapeake Bay Magazine, 47 (October 2017): 30. [Naval Academy Museum]
INTELLECTUAL LIFE, LITERATURE, AND PUBLISHING

Elkington, Linda. “From Religious Texts to Romance Novels: Anne Arundel Records Give Clues to What Colonial Maryland was Reading.” Anne Arundel County History Notes, 48 (Fall 2017): 1-9.

MARITIME

Clarke, Wendy Mitman. “Keeper of the Flame.” Chesapeake Bay Magazine, 47 (July 2017): 80-86, 89. [Fred Hecklinger]
Dodds, Richard J. “The Ark of Hungerford Creek.” Bugeye Times, 42 (Fall 2017): 1, 4-6.

**MEDICINE**


**MILITARY**


**MUSIC AND THEATER**


**NATIVE AMERICANS**

Cale, Clyde, Jr. “Hunting—A Tradition Since the Indians were Here.” *Glades Star*, 13 (September 2017): 505-10.

**POLITICS AND LAW**


RELIGION

Daugherty, Charles R.C. “The Church of England in Maryland, Especially St. Mary’s County, 1634-1776.” Chronicles of St. Mary’s, (Spring 2017): 30-36; Chronicles of St. Mary’s, (Summer 2017): 8-12; Chronicles of St. Mary’s, (Winter 2017): 15-22.
Osborne, Catherine R. “‘So that one day we may be one’: The Interfaith Center at Columbia, Maryland.” U.S. Catholic Historian, 35 (Summer 2017): 75-104.
Woodburn, Pat. “Church Festivals: The Heart and Soul of Church Communities in St. Mary’s County for Centuries.” Chronicles of St. Mary’s, (Fall 2017): 7-8.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY


SOCIETY, SOCIAL CHANGE, AND POPULAR CULTURE

Tom Voss and Maryland-bred “Good Night Shirt” enter thoroughbred racing’s Hall of Fame]


Unger, Mike. “Squad Leader.” Baltimore, 110 (October 2017): 88-91. [Ken Niumatalolo]

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Wisthoff, John L. “Notes from the Library Basement…” Anne Arundel County History Notes, 48 (Summer 2017): 3. [construction of a canal vs. a railroad]
WOMEN


Morrow, Diane Batts. “‘Not only Superior, but a Mother in the true sense of the word’: Mary Louisa Noel and the Oblate Sisters of Providence, 1835-1885.” *U.S. Catholic Historian*, 35 (Fall 2017): 31-52.


“Rare Border State Diary.” *Civil War Times*, 56 (December 2017): 12.


Letter to the Editor

Editor,  
*Maryland Historical Magazine*

Dear Editor:

I have acquired some fairly recent issues of your fine publication, and wish to call attention to the intriguing cover story of Fall 2013, that of the Alexander Gardner photograph taken on the day of Lincoln’s speech.

While perusing older issues of the *Indiana Magazine of History* (IMH), I came across this little chestnut of a reminiscence by a young woman who sang in a choir on the platform that day. The *IMH* quotes the interview from the *Marion, Indiana Chronicle* of February 11, 1929, and reproduced in the IMH in 1930.

Mrs. Catherine Kuhn was interviewed about her experience that day at Gettysburg, and this is how she described Abraham Lincoln; it will be noted that her recollection is set against the book “Lincoln at Gettysburg” by William E. Barton (Bobbs Merrill). The intriguing aspect contradicts what analysts believe may be Lincoln in the photograph. I quote:

“I remember seeing Lincoln riding to the cemetery on horseback. *His head was bare and he did not even bother to put his feet in the stirrups*. They almost touched the ground. I don’t believe that I have ever seen a sadder looking man than Abraham Lincoln….After the services, President Lincoln shook hands with all the choir members.” (Italics my emphasis).

In the picture discussion of your magazine, Lincoln is identified as bare-headed on the platform. Mrs. Kuhn says he rode to the cemetery bare-headed. Based on this information, the highlighted photos of a man wearing a stovepipe hat could not be Lincoln. Barton’s book cites, on p. 75, information by Col. Carr who rode behind Lincoln.

“Colonel Carr, who rode just behind the President stated that when the procession started, the President sat erect on his horse and looked the part of the Commander in Chief of the Army; but as the procession moved on, his body leaned forward, his arms hung limp, and his head was bent. He seemed absorbed in thought.”
As a sidenote, I am not up-to-date on the research of the photograph, but having this information stored for quite a while, I thought I would pass it along. You may of course do what you wish, including ignoring it.

References:
William E. Barton, *Lincoln at Gettysburg* (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Co, 1930)

Sincerely,

John Widner
As't Prof, Baron Forness Library
Edinboro University of PA
Edinboro PA 16444
widner@edinboro.edu

**EDITOR’S NOTE:**

Professor Widner’s letter references “These Grounds will be Consecrated,” *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 108 (2013): 257–60, reprinted on the following pages.

Enlarged view of the above detail, reveals a tall figure in a stove-pipe hat. Enlarged five and a half times the original size.
On November 19, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln and two of his secretaries boarded a train in the nation’s capital for the dedication of the Soldiers National Cemetery in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Edward Everett, the ceremony’s featured orator, addressed the crowd for nearly two hours. The cemetery committee asked Lincoln, last on the program, to “formally set apart these grounds” and to reassure all who gathered that “those who sleep in death on the battlefield are not forgotten.” The president spoke for just two minutes, delivering an address that continues to resonate after a century and a half.

Only one photograph of Lincoln at Gettysburg was known to exist until the Library of Congress began placing their 7,000 Civil War photographs online. High resolution digital scans revealed a figure who may be the president in two additional images, an exciting find in 2007 and one that prompted others to closely examine the tall, bearded figure among the throngs of people gathered for the dedication. Experts include a former Disney animator, members of the Center for Civil War Photography’s “murder board,” and noted Civil War historians. Is the tall and bearded man in the photographs Abraham Lincoln? The question is as yet unresolved. The images presented here depict the figure in question. For the complete story and interactive features see Franz Lidz, “Will the Real Abraham Lincoln Please Stand Up,” *Smithsonian Magazine*, October 2013 (www.smithsonianmag.com).

Additional detail, arm raised saluting the troops? Perhaps . . . . This detail is enlarged fifteen times its original size.
ABOVE: Lincoln experts found another view of the president in the second stereoview. The framed detail is enlarged below. Researchers framed a second section for close examination. Is Lincoln the bearded gentleman in the tall hat? 4″ × 10″ Stereograph 1863 Nov. 19 by Alexander Gardner.

LEFT: Detail enlarged sixty-one times its original size.

BELOW: Detail enlarged to thirteen times original size.

ABOVE: Former Disney animator Christopher Oakley overlaid a portrait of Lincoln painted several days earlier. Do the facial lines and features match?
BELLOW: Lincoln at Gettysburg. The name of the photographer who captured this famous view of Lincoln at Gettysburg has not been verified. Perhaps it is from one of the glass negatives that Bachrach made and later gave to Harper’s Weekly. Lincoln is sitting bare-headed on the speaker’s platform.

Gelatin Silver Print from copy negative

RIGHT: Detail
William Faris diary entries. Above, “Monday [May] 13th, 1799, a fine morning... marked the following flowers.” Below, “The following flowers were named by Allex C. Hanson Esq. 1798.” (William Faris Diary, 1792–1804, MS 2160, Maryland Historical Society.)
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“Fresh Air and Cheer”: The Origins of Camp Louise  
in the Settlement House Movement of Baltimore’s Jewish Community  
*Barry Kessler*

Carlin’s Park: “Baltimore’s Million Dollar Playground”  
*Lara Westwood*

*David W. Woodell and Robert Pratt*

The Passano-O’Neill Historic Index File  
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Classics Corner: First Free School in Queen Anne’s County  
*Edwin H. Brown, Jr.*
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