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Collecting in Quarantine

In March 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic spread globally, the Maryland Center for History and Culture started a new responsive collecting initiative: Collecting in Quarantine. As an organization dedicated to history, we realized that we were witnessing a historic event. As an organization dedicated to collecting and making historical material available to researchers, we understood that we needed to keep a record of Marylanders’ experiences of the pandemic.

Turning to what our predecessors had bequeathed us in the form of letters and diaries from past crises such as the Civil War, World Wars I and II, the Spanish influenza of 1918, and the Annapolis yellow fever epidemics of 1793 and 1800, we called on Marylanders to send their personal stories of how the pandemic was impacting their lives. Our invitation to create an archive for future generations was well received: submissions took the form of letters, poetry, diary entries, or just wordless images, testifying to the resilience of the human spirit, all the while acknowledging the toll this crisis took. The submissions were published as Letters from the Homefront and Business Unusual on our Library blog, underbelly, at mdhistory.org/category/underbelly.

About the Front Cover Image

The image on the front cover of this special 2020 issue was submitted by musician, retail historian, and author Michael Lisicky, and taken by Jordan Lisicky. One of the earliest submissions to our Collecting in Quarantine initiative, it became an image that we would associate with 2020: the Fells Point neighborhood in Baltimore, usually teeming with people in bars and restaurants, enveloped in the sound of live music and laughter, was all of a sudden unprecedentedly empty. Yet, in this image, a man and his playful dog showed us that there would be a way out.

When we asked Michael how he would prefer to have his image captioned, this was his response:

“It’s funny, I never thought of a title for that photo. The dog’s name is Murphy and for her it was ‘Business as Usual.’ She didn’t know there was a virus and didn’t care that she needed to show affection in the middle of a street. Perhaps I’d just call it ‘Oblivious…’ The one interesting thing is that it was taken on March 16, 2020, the first true day of the lockdown. I was on a walk with Jordan. I had just brought them back from Brooklyn as NYC shut down.”

While some aspects of 2020 may always remain beyond words, we remain committed to collecting, preserving, and sharing everything that pertains to historical record. Please consider sharing your experiences for future generations, and encouraging those in your networks and communities to do so too. Find out how you can submit your stories, images, and physical materials on our website, mdhistory.org/collecting-in-quarantine.
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From the Editor: Special 2020 Issue

MARTINA KADO, PHD

Dear readers,

We greet you from these exciting, redesigned pages of our special 2020 issue of the Maryland Historical Magazine. We also greet you under our new name: after 176 years as the Maryland Historical Society, in September 2020 we became the Maryland Center for History and Culture.

Two poignant events defined the last year for our organization, our members, visitors, and readers. The first, of course, came in the form of the COVID-19 pandemic, affecting millions of people worldwide and changing what we consider essential and non-essential in life, work, and research. Our staff successfully switched to telework as our doors physically closed for more than six months, and we turned to virtual exhibitions and programming, social media, increased digitization efforts, and remote research services to connect with our community. The role of history in providing context for interpreting current events and critical thinking in forging paths forward became even more relevant on a global scale.

The second event—our rebrand as the Maryland Center for History and Culture—was the result of two years of self-reflection and conversations with our staff, our stakeholders, and the wider community. Our new name, website, vision, and mission are underscored by the core values of Community, Authenticity, Dialogue, and Discovery, which guide us in our work. They reflect our commitment to sharing resources and collections state- and nation-wide as well as internationally, and being more inclusive and representative of Maryland’s diverse people. We celebrated our rebrand with a soft reopening of our Museum with COVID-19 safety precautions in place, excited to reconnect with our members and visitors. Out of an abundance of caution for our patrons, staff, and collections materials, the H. Furlong Library reopened a month later,
then closed again to reopen in April 2021, welcoming researchers back by appointment.

The research community faced an unprecedented obstacle as archives and libraries closed for the majority of the past year: for many, this meant that research projects stopped midway and writing had to be postponed for better days. Some of our contributors reported the most overwhelming teaching schedules of their careers, and others decided to combat the lack of access to research facilities by reaching for older projects sitting on their desks and completing them with the ingenuity of using digitally available materials and collaborating with their colleagues. The number of submissions to the *Maryland Historical Magazine* halved during this time, and a number of peer reviewers had to decline or request extensions for their reviews due to changed work circumstances.

This special issue of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (volume 115, no. 1–2) is an homage to 2020 as a year of crisis and resilience. We used the closure of 2020 to reimagine the journal’s graphic design, bringing it closer to our new identity and serving our readers as we remain committed to publishing the best new research on Maryland history. “A Home of Their Own: African Americans and the Evolution of Unionville, Maryland” is the final article in William Messner’s series on nineteenth-century African American communities on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. In the author’s own words, “The story of Unionville is both a testament to the perseverance of black people in late nineteenth century America to establish a safe haven for themselves free from white depredations and the limitations inherent in such an effort in the face of social and economic forces far beyond their control.” The article by Charles Webb, “Annapolis Colonial Restoration: The Secret Project, 1926–1935,” delves into the subterfuge and intrigue of real estate development at St. John’s College in Annapolis during the Colonial Revival movement, registered in the college’s board minutes and tucked out of sight until the author recovered and reconstructed this former plan for Annapolis to rival Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia and Greenfield Village in Michigan. We are proud to feature “‘The Wealth and Glory of the City’: Displays of Power in Baltimore’s Sesquicentennial” by Emma Rothberg, who was our Lord Baltimore Fellow for 2019/2020. Being a direct result of Ms. Rothberg’s research at the Maryland Center for History and Culture, this article epitomizes the purpose and success of research programs at MCHC’s H. Furlong Baldwin Library and we hereby invite researchers to look for the 2021/2022 call for applications on our website in the fall. Beyond this astute analysis of the celebration of the 150th anniversary of Baltimore’s founding, Ms.
Rothberg and our staff collaborated on the educational video “Maryland Falls in Line: Parades and the Fifteenth and Nineteenth Amendments in Baltimore,” available online at vimeo.com/417345988. In addition to our section on book reviews, this issue also features the Maryland History and Culture Bibliography for 2019, compiled and generously provided by Anne S. Turkos and Elizabeth Caringola from the University of Maryland Libraries, also available online at digital.lib.umd.edu/mdhc.

We are delighted to announce a new MCHC Press book title: The Material World of Eyre Hall: Four Centuries of Chesapeake History, publishing in September 2021 in association with D Giles Ltd. Edited by Carl R. Lounsbury, co-editor of The Chesapeake House: Architectural Investigation by Colonial Williamsburg (2013), and featuring the work of 22 contributors and 400 stunning illustrations, this book offers a rare and fascinating insight into the preservation of a family home in the midst of changing aspects of southern history through Eyre Hall’s material culture, which will appeal to enthusiasts of architecture, gardens, decorative arts, and beyond. Among the losses of 2020, we mourn the passing of the Honorable James F. Schneider, the longest-serving federal or state judge in Maryland and historian and archivist of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. A longstanding member of MCHC’s Publications Committee and friend of our organization, Judge Schneider is remembered in the personal In Memoriam written by Dr. Edward C. Papenfuse and will be missed by all of us.

As restrictions ease and the world carefully looks toward a post-COVID-19 future, we wrap up this issue with a heightened sense of appreciation for all those who contribute to the Maryland Historical Magazine. We look forward to getting back on schedule with two annual publications in 2021: our next issue will be Spring/Summer 2021 (vol. 116, no. 1). We invite you to safely visit our Museum and Library, submit your latest article to our journal, tune in to our upcoming fall session of virtual and in-person public programs, and more, as we continue our journey in Maryland history.
A Home of Their Own: African Americans and the Evolution of Unionville, Maryland

BY WILLIAM F. MESSNER

On July 29, 1922, the Easton Star Democrat published an article regarding the fifty-fifth anniversary of the founding of Unionville, Maryland. A newspaper notoriously unfriendly to blacks, the fact that the Star Democrat reported a story concerning a town settled exclusively by African Americans, and did so in a relatively benign, albeit patronizing, manner was a testament to the positive reputation that Unionville’s residents had established. Equally, if not more, significant was the fact that the town and its residents had persisted for over half a century despite having encountered challenges that had threatened its existence. The paper portrayed Unionville as “a straggling [sic] little village built on either side of the main road running to Tunis Mills and into Miles River Neck. Some of its houses are dilapidated and rather tend to lean in the direction that the north winds blow, while others are more pretentious, and some are even little bungalows. It has a church and a good reputation for law-abiding citizenship.”¹

Unionville’s founding and evolution are indicative of a dimension of African American life in the latter part of the nineteenth century highlighted by Steven Hahn in his magisterial work A Nation under Our Feet. Hahn observes that over the course of this period in the South, “some
black families and communities had set out to reconstitute themselves as ‘colonies’ or ‘towns’ in an effort to establish their independence and integrity in the teeth of white demands for subordination and submission. The challenges usually proved overwhelming.” Similarly, Hahn notes that “everywhere land ownership [for African Americans] demanded the toleration and involvement of white people; and almost always, it demanded a protracted and precarious effort on the part of black households and, often, extended black families.” Hahn’s observations were especially apt on the Miles River Neck of Maryland’s Eastern Shore where African Americans, aided by a Quaker family, worked to establish a black community that endures to this day. The story of Unionville is both a testament to the perseverance of blacks in late nineteenth century America to establish a safe haven for themselves free from white depredations and the limitations inherent in such an effort in the face of social and economic forces far beyond their control.

The roots of black Unionville are to be found among the antebellum estates of Talbot County, Maryland. The largest of Talbot County’s estates were owned by the Lloyd family, who was described by an admiring local historian as “the county’s fulcrum.” Over the course of three centuries the family had established a virtual fiefdom on the county’s Miles River Neck. By the time of the Civil War, Edward Lloyd VII governed this domain, having inherited his father’s holdings in 1861. Lloyd owned two estates comprising 9,000 acres and 410 slaves on “the Neck” while also possessing land and slave holdings in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas. A shrewd businessman and politician who disdained much of the pomp of his forebears, Lloyd practiced a careful neutrality during the war years, which allowed him to maintain control of his holdings and emerge from the war with his political influence undimmed. After the war he served several terms in the State Senate, ultimately being elevated to the position of Senate president, and was generally regarded as the leader of the Democratic Party in Talbot County.

At approximately the same time that Edward Lloyd VII was assuming control of his family’s landholdings, the Cowgills, a Quaker family from Delaware, purchased the Lombardy farm contiguous to Lloyd’s Wye Plantation. Steadfast opponents of slavery, the Cowgills were led by sixty-three-year-old Ezekiel and his wife Sarah and were accompanied by their sons James and John. Ezekiel had been a successful miller and an elder in the Delaware Quaker community, and had helped establish a school for free blacks in that state. Now moving to the Miles River Neck of Maryland, he began the reclamation of the Lombardy farm that he had purchased in 1855. When viewed from an economic perspective the Cowgills’ move is puzzling,
especially given Ezekiel’s age and lack of farming experience, but it is reasonable to assume that his actions were prompted, at least in part, by his antislavery beliefs. Using free black workers to restore his landholdings, Ezekiel quickly returned Lombardy to profitability. By 1860, Ezekiel’s real estate was valued at $10,000 along with $3,500 in personal property. While Ezekiel’s wealth paled in comparison to Edward Lloyd’s, whose total worth at the time was estimated at over $300,000, it did establish him as a solid middle-class farmer. Concurrent with his agricultural efforts, Ezekiel’s antislavery feelings were growing in intensity, fed no doubt by the sight so close at hand of Edward Lloyd’s large enslaved workforce. He described in florid terms his new Maryland home as “the great hotbed and stronghold of American Slavery,” and his neighbors, foremost among them being the Lloyds, as “the Goliaths, Nebuchadnezzars and Pharaohs of the peculiar institution.” The presidential election of 1860 presented Ezekiel with the opportunity to act on his antislavery beliefs. In an action that gained him the animosity of local white residents, he voted for Abraham Lincoln, the only one of two such votes cast for the Republican candidate in Talbot County.⁴
With the outbreak of the Civil War in the summer of 1861, both Edward Lloyd and the Cowgills were drawn into the war’s vortex. Ezekiel, although ostensibly a pacifist and at age sixty-eight too old to take an active role in the war, began to immediately agitate for the federal government to free the slaves and thereby “insure the friendship and material aid of 4,000,000 persons who now . . . are furnishing their rebel masters with the means of living and the Service of War.” At the same time, his son John broke with his Quaker pacifist beliefs and entered the Union army, ultimately becoming an officer in the 108th Regiment of the United States
Colored Troops. Edward Lloyd, on the other hand, avoided military service and unlike some of his slaveholding neighbors maintained an initial outward silence regarding his wartime leanings. But the enlistment of blacks into the federal military in late 1863 stirred him into action. Recognizing the inevitability of emancipation in Maryland, Lloyd helped facilitate his workers’ enlistment into the army. For his effort, he was compensated by the federal government with a payment of $300 per recruit.\(^5\)

Much the same situation was occurring throughout Talbot County as Union army recruiters swept through the region. Some enslaved workers like Matthew Roberts (sometimes spelled “Mathew”), one of the Lloyd slaves and later a Unionville settler, took matters into their own hands and simply ran away from their owners and joined the Union military. Others who stayed with their enslavers eventually responded to the blandishments of recruiters under the direction of Colonel William Birney who enrolled forty Talbot County blacks in the USCT. Birney initially enrolled enslaved blacks only with their own and their enslavers’ approval, but as the war progressed and troop needs increased, slaves were enrolled despite their enslavers’ protests and even impressed against their own wishes into the military. Ultimately, 228 Talbot County blacks joined the Union army, with the great majority of them serving in the 7th and 4th Regiments of the USCT. Among this number were eighteen of the original Unionville settlers.\(^6\)

Black recruits into the Union army from Talbot County traveled first to Baltimore to be indoctrinated into the discipline and rigors of military life. Joseph Califf, a white officer in the 7th USCT, recorded his assessment of the way these troops adapted to their new circumstances.

In starting out upon its career a colored regiment labored under an immense disadvantage as compared with a white one. The bitter prejudice existing against troops of this class, both among military officials and the people at large, made it difficult for it to obtain a fair show . . . . To compensate for these disadvantages there was on the part of the men an eagerness to learn their duties and an interest in them that could not be excelled. They gave themselves up to the work before them wholly and without reserve. . . .\(^7\)

The record amassed by the 7th Regiment would confirm Captain Califf’s positive portrayal of these black recruits. Led by Colonel James Shaw, a fervent abolition-
ist from Rhode Island, the recruits underwent intense drilling combined with the building of fortifications. By the onset of winter, Califf reported “a great deal of sickness” among the recruits, a situation very common among black Civil War soldiers often placed in the most inhospitable environments and given the most noxious duties. But unlike many black troops for whom fatigue duty was their sole military activity, the 7th Regiment was also involved in a continuous round of combat operations from the spring of 1864 onward, fighting in nine engagements in Virginia, South Carolina, and Florida. By the war’s end, the regiment had earned a distinguished combat record for which the army rewarded Colonel Shaw with a promotion to Brevet Brigadier General. As for the enlisted men, eighty-four of them were killed in combat, an uncommonly high number for a black regiment, along with 307 who died of disease, a mortality rate approximately double that of all Civil War soldiers. The regiment’s record did not go unnoticed. At the war’s end General Godfrey Weitzel, commander of all black troops in the Union army, rated his regiments in order of merit. At the top of his list Weitzel placed the 7th Regiment, from whom the majority of the original Unionville settlers would be drawn.8

The men of the 7th Regiment had acquired a variety of valuable assets as a result of their military service. In addition to the discipline instilled in them through continuous drilling, the members of the regiment were provided with the rudiments of an elementary education by the regiment’s leadership. Colonel Shaw reported, “Two months ago I don’t think fifty members in the regiment knew the alphabet—now, with what assistance they have received from their officers and from each other, three-fourths of the men at least have learned it, and many can already read fairly well.” George Sherman, another of the regiment’s officers, observed more broadly that the enlisted men went home “with views enlarged, ambition aroused, and their interest in the outside world thoroughly awakened.” And on a financial level as well, the men benefitted from their service. After learning that the bounty promised by the federal government to slave recruits would be paid instead to their former enslavers, Colonel Shaw successfully lobbied Secretary of War Edwin Stanton for a similar payment for his men. On November 15, 1865, the enlisted men of the 7th Regiment received their $100 payment. “A little before midnight it was over,” reported Captain Califf, “and the 7th U.S.C.T. ceased to exist.”9

Returning to Talbot County, black veterans along with other freedmen sought to establish new lives for themselves and their families. For some the desire for safety and security was paramount, and as a result they returned to their former
enslavers seeking places to live and work. For others, freedom meant removing themselves as far as possible from the scene of their enslavement. Baltimore and Washington, D.C., were attractive urban locations for these individuals, as they hoped to find employment opportunities available in these cities. But a significant number of African Americans sought to establish a degree of independence and security for themselves within Talbot County apart from whites by clustering together and eking out a living from the land. Unionville was born from this impulse. Somewhat ironically, this desire for black autonomy free from white control was facilitated by the Cowgills, a family of white Quakers. While the Cowgills never explicitly commented on their reasons for providing land to blacks, by 1867 it was apparent that aiding black people in acquiring their own homes would be a primary focus throughout their time in Talbot County.10

Ezekiel Cowgill’s activity in support of African Americans began in February of 1867 as he recorded land leases in the Talbot County Courthouse for Joseph Goo- by, John Henry Gibson, Horace Gibson, Matthew Roberts, William Samson, Joseph Johnson, and James Johnson. Cowgill followed these initial leases with a half dozen more in November and December of that year to Joseph Nicols, William Doran, Isaac Copper, Henry Blake, James Blake, and Charles Skinner. All the lessees were black, and all the leases were for thirty years’ duration at a cost of one dollar a month. Over the next eleven years Cowgill continued the practice of providing extremely low-cost leases to black families, with the only substantial variation being that by 1871 he was extending the leases to ninety-nine years’ duration. By 1878 Ezekiel had provided thirty-seven leases to thirty-four different black leaseholders providing access to plots of land eight-tenths of an acre in size upon which the blacks built homes for themselves and their families.11

By 1880, Ezekiel Cowgill’s leasing activity on the Miles River Neck to African Americans had resulted in the establishment of a town of sizeable proportions, and a name—Unionville—that would distinguish it for well over the next century. While the local Easton press insisted on referring to the town as Cowgilltown for the remainder of the nineteenth century, Ezekiel Cowgill himself was using the name Unionville to refer to the black enclave as early as 1874. The federal census of 1880 also used the name Unionville and listed the town for the only time as a separate municipal entity. The census indicated that Unionville in 1880 comprised 46 households, 56 families, and 269 individuals. At least 14 of the town’s households were headed by USCT veterans, of whom the largest number came from the 7th Regiment. The primary occupation represented by heads of households was farm
hand, with a scattering of other unskilled occupations listed such as mill hands, domestic servants, and sailors. Only two individuals occupied positions that could be considered above the unskilled level, with one grocer and one preacher being recorded in the census. The fact that families outnumbered households by a factor of 20 percent was consistent with the practice of blacks after the war. As Seth Rockman has observed in his study of Baltimore’s working class, black households were propelled by economic concerns to be multigenerational and multifamily, while Amy Taylor in her study of freedmen stated that for blacks “freedom promised to allow extended family networks to share physical spaces, and to share all the social and emotional sustenance that this entailed.” Unionville residents also shared their financial resources, coming to each other’s aid when they fell behind in their rental payments, while the Cowgills were flexible in the extreme in accepting creative financing schemes to allow their black leaseholders to stay in their homes.\textsuperscript{12}

Beyond providing land for blacks to establish homes, the Cowgills also cooperated with the new black community in establishing an institutional infrastructure that would support its growth and development. In 1868 Ezekiel provided a deed to five USCT veterans for a third of an acre of land at the cost of one dollar for “the purpose of erecting or allowing to be erected thereon a school house, for the use, benefit, and education of the colored people of Miles River Neck and vicinity.” Similarly, in the 1870s Cowgill and his wife both leased and sold land on three different occasions to groups of Unionville residents for the establishment of churches, out of which would evolve St. Stephens African Methodist Episcopal Church. Ezekiel’s support for his Unionville neighbors is given a wry turn in a story told by Joseph Sutton, a second-generation Miles River Neck resident. Having caught several Unionville blacks stealing sheep from nearby white farmers, Sutton recounted that Cowgill “wouldn’t tell on em [sic].” Rather, Ezekiel declared that he would keep part of the sheep for his own breakfast, and that the would-be sheep rustlers could keep the rest for themselves. While Sutton’s story was told at secondhand and a distance of some fifty years, its perpetuation as part of the “the Neck’s” folklore confirms the image that Ezekiel Cowgill had established as a rare white ally for the region’s black population.\textsuperscript{13}

By 1880, management of the Cowgills’ landholding on Miles River Neck had passed on to their sons John and James Cowgill. Of the two, John was the more likely candidate to follow in his father’s footsteps as a patron of the Unionville community. After serving as a Union officer in the USCT, John returned to Talbot County and became a prosperous lumber merchant and an active member of the
Republican Party. Regarding the latter, he was following in the footsteps of his father who in 1866 had been a delegate to the Southern Loyalist Convention in Baltimore, which, Ezekiel wrote to his wife, had “done much . . . to advance the great cause of universal suffrage, equal rights to all men, and to establish the glorious principles of liberty, equality and fraternity.” Shortly thereafter, Ezekiel ran unsuccessfully for the State Senate on the Republican ticket. The following year James served as a delegate to the Republican State Convention, and then emulated his father in being an unsuccessful State Senate candidate. During this campaign John brought significant attention to himself for his role in the formation of a black military group which the decidedly unfriendly Star Democrat labeled “Cowgill’s Militia.” John put his organization to good use in the celebration of the passage of the Fifteenth Amendment, an event that coincided with the State Senate election. Labeling himself “The Freedman’s Friend,” John rode into Easton at the head of his fully armed black militia and delivered, according to a not unbiased Star Democrat, “a regular war and negro speech, winding up telling ‘de bredren’ how to vote, instructing them that their true interests were with the Radical Party, of which he was the chief in Cowgillville.” While the newspaper’s account was undoubtedly sensationalized, its substance was corroborated by contemporary observers and confirmed John’s image, in the words of his niece, as “a wild young blade.”

After his memorable but ultimately unsuccessful run for public office, John Cowgill inexplicably retired from the Talbot County political scene and by the 1880s had moved first to Lancaster, Virginia, and then to Washington, D.C. John’s departure left the management of his father’s landholding to his brother James. Having chosen to stay at home during the war while his brother engaged in an active military role, James’s only foray into the public limelight occurred in 1873 as he narrowly lost a race for the State Senate to his neighbor and Democratic opponent Edward Lloyd. That same year Ezekiel deeded to James land to establish his own farm, and upon Ezekiel’s death in 1881 he gained possession of all his father’s landholdings.

With James’s ascension to the management and ultimately ownership of Lombardy Farm, the village of Unionville entered a new and seminal stage in its development. While during Ezekiel’s tenure the residents of Unionville had been tenants of the Cowgills, albeit ones with extremely long leases and very generous terms, under James’s management Unionville residents were provided with the opportunity to own their own homes. James’s first sale of land to a black Unionville resident occurred in 1879. For the sum of $78 he sold a lot to Frederick Pipes, a Union veteran and acknowledged leader of the Unionville community. Sixteen years
would then pass before James made a second land sale for $200 to Matthew Roberts, also a veteran and one of the original Unionville settlers who thirty-three years previously had leased land from Ezekiel. By the end of the century and the termination of Ezekiel’s original thirty-year leases, James’s land sales began in earnest and extended over the next twenty years. Over that period, James made forty sales of land to black Unionville residents. Unlike Ezekiel who had largely standardized his leases, James’s sales varied both in size and price. Most land sales were simply listed in the county land records as “lots,” which suggests that they were the eight-tenths-of-an-acre parcels that Ezekiel had established thirty years previously. Others, however, varied in size, although almost all were relatively small house lots and none were able to support their owners as farm operators. The price for these lots also varied, although most sales to black buyers were in the range of $100 to $200, while five sales were above that range and two below. The least expensive lots were sold to Rebecca Mooney, James Gibson, and William Kellum for $5 “and other good and valuable considerations.” James did not identify the nature of those “considerations,” but they suggest that he considered personal, as well as economic, factors in the pricing of his land sales to Unionville’s residents. That certainly appears to be the case in the sale of land to William Kellum, whose parcel of land sold to him by James for $5 in 1928 was valued at the extraordinary sum for a black homeowner of $1,000 only two years later. James Cowgill’s sale of land to African Americans continued the tradition of his father Ezekiel in providing homes to freedmen in a secure environment largely free from white intrusions. James also followed his father’s example in aiding the Unionville residents in the establishment of institutional structures that would stabilize their community. On at least five occasions between 1896 and 1911 he sold lots ranging in price from $25 to $60 to aggregations of community members for the establishment of organizations such as the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Grand Army of the Republic (GAR), Young Men’s Enterprise Association, and the Union League Success Company. While not all these organizations were successful in sustaining themselves, their establishment attests to the collective determination of Unionville residents, aided by the Cowgill family, to build a vibrant community. James did not restrict his sale of land exclusively to black Unionville residents, as on at least a half-dozen occasions he sold land outside of the village to white businessmen, generally in amounts of acreage significantly larger than the sales he made to blacks. But his willingness to go even beyond his father’s example by providing access to home ownership for blacks was completely at odds with the racial temper of the times and solidified the foundation of the Unionville community.
By the early 1920s James’s land sales came to an end, and in 1923 he sold the last of his Lombardy farm and moved to a smaller plot of land on the Miles River he entitled “Little Lombardy.” In 1929 at the age of ninety-five he died, and was lauded by the Star Democrat as “a polished, courtly gentlemen [sic] of the old school and very highly esteemed by many” who had played a central role in the development of the village that the newspaper insisted on labeling “Cowgilltown.” By this time Unionville had acquired the distinctive characteristics that would mark it for much of the next century. First and foremost, it was an all-black hamlet, albeit one that had shrunk in size since the 1880s. The federal census indicates that the village had been reduced from 46 homes and 269 individuals in 1880 to 27 homes and 100 individuals in 1920. In this regard, the village was mirroring the overall loss of black population in Talbot County at the turn of the century. The county’s black popula-
tion shrank from 38 percent to 34 percent of Talbot’s total from 1880 to 1910, and Easton, the county’s largest town, lost 8 percent of its black population during this period. Additionally, Unionville’s relative isolation, located at a distance from Easton and St. Michaels where employment opportunities in oystering and packing houses had developed, made it exceedingly difficult for the town’s residents to access these jobs without moving from “the Neck.” The town’s fate was similar to other isolated black towns of the period that withered under what one historian of these hamlets has labeled “the onslaught of modernization.” While reduced in size, Unionville had acquired an institutional stability that would serve it well during the coming years of the Great Depression. Of the twenty-seven households in Unionville, all but one were owned by their black residents, and nineteen of the twenty-six were mortgage free. Home ownership had become an absolute priority for Unionville residents. Joseph Sutton, an African American who resided on Miles River Neck, explained: “Poor people, slaves, they got a house, they felt like they had a mansion.” The only exception to the general pattern of home ownership was the village minister, Henry Lewis, whose occupation lent itself to an itinerant existence. Village residents still were largely farm laborers working for white landowners, although by 1920 there was a sizeable number scattered across a variety of other occupations such as cooks, lumber mill laborers, grocery market operators, and nursery laborers. Several male household heads were retired, an indication of the village’s aging population, while four female heads of households were listed as unemployed.18

While reduced in population, Unionville residents had established a sense of community that sustained it through its formative years. Central to the community were the town’s church and school. St. Stephens AME Church was built in 1892 and had been preceded by several other buildings dating back to Ezekiel Cowgill’s one-dollar grant of land to the village for the establishment of “a place of Divine Worship.” Over the next twenty years various buildings in Unionville were used as houses of worship, with the permanent structure built with the aid of a fundraising campaign during the 1890s. Over two hundred donors contributed in excess of $1,000 for the construction, and church members traveled distances of four to five miles in order to attend services. Contiguous to St. Stephens Church was Unionville’s elementary school. A testament to the residents’ determination to have their youth educated, the school had been made possible by another Cowgill grant of land to five of the Unionville veterans who served as the school’s initial trustees. By 1900 the heretofore independent school had been absorbed into the Easton School
District with Reverend William Chase and two other Unionville residents serving as trustees. The school, like St. Stephens Church, drew from a wide catchment area, and was well attended despite being woefully underfunded in comparison to white schools in the county. The school principal, as an example, was paid half as much as his white counterpart in the neighboring town of Tunis Mills.19

### Unionville A.M.E. Church

List of Persons and Amounts Paid by Them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johns</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Dobson</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sutton</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah DeShields</td>
<td>$1,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Miller</td>
<td>$10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitie Johnson</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannie Banning</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry A. Skinner</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann M. Johnson</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Doran</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Carter</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Carter</td>
<td>$9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah DeShields</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Belden</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William照料</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Connor</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Blake</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Roberts</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Roberts</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Johnson</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Glagow</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Louden</td>
<td>$12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Blake</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hill</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Doran</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Connor</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Gross</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Sherwood</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Floyd</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Gross</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Robert</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Gross</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Thomas</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Gross</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallie Jackson</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Mosey</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>嗲々</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Gooby</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gross</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Gross</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nannie Belden</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Nichols</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. Story</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Sampson</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Roberts</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Porter</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Skinner</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Glagow</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Pipes</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haunted Township</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Townsdown</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Belden</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Green</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Epps</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosey Johnson</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William A. Banks</td>
<td>$3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George A. Gross</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James H. Goss</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Skinner</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Miller</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Sampson</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Williams</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Floyd</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Glagow</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Gross</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jackson</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jackson</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry M. Green</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie Jenkins</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Johnson</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Belden</td>
<td>$6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George A. Gross</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James H. Goss</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jackson</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Green</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Gross</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Robert</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Miller</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Glagow</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Mosey</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Epps</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Sampson</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Skinner</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James H. Goss</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Mosey</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Belden</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Green</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Glagow</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Gross</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jackson</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Belden</td>
<td>$7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Green</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Glagow</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.** The donations by Unionville residents were used to defray the cost for the building of St. Stephens Church. "Unionville A.M.E. Church: List of Persons and Amounts Paid by Them," Cowgill Papers, Talbot County Historical Society, 1300.0009. Used with permission. Image courtesy of Larry Hitchens, Hitchens Photography.
Central to the process of community building in Unionville were the efforts of black women who acted as unsung religious and educational leaders. As one historian has observed, “women were the organizers, leaders, teachers and the backbone of the church and school.” Women comprised the majority of the several hundred donors who contributed to the building of St. Stephens Church in 1892. They cooked the meals for Sunday and Wednesday prayer meetings and cleaned the church and school. They cared for orphans, the sick and the elderly, delivered babies as midwives, and served as teachers in the school. Additionally, although listed in the 1900 census as unemployed, they supplemented their households’ income by taking in “day work,” doing washing for white families on “the Neck” for as little as fifty cents a wash. By 1920 this situation was changing, as the census listed 36 percent of adult women, both married and unmarried, as employed and 22 percent as the heads of households—a reflection of the migration of men to urban areas where employment opportunities were more abundant. Women increasingly served as the social bond for the village, and provided a cohesiveness in the face of poverty and population loss.

Unionville’s church and school, wholly black, were indicative of the segregated existence that marked the residents’ lives. A neighboring Caroline County newspaper reported that “there is not [in Unionville] a white person in the place, and stores, a school, and two churches are patronized solely by the darkies.” While the national GAR was ostensibly an integrated organization, which its Easton commander proudly proclaimed “numbers among its members citizens of all stations in life . . . all that is required for membership being an honorable discharge and good citizenship,” the officers of the Easton chapter were exclusively white and its activities focused on every sizeable Talbot County community except Unionville. As a result, Unionville’s veterans established their own all-black post named after Joe Johnson, one of the town’s original settlers. Similarly, Unionville’s residents held countywide all-black celebrations of the Emancipation Proclamation’s anniversary as well as other celebratory events in conjunction with the neighboring black town of Copperville. By 1922 the Star Democrat reported that the town’s residents had “established a church and a Grand Army post, one of the first colored posts in the country, and both the church and the post flourish until this day.”

Along with their commitment to church and school, Unionville residents demonstrated firm support for the Republican Party. That they did so is not surprising, as blacks throughout Talbot County remained staunch supporters of the Republican Party well into the twentieth century despite the best efforts of white
Democrats to limit their ability to vote. As early as 1871 Democratic newspapers in Talbot County were calling the alarm regarding African Americans’ commitment to exercising their voting rights by supporting the Republican ticket. Ten years later nothing had changed. The *Star Democrat* pronounced that “the negroes are always on hand to register and vote. Democrats are often indifferent both about registering and voting.” As late as 1922 the newspaper, in begrudging yet complimentary tones, reported that black Unionville voters “to this day vote the solid Republican ticket, and no amount of persuasion could change them.” Their determination to vote and support the Republican Party had become an integral part of their community’s identity.  

The fact that Unionville’s residents were able to maintain a strong sense of community life was especially remarkable given the array of economic and physical challenges they faced. As early as 1899 the *Baltimore Sun* reported that “the town has gone to decay. Some of the houses have become uninhabitable, and many of
the people have moved away where they can live among whites.” Although the \textit{Sun}’s assessment of the town’s condition was exaggerated, it did contain a modicum of truth. A dearth of sustained employment opportunities resulted in many Unionville residents migrating to urban areas where work was more readily available. In some cases, blacks traveled to Baltimore for work on a seasonal basis and returned home to Unionville periodically, while for others the migration northward was permanent. While the town’s residents had benefitted from the willingness of the Cowgills to provide them with the opportunity to lease and then own their homes, the ability to purchase their own farmland was well beyond the means of most agricultural workers, both black and white. Farm acreage in Talbot County at the turn of the century ranged in price from $25 to $125 per acre, and by 1918 a 150-acre farm on Miles River Neck was selling for $15,000. Black farm ownership was unknown as a result, and most farms on Miles River Neck were worked by white tenants who in turn hired black laborers to work for them. Blacks in the best of circumstances worked as tenants with a year’s lease, although in many cases they were compelled to eke out a living as day laborers working at the behest of white tenant farmers.

For many of the original Unionville settlers, their economic challenges were exacerbated by infirmities that had resulted from their days of enslavement and wartime experiences. An examination of census and pension records illustrates their mixed success in overcoming the challenges they faced. Peter Johnson, who had joined the 7th USCT in 1863 after being enslaved by Edward Lloyd, sustained a gunshot wound to his left hand during the Battle of Darbytown Road, Virginia, in October of 1864. Johnson’s war wound resulted in the virtual incapacitation of his left arm, and as a result, he was granted in 1880 a federal pension of $4 a month, which by the time of his death had grown to $12. In combination with the one-dollar-a-month lease he received from Ezekiel Cowgill, Johnson was able to live out his years in Unionville. Joseph Gooby, also formerly enslaved by Lloyd, a member of the 7th USCT and neighbor of Peter Johnson, had an even more challenging history. Gooby suffered a wound to his hip during the Second Battle of Deep Bottom in the summer of 1864, which left him paralyzed in one leg. Unable to work full time, Gooby and his family were compelled to live as tenants with other Unionville residents and supported themselves on his veteran’s pension of $8 a month. Matthew Roberts, a third Unionville resident formerly enslaved by Lloyd and veteran of the 4th USCT, was wounded at the battle of New Market in 1864. Although significantly disabled as a result of his war wound, there is no record of
Roberts ever collecting a federal pension. Despite his disability and lack of a pension, Roberts was able to be among the first in 1867 to lease a lot in Unionville from Ezekiel Cowgill for one dollar a month and in 1900 purchase that lot from Ezekiel’s son James for $100. Roberts became an acknowledged leader of the Unionville community, serving as a trustee of the first church established in the community. Frederick Pipes was one of the Unionville founders who had been a free man prior to the war. Pipes distinguished himself during his service in the 4th USCT, rising to the rank of sergeant by the time of his discharge. In 1879 Pipes was the first Unionville resident to purchase a lot from James Cowgill for $58 and would add to his landholdings in 1911 and 1916 by purchasing several more lots from Cowgill. Pipes suffered from diseases of the kidney which he attributed to his service during the Civil War and engaged in a long-running twenty-year struggle with the federal pension bureau to receive and then increase his pension.24

Frederick Pipes’s effort to secure a federal pension was illustrative of the difficulties that many Unionville veterans faced in collecting financial support from the federal government that they believed was due to them as a result of their wartime service. Veterans such as Peter Johnson and Joseph Gooby who had suffered battle wounds in the war still had to prove that these wounds significantly impaired their ability to work. Others, such as Frederick Pipes, who suffered from illnesses that they contended resulted from their wartime experience, faced an even more difficult task. Federal officials maintained that veterans like Pipes had to demonstrate that their health concerns were directly attributable to their military activity. While such difficulties were not unique to black veterans, they often lacked a documented history of medical care due to their impoverished circumstances, making their burden of proof especially difficult to overcome. In the face of these challenges, Unionville residents turned to one another for support. The pension records of Unionville veterans are replete with testimony from fellow veterans and town residents attesting to the fact that the petitioners had been healthy prior to the war and had emerged from their military experiences burdened with health issues. Supplementing the support received from their neighbors, Unionville residents were aided by Joe Gray, the acknowledged black leader of the Republican Party in Easton. Gray himself had served in the federal military during the war and had been successful in gaining his own federal pension. Based on his personal experience coupled with substantial political connections, Gray served as an adviser and intermediary for Unionville veterans with the federal bureaucracy.25
A Home of Their Own

Figure 7. United States Colored Troops, 7th Regiment Infantry, Talbot County Soldiers, by Larry Hitchens. The 7th Regiment USCT was comprised of approximately 185 Talbot County black recruits, of whom ten were among the original residents of Unionville. Courtesy of Larry Hitchens, Hitchens Photography.

By the close of the 1920s, the last of the Unionville founders had passed away along with James Cowgill. The small, tight knit, all-black hamlet that the town’s founders had established would endure though into the twenty-first century. While most of the original residents’ homes have now been replaced by newer, albeit still modest, construction, the village itself, dominated by St. Stephens Church, looks in large part much as it did when Frederick Pipes and his fellow veterans resided there. Considered by some a quaint backwater which occasionally merits attention as a relic of the past, Unionville viewed through a broader lens is a testament to a people’s desire for security and autonomy after having been cast adrift into a post-emancipation sea of white indifference and hostility. The Unionville story certainly
has a bittersweet dimension to it, one that Joseph Sutton, a town resident, alluded to in his recollection of its evolution. “Many people went to Baltimore,” he remembered. “There wasn’t work enough here for em [sic] all.” Unable to find sufficient employment to sustain themselves and their families and finding it impossible to acquire ownership of land, large numbers of the town’s residents migrated north, some temporarily, others permanently. Unionville, as a result, shrank in size over the course of its formative years. And those left behind were very often the individuals least able to take advantage of the few opportunities available to them on Miles River Neck. John Cowgill’s assessment of the formerly enslaved individuals under his command during the Civil War was prescient of the ills which would afflict the population of Unionville. “Negroes here as well as in Maryland have all kinds of pains to which they are subject. I have never yet seen one perfectly well as a consequence.” Hobbled by disease and war wounds, many black veterans died young, and those who endured found themselves enmeshed in a web of rural poverty from which there was little chance of escape. But still they persisted. And Unionville, then and now, stands as a monument to their persistence and to the faith of African Americans in the promise of establishing homes of their own.26
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Courtesy of Hammond-Harwood House Association
Annapolis Colonial Restoration: The Secret Project, 1926–1935

BY CHARLES A. WEBB

This is the story of an effort to undertake a colonial restoration in Annapolis that would rival Rockefeller’s Williamsburg. It began innocently enough in the late 1920s, with St. John’s College and Dr. James Bordley Jr., a member of its Board of Visitors and Governors, simply trying to save Annapolis’s historic houses from developers. The effort expanded to include two notable New Yorkers, Francis Patrick Garvan, a wealthy man with one of the finest collections of colonial decorative arts, and Richard T. Haines Halsey from the Metropolitan Museum of Art, who became Garvan’s man on the scene. The restoration effort reveals Garvan as the mysterious man behind the Annapolis legend that someone had wanted to buy up the old buildings and convert the town into another Williamsburg. Garvan realized Annapolis’s potential for a major restoration project and was well along in his plan to quietly acquire buildings and land when the Depression struck—and the president of the college made a foolish mistake alienating both Garvan and Halsey. The effort collapsed and remained largely unknown because, until recently, Garvan’s acquisitions never became public knowledge.1

Charles A. Webb Jr., MD, is a graduate of Trinity College (Hartford), BA 1960; The College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, MD, 1964. He completed a residency in orthopedic surgery at Johns Hopkins University in 1969. He served on the Board of Directors at the Hammond-Harwood House from 2012 to 2018 and discovered the material for this paper in the St. John’s College Board of Directors minutes while doing research for a biography of his grandfather, James Bordley Jr., MD.
The Colonial Revival movement was in full swing in the 1920s. John D. Rockefeller was buying the land around Williamsburg, Virginia; Francis DuPont was building a collection in Delaware that would become the Winterthur Museum; and Henry Ford was moving whole buildings to create Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan. Marylanders were coming to realize the historic value of their capital. Following the American Revolution, commerce shifted from Annapolis to Baltimore, leaving twentieth-century Annapolis much closer to its colonial state than other rapidly developing East Coast cities. Much of the original town was still intact and in use. It did not have to be rebuilt like Williamsburg or acquired and moved, as DuPont and Ford were doing. The State House, where George Washington resigned his commission in the army and where the Treaty of Paris was ratified, was still functioning. Stately colonial mansions, early citizens’ homes, and tradesmen’s shops continued to have various uses, and the harbor remained active.

In 1901, a New Jersey developer bought William Paca’s five-part Georgian mansion. It was made into the entrance and lobby for what eventually grew to a 200-bed hotel, built behind the mansion and taking out what had been a beautiful colonial garden. The trustees of St. John’s College in Annapolis, known as the Board of Visitors and Governors (referred to as the board hereafter), were concerned that many of the other stately old houses would fall to developers as they became too expensive for private owners to maintain. The board felt that there was a better chance to preserve these buildings if they were under the control of an established local institution such as the college, rather than leaving them to the open market and the “developers.” In the Roaring Twenties the college could count on wealthy donors to help with funding.

St. John’s preservation efforts began in earnest following the death of Hester Ann Harwood in 1924. She never married and was the sole owner of the Hammond-Harwood House. This house is one of at least seven Annapolis mansions dating from prerevolutionary times. Because Hester Ann Harwood left no will and had no direct heir, the furnishings and house were to be sold, with proceeds going to nieces and nephews. The contents of the house were auctioned in 1925 and attracted a good bit of attention for their quality and historic value. A year later, on September 21, 1926, the house was up for auction, and St. John’s wanted to buy and preserve it. The mansion was just a block away from St John’s campus.

Because of this, in the spring of 1926, James Bordley Jr., a Baltimore physician, was asked to join the board of St. John’s College. He had a reputation for his interest in the colonial period and its decorative arts. He was active in the Maryland
Historical Society, had been a founder of the Baltimore Museum of Art, and had a first-class collection of colonial furniture and arts. The board put him on the Buildings and Grounds Committee and made him chairman of a new Special Colonial Development Committee. Other members of his committee were James Walton, Sylvester Labrot, John Hays Hammond Jr., William Woodward Sr., and Walter Buck. One of Bordley’s missions was to try to acquire the Hammond-Harwood House for the college.5

Dr. Bordley had a stroke of luck in the summer of 1926. Prior to air conditioning, he and his wife customarily spent their summers in New England. They were eating lunch one day in the historic Wayside (Longfellow) Inn in Sudbury, Massachusetts. Henry Ford owned the inn, having purchased it as one of the historic buildings he was planning to move to what would become Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan.6

Years later Bordley recounted the following remarkable story of the luncheon in a letter to his friend Walter Buck:

A man came in whom I recognized as Mr. Ford’s agent who had visited Annapolis and gone through the Hammond-Harwood House at a time when I was there. This man took a table next to ours and was joined by the lady who ran the lunchroom. She asked what progress he had made in the purchase of the Hammond-Harwood House. The man told her that he had orders from Mr. Ford to purchase it. Mrs. Bordley and I made a hurried exit, and I went to a telegraph office and wired you of the conversation.7

The thought was that Ford intended to move the house to Dearborn. It would have been a real prize for him but a tragic loss to Annapolis. Buck called the situation to the attention of St. John’s College President Enoch Garey. Garey promptly went to Detroit and got in touch with Henry Ford’s attorney to persuade Ford not to purchase the house. Garey succeeded. The Executive and Finance committees of the college then approved a plan for the college to try to acquire it. With the most serious competitor out of the way, Walter Buck went to the auction and bought the house on behalf of the college with a bid of $47,000. A mortgage was obtained through the Union Trust Company. Garey told the board, “Without Dr. Bordley’s enterprise, Maryland might have lost the mansion.”8

James Bordley Jr. and his committee took over the management of the house. As his first move, Bordley gave a dinner for the board at the Maryland Club in Baltimore.
He told them he needed $20,000 to rejuvenate the building. Labrot, Woodward, and Hammond each gave $5,000, and the remaining members came up with the balance. The committee hired Walter Tovell, a builder experienced in preserving old homes, to do the necessary repairs. A year later Bordley reported to the board, “The house was restored without a single original part missing and with no additions.”

At the October 26, 1926, board meeting, Bordley gave a report from his Special Colonial Development Committee. He extolled the quality of the house and reviewed plans to make it a museum with colonial furnishings that would include some of his collection. He appointed a large and wide-ranging subcommittee headed by Virginia White, a noted Baltimore collector, to furnish it. He recognized that properly furnishing the house could be a greater expense than purchasing it. The committee included Luke Vincent Lockwood of the Brooklyn Museum and a prominent author on antiques; Richard T. Haines Halsey, a founder and first director of the Metropolitan’s American Wing; and Francis P. Garvan, a wealthy New York collector. Garvan’s wife, Mabel Brady Garvan, and Mrs. White, who had been buyers at the previous year’s Hammond-Harwood furnishings auction, were included. Mrs. Garvan loaned back much of what she had bought at the auction including the Charles Willson Peale portrait of William Buckland, the house’s architect, showing drawings of the house on a table in front of him.

Here we must step aside and say something about Francis Patrick Garvan (1875–1937). He was born in East Hartford, Connecticut, but the family was originally from Ireland. His father was a paper manufacturer and was successful enough financially to send his children to top private schools and be considered socially acceptable. Francis (Frank in the family) attended Andover preparatory school, then Yale University, after which he got an LL.B. from New York University in 1899. He worked as an assistant district attorney in New York from 1900 to 1910 and participated in the prosecution of several prominent cases, including giving the opening statement in the trial of the murder of architect Stanford White. In 1906 his sister married Nicholas F. Brady, and Francis thus met Mabel Brady, Nicholas’s sister. They fell in love, married in 1910, and had seven children. The Bradys were a very wealthy New York family of industrialists, and much of Francis Garvan’s wealth came from the Brady family. The Garvans had a townhouse at 740 Park Avenue in New York City and a Long Island mansion in Old Westbury between the Phipps and Whitney estates.

When the United States entered World War I, President Woodrow Wilson appointed Garvan director of the New York office of the Bureau of Investigation, precursor of the FBI. He was also appointed U.S. Alien Property Custodian, giving
him control of the patents of the German chemical industry applicable in the
United States. He saw how dependent the country was on German organic chem-
icals and the need for the United States’ own chemical industry. After the war,
President Wilson appointed him director of the Chemical Foundation, a position
that he continued to hold for the rest of his life. He worked for no salary and was
so successful in helping develop the chemical industry in the United States that he
was the only person up to that point without a degree in chemistry to have received
the American Chemical Society’s highest award, the Priestley Medal. With Charles
Herty he helped in the formation of the National Institutes of Health and received
honors for many other activities.\textsuperscript{11}

From early in their marriage, both Francis and Mabel showed an interest in col-
lecting colonial decorative arts. They started with silver, but their interests expand-
ed into all categories, and they developed one of America’s largest and finest
collections. Accordingly, they became well acquainted with both Halsey and Lock-
wood prior to 1926. Garvan had consulted with them about objects and had
loaned pieces to them for exhibitions in their New York museums. In her article
on Garvan as a collector, Patricia Kane comments that, when the National Gallery
requested loans from his collection for an exhibition in 1925, the Garvans realized
that their large collection did not belong just to them, but that they were custodi-
ans of a key part of America’s artistic heritage. They felt an obligation to share it
with the country.\textsuperscript{12}
St. John’s continued to add to its collection of historic Annapolis houses. (A full list of all the properties can be found in the Appendix to this article.) In 1927 the college bought the Pinkney House for $21,500, and the Admiral Laws House (better known as the Commodore Waddell House) for $13,000. The James Brice House cost $50,000. Its large ballroom became an area for college social events, and faculty rented other rooms as living quarters, which generated a steady stream of income that helped cover its cost. Because the Jennings family acquired the adjacent Paca house in 1780 and their daughter had married the Brice House builder, James Brice, Dr. Bordley purchased and donated the portraits of Thomas Jennings and his wife by John Hesselius for the ballroom.

On October 29, 1927, things were going well at the Hammond-Harwood House. Because the house had no central heat, Dr. Bordley paid for a modern heating system to be installed. It was a forced air system with vents hidden in places such as inside chimneys so as not to be visible. Dr. Bordley reported to the board that since the restoration work was finished and sufficient furnishings had been obtained, it was ready to be opened. In celebration he hosted a dinner for the board in the house. The Hon. Carroll T. Bond, chief judge of Maryland’s Court of Appeals, offered historic judicial documents for a special exhibition. The Maryland Historical Society sent a supportive letter. Favorable articles appeared in the Baltimore and Washington papers. The Washington Post said that St. John’s would be unique among American colleges in possessing a colonial museum available to its faculty for teaching purposes.

Francis Garvan became very interested in Annapolis and the Hammond-Harwood House by early 1928. He sent enough furniture, carpets, silverware, and paintings to complete the furnishing of the house. The college minutes reveal that Bordley was invited to visit Garvan’s furniture warehouse in New York and select pieces to be sent to Annapolis. Such was Garvan’s interest in Annapolis that he told Bordley that if he found something in the market the house needed, and a similar piece was not in the Garvan collection, Bordley was to buy it and send him the bill. This remarkable generosity by Garvan is a clue to what was going on behind the scene, which would soon become apparent.

In the spring of 1928, a fortuitous sequence of events enabled St. John’s president Enoch Garey to add the distinguished Richard T. Haines Halsey (1865–1942) to the staff of the college. Known to his friends as R.T., Halsey graduated from Princeton and worked on the New York Stock Exchange. He was also a writer on antiques. As Wendy Kaplan points out in her biography, Halsey “helped legitimize the collec-
tion and exhibition of American decorative arts.” He was “a prolific author, indefatigable lecturer, prominent educator, consultant, and collector.” When he was fifty-eight he retired from the Stock Exchange to develop the American Wing for the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The American Wing opened in 1924 with Halsey as the curator and was the first permanent gallery space for colonial arts in a major museum. Halsey’s assembly of objects in the “Period Room” was quickly copied by several other major museums.15

In the spring of 1928, Halsey and Lockwood were visiting Annapolis as part of a tour of southern Maryland with the Walpole Society, an organization dedicated to the appreciation and study of American decorative art, architecture, and history. It appears that Bordley’s efforts to publicize events at the college paid off. Halsey had given up his work at the Metropolitan Museum of Art because he did not like the administrative work of the job and was thinking about going to the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg to help on a restoration project there.16

![Dr. R. T. H. Halsey in the Dedication of the student yearbook The Rat Tat (1930), Pickering Studios, n.d.](St. John's College, Greenfield Library Archives, Annapolis, MD)
Halsey was very impressed when he saw the work that St. John’s was doing preserving historic buildings. After meeting him, college president Garey realized Halsey’s potential for St. John’s and made R.T. an offer he could not turn down. Mr. Halsey would be given a teaching position as Professor of Fine Arts and an honorary Doctorate of Letters. The now Dr. Halsey offered to take a one-dollar-a-year salary and was given full charge of the Hammond-Harwood House. He requested that all the furnishings but Garvan’s be returned to the owners. He wanted the house to be fully furnished by Garvan, whose pieces he considered the best. Bordley was initially disgruntled, but accepted it, and even nominated Halsey to be a member of the Board of Visitors and Governors. Halsey was elected to the board on October 28, 1928.17

The hiring of R. T. H. Halsey was an excellent move for the college. He wanted to expand on Bordley’s idea of turning the Hammond-Harwood House into a museum. His goal was for St. John’s to be the first college in the country with a program actually teaching a regular course on American colonial decorative arts. The museum would serve to demonstrate the material of the course. In this, Halsey was ahead of the times: a similar program at Yale University did not start until several years later and Winterthur did not open full time as a museum until 1951, and its educational program was not formalized until 1974.18

On May 15, 1928, a great celebration was held in Annapolis under the lead of St. John’s College. Known as “Colonial Days in Annapolis,” the event was another one of James Bordley’s public relations efforts. The day served to heighten interest in the city’s history and the role that St. John’s was playing to preserve the historic buildings. It commemorated the Annapolis Convention of 1786, which had been a forerunner of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. For a day the city gave itself over to a colonial theme with citizens dressed in historic costumes, colonial music was played, and historic food was served. There were many celebratory events and notable visitors: President Calvin Coolidge and his wife Grace attended a costumed re-enactment depicting Washington’s resignation of his military command, but they declined to don colonial dress. In the evening a banquet was given in the State House.19

Over the next few years, R. T. H. Halsey continued to develop his curriculum and contributed to the success of the college. In the summer of 1928, the Bordley-Randall House came up for sale. St John’s bought the house and grounds and made a portion of the property available to R. T. Halsey and his wife Elizabeth to rent as their living quarters. Halsey’s curriculum was a success, attracting students to the
college and increasing the college’s national visibility. Halsey visited Yale early in the spring of 1929 and suggested that they send a group of their students who were primarily interested in American history and colonial architecture to St. John’s during Easter vacation, in order to attend Halsey’s lectures. He said the idea received great approval at Yale, and he was going to make the same suggestion to Princeton and the University of Pennsylvania. In 1930 Halsey secured a grant of $5,000 from the Carnegie Corporation to be expended for equipment to be used in teaching and appreciation of fine arts. This was a considerable sum in those early Depression days—more than the annual salary of the college dean and twice that of the instructors.20

The college operated the Hammond-Harwood House as a public museum as well as a teaching center. Admission fees from the visitors partially subsidized the museum’s operating expenses. During his tenure, Halsey put on a series of special exhibitions at the Hammond-Harwood House. In the spring of 1929 there was an exhibition of colonial textiles. Elizabeth Halsey, an author, wrote articles for the *Baltimore Sun* and *New York Times* promoting the exhibitions. In April 1930 Halsey reported to the board on his progress. Through a loan from a wealthy New York donor, H. A. Elsburg, Halsey had put on an exhibition of ten exquisite eighteenth-century costumes. Halsey also reported that various garden club groups were coming to visit the house. Also, the May edition of *The Magazine Antiques* would publish an article with five pages of illustrations and some editorial comment of what was being done at the Hammond-Harwood House. The editor, Homer Eaton Keys, a former professor at Dartmouth College, spent three days as a guest of the Halseys in the Bordley-Randall House. Mr. Keys was so impressed that he said he would like to come down and be on the faculty in a year or so.21

Halsey was busy teaching, running the museum function of the Hammond-Harwood House, and serving on the board of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. He taught his course only in the fall semester. He set up an exhibition at the Hammond-Harwood House celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of Josiah Wedgwood’s birth. This was the only museum in the country to do so, and again, it helped attract attention to his program at the college. “I have been giving illustrated lectures in Baltimore and Washington . . . on Annapolis solely with the idea of the publicity gained for St. John’s,” he is quoted in the board Minutes. “It is most gratifying to me to find students bringing their friends to be shown through the house and the sense of pride which the boys are taking in the feeling that we have something here that no other college has.” The board described the house as
“not only a noteworthy Colonial Art Museum, but a laboratory in American History and Tradition.” Halsey was popular with the students. He had been at St. John’s only two and a half years when the students dedicated their yearbook to him.22

In addition to his work in Annapolis, in the spring of 1929 Halsey, along with Francis Garvan, James Bordley, and Fiske Kimball of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, started consulting for Johns Hopkins University on a project to restore Charles Carroll’s house, the Homewood Estate, on the Hopkins campus in Baltimore. Garvan helped furnish it, and it was opened in May 1932 with Halsey himself doing much of the installation of Garvan’s pieces.23

To honor his wife on their twentieth wedding anniversary in 1930, Francis Garvan gave Yale University an endowment to be called the Mabel Brady Garvan Foundation. It included 5,000 pieces across the spectrum of American colonial decorative arts. In the bequest he noted that many other pieces were on loan to a variety of museums on the East Coast. He said that at the Homewood Estate and at the Hammond-Harwood House in Annapolis the pieces “were under the leadership of Richard T. H. Halsey, that great pioneer of the preservation of Americana . . . . It is my wish that these articles, though transferred to the ownership of Yale University, remain in these natural shrines as loans from Yale University, so long as they are adequately cared for.” He wanted “these loans to be supplemented” and the work in those institutions further encouraged.24

At the April 14, 1929, meeting of the St. John’s board, Enoch Garey stated his desire to resign immediately as college president for health reasons. Two years passed before the board was able to find a replacement at the board meeting of May 25, 1931. The Minutes did not record the attendance, and there is no indication whether Halsey was present at this meeting. Mr. Noble, presiding, announced that the search committee nominated Douglas Huntley Gordon to replace Dr. Garey as college president. Gordon, not yet thirty years old, was an attorney, two-year trustee, and the past year’s board secretary. Barbara Brand, former Hammond-Harwood administrator, left a note on a piece of scratch paper in the files about Gordon: he “came from Baltimore—very capable, wealthy, a grouch, tall, imposing, very patrician, arrogant.” The Minutes state: “Mr. Labrot pointed out to Mr. Gordon that not only had they elected him president of the college, but they were definitely notifying him that he would have full and complete support of the board and would not be hampered by any of the existing machinery for management of the Institution.” This commitment would lead to a conflict with R. T. H. Halsey.25
The trouble began in the spring of 1932 when President Gordon, who had been in office about nine months, sent a brusque note to Halsey announcing that he planned to host a luncheon in the Hammond-Harwood House for a group of his fellow Harvard alumni prior to the Harvard-Navy crew race on May 14. Gordon was going to do a bit of showing off for his old college mates. Halsey at this point had been running the house independently for almost four years, and was offended by the tone of the note. Halsey refused Gordon, saying he had been given sole authority over the house by former President Garey and was responsible for Garvan’s furnishings, which was true. He felt that such a potentially boisterous event posed a threat to the historic contents. The risk of spilled food or drink was too high, and no one was ever allowed to sit on the furniture. A major battle erupted between Dr. Halsey and President Gordon. There are copies in the St. John’s Minutes of increasingly vitriolic messages between them from May 10 to May 12, with copies to the board. Halsey asserted his independence, and Gordon threatened to
call an emergency meeting of the Executive Committee to “get my powers delineated.” Fortunately, the two managed to calm down. Gordon ended up having his party for the Harvard alumni with a tour of the Hammond-Harwood House, followed by lunch in the Brice House.26

The first opportunity the board had to deal with the spat was the following week at a combined meeting of the board’s Executive and Finance committees, which had been called by Walter Buck, then president of the Executive Committee. They met in Mr. Woodward’s office at the Hanover Bank in New York City, on May 19, 1932, for the purpose of trying to resolve the college’s financial issues. Among other debts, there was a payment of $42,000 coming up at Hanover Bank. The college also had mortgages totaling $400,000 coming due at Annapolis banks in September.27

The minutes of the New York meeting are very detailed. Unlike the board secretary’s usual notes, which were post-meeting summaries, these minutes quoted verbatim comments. It appears that Woodward had his stenographer in the room, thus providing a remarkable documentation of a critical meeting.28

Mr. Buck altered the agenda and opened the meeting by bringing up the Gordon-Halsey disagreement. Gordon and Halsey were both there as committee members. Halsey said the issue had been resolved, and the luncheon had taken place in the Brice House. However, several board members felt that it was important to clear up the chain of command in the college. A motion was made that the president had full authority over the entire college. Halsey reaffirmed that he had been given sole authority over the Hammond-Harwood House, and he threatened to resign if he did not have it. He reiterated that he was personally responsible to Garvan for the loaned furnishings. Neither Halsey nor Gordon gave ground. Ultimately the board supported its president. The board also discussed closing the museum function of the Hammond-Harwood House because of costs that Halsey had not been able to reduce. Since opening, the college had spent a total of $10,000 of general funds on the Hammond-Harwood House. Halsey, after losing this long and bitter battle, stayed for the rest of the meeting, and made some enlightening comments. But at the end, he announced that he would retire from his position at the college.

The board needed to know how Garvan was going to react if Halsey departed. After the meeting in Woodward’s office, and while they were still in New York, a subcommittee went to see Garvan but was rebuffed. They came to feel that Garvan had gone silent and threatened a suit to get him to state his intentions. They wanted the furnishings to remain in the Hammond-Harwood House, and they demanded that the property held by Davis-Smith Realty be turned over to the college.
What was Davis-Smith Realty? There is no mention of such an organization in the board Minutes prior to the New York meeting. However, from the way this was recorded, it is clear that the name was familiar to the board. It turns out that in 1928 Francis P. Garvan launched the first step in a plan to do a major colonial restoration project in Annapolis. He thought that Annapolis offered an even better site than Williamsburg for such a project. He formed the New York based Davis-Smith Realty Corporation and was using it to acquire property secretly prior to going public with the plan. He owned all the assets of Davis-Smith Realty. Lawyer Ridgely Melvin, a board member, did some of the local legal work. Halsey was also considered a local agent for Garvan, especially as caretaker of furnishings loaned to Hammond-Harwood House. There is little information about Davis-Smith other than the role of Mr. Davis, who was the president of the organization. Davis was working as Garvan’s agent and was liaison to the board on real estate matters; there was never any mention of Smith beyond the name of the firm. Rockefeller’s Williamsburg project had similarly been kept secret in the land acquisition phase to prevent real estate prices from soaring.29

Garvan was actually funding some of the property that was being “bought” by the college. The Bordley-Randall House is a good example of how the process worked. The Randall family wanted St. John’s to acquire the house. Five generations of the family had served on the board. The family settled on a price with college representatives. The board authorized the purchase of the house; the funding came from Garvan via Davis-Smith Realty. Title registration was delayed until the next year so that nothing was immediately transparent to the public.30

St. John’s had an agreement with Davis-Smith to pay rent and maintenance for use of the houses it occupied. The board’s understanding from Davis, and at times perhaps Garvan himself, was that the titles would be transferred to St. John’s at the “appropriate time.” Confident of this, the board put a considerable amount of college money into repairs on the buildings in spite of the fact that they had no written assurances. Walter Buck said the college had spent a total of $50,000 on the houses, and Halsey said that $26,000–$29,000 of the total was spent on the Bordley-Randall House.31

Mr. Davis is mentioned several times in subsequent board minutes. He was said to have met with one or another board member to discuss purchases in 1929. Several board members said Davis had told them that certain properties would eventually be transferred to the college.

In 1929 Garvan purchased British Colonial Governor Sharpe’s magnificent mansion, Whitehall, just outside of Annapolis, through another hidden deal. The Na-
tional Savings and Trust Company of Washington, D.C. “bought” Whitehall and “gave” it to Garvan in an unrecorded trust. Garvan’s name never appeared in the Anne Arundel County Land Records for any of these deals.

Garvan also purchased a large amount of open farmland just on the edge of the city under the name Davis-Smith Realty Corp. He acquired the 265-acre Dorsey (or, as the board called it, “Finkbine”) farm. This large tract was on the town side of Weems Creek. He acquired another 73 adjacent acres in three parcels that extended to College Creek. This included land across from the college that the board wanted for athletic fields plus two more adjacent lots. In total he had 338 acres of land at the edge of town. This roughly rectangular collection extended from just short of Admiral Drive at the head of Weems Creek downstream along the waterfront almost to where the Rowe Boulevard Bridge now stands and then across to College Creek. The diagonal length of the parcel was over a mile long and included today’s Admiral Heights residential area, the Naval Academy stadium, and part of West Annapolis. Garvan obviously had serious plans for a major project. (See Figure 6)

---

**FIGURE 6.** Map by Lane Engineering, Easton, MD: Garvan’s 1928–29 Land Purchases Outlined on 2015 Map of Annapolis. Note the Naval Academy Stadium on the line between “Dorsey” and “C” Tracts. The small triangle between “A,” “B,” and “C” was the WB and A Railroad Tracks.
During the meeting at the Hanover Bank, Halsey said Garvan’s “original idea unquestionably was to do at Annapolis what they are doing at Williamsburg, to restore it.” He quoted Garvan as saying, “You can count on me for this restoration of old Annapolis.” Halsey also said that Garvan had an idea that he could get his old Yale friends Harry and Payne Whitney to come up with additional funding for the project to restore colonial Annapolis. The Garvans’ Long Island mansion was next door to the Whitneys’. In 1932 Garvan made a second bequest to Yale, a collection of art he named the “Whitney Collection of Sporting Art” in honor of these two Yale friends. Clearly the Whitneys and Garvan were close friends, and it is reasonable to believe Halsey’s statement that Garvan had anticipated additional financial backing from this very wealthy family.33

At the board meeting held on April 13, 1929, Edwin Walton delivered a brief and glowing Finance Committee report outlining the shower of money Garvan was pouring into Annapolis to fund property purchases.

The purchase amount of the Finkbine Farm, The Randall House and Wing, amounting to One Hundred nine thousand dollars ($109,000.00), has been paid in full, and all papers for the transfer of said properties executed. The purchase price of Forty-six thousand, five hundred dollars ($46,500.00) for the W. B. & A. Elec. R.R. property I have in hand for payment when all necessary papers for transfer of this property are completed. This makes a total of One Hundred fifty-five thousand, five hundred dollars ($155,500.00) advanced for these payments by our very good friend Mr. Francis P. Garvin [sic] of New York City. The total amount of repairs upon the Randall property of Twenty-nine thousand, two hundred twenty-six dollars, and seventy-nine cents ($29,226.79) which was paid by us will be, in due course, be taken up by said benefactor.34

Here the minutes document that Garvan was paying for the purchases, but it sounds as though he acted on behalf of the college. There was no explanation of the intended use of the large farm. The minutes do not mention Davis-Smith. As the board saw this wealth coming from “the benefactor” and “our very good friend Francis P. Garvan of New York City,” it must have been difficult for them to pin him down and get written assurances.

In the fall of 1929, before the stock market collapsed, Garvan appears to have just about gotten things in place to go public. He and St. John’s had ownership of the Hammond-Harwood, James Brice, Bordley-Randall, Pinkney, Admiral Laws
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(or Commodore Waddell), Claude, Howard, Mullen, Andrews, Anna Lutz, and August Lutz (or Farrell) houses; the houses comprising Cumberland Court, Whitehall; the option on the Peggy Stewart house; and the farmland on the edge of town. Garvan had serious plans to do a major project.

In a letter James Bordley Jr. wrote in 1955, he confirmed the concept of the restoration project for Annapolis. He said: “The idea was to reestablish the old Colonial lives and make a Williamsburg out of Annapolis. We had an option on $870,000 worth of property when the Depression struck and our sponsor went into his shell.”

Those who knew of Garvan’s project let its memory slip away into the fog of time. There is no mention of it in a comprehensive book by Jane McWilliams, Annapolis, City on the Severn, published in 2011. A former Hammond-Harwood curator, who reviewed the same St. John’s board Minutes reported here, simply left some notes about the project in a file in the Hammond-Harwood House.

In 1951, the Maryland Historical Magazine published a history of the property of Whitehall, written by the owner, Charles Scarlett, himself. The article included one of the few available references to Garvan’s project, stating that Whitehall was purchased by “the late Francis P. Garvan in 1929 as part of his plan for the restoration of Annapolis, with the intention of offering the estate as a summer White House for the President.”

The letter that James Bordley Jr. wrote to Purnell Brown, Charles Scarlett’s comment in the article on Whitehall, and Halsey’s statement at the St. John’s College board meeting in New York are the only records found of Garvan’s intentions, and much about this project remains unclear. Because Annapolis continues to be a thriving state capital, whatever Garvan wanted to do would have been very different than Williamsburg, Winterthur, or Greenfield Village, all of which are unimpeded by the need to work inside of a busy state capital.

At the New York Executive Committee meeting, Herbert Noble commented that at some time earlier (presumably 1928) Garvan told him he wanted to acquire all the properties that surround the colonial houses, as well as the houses themselves. The reason for Garvan’s purchases of the Cumberland Court and Blue Lantern Inn properties seems obvious. These purchases would allow the original Hammond-Harwood House garden to be restored to the Paca House Garden wall. Why he purchased several other small houses in the vicinity of the college is less clear. They do not seem to have serious historic value. Some were rented to the college. They were used as housing for faculty, a fraternity, the infirmary, and the biology laboratory. Several board members stated that Davis or Garvan had told them
these would eventually be given to the college. Mr. Noble is quoted as saying, “not only on one occasion but on many occasions, Mr. Davis assured me that each and every one of these properties, which he was acquiring through the Davis-Smith Realty Corporation would be given to St. John’s College. In respect to the land immediately across the creek [College Creek], the reason that they [the sellers] sold that property to us was that they believed it would come to the St. John’s College.” But it could not be proven. There was nothing in writing, and Mr. Davis unexpectedly died in 1930. Thomas Conroy eventually replaced him at Davis-Smith.38

Once the vote was passed at the New York Executive Committee meeting that St. John’s president had full authority of all aspects of the college, which would prompt Halsey to resign at the end of the meeting, the discussion turned to its original purpose, the financial problems of the college. Walter Buck read the following statement:

On my own responsibility as Chairman of the Executive Committee and at the request of President Gordon, I have called this joint meeting of the Executive and Finance Committees to bring to a head the relationship between St. John’s College and the Davis Smith Realty Corporation, which began in 1928, especially in view of the maturity of the college loans in August of this year. It is quite impossible for the college to pay in cash, the rent for the properties of the corporation which the college now leases because of the impaired cash position of the college . . . . I further suggest that we must now insist that an answer from Mr. Garvan be given stating his present intentions in the property which the college was led to believe would be given to it by Mr. Davis and others, on the strength of whose representations the college has made expenditures and otherwise altered its position.39

Halsey, still present, said, “I second the motion.” He rambled a bit but said, “There was never any promise in any of your negotiations with [Davis and Garvan].” Mr. Noble then made a long statement that suggested all the properties, including the Finkbine (Dorsey) Farm, had been covered by promises. Halsey said “I tried once to pin [Garvan] down on that thing. ‘Tell me frankly,’ I said, ‘Do you intend to give these things?’ Garvan said, ‘Time alone will tell.’”

It seems clear that the board had already been growing concerned about its verbal relationship with Davis-Smith prior to the New York meeting, and there was a dramatic difference between the board and Garvan about what would come to the
college. What is not clear is exactly which properties were under discussion, nor why Garvan would ever have wanted to give them to the college while he was proceeding with an historic project in Annapolis.

Halsey was not present at the full board meeting on June 29, 1932. His letter of resignation was read and accepted. Then a letter from Francis Garvan was read:

Herbert Noble, Esq.
Chairman of the Board of Governors and Visitors, St. John’s College
115 Broadway
New York City.

Dear Mr. Noble:

In response to a request made at the recent interview with a Committee of the Board of St. Johns’ College, that I give them some idea as to what my intentions are in regard to the future relations between the Davis Smith Realty Corporation and St. Johns’ College:

FIRST: I wish to reaffirm my statement that I made to the Committee that neither I nor the late Mr. Davis (whose statement I have in writing), nor my friend Mr. Halsey, ever made any promises that any of the Davis Smith properties would be eventually given by me to St. John’s College. My intention in acquiring these properties was solely to assist in preserving the Colonial atmosphere of Annapolis. I believe that such an atmosphere would provide an atmosphere [sic] for St. John’s College which would inevitably lead to interesting people in supplying the needed endowment [sic].

SECOND: As to the request that I give the college certain properties, the Biology building, the Infirmary, and the two which are being used for housing of students, the use of which has made possible the great improvement in the educational facilities of St. John’s College, I am not willing to give them. However, I would sell them at a fair price to any member of the board who may feel [sic] inclined to donate them to the college. I am also inclined to rent them to the college on the same terms as outlined in the agreement between St. John’s College and the Davis Smith Realty Corporation.

THIRD: As to my intentions (if the agreement is cancelled) as to the other properties, especially the land across the creek, which I have been
told is necessary to the future development of the college, and the furnish-ings of the Hammond-Harwood House, which have done so much to el-evate St. John’s College to a unique position among colleges, I will leave these matters open for a future conference.

FOURTH: As to the request that the Davis Smith Realty Corpora-tion pay the sum due to St. John’s College (something under $10,000, as I understand it) I see no obligation on my part except under the terms of the agreement as this and other monies were expended by the college in order to make the Davis Smith properties usable for college purposes.

In view of the financial conditions, I can understand the desire of the board to cancel the agreement made with the Davis Smith Realty Corpora-tion. I am willing to do this under the terms outlined in said agreement.

At the time of writing this letter, I am ignorant of the reasons which forced my friend, Mr. Halsey, to leave Annapolis. I understand from him early next month he will be at liberty to give me this explanation. One thing must be understood. My entire interest was enlisted by Mr. Halsey, and the agreement is only capable of being accomplished under his direc-tion. Therefore, with his retirement, my interest in the whole situation is lost and I must protect my own finances.

Very truly yours.

[signed] Francis P. Garvan

Garvan’s use of the term “agreement,” in quite possibly two different senses, as explained in Note 40, implies that there was something in writing. While there may have been a temporary rental agreement with Davis-Smith about the college’s use of buildings Garvan funded, nothing is available to indicate that an agreement existed regarding the overall project. Several board members are quoted expressing frustration about Garvan and Davis making promises that they felt were not being kept. If there had been written assurances, the outcome of the subsequent litigation attempt might have been more successful.

Upon hearing the content of the letter, the board appointed a subcommittee of Ridgely Melvin and Walter Buck (both attorneys) “to enter into and conduct, in the name of the Board of Visitors and Governors, all necessary litigation against Mr. Francis P. Garvan and others, to the end that there may accrue to St. John’s College as much benefit as possible in the final termination of its relations with said Mr. Garvan.”
Garvan was upset about the way that the board had treated Halsey. Also, his financial situation was deteriorating significantly, and he was in no position to be generous. His personal finances were in trouble, and the hoped-for collaborators, the Whitney brothers, had both died. Although the issue never got to court, a year later the board was forced to admit defeat, as they could not prove any of Garvan's promises. They had nothing in writing. The minutes of June 7, 1933, state that all the college leases with Davis-Smith had been or would be cancelled. In addition, Mr. Garvan would be removing all his furnishings and other effects from the Hammond-Harwood House, and it was to be closed as a museum. Garvan indeed took back all of his items, including the Peale portrait of Buckland, architect of the house.42

Eight months later, on February 10, 1934, Walter Buck introduced a resolution to dismiss Douglas Gordon as the college president. Halsey was not the only individual who found President Gordon a difficult personality. The Alumni Association was urging that he be replaced, which indicates that he must have been stepping on a lot of toes. The Alumni Association recommended his dismissal not for any specific action but because “Dr. Gordon does not suit the Chair at St. John’s College and it does not suit him.” The board split on this, but a majority of nine to four voted to remove Gordon. William Woodward Sr. and Sylvester Labrot—two long serving, financially supportive, and prominent members—resigned from the board in protest. General Amos W. W. Woodcock, a 1903 alumnus of St. John’s, was made president of the college. Gordon was gone, but it was too late to save Garvan’s Annapolis project, Halsey’s teaching program, and all the furnishings in the Hammond-Harwood House.43

St. John’s College could not pay its bills. In November 1935, the board put the Hammond-Harwood and James Brice houses up for sale. On December 2, 1935, there was a stunning letter from the new chairman of St. John’s Executive Committee, Charles A. Cummins, to Henry Ford stating that the college had to sell the Hammond-Harwood House to reduce its indebtedness. He warned there would be a strong reaction from the community should the building be removed, but he felt compelled to make the best possible arrangement for the college. It was offered to Ford for $175,000, which was three and a half times what the college had paid for it. Fortunately for Annapolis, on December 10 Ford’s secretary replied that Mr. Ford was not interested. By the end of 1939 all Garvan’s properties had been sold and scattered to new owners. Navy Captain Philip Van Horn Weems bought the Bordley-Randall House, and Ellen Henderson, Sylvester Labrot’s sister-in-law, got Whitehall. The Dorsey Farm was sold and developed to become residential Admi-
ral Heights and the Naval Academy stadium. The college just barely survived the economic crisis that descended upon it. F. Stringfellow Barr, an academic and classical scholar, became the president in 1937, and under him the school gradually recovered to become a unique leader in liberal arts education with a curriculum based on one hundred classic books.44

The empty Hammond-Harwood House was little used for the next several years. In 1936 a local group known as The Company for the Restoration of Colonial Annapolis had an office in the Hammond-Harwood House and conducted tours of the building. In conjunction with the Federated Garden Clubs of Maryland a vigorous and successful fundraising drive was undertaken, and the building was bought from the college in 1940. It became an independent house museum and was refurnished in a campaign led by Virginia Bonsall White, from James Bordley’s prior decorating committee. The Hammond-Harwood House was saved and refurnished a second time, and today it can be visited as a museum.45

From 1926 to 1932 the Hammond-Harwood House under St. John’s College had been a beacon of American culture. With Professor Halsey, St. John’s was the nation’s first college to teach the history of colonial decorative arts, and it had Garvan’s wonderful collection to use as teaching material. Garvan had become so interested in Annapolis that he was investing heavily to buy up historic buildings and land in preparation for a restoration project to rival Williamsburg. Between a foolish college president and the financial strain of the Depression, the effort collapsed. It is interesting to speculate whether St. John’s could have closed the Hammond-Harwood House as a museum but kept Halsey, the furnishings, and his academic program. At the Homewood Museum, many of the furnishings that Garvan sent there in the 1930s were gifted to Johns Hopkins University by the Yale Museum after Garvan’s death in 1937 and are still there on display.46

All the grand homes of Annapolis, the tradesmen’s shops and houses, the State House, and the busy waterfront are still present and provide a continuing preservation opportunity. In 1952 a group of concerned citizens formed a nonprofit organization that today is known as Historic Annapolis. It has taken over the preservation efforts to save the old houses and the historic nature of the city. It now owns the Paca House, which is open to the public, and succeeded in an effort to get the gardens restored. It bought the Shiplap House, which is one of Annapolis’ oldest buildings. It operates a museum on Main Street at the waterfront and has prevented the destruction of some of the old buildings. New zoning laws have been passed to help protect the old buildings. In 1965 one of the first National Historic Landmark Districts was established as the Colonial Annapolis Historic District.
The Hammond-Harwood House is still an independent house museum. Most of the old houses are in the care of private owners. Today’s efforts are, of necessity, more gradual. There is no great visionary who has the vast wealth to pull it all together to make his dream a reality the way Rockefeller, Ford, and DuPont did. Sadly, Garvan left us no record of what he intended to do. We now know who was behind the rumors of a preservationist for Annapolis, and we know what had been underway. But we do not know what Annapolis and all that farm land along Weems Creek would be like today if Garvan’s project had come to fruition.
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Appendix

Annapolis Properties Acquired by St. John’s College and Francis P. Garvan

St. John’s College began acquiring property in 1926. All the properties acquired by Francis P. Garvan through the Davis-Smith Realty Corp. that have been identified were bought between the spring of 1928 and the fall of 1929. The deeds were all recorded in 1929. The Whitehall purchase shows that Garvan used more than Davis-Smith Realty as his method of hiding what he was buying. Thus, this list may be incomplete, but still represents an impressive number of purchases in a short period.

Properties Acquired by St. John’s College

Peggy Stewart House, option to buy 1925
Hammond-Harwood House, purchased 1926
Pinkney House, purchased 1927
Admiral Laws (also known as Commodore Waddell) House, purchased 1927
James Brice House, purchased 1927
Property Acquired by National Savings & Trust Co. of Washington, D.C.

Whitehall Manor, purchased Oct. 28, 1928, by the National Savings and Trust Company of Washington, D.C. When it was sold in 1934, the grantors were the National Savings and Trust Company and the Whitehall Corporation “by virtue of the Declaration of Trust from the National Savings and Trust Company to the said Whitehall Corporation, dated Oct. 10, 1929, but not recorded.” Thomas F. Conroy signed as president of the Whitehall Corporation. Conroy was then acting as Garvan’s agent and was also head of Davis-Smith Realty Corp. 48

Properties Acquired by Davis-Smith Realty Corporation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Anne Arundel County Circuit Court (Land Records)</th>
<th>Date Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Dorsey by Exrs.</td>
<td>“Valhalla” 265 acres of farm land on Weems Creek (Finkbine Farm in board minutes)</td>
<td>1929–1929 FSR 48, p. 0088–91 MSA CE 59-392</td>
<td>Feb 2, 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard Randall</td>
<td>Bordley-Randall House</td>
<td>1929–1929 FSR 52, p. 0006–11 MSA CE 59-396</td>
<td>Feb 6, 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Randall heirs</td>
<td>Bordley-Randall House</td>
<td>1929–1929 FSR 52, p. 0006–11 MSA CE 59-396</td>
<td>Feb 6, 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna M Lutz et al.</td>
<td>SW corner College &amp; King George St. 42 x 70'</td>
<td>1929–1929 FSR 53, p. 0483–4 MSA CE 59-397</td>
<td>July 11, 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny Claude</td>
<td>#9 St. John’s St.</td>
<td>1929–1929 FSR 53, p. 0486 MSA CE 59-397</td>
<td>July 11, 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen B. Howard</td>
<td>NE corner Prince George &amp; College Sts. 2 lots</td>
<td>1929–1929 FSR 61, p. 0187–8 MSA CE 59-405</td>
<td>Oct 2, 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate D. Andrews</td>
<td>16 Maryland Ave &amp; King George St.</td>
<td>1929–1929 FSR 61, p. 0196–7 MSA CE 59-405</td>
<td>Oct 2, 1929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary Coale Dugan
3 lots on Cumberland Court and 211 King George St. then known as The Blue Lantern Inn
1929–1929
FSR 61, p. 0246–50
MSA CE 59-405
Oct 11, 1929

Wm. C. Stevens
Cumberland Court lot
1929–1929
FSR 61, p. 0333–4
MSA CE 59-405
Oct 14, 1929

Edwin H. Crouch
Cumberland Court lot
1929–1929
FSR 61, p. 0333–4
MSA CE 59-405
Oct 22, 1929

Lillian W. Clark
Bordley-Randall House west side of the property
1929–1930
FSR 67, p. 0378–9
MSA CE 59-411
Dec 19, 1929

Francis P. Garvan’s List of Annapolis Properties and Costs


Note: the college calls the Dorsey Farm “Finkbine” and the Lutz house “Farrell.” The Dugan “house” is multiple Cumberland Court properties.

University of Maryland, Special Collections and University Archives, University of Maryland Photographs, 15396
NOTES

1. Minutes, Board of Visitors and Governors, St. John’s College, 80–370, 1926–1934, St. John’s College Archives Collection, MSA 5698-1-33, Location 2/72/9/7, Special Collections, Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD (hereinafter Minutes). The author discovered this material while completing research for a biography on James Bordley Jr.


4. Mary Clark Bowie, “Death of Last of Ancient Family,” Baltimore Sun, October 4, 1925. This is a review of the Harwood family history. Other historic houses include the William Paca, James Brice, Chase-Lloyd, Charles Carroll, John Ridout, and Bordley-Randall houses. For more about the auction of the house’s contents, see “Hundreds Scramble to Buy Antiques at Harwood Home,” Baltimore Sun, May 21, 1925.

5. For Bordley’s joining of the board, see Minutes, 89, July 12, 1926. Walton was president of Annapolis Bank and Trust Co., and Hammond was a distant relative of the builder. Woodward was head of the Hanover Bank in New York and owned the Belair plantation near Bowie between Annapolis and Washington. One of the buildings on the St. John’s campus was named for his father. Labrot was a wealthy local businessman from Louisiana and now local landowner on Meredith Creek adjacent to Whitehall. Buck was an attorney in Baltimore. Bordley was a distant relative of the builder of the Bordley-Randall House.

6. Dr. Bordley was one of the early specialists in eye, ear, nose and throat surgery in Baltimore. He had a busy and successful practice, yet was able to find the time to help on the St. John’s board.

7. James Bordley Jr. to Walter Buck, December 19, 1955, letter in the Hammond-Harwood House files. In 1955 the Garden Club of Maryland was planning to install a memorial bronze tablet in the Hammond-Harwood House to honor Virginia Bonsall White (Mrs. Miles White) for “saving” the house. Buck was concerned that Bordley was being given no credit. He wrote Bordley for his memory of the events prior to writing to the Garden Club.


9. This may be a bit of an overstatement as a central heating system was installed.

10. It is rather remarkable that Bordley was able to get these three prominent New Yorkers to serve on his Decorating Committee in Annapolis. He must have known them fairly well through his collecting efforts. We know from family history that he had previously loaned a piece to the Metropolitan Museum of Art for a special exhibition that Halsey was doing on Duncan Phyfe furniture: “Rare Furniture is Returned to Hammond-Harwood House,” Baltimore Sun, December 4, 1927.


13. For purchases of the Pinkney and Admiral Laws houses, see Minutes, October 29, 1927, 121. The Jennings portraits are now in the Carroll Barrister House, the admissions office of St. John’s College. Mrs. Jennings’ portrait is listed at the Frick as #122-11h, but the author did not find Mr. Jennings in the listing.


17. For Halsey’s honorary doctorate, see Minutes, June 6, 1928, 132. Minutes, October 19, 1928, 139.


20. Minutes, June 26, 1928, 135. The Bordley-Randall House, built in 1760 by Stephen Bordley (1710–1764), is kitty-corner to the campus between College Avenue and State Circle. The purchase was proposed at the board meeting in June. Because the house had been divided by the Randall family, separate deeds of sale were needed. See Appendix on Davis-Smith purchases. Minutes, April 25, 1930, 182. The Carnegie Corporation had a long-standing relationship with the college. On page 139 of the October 1928 minutes it was noted that the corporation was funding a major portion of the faculty Insurance Pension Fund.


26. Minutes, June 29, 1932, 226–228. Halsey’s reaction to Gordon was immediate and very strong. We do not know if there had been prior disagreements between them. Halsey might have felt that he was an ill-treated distinguished faculty member considering his seniority, his Metropolitan Museum background, and his greater time on the faculty. The students had dedicated their yearbook to him twice. Also, he was responsible for Garvan’s furnishings. A Gordon family member described Douglas as a professional curmudgeon, and said he spent his life offending people. In later years Gordon typed a book, “Unamiable Baltimoreans,” in which he excoriated almost everyone he knew. He gave the manuscript to the Virginia Historical Society, now the Virginia Museum for History and Culture, with instructions not to publish it until thirty years after his death.

27. Ibid., 238.

28. Ibid., 223–232. The minutes of the May 19 Executive Committee meeting in New York City are included in board Minutes of June 29, 1932. Enrollment at St. John’s declined significantly during the Depression. This reduced the income and created budget deficits for the college. To try to maintain enrollment they were forced to take in students of progressively lower qualifications. By 1935 they were accepting high school students who were not recommended by their principals and who were not college ready. For a brief period, this cost St. John’s its accreditation.

29. Ibid., 234. One of the reviewers of this paper reported that information about the James Andrews House (16 Maryland Ave.) indicated that James N. Smith of Annapolis was a founder of Davis-Smith Realty: Capsule Summary, James Andrews House, 16 Maryland Avenue, AA-625, Maryland Historical Trust, accessed April 26, 2020, mht.maryland.gov/secure/mudusa/PDF/AnneArundel/AA-625.pdf. Further, R. H. McIntire’s *Annapolis Maryland Families*, 654, states that James Norman Smith (1887–1961) was a real estate agent (Baltimore: Gateway Press, 1979). Interestingly, Smith was not mentioned in the board’s Minutes. Davis was always the contact person. No information is available about Davis, but when Thomas Conroy took over after Davis’ death, Davis-Smith had a New York address: see note 38 in this article. For Rockefeller’s Williamsburg, see *WPA Guide to Colonial Williamsburg, The Corporate Town, “Reactions: Congratulations and Controversy,” accessed April 26, 2020, xroads.virginia.edu/~ug99/coe/wpa_guide/reactions.html*.


32. Walter Dorsey, whose estate sold the farm to Garvan, had purchased it from the Finkbine family earlier, and in the college minutes it is referred to as the Finkbine Farm.


34. Minutes, April 1929, 148.

35. Bordley-Brown Letters, December 5, 1955, images of letters in author’s possession, access to documents provided in 2001 by a Brown family member. The dollar amount was from memory of an event over 35 years earlier.
37. Charles Scarlett Jr., “Governor Horatio Sharpe’s Whitehall,” *Maryland Historical Magazine* 46, no. 1 (Spring 1951): 25. It is not clear whether the Summer White House idea was truly part of Garvan’s original intention, or if it is what Charles Scarlett heard after the original plan collapsed and Garvan was trying to dispose of the property during the Depression. In any event, the government turned down Garvan’s offer, according to Orlando Ridout IV during an interview at his home adjacent to Whitehall.
38. Minutes, June 29, 1932, 233. In 1933 the board wrote a letter to Davis-Smith addressed as follows: Mr. Thomas F. Conroy, President, The Davis Smith Realty Corporation, c/o Pasley & Conroy, 67 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. Conroy continued on to the end and was the signer of the deeds of sale for the properties through 1939, even after Garvan’s death in 1937.
39. Minutes, June 29, 1932, 219–220. The term “agreement” in the “SECOND” part probably refers to a rental agreement between St. John’s College and Davis-Smith Realty that was being cancelled by the college. The terminology in the final paragraph is interesting: to what “agreement” is Garvan referring now? Is it the same as in the paragraph above? Or, had Halsey been tapped to be the onsite manager of the restoration project?
40. Minutes, June 29, 1932, 220. Francis Patrick Garvan papers, 1867, 1912–1953, AAA.garvfran, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. After his death in 1937, Mrs. Garvan organized and donated her husband’s papers to these archives. There are 44.9 linear feet of material. It includes only information on Garvan’s colonial decorative arts collection. Two boxes were labeled as correspondence with R. T. Halsey (Box 4, Folders 27–35; Box 46, Folder 2). These revealed that Halsey sold his silver collection to Garvan, probably in the late 1920s, and took a note as payment. During the mid-1930s Halsey had to write repeatedly to Garvan to get payment, as Garvan was very hard up for cash. Nothing has been found about Garvan’s plans for the Annapolis project in these papers other than a list of his furnishings in the Hammond-Harwood House and a cost list of his Annapolis properties (see Appendix). The college leases to be cancelled were the Blue Lantern Inn and the Andrews, Claude, Farrell, Howard, and Lutz properties. For closing of the Hammond-Harwood House, see Minutes, June 7, 1933, 249. The William Buckland portrait by Charles Willson Peale in the Hammond-Harwood House today is an excellent copy of the original now at Yale University, painted by Winifred M. C. Gordon, wife of fired President Douglas Gordon.
41. Minutes, June 29, 1932, 220.
42. “Amos W. W. Woodcock Is Dead,” *New York Times*, January 18, 1964. Woodcock was an attorney, an army officer serving in both world wars, an author, and president of St. John’s College. President Herbert Clark Hoover appointed him Director of Prohibition in 1930. “My reputation as a Dry seemed to eclipse everything else I did,” he said sadly.
43. Letter to Mrs. Robert B. Welch from Andrew Craig Morrison, September 9, 1975, HHH files, Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, Dearborn, MI. Mrs. Welch wrote to the Ford Museum in 1975 asking about Ford’s interest in the Hammond-Harwood House. Was she inquiring about Ford’s 1926 interest or did she know of Cummins’ 1935 offer? Repeated requests to the Benson Ford Research Center for copies of the Cummins and Welch letters finally resulted in the following email reply: “I have looked through Henry Ford’s
Office Papers (acc. 285, Box 1740) for 1935, for correspondence with Cummons [sic]. I was unable to find the letters to which you refer. It may be that these letters were removed in 1975 by Andrew Craig Morrison and never refilled. Unfortunately, there is no way to find Mr. Morrison’s correspondence [sic] from 1975. Reference Specialist, Benson Ford Reserch [sic] Center, The Henry Ford.” There is no mention of Cummins’ writing to Ford in the Minutes of St. John’s College. The image of Morrison’s letter is included at the end of this article.


47. The properties acquired by St. John’s College are documented in the board Minutes, cited in Endnote 1.

FIGURE 1. Wells and McComas Monument, Baltimore, unknown photographer, 1880. Maryland Center for History and Culture, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Baltimore Sesquicentennial Celebration Photograph Collection, PP135.36
On October 11, 1880, Baltimoreans began celebrating the sesquicentennial (150th anniversary) of their city’s founding. Across the city, residents and visitors waited expectantly. All eyes were trained on the empty street, anticipating the sound of thousands of shoes hitting pavement and the sight of uniformed men. Some looked on from their windows or perched on their stoops. The rest crowded on the sidewalks, their sheer numbers pressing those in front closer to the street. Flags, bunting, and archways lined the streets and adorned the buildings along the parade route. The route started at the intersection of Broadway and Canton Avenue and followed a circuitous route whose main streets included Broadway, Baltimore, Eutaw, and Gay and ended at Schuetzen Park. Spectators awaited the spectacle that newspapers and boosters had promised would be a grand affair—a celebration of their city and of the age in which they all lived.¹

Emma Z. Rothberg was MCHC’s Lord Baltimore Research Fellow for 2019–2020. She is a PhD candidate in history at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill who focuses on urban, cultural, and gender history in the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century United States. Her dissertation examines the cultural practices of urban democracy and identity in American cities at the turn of the twentieth century. She is currently the Co-Director of UNC’s Digital History Lab and serves as the U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg Predoctoral Fellow in Gender Studies at the National Women’s History Museum. Originally from New York City, Rothberg received her BA from Wesleyan University and MA from UNC-Chapel Hill.
The thousands of people that waited expectantly on that October day did so not only for the visual feast, but also because they understood the singular importance of civic promotion in American life. According to the *Sesqui-Centennial Journal*, a souvenir publication printed for the celebration, an estimated “seventy-five thousand strangers,” presumably referring to non-Baltimoreans, were in Baltimore for the celebration’s first day. The *Baltimore American and Commercial Advertiser* (hereafter referred to as the *Baltimore American*) described day one’s parade as having “Twenty-Five Thousand Men in the Line of March.” The *Baltimore Sun* wrote of the Sesquicentennial, “the sense of energy is vital in all our people, and in celebrating Baltimore’s birthday we give the occasion remembrance on account of the renewed consciousness of strength which we naturally derive from the authentic history of the past, assuring us of our perfect competency to grapple with our rival cities in the immediate future.” J. Thomas Scharf—a journalist, historian, active member of the Maryland Historical Society (now the Maryland Center for History and Culture), and an organizer of the Sesquicentennial—said in his “Historical Sketch” entitled “Baltimore, Ancient and Modern: Its Growth and Development” that Baltimore’s suspended prosperity has been steady and firm; nor can anyone observe our thronged streets, our crowded cars, our packed vans, the gay crowds of pleasure-seekers in our parks, the wide-awake, healthy alacrity of our people at all times, the rows of comfortable houses, built and building in every direction, without being aware of Baltimore’s substantial growth and prosperity.

Baltimore was a modern, prosperous, and important city. What made it so, however, was the subject of much debate.2

Despite the soaring, unifying rhetoric employed by Scharf and newspapers, the week-long Sesquicentennial celebration held in October 1880 was in fact a highly choreographed performance that proposed a single image of cosmopolitan success. The parades that occurred throughout the week reinforced this image with the participation of men who were tied to and upheld one economic class’s claims to power over Baltimore’s institutions and streets—Baltimore’s business and political establishment. This group included business owners and investors as well as Democratic politicians whose own political power rested in promoting business and restricting access to the political process. These men had a vested interest in pro-
moting Baltimore as an orderly, economic engine, capable of leading the nation to new heights, if it was under the leadership of the “best men.” The Sesquicentennial privileged the presentation of men who worked in positions that supported these political and economic goals in the city.

A celebration with purported broad, public appeal was necessary for Baltimore’s business and political establishment at this moment given the historical context. The Sesquicentennial came on the heels of the 1873 financial panic and the 1877 Great Railroad Strike. Baltimore’s business and political establishment wanted to market the city as a solid and safe investment, a city ready to be an economic leader rather than a “branch office town.” While there were many ways in which individuals and groups worked through this state of flux, civic celebrations were an important medium for articulating a vision for the future because of their public nature and wide-scale appeal. In the context of the larger struggle between capital and labor that dominated Baltimore in the 1870s and 1880s, the business and political establishment was consciously trying to reset the status quo that seemed threatened by this struggle as they planned the Sesquicentennial.\(^3\)

This article argues that the 1880 Baltimore Sesquicentennial celebration—ostensibly intended to celebrate place, epoch, and all who lived in them—used the rhetoric and visuals of manhood to support the goals of the business and political establishment: marketing the city as a good investment, promoting its power as necessary for Baltimore’s continued prosperity, and undermining workingmen’s claims for social and economic change.

**Manhood and Power in the Nineteenth-Century United States**

Power was inherently gendered in the nineteenth-century United States. From the country’s founding, there was an emphasis on the idea of republicanism, which underscored much of the rhetoric around rights and citizenship. Republicanism emphasized that independence was the basis of virtuous citizenship; only by having an independent relationship with the government could an individual avoid the supposed corruption brought about by dependency on another for land, subsistence, or work. Thomas Jefferson’s proposal that the United States become a nation of yeoman farmers also derived from this rhetoric on republicanism and independence. Women—who were the legal dependents of their husbands or fathers, rarely had the right to own property in their own names, and who men thought were too weak to take an active part in the public sphere—were thus unable to embody ideal
American citizenship. The ideal American citizen was male. Therefore, displaying one’s manhood—either as an individual or representative of a larger group—was far from innocuous in the nineteenth century. Manhood was a means to and way to maintain power.4

Yet what defined independence was constantly in flux. As the United States industrialized, a class of permanent wage workers emerged. After the Civil War, Americans began abandoning farming en masse and flocked to ever-growing industrial centers to work in increasingly large factories. According to census data compiled by historian David Montgomery, in 1870 two-thirds of individuals engaged in the marketplace were “hirelings.” As more and more individuals found themselves dependent on a wage, what defined independence and the ideal citizen became more contested.5

Ideal republicanism was untenable for most men as they worked in factories or on land owned by another. Particularly for wage workers, who had to contend with the new realities of an increasingly industrialized and stratified marketplace, they could not accept the argument made by E. L. Godkin in his July 1867 North American Review essay, “The Labor Crisis,” that “when a man agrees to sell his labor, he agrees by implication to sell his moral and social independence.” As male workers pushed back and began to declare themselves as independent heads of households—calling for privileges such as a “family wage”—they also called for government intervention on their behalf. Those who benefitted from the status quo—namely those who benefitted from laissez-faire capitalism—felt their sense of themselves as men of power challenged. A renegotiation of the relationship between workers and employers was implicitly a push against the social and economic order in which a few men wielded most of the power. It was also implicitly a renegotiation of how to define and who could claim manhood.6

Baltimore’s business and political establishment recognized these challenges to their more exclusive definition of manhood and the power derived from it as they planned the Sesquicentennial. They were not about to surrender their privileged status willingly. To shore up their claims to and promote their power within Baltimore, the business and political establishment used the Sesquicentennial to display their power over the streets of Baltimore—both physically and metaphorically—to both an excited audience and an excluded labor movement. They did so through displays of specific men that upheld a definition of manhood tied to independence and ownership.
Labor, Political, and Economic Context of the Sesquicentennial

At the time of the Sesquicentennial, Baltimore’s population of 332,313 made it the country’s seventh largest city. According to Sherry H. Olson, while Baltimore had less capital and fewer millionaires than other cities, the city had a “strikingly commercial nature” in which “commercial interests dominated every industrial sector in Baltimore” after the Civil War. Baltimore had also increased its industrial output after the Civil War, and by 1880 was the United States’ “leader in canned fruits and vegetables” and had taken a leading role in the emerging fertilizer business, as well as in railroads, fishing, and farming. Yet Baltimore’s economy in the 1870s was also unbalanced, heavily tilted towards commerce and the business of moving things rather than making things, argues Matthew Crenson. In particular, the railroad drove Baltimore’s economy and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad (the B&O) was a source of civic pride and considered a “crown jewel” of the city.7

Baltimore and Maryland politics were also dominated by Democrats in the second half of the nineteenth century. Democrats, on the whole, were against any expansion of enfranchisement that might cost them seats in local or national elections. This position in part explains why Maryland did not ratify either the Fourteenth or Fifteenth Amendments until the twentieth century. After 1850, there was a significant reaction against universal suffrage due to the changing social and economic landscape in the United States; Southern whites and Northern economic elites in particular looked to restrict the voting rights of poor whites, immigrants, and African Americans in an attempt to maintain their power in and influence over U.S. politics. Democrats, on the whole, were also less likely to support laborers or labor reforms, instead supporting voting restrictions that would inhibit workers’ ability to cast ballots. As the labor movement became more powerful by 1880, Democrats became acutely aware of the threat workers’ votes posed to their hold on government positions. It is not surprising, then, that the organization and planning of the Sesquicentennial—an event meant to promote Baltimore as a stable, lucrative marketplace—was led by three Baltimore Democrats.8

Baltimore was also home to a growing labor movement that since the early nineteenth century repeatedly challenged the business and political establishment and their means for holding onto and exerting power. Baltimore was an early boomtown in the United States, growing both economically and physically during the Early Republic. This economic growth was dependent upon the menial labor of
thousands of workers, many of whom were African American (both enslaved and free) and immigrants. As more workers streamed into Baltimore from rural areas, other states, and overseas, there was a larger pool of workers and thus wages could be kept low. Baltimore’s wealthy also facilitated this economic growth because they had both ideology and the municipal government on their side, meaning they could enforce laws and practices that supported their economic security and prosperity. By the 1850s, most workers in Baltimore were more likely to be unskilled and working in factories, and many of those workers would be women and children hired to cut costs.

These same dynamics continued after the Civil War. During the Panic of 1873—the largest economic downturn up to that point in the nineteenth century—many industrial workers saw their wages or jobs cut. Without anything to fall back on, unlike industrialists and capitalists who could look to their savings or other investments, workers in many industries—including railroad workers of the B&O—began to strike. What came to be known as the Great Railroad Strike of 1877 created disruption in multiple states, including West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Missouri, and Maryland. In many areas with striking workers, including Baltimore, violence erupted between strikers and the military units mobilized to end the strikes.

It was the centrality of the railroad to Baltimore that made the 1877 Great Railroad Strike so disruptive both economically and emotionally to the city and its residents. According to Sylvia Gillett, conditions on the B&O were bad even by industry standards. Wages for B&O workers averaged around $400 annually, $200 less than workers on other railroads. Teams of workers were often short-handed and overtime pay had been eliminated. Furthermore, the company refused to allow workers who had ridden out as part of a train’s crew to get compensated return tickets, forcing them to work or remain away (at their own expense) until they could find a job on a home-bound train. These policies, fallout from the economic panic, and wage cuts on July 13, 1877, pushed B&O workers over the edge. Shortly after the wage cut, roughly 14,000 men, women, and children took to the streets in Baltimore to protest and strike. When Maryland National Guard units were called out to quell the strike, some of the strikers began hurling bricks and cobblestones; the Maryland National Guard eventually responded by firing into the crowd. Estimates of the number of killed or wounded vary, and the number includes some bystanders. The reaction to the strike was mixed. While a letter to the Baltimore American editor on July 20, 1877, stated
that the strikers had “just cause of complaint at the action of the [B&O] Company,” the editors themselves discussed different, commercial concerns related to the strike. The *Baltimore American* wrote on July 19, 1877, “the strike is, however, already beginning to tell on shipments. The foreign trade especially will suffer, both in coal and oil, unless the embargo is soon removed, and the business interests of the city will be temporarily affected.” Some Baltimoreans were more afraid the strike would tarnish their city’s reputation as a safe, commercial investment than concerned with the cause of the strike.11

The Great Railroad Strike was the first major and general strike in the United States. While, in the end, the strike failed, it revealed major fault lines and the tenuous nature of power. Workers saw that spontaneous action and better labor union leadership could result in change and that their bodies were powerful weapons against a system they argued was exploitative.

The strike also made America’s wealthy and the politicians who supported them recognize that their power and economic security was challengeable and, perhaps, fleeting. In the wake of the 1873 economic depression, the wealthy’s optimism about the country’s economic future turned into anxiety. The depression showed that both money and power were easily lost. America’s upper class emerged from this depression with a fairly distinct class identity whose culture and politics manifested a greater distance from others. Through institutions and ephemeral celebrations, the upper class across the United States sought to reassert their dominance over both the culture and physical space of the places in which they lived. They could do this in part by showcasing their ability to organize, raise money, get the support of local and national politicians, and literally control the streets. The upper class and the politicians who supported them could simultaneously promote themselves and their city’s reputation through civic celebrations.12

The battle between labor and capital was immeasurably important to late-nineteenth-century Americans not only because it would dictate the structure of the economy and power relations. It was also important because it raised questions about what American democracy really looked like, how it functioned, and who it served.

It is within this context that the Baltimore Sesquicentennial occurred. How Baltimoreans organized and celebrated their city’s 150th birthday was far from innocuous, particularly for the business and political establishment who led the organizing efforts. Protection was tied to promotion. A successful celebration would not only reassert the power of the business and political establishment...
within the city, but also help their pocketbooks. By showcasing Baltimore as an orderly city with orderly, willing workers, the business and political establishment could make the argument that the city was ready and safe for investment as long as their leadership continued.

Conception of the Sesquicentennial

Parades were part of a time-honored tradition for marking and celebrating civic achievements and events. Parades were a common feature of Independence Day celebrations and the opening of civic infrastructure projects—such as canals, bridges, and buildings—across the country. Fire companies, veterans, and political and fraternal organizations also all frequently turned to parades as a way of showcasing and promoting themselves. These trends were true in Baltimore as well. For example, the first stone laying of the B&O in 1828, the partnership between the B&O and the North German Lloyd Company from Bremen, Germany, in 1868, and annual Defenders Day celebrations all included spectacular parades. Organizers of the Baltimore Sesquicentennial were aware of these parading traditions and a parade’s ability to create and instill a collective identity amongst participants and observers. They knew parades needed to be a central part of their Sesquicentennial plans.

Proposals for the Sesquicentennial celebration came from Baltimore’s business and political establishment. Those involved in its planning were overwhelmingly men with major roles in the city’s commercial and cultural institutions. The main organizing committee was made up exclusively of men prominent in Baltimore’s social, political, or economic life. We should think of the parades they organized as functions of their civic power and their self-understanding as powerful men.

Three men greatly credited with conceiving, organizing, and executing the Sesquicentennial were Mayor Ferdinand C. Latrobe, Francis Putnam Stevens, and J. Thomas Scharf. Each of the three men received an extensive biographical sketch in the *Baltimore Sesquicentennial Record*, a souvenir paper printed by J. W. Torsch, a local Baltimore publisher. The three men had similar biographies: their fathers were all merchants, they all had legal training, and all were somehow connected to or actively serving as Democrats in Baltimore and Maryland politics. They were also all members of the Maryland Historical Society. In terms of their priorities, past experiences, and allegiances, all three men’s biographies also represented the division between Baltimore’s wealthy and Baltimore’s working class. Latrobe had
served as counsel to the B&O, authored an 1868 Act organizing eleven regiments of the Maryland Militia as a member of the Maryland House of Delegates, and been mayor during the 1877 railroad strike. Scharf had proudly volunteered to serve in the Confederate Army and did so for three years. Stevens had voted against the Fourteenth Amendment while representing Baltimore in the House of Delegates of the Maryland General Assembly. For the Sesquicentennial, Scharf and Stevens served on the Municipal Executive Committee as Secretary and Chairman respectively; Mayor Latrobe served as President of the Organizing Committee.13
The Maryland Historical Society would play a large role in the Sesquicentennial. The organization’s committee received and wrote correspondence, including invitations, during the planning stages of the celebration. It also hosted many events during the Sesquicentennial, including a number of speeches and historical lectures celebrating Baltimore and its history. Beyond his role as organizer and featured speaker, Scharf was also actively involved in the printing of celebration ephemera. In addition to his speech focused on Baltimore’s history that glorified the city’s “Growth and Development,” Scharf would give another talk during the week of celebration focused on Baltimore’s “coming of age” and “hour of manhood.”

Newspaper coverage endorsed the idea of the celebration early on. According to newspaper reports, the organizers of the Sesquicentennial wanted their celebration to cement Baltimore’s standing as a commercial and industrial center. Newspapers also wrote that organizers wanted to boost Baltimoreans’ sense of civic pride and use their expansive roster of parade participants to generate public interest and investment. By using the Sesquicentennial as a means of civic boosterism, Baltimore’s business and political establishment would elevate their claims to power by elevating the status and potential of their city. A great city made those presiding over it, by extension, great. The *Sesqui-Centennial Journal* stated, “the merchants, business men and capitalists who have shown an interest in the celebration, being credible to our city, will doubtless reap advantages from the trade and money that it will attract.” Newspapers’ endorsement of the event and its purported public purpose was implicitly an endorsement of the self-interested designs for the event.

One way in which organizers and newspapers hoped to boost the civic pride of Baltimore’s residents and the city’s stature was through comparisons to another American city. Coverage of the Sesquicentennial consistently compared Baltimore to New York. During the 1880s, New York was the commercial powerhouse of the United States, and some of the wealthiest Americans lived there, clustered mostly in Manhattan and Brooklyn. According to historian Sven Beckert, by 1892 a staggering 27 percent of all the United States’ millionaires lived in Manhattan. It was also seen as the cultural capital of the country. The *Baltimore Sun* included the comment that “as the second grain port in rank in the United States, [Baltimore] has been seriously alluded to as ‘the young rival of New York.’” The *Sesqui-Centennial Journal* stated that Baltimore was growing so fast in terms of its industrial, manufacturing, and commercial importance that “even mighty Gotham may have to tremble for her laurels.” Whether or not Baltimore truly matched New York is
beside the point; of note is that the organizers of the Sesquicentennial sought to directly compare their city to the city that had come to embody the nation’s financial and economic promise. Industrial and commercial capacity made a city great.  

To further boost Baltimore’s image, organizers were intent on showcasing institutions and groups that represented their own interests, both socially and economically. They especially favored representatives of commercial or cultural institutions, electoral politics, and their power over the streets. Local and national politicians were a feature of the parade, since the business and political establishment had a vested interest in showcasing that their politics and goals were widely supported. Like in other civic celebrations, the police, voluntary militias, and National Guard regiments—law and order units—were prominent participants in the parade. The men involved in these law and order units were essential for (re)enforcing the business and political establishment’s power over city streets and urban space. The “order” these men enforced was one that generally benefitted and was defined by the interests and power of the business and political establishment as opposed to that of the working classes. Veterans of previous American wars were also conspicuous in parades, since their popularity and the public respect they received made them symbolically essential participants.

The final plan for the Baltimore celebration, which took place between October 11 and 19, 1880, centered around multiple days of parading, fireworks, musical performances, orations, and a display of maritime vessels in the port. Each day showcased an element of the image Baltimore’s business and political establishment wanted to promote. Day one included historical tableaux depicting Maryland’s history and emphasized “the trades and industrial and mechanical interests.” Day two highlighted the Free and Accepted Masons, Knights Templar, and public and private school children. Day three was the “parade of the State, city, and visiting military organizations, city and visiting fire departments, police department, letter carriers and telegraph messenger boys.” Days four through six showcased benevolent, temperance, and fraternal societies along with “colored social and benevolent organizations, societies and orders.”

Organization of the Sesquicentennial

After the organizing committees chose dates and identified appropriate participants, they secured funding for their celebration. Baltimore’s Sesquicentennial received public and private funding. The public funding supported organizers’ claims that
the Sesquicentennial reflected public sentiment. The private funding reaffirmed this sentiment, for it suggested that donors’ faith in and support of the celebration was not misplaced. According to *The Stranger’s Guide in Baltimore and Its Environs*, a pamphlet produced about the Sesquicentennial in 1881, $10,000 in funding came from the Municipal Treasury while another estimated $20,000 “[was] contributed by private citizens.” The municipal funding that supported the Sesquicentennial is not only significant for its amount, but for its origins. That Baltimore’s business and political establishment could secure money from the Municipal Treasury for an event benefitting their own commercial interests—at perhaps the expense of other municipal responsibilities such as infrastructure, public services, or poverty relief—reflected their influence over the city’s coffers. The Sesquicentennial visualized the marriage of wealth and civic power. The *Baltimore American* commented on September 23, 

... there is not much of a probability that an appropriation will be made [by] the [City Council Committee on the Sesquicentennial Celebration] for the celebration. The citizens are manifesting a laudable desire in swelling the contributions, and it is the general belief that the private contributions will reach the sum necessary to meet all the expenditures without any aid from the city treasury.

Baltimore’s parade organizers were certain the city’s residents would continue to add to the parade’s funds until the spectacle organizers wanted was paid for. This assumption, however, ignored the fact that not everyone in Baltimore had an expendable income or saw the Sesquicentennial as a necessary or beneficial expenditure of city funds. Private funding came through subscription funds set up by the organizers. Some donations came in small dollar amounts from individuals, mostly in increments of $1–3, while others came from members of the business and political establishment, private businesses, and cultural institutions, mostly in the range of $10–25.¹⁹

With plans and funding in place, the organizers then began issuing invitations to both guests and participants. The organizers invited politicians from Baltimore, the state of Maryland, and surrounding states both north and south. Politicians were important as attendees not only because they held the reins of political power, but because their presence—whether they marched in a parade or viewed it from conspicuous positions—aided the business and political establishment in asserting
its own power. Their presence linked the local politics of Baltimore to national politics; it visually rendered the political goals and decisions of Baltimore’s establishment as part of a larger whole and in service of the national interest as opposed to their own interests. Having local and national politicians present at the Sesquicentennial would also signal to organized labor and individual workingmen that the political system was not on their side, but rather sided with moneyed interests.

Day one’s Procession of History and Industry prominently featured politicians marching or riding in carriages. Given the conspicuous absence of industrial workers or representatives of unions, this spectacle showed the influence that the business and political establishment held over political, civic, and commercial life.

Another group to which the organizers sent many invitations was units representing the control that the business and political establishment wielded over Baltimore’s streets and industries—namely, police, volunteer militias, and National Guard units. Their presence reflected an essential element of nineteenth-century businessmen’s power—their control of space through control of others. Beginning in the 1850s, Baltimore’s police department frequently protected private property. Given the highly partisan process for police appointments, assignment of “beats,” and promotions, individual policemen were often willing to listen to those who held the reins of power and were less likely to support their socioeconomic or ethnic group peers in disputes with employers. This also meant the police could be highly partisan, enforcing the rules to benefit the political party in charge in order to retain jobs or receive promotions. Beginning in 1877, municipal police departments became frequent strikebreakers in American cities. Baltimore’s police not only provided crowd control during the Sesquicentennial, but they also participated, symbolizing the power that the business and political establishment held over city streets.

Voluntary militias served a similar purpose to the police. These militias were predominantly made of men from the middle and upper classes and their sons who used their militia membership as a vehicle for demonstrating power. These men had the time and the means to volunteer for militia service, and thus proclaim their socioeconomic status and their patriotism simultaneously while parading in uniform. Membership in a militia allowed men to claim status as patriotic “citizen-soldiers.” The idea of the citizen-soldier in the United States dates back to the minutemen of the American Revolution and was championed as a way to avoid the tyranny associated with a standing army. Citizen-soldiers were also thought to create “manly citizens who loved their community”—men who were more concerned with the
common good than their individual goals. In this sense, the citizen-soldier served as a powerful political, social, and cultural tool for defining masculine citizens as well as tying together power and manhood. It is why militias and military units were frequent if not consistent participants in civic parades across the United States in the nineteenth century. In Baltimore, militia units had participated in annual Defenders Day parades, Civil War veterans’ parades, and the 1870 Fifteenth Amendment parade. Invited volunteer militia units came from multiple states and localities.21

The volunteer militias—along with National Guard units who were invited to participate in the “Military and Naval Forces, Fire Department, Police, &c. Procession” on Wednesday, October 13—also helped protect the interests and property of the business and political establishment. The National Guard in the late nineteenth century could not be federalized and was not associated with the U.S. Army. Their funding, training, and size varied from community to community, but many regiments began to petition—and receive—support from state legislatures in the late 1870s. The National Guard at this time acted similarly to volunteer militias—effectively a social club or a fraternal organization whose membership drew primarily from white men, who represented skilled workers and the upper middle-class. The inclusion of the National Guard in the Sesquicentennial parade was particularly important for promoting the interests of the business and political establishment at the expense of workers, who were excluded from the parade as members of organizations or unions; the Maryland National Guard had put down the 1877 strike in Baltimore and killed strikers and bystanders in the process.22

The celebrated Seventh New York Regiment, invited to march in the Sesquicentennial’s military parade, exemplified the close relationship between citizen-soldiers and the business and political establishment. A part of the Union Army during the Civil War, the Seventh’s origins were directly associated with and made up of members of the business and financial worlds of Manhattan. While the regiment became famous for its valor during the Civil War, it was also known for its dandiness. In 1861, young merchants, bankers, professional men, and clerks composed the New York Seventh. When they departed New York for Washington, D.C., on April 19, 1861, newspapers noted the Seventh carried white kid gloves in their packs so they could dress the part for the victory balls they thought they would attend. The Seventh was also involved in putting down two major New York workers’ demonstrations—the Draft Riots in 1863 and Tompkins Square in 1874. In the 1880s, the Seventh was a regiment in New York’s National Guard. There was also a personal connection between the New York Seventh and the Maryland National Guard; the
Maryland Fifth Regiment, organized in 1867, modeled its uniforms off the New York Seventh. It was no coincidence that a regiment known for its associations with the business interests of New York played such a prominent role in a celebration promoting the business and political establishment's self-aggrandizement and Baltimore's commercial progress and potential. Due to its long-standing associations with elite circles in New York, the Seventh was perhaps the best embodiment of the power and order that Baltimore's business and political establishment wanted to showcase.23

The business and political establishment were keenly aware of the mass appeal soldiers held in this moment and used this appeal to promote their events. In the 1880s, there was a renewed interest in honoring and memorializing soldiers, particularly of the Civil War, in monuments, literature, and holidays. The organizers of the Sesquicentennial were clear that the “illumination of the city and pyrotechnic display [was] in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of Baltimore City, and the 99th anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown.” While the ninety-ninth anniversary of Yorktown did coincide with the first day of the Sesquicentennial celebration, the organizers’ desire to link the two events speaks to their interest in foregrounding soldiers and linking the present Baltimore to a glorious, American event. Yorktown was not a Maryland event, nor are ninety-ninth anniversaries usually celebrated as important temporal markers. Yet the organizers co-opted Yorktown’s significance as an American military victory to promote their own local celebration.24

Parade organizers also invited veterans from previous American wars to march in the Sesquicentennial, creating visual links between bona fide soldiers and men whose service was largely social, based on class, and capital. The Baltimore American wrote on September 28: “invitations were sent yesterday to the Society of the Cincinnati, Grand Army of the Republic and the Society of the Army and Navy of the Confederate States—all of them being non-political organizations . . . . The survivors of the war of 1812 and of the Mexican war had been previously invited to take part in the military celebrations.” The inclusion of Confederate veterans revealed the importance of veterans, regardless of their previous loyalty, to organizers. While the veterans would have come from diverse socioeconomic and political backgrounds, they paraded as symbols of military and state power and not as members of their respective classes or political ideologies. They also marched in uniform or uniformed clothing. Thus, their military identity made invisible any identity that would have linked the veterans to class. The combination of U.S. Army veter-
ans and members of voluntary militia units made them part of the same whole. Newspapers and parade programs listed the units under the same heading, allowing the veterans’ service and popularity to bolster militia members’ standing as citizen-soldiers. The visual created by the military divisions of parades was of a single army of citizen-soldiers serving the community; that community, however, was one controlled by the business and political establishment.25

One group that parade organizers hesitated to include on their own terms was workingmen. 1880s’ Baltimore had a large, vocal, working class comprised mostly of ethnic or racial minorities who took many opportunities to mount challenges to the exclusive claim men of the business and political establishment believed they had to power in the city. These workers used strikes, walkouts, and protests to try and enforce labor laws or their own demands. Many of Baltimore’s workingmen were also members of the Knights of Labor (KOL), the most expansive and powerful labor organization in the nineteenth century. Despite the presence of an organized labor movement in Baltimore at the time of the Sesquicentennial, no labor organizations—including the KOL—were invited to participate on any day of the parade. Allowing these workingmen to parade would have been tantamount to conceding a key part of the business and political establishment’s symbolic and actual power over place.26
Yet workingmen also had their own robust parading culture during this period. According to historian Sean Wilentz, workers in the United States paraded to exhibit their pride or to protest. Artisans and tradesmen frequently participated in many civic celebrations honoring days of local and national importance and infrastructure projects in the nineteenth century. Local tradesmen participated in the July 4, 1828, celebration for laying the first stone of the B&O Railroad. This “spectacular” included a procession of trade associations in which representatives of the trades manufactured their goods while parading, and manufacturing companies had employees march with signs. For example, “the bleachers and dyers carried a banner saying ‘ye were naked and we clothed ye’” in a direct reference to the Bible.27

Labor unions would also begin parading as a means of advocating for their causes and members, including the KOL. In New York City on September 5, 1882, the first Labor Day parade in the U.S. occurred. In June 1885, the Baltimore Knights of District Assembly 41 marched in Baltimore where, at the procession’s end, speeches attacked the city’s capitalists. Over 600 marchers participated, including men from the KOL, Brotherhood of Carpenters, Monumental Assembly (shoemakers), and numerous other trade unions. Only five years after the Sesquicentennial, which praised the trades and artisanship without recognizing the worker, the KOL’s June march critiqued the conscious choice the Sesquicentennial’s organizers made to ignore alternatives to the status quo. Baltimore’s labor movement was growing so rapidly that in 1886, six years after the Sesquicentennial, the city was the site of one of the nation’s largest May Day parades with an estimated 15–20,000 workers “of all colors and nationalities” participating. That the Sesquicentennial’s organizers were loath to include workingmen’s organizations and instead only had workingmen parade as employees further substantiates the argument that the Sesquicentennial was about reaffirming and reasserting the business and political establishment’s control over the city.28

The organization of the Sesquicentennial garnered significant popular interest, sometimes in ways its organizers did not want or expect. The organizers hoped Baltimoreans would get involved in its funding, but the city’s residents also voiced their opinions regarding its participants, format, and route. Hundreds of people from Baltimore and its environs wrote letters to Latrobe, Stevens, and Scharf. These letters ranged in topic. Some writers pleaded to be included in one of the parades. Some accepted or denied requests to participate. Others urged the organizers to change a parade route for personal or commercial reasons. One letter written by a young boy to “Mr. Mayor” on September 19 expressed his youthful glee about the prospect of participating in the Sesquicentennial parade:
My papa is all the time talking about the centennial procession next month made me write to you to ask you if you would not let us boys join in the procession I know I can get lots of boys of my playmates and other boys to march in the line I want you to let each boy have a tin horn and a flag we will have [our] own boy band of music and will make has [sic] much noise as the big men will, I will head the procession mounted on my little horse please let me know what day I can see you about us marching

your Little Friend
11 years of old
Willie K. Hooper
No. 399 Lanvale Street

Besides showing the sheer excitement of a young boy, Willie Hooper’s letter to “Mr. Mayor” also speaks to cross-generational interest in the Sesquicentennial. While it is unknown if Willie got his chance to march with his “playmates” in the parade, other young boys did get to march in a soldierly fashion. When public and private school children marched in the parade on October 12, they also marched as young soldiers. Grammar Schools No. 19 and 6 each had “companies” of young boys with “muskets” and “officers.” Many of the school children, who only came from male grammar schools and Catholic schools, paraded in uniforms with caps and sashes and were organized in “divisions.” By including younger generations in the parade, the event could be didactic as well as spectacular. The organizers could involve young men and show others what it took to display proper manhood, as visual organizers could dictate and define on their terms.29

Some writers wrote about their support for or against the inclusion of “colored” societies as participants, sometimes in threatening language. A Mr. Harry S. Buckless wrote a letter threatening that miscegenation would occur if African American and white societies paraded in line together. By 1880, Baltimore’s African American population was second only to that of Washington, D.C. African American men, who could vote by the Sesquicentennial, voted overwhelmingly for Republicans and therefore posed a direct threat to the hold Democrats had over Baltimore and Maryland politics. African American men were also beginning to claim civic space for themselves in new and spectacular ways, including a grand parade on May 19, 1870, celebrating the passage of the Fifteenth Amendment.30

Perhaps due to hesitancy to grant African Americans another civic stage, the day that the organizing committee planned to showcase Baltimore’s African American societies changed multiple times. According to the Baltimore American on Septem-
ber 24, the “committee passed a resolution that all colored societies who desire to join in the parades of Thursday and Friday with other organizations have the right to do so, and that it is optional with the colored citizens to parade on Saturday, that day having been allotted to the colored societies at their own request.” “Colored” societies took the opportunity offered by the organizers. During the parade of Thursday, October 14, the Sun wrote how after the processing of societies of “Fair-haired Teutons,” Poles, and the “Sons of Erin” came African American societies. Grouped together at the end of the line, the Sun wrote “the long and picturesque line ended with hundreds of the colored race, who have not only been raised to the dignity of citizenship, but who, with that investiture, have realized the benefits of union and organization, and who yesterday marshaled themselves in societies, which, however fanciful their titles may sound, help their members in substantial ways.” The “densely crowded” streets of spectators did not stop their applause or shouts when the African American societies paraded by, and the Sun commented that the African American marchers “looked at their best and were evidently on their mettle.” These parading African American men—and they were all men since the “conference committee of the colored organizations who intended [to parade] on Thursday . . . decided not to admit any ladies within their ranks, whether in barouches or otherwise”—adopted the terms of manhood that other, white organizations had. Even though they came at the end of the line, African American men could advance their claims as equal citizens and men by adopting the terms of manhood and civic space. They participated in this parade as they sought to establish themselves economically, socially, and politically in post-Reconstruction Baltimore.  

Printed programs for the Sesquicentennial indicated “colored” fraternal, social, and benevolent organizations, societies, and orders participated in the parade on Saturday, October 16. While the Sun had articles on the parade of fraternal organizations on Friday, October 15—which the paper referred to as “the closing parade of the week’s celebration”—it did not have any articles that highlighted the parade of the “colored” organizations on Saturday. A similar omission in the Sun’s coverage occurred in the following Monday, October 18, edition of the paper. That edition included two articles on the harbor pageant on the Patapsco River, but no articles on the parade of “colored” organizations on Saturday.  

Other letters written by members of the public to the Sesquicentennial’s organizing committee spoke directly to the conflict between workingmen and the business and political establishment’s intentions in the celebration. A letter written to F. C. Latrobe from “A Citizen” in Baltimore dated September 30 stated, “a
citizen desires to say that in looking over the names of the gentlemen appointed as Aids to the Chief Marshal he does not recognize the names of a Mechanic or Workingman among them” and recommended appointing the “late President of the 6th Ward Democratic Association” as an aide. A letter from a Mr. J. Luther Kessler to the organizing committee, described in the Baltimore American on September 28, asked, “why no provision is being made for the workingmen to participate in the celebration.” Mr. Kessler stressed “that as the election is soon to come off, the votes of the workingmen will be wanted, and unless something is done for them they will not be had. He asks that ward committees be appointed to enroll workingmen who do not belong to any organization, and to raise money for them to purchase hats and gloves.” Kessler’s letter speaks to the business and political establishment’s awareness of workingmen as a conscious political group. Kessler, like the Sesquicentennial’s organizers, wanted it both ways: the inclusion of workers without the markers of their affiliation with the larger labor movement. The organizers’ unwillingness to acknowledge this political movement in the parade speaks to the ways in which organizers sought to promote the power of the business and political establishment while dismissing competition. Workers could only participate as innocuous individuals, not as members of a powerful movement looking to change the status quo. To do otherwise would be a dangerous relinquishing of symbolic power.33

Labor unions and workingmen were aware of their subordination to the interests of the business and political establishment as the Sesquicentennial’s planning unfolded. Workingmen in Baltimore were concerned about their absence from the week’s parades. A letter to F. C. Latrobe from the employees of factories on Camden Street read,

We the undersigned employees in the extensive Factories situated on Camden St. between Howard and Sharp—do respectfully entreat you to use your influence in having one day’s procession of the Sesqui-Centennial week, pass our block, it being impossible for us to obtain leave of absence except on that first day. We represent the following Factories: Pacholder + Bauberger, Cigarette Factory employing 350 hands, Elbrise + Sons, Taylor + Co, E. Wise +Son, Steifel + Juhu, Stief Piano Factory.

After three pages of signatures, an added note reads, “about 1000 more that did not get time to write there [sic] names” were also in support of changing the pa-
rade route. The letter ended with the words, underlined in the original, “do not forget us.” Absence from the parade—either as participants or spectators—meant anonymity and the inability to define the Sesquicentennial’s message concerning power dynamics and relationships in the city.\textsuperscript{34}

Three Days of the Sesquicentennial

In an oration delivered on the opening day of the Baltimore Sesquicentennial on October 11, 1880, the same day as representatives of trades and industries marched through Baltimore’s streets, Scharf said, “Baltimore has come of age, yet some of those here, who now proudly do homage to this hour of its manhood, were witness of its vigorous expansion in youth, of its active struggles in infancy.” After asserting Baltimore’s achievements in industry, its pride in labor, and the military heroics of its native sons, Scharf ended his oration with, “Baltimore has come of age—let her prove her manhood by preserving her inheritance pure and clean, an apple of gold in a vessel of silver.” By referring to Baltimore as a “her” coupled with the term “manhood,” Scharf revealed that manhood was a concept, a term that could be—and should be—used to define success, power, and progress, not only of the city but of the men who controlled it. On October 16, the \textit{Baltimore American} stated, “the vast display of physical strength represented in processions miles in length, of strong men, whether that physical strength is to be utilized in war or labor or commerce or science or art—this is after all the wealth and glory of the city.” Baltimore’s men embodied a glorious city and a glorious age. They worked, united, to elevate Baltimore above other American cities. Yet, this description from the \textit{Baltimore American} also constructed Baltimore as a city of men—those who were not marching in this “glorious display” were not only excluded from the festivities, they were also left out of the glory, Baltimore’s body politic, and masculine (and thereby a powerful) identity itself. As Scharf’s speech makes clear, the Sesquicentennial implicitly reaffirmed the ties between power and the gendered language of manhood.\textsuperscript{35}

On the first day of the Sesquicentennial, thousands of men stood on cross streets, waiting to fill their place in line and begin the Procession of History and Industry. Organizers had warned them that order, discipline, and a celebratory demeanor during the procession were paramount. A “permission slip” for participation issued by the Executive Board required that “every person participating in this Procession, [must] decorate himself with a Badge.” A printed yellow card issued by the Head-
Quarters Chief Marshall, City Hall for the Procession of History and Industry from H. D. Loney, Chief of Staff, included the following instructions:

When the column moves you will be careful to preserve an interval of ten paces between the rear of the preceding and right of your section; also, to prevent straggling of any of your men from the column upon any pretense whatever, and to obey all orders delivered by the Chief of your Division or his Aids; to prevent all smoking or drinking of spirits or malt liquors, and exhibition of political or obnoxious designs or legends.

All parade participants would carry themselves with a military bearing and respect for authority.  

The actual celebration was spectacular. The Procession of History and Industry began with historical tableaux representing Maryland’s history. The tableaux focused on farming, artisanship, military might, and industrial technology. The First Division commenced with a depiction of John Smith and Jamestown, fol-
The Second Division, which represented Maryland history from 1812 to 1880, included tableaux representing the introductions of gas, railroads, and telegraphs; firemen parading with their new engines; and an “allegorical representation of the horticultural and agricultural products of the State.” The final tableau was “a grand triumphal car, representing the Temple of Liberty, surmounted by an American eagle. Under the canopy [was] the Goddess of Liberty, and on the steps leading to the temple [were] representations of the various nations, Europeans, Chinese, Africans, &c., coming to worship her.” In both the First and Second Division, organizers presented floats that showcased the fruits of labor without the workers who harvested them. Furthermore, to highlight Baltimore’s agricultural past while ignoring its industrial present was to make a pointed claim about what had led to the American greatness depicted in the “Temple of Liberty”—the work of independent farmers and merchants. The “Temple of Liberty” tableau was also significant for its emphasis on American democracy as the envy of the world despite the fact that much of the political establishment of Baltimore and Maryland actively sought to limit the political access and participation of groups it did not favor. By having representatives of other countries “worship” at the feet of “Liberty,” organizers visually reaffirmed the exceptionalism of American democracy as it was—namely, when it was controlled by white men of the business and political establishment. The business and political establishment constructed a historical narrative that only recognized the contributions of a select few.37

The second part of the parade celebrating trades and industries began with representatives of the business and political establishment riding on horses or in carriages. The B&O represented itself with hundreds of workers followed by barouches filled with executives and members of the B&O’s Board. The B&O played such a large part in the celebration despite their role in the 1877 Great Railroad Strike because it was an economic driver in the city. It represented the type of economic might and possibility in Baltimore that the business and political interests wanted to highlight in the Sesquicentennial.38

The Baltimore American commented under the headline “New Baltimore” that “in the procession were carried the things, or representatives of the things, that make Baltimore great—her manufacturers, labor-saving machinery (that enables one man to do the work of fifty), the tokens and emblems of commerce, of agriculture, mines, and lines of transportation, sometimes simply displayed.” While work-
ers protested and resisted the depression of their wages due to industrialized machinery, the *Baltimore American* celebrated this same process. “New Baltimore” could achieve these soaring commercial and manufacturing heights because of the acumen and support of the business and political establishment. Their control over the economic landscape of Baltimore made the city “great.”

While workingmen were overwhelmingly absent from the parades as visible members of a political movement, their work was included in the industrial and trade section of the parade. Baltimore businesses used “displays” to advertise their wares. Drawings and descriptions in newspapers and photographs from the day show the displays as similar to modern-day parade floats. These displays, excluding the driver, did not necessarily include people. Displays without people were characteristic of the Ninth Division of the parade, which “was devoted exclusively to industrial displays, and comprised, among other, two of Baltimore’s leading industries—the oyster and fruit packing trade and the brewers of Baltimore.” This nod to Baltimore’s industrialization recognized the business without those who made it productive. The trade section of Baltimore’s Sesquicentennial’s Procession of History and Industry was more or less a parade of advertisements for Baltimore companies.

**FIGURE 6.** Stereoview of a Group of American Indians at the Baltimore Sesquicentennial, celebrated on October 11–19, 1880, and marking the 150th anniversary of the city’s founding in 1730, photograph by William M. Chase, October 11, 1880. Maryland Center for History and Culture, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Stereoview Photograph Collection, PP1.2.14
There were some businesses and industries that did choose to have working men represent them. However, these representative working men had their class identity subsumed by an institutional one. Floats and displays visually rendered working men as cogs in a machine that, like the law and order units marching in uniform, served the business and political establishment’s interests and not their own. Their identity was inextricably linked to their employer rather than their class; they were dependents rather than independent agents. The organizers of the Sesquicentennial emphasized working men’s status as disciplined employees who were happy with their work. Contemporaneous labor unions’ calls for change or strikes, both ignored in the Sesquicentennial, contradicted this display of unity and contentment.

For example, the B&O’s display included “five thousand men” marching in companies and their inclusion was “indeed a credit to that great corporation.” Their identity as working men, and potential strikers from 1877, was ignored but their identity as employees was celebrated. In describing the display of Henry McShane & Co. (a bell and brass foundry), the Baltimore American wrote on October 12, “three hundred and fifty of the employees of the foundry, in sections of one hundred and fifteen each, each section dressed to represent the national colors.” The paper used the same language when describing Hugh Sisson & Sons’ (marble) display that included “one hundred of the employees.” The Baltimore American’s description in its October 12 edition stated each trade was “fully represented” by a number of “firms,” the emphasis placed on the businesses themselves rather than the men whose work ensured the products’ availability.41

Other companies used race and gender to visually deny working men’s independence and manhood. The B&O Railroad also chose to include “a team of four oxen” dragging an “antiquated wagon” under “the guidance of an old darkey of pre-historic appearance” as well as “a lean and lank mule, propelled by a negro female.” The inclusion of caricatures of African Americans, and the inclusion in particular of African American women, in the B&O display effectively emasculated its workers; if African American women could have their jobs, on what basis did these workers claim white manhood? If B&O railroad workers were not white men—in a world where a white, masculine identity was a prerequisite for full citizenship, access, and protection—then their second-class status and lack of power was justified. The Powhatan Cotton Mills display similarly included “three large wagons, each drawn by six horses” that held “male and female employes [sic], about 50 men and 54 young ladies. The latter looked very nice in their calico dresses and
white caps.” Placing male and female employees together on a parade float, like the B&O’s use of a “negro female” in their display, visually delegitimized the workingmen’s claims to manhood; if women could have the same jobs as these workingmen, what made them men and why did they deserve higher wages? D.H. Junior & L.V. Miller, “the only manufacturers of plug tobacco as a specialty in Baltimore” also used a visual that negated their male employees’ claims to manhood: “they had a very large wagon, showing a fully equipped tobacco factory in operation, with fifteen colored hands singing at their work.”

Putting workingmen in uniforms and having them march as employees rather than as skilled tradesmen or members of a class, unions, or movement, rendered their work as service to the city and country. This visual further supported the business and political establishment’s goal to use the Sesquicentennial to reaffirm their own power. Workingmen’s uniforms and discipline linked them to soldiers, rendering them as members of a bureaucratic institution that functioned by a command structure in which they were subordinates. Relating white workers to economically, politically, and socially marginalized African Americans visually reminded spectators that neither should have full access to the political process. Particularly in Baltimore, a city that was becoming steeped in Lost Cause ideology by the end of the nineteenth century and whose wealthy residents had Confederate sympathies
during the Civil War, this linking of workers to a group that faced serious discrimination was particularly damming for the labor movement. The parade structure presented workingmen as dependents of their employers, and this status obscured the idea of workers’ power.

Day three’s Military and Naval Forces, Fire Department, Police, &c. Procession brought a new cast of characters to Baltimore’s streets and received a lot of positive press coverage in Baltimore’s newspapers. According to newspapers reports, the crowds were enthralled when men representing law and order units and military organizations passed them. Whether or not the newspapers exaggerated the extent of the crowd’s enthusiasm is not as significant as the fact that their editors and writers believed that dedicating significant column space and laudatory language to these participants would appeal to their readers. Given the spectating crowd would have consisted of men, women, and children from all socioeconomic backgrounds, the crowd’s described enthusiasm toward men who represented the interests of the business and political establishment is striking.

Women, the newspapers implied, were particularly drawn to the police. This editorializing augmented the police’s status as men by accentuating their virility. Since the police were tied to the business and political establishment and its interests, the crowd’s respect of the police implicitly extended to the business and political establishment as well. The most laudatory account of police parading came from the *Baltimore American* on October 14:

> The battalion of police was a feature of the procession . . . . Their uniforms were pictures of neatness . . . and the perfect order held among them gave evidence of the fact that they were a finely drilled and well officered body of men. The city, therefore, had every reason to feel justly proud of her force as they marched along with measured tread and perfect alignment.

The police were “her force,” a feminized reference to Baltimore. With the reference, the *Baltimore American* portrayed the police department as a civic institution that served all of Baltimore rather than as a tool of an economic class whose very legitimacy was currently questioned. By describing their physical uniformity and their dignified bearing, the *Baltimore American* implicitly celebrated the status quo that police defended—one in which the business and political establishment and their interests were on top. The National Guard, another group that defended an establishment-dominated status quo, also received similar approval from the crowd according to the newspaper’s coverage.43
Perhaps due to their popularity as parade participants, newspapers dedicated a significant portion of their print space to describing the voluntary militia units. The Baltimore American on October 14 highlighted the presence of multiple militia units from Virginia, including the Light Artillery Blues and the City Guards of Norfolk, the Warren Light Infantry of Front Royal, and the Staunton Artillery. The Seventh Regiment Band conducted a “Brilliant Musical Programme” that the Baltimore Sun praised for its “proper phrasing and most intelligent shading.” The musical selections included, “splendid transcriptions of Chopin, Meyerbeer’s Fackeltanz, Wagner’s ‘Invocation from Rienzi,’ [and] Rossini’s Overture of William Tell.”

Each newspaper paid close attention to militia units’ uniforms, which could be quite lavish. These costume-like uniforms were in stark contrast to the uniforms worn by soldiers in previous military parades. In 1871, the New York Times be-moaned the fact that “the plain uniforms which were so much in vogue among the real soldiers of eight years ago [were] gradually giving way, and the old gorgeous play-soldier apparel [was] gradually coming up again.” The shift in uniform the New York Times reported on also marked a shift away from a draft army back to a volunteer army and local militias. Citizen-soldiers were not economically dependent on military service and could thereby claim their independence through voluntary military participation and showy uniforms.

The ornate uniforms of the voluntary militias emphasized their elitism and social purpose. The Baltimore American noted that “the uniform of the Light Artillery was especially noticeable: white, or rather cream colored, frock coats, blue breeches, with red stripes, ‘Busby’ hats (half shakos), with crimson side flat, and gilded shield in front, and white plumes.” The City Guard’s uniforms were “tastefully ornamented, and, notably, [included] bearskin shakos of the utmost altitude.” The Warren Light Infantry’s uniform included “gray, swallow-tailed coats, with admirable trimmings.” Nowhere did the newspapers comment on signs of wear on the uniforms. While it could be argued these were simply dress uniforms chosen for the occasion, it is the sheer spectacle and costume-like nature of these uniforms that stood in stark contrast to the dress uniforms of veterans. Plenty of parades of Civil War soldiers and veterans in the previous decade and a half had the men march in their worn uniforms; the signs of wear and tear serving as a reminder of the marching men’s patriotism and sacrifice for their communities and nation.

Veterans too distinguished themselves with their clothing. While voluntary militia units used uniforms to reassert elite status, veterans could not make such class claims. Unlike militia members, whose socioeconomic background was more ho-
mogenous, veterans had been members of armies in which men of many socioeco-
nomic backgrounds served. This more democratic army experience was
particularly true for Civil War veterans of both the Union and the Confederacy,
who made up the bulk of veteran parade participants, for they had served in the
first draft armies in U.S. history. Their uniforms needed to remind the crowds of
their civic service, despite the fact that many veterans of both armies had served
involuntarily. As the main organization for Union veterans, many Grand Army of
the Republic (G.A.R.) posts—including both white and African American posts—
participated in Wednesday’s parade. The *Sun* commented that the turnout of
G.A.R. members was “very fine” and “all wore Grand Army uniform, caps and
badges, presented a fine appearance and marched well.” Lincoln Post, No. 7, a “col-
ored” G.A.R. local, had thirty-four men in the line of march. Included in their
number was “one old colored man who had lost a leg” and “marched along bravely
on crutches.” Overall, the *Sun* remarked on the “unabated enthusiasm” of the
crowd for these marching veterans. In this case, African American men had their
manhood acknowledged and affirmed by spectators. Their status as veterans, at
least in this celebratory moment, helped erase any racial animus from the crowd.47

Conclusion

The Baltimore Sesquicentennial, ostensibly meant to celebrate the city and its
glorious history, was instead used by one class to erase the mounting power of
another. The organizing committee was made up exclusively of men prominent
in Baltimore’s social, cultural, political, and economic life, meaning the parades
they organized were functions of their civic power and their self-understanding as
men. A look into the funding and invitations reveals that the organizers formed
the parade’s structure and invitation list around the desire of the business and po-
litical establishment to promote its power through displays of specific men. The
way in which Baltimore’s press covered spectators’ reactions promoted an overall
acceptance of the message crafted by the business and political establishment. In
the words of J. Thomas Scharf, Baltimore was “heroic, . . . full-grown, large and
shapely; clear in vision and correct of thought; wisely planning, slow to offence,
vigorous in defence [sic]; brain well adorned and amply furnished; hands deft and
skillful and not ashamed of labor . . . . We can be certain of Baltimore’s perpetuity
because we know that she has bred immortal men.” These “immortal men” took
part in the Sesquicentennial, simultaneously celebrating the city, themselves, and
an economic landscape that served the business and political establishment’s interests. Those who did not parade in the streets in October 1880 were not counted as part of “the sons of Baltimore who have turned aside in their careers to toil for her, to fight and bleed and die for her, to endow her institutions and her charities with the earnings of their sagacity and labor! . . . These men venerated Baltimore.”

The Baltimore Sesquicentennial was an exclusive affair that showcased a restricted definition of manhood presented by and benefitting the business and political establishment. Per the instructions given them by the organizing committee, the parade’s participants collectively represented volunteerism, discipline, and respect for authority. In particular, they had to demonstrate a respect for the business and political establishment’s power as the organizers and main financiers of the celebration. Politicians, commercial entities, and law and order units all inherently represented and protected the establishment’s interests and were thus prominent elements in the parades. Veterans, who the public glorified and esteemed, added to the business and political establishment’s claims of popular support. Their service to and sacrifice for country made them ideal men and their popularity made the image of veterans influential and didactic for the next generation.

The Sesquicentennial was important for staging the business and political establishment’s claims to power because of its civic nature. The Sesquicentennial celebrated both place and epoch and marked Baltimore’s “hour of manhood.” It was an ideal event through which the business and political establishment could reclaim their position at the top of the social, economic, and political order in Baltimore in the aftermath of major labor unrest and an economic downturn. This event was purportedly an inclusive, people’s celebration, an idea further substantiated by the soaring rhetoric of unity and glory used by newspapers and parade organizers. Staging power in this setting therefore not only reached a wide audience but also allowed the business and political establishment to say their celebration—and its intent, goals, and presentation—reflected the people, their understandings, and their desires for the future of Baltimore. The consequences of the celebration’s exclusivity erased Baltimore’s workingmen and their movement and negated the existence of power negotiations in the United States in the 1880s. And it did so in highly gendered terms. Those not counted as “men” had their gendered claims to power and respect negated.

The impulse to perform and codify power into something tangible and visual reveals the shifting ground in the postbellum United States. It reveals that the rampant industrialization and commercialization that created a capitalist United States
was far from uncontested. The impulse to mount and participate in these large-scale parades also reveals the anxieties men of multiple classes had about their claims to and holds on power in urban space. Laying claim to manhood and displaying it publicly meant securing its associated rights and privileges in a world where being white and being a man were the best, most uncontested ways to exert power. Defining power in nineteenth-century cities after the Civil War required a translation of manhood into choreographed elements that were to be performed in public space, and the Baltimore Sesquicentennial in October 1880 did just that.
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IN MEMORIAM

The Honorable James Frederick Schneider, 1947–2020

After a long battle with multiple health issues during which he maintained a cheerful self-effacing outlook and an abiding interest in his family, his church, and history, retired Bankruptcy Judge James Frederick Schneider passed away on April 6, 2020.

Jim was a long time member of the Publications Committee of the Maryland Center for History and Culture (formerly the Maryland Historical Society), who wrote and lectured on the history of the legal profession, the courts, and the law.

I had the privilege of interviewing him in 2012 for the Historical Society of the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland: the interview can be viewed on YouTube (youtu.be/uYXteAdY4XA). There Jim provides a thoughtful overview of his long and distinguished career as a lawyer, judge, and historian in his usual outgoing and humble way.

His most recent essay, which was based on a talk to the Rule Day Law Club on October 12, 2010, is typical of his best work. It is both humorous and a scholarly account of Charles Dickens, Edgar Allan Poe, and a Baltimore murder mystery.

Over several months before his death it was my good fortune to spend “Tuesdays with Jim” at the Baltimore City Archives. As his sight deteriorated I set up a large screen monitor connected to the desktop computer in my office where he could enlarge the images of the records he wished to explore. While I met with volunteers out in the search room, we often heard him exclaim that he had found what he was looking for, and periodically he would emerge to join in our conversations, bringing his usual insight and stories to enrich the research goals of the day.

Until the very end Jim was not only cheerful and positive about himself, but also spirit-raising for all of us. He leaves behind a corpus of work that will be forever useful and enlightening, but also for those who knew him, an abundance of knowledge, humor, and good will that will not be forgotten.

Edward C. Papenfuse,
Maryland State Archivist, retired

On the drive into Annapolis on Rowe Boulevard, in front of the District Court, is a little-known eight-column memorial to one of the greatest of American architects, Benjamin Henry Boneval Latrobe. The columns were once a part of one of the most prestigious buildings in Baltimore towering above the city as viewed from Federal Hill. When that building was demolished, they were incorporated into the Maryland Court of Appeals building in front of the State House, and after that edifice was torn down, relegated to an open field until resurrected to their present location. Perhaps they will remain there for the foreseeable future as a reminder of the architect who made them an integral part of his impressive Baltimore Merchants’ Exchange building. If not, at least he will no longer be overlooked for his extensive contributions to the “building of America.”

Once again Jean H. Baker has written an absorbing narrative of a prominent contributor to the architecture of the American way of life, Benjamin Henry Boneval Latrobe (May 1, 1764–September 3, 1820). She follows his life as a disaffected Moravian educated in cloistered communities in Germany and England through the honing of his architectural and engineering skills, and his many speculative adventures in America.

Latrobe is best known for his work on the U.S. Capitol and the Baltimore Cathedral, now the Basilica in Baltimore, but he built banks, private homes, and waterworks of grace and beauty as well as trained a generation of architects who also made their mark on the architecture of the Early Republic.

Latrobe finally settled his family in Baltimore in 1818, following a precipitous decline into bankruptcy, not so much because of his architectural triumphs but because he overextended himself through disastrous speculations in steam-powered enterprises from steamboats to power looms. His journey to fame ended in tragedy in New Orleans where he died in 1820.
of yellow fever, but not before his genius had been realized as America’s foremost professional architect.

Based on Jean Baker’s references to Latrobe’s mental health, it is possible to deduce that today Benjamin Latrobe probably would have been diagnosed as suffering from bipolar disorder. He suffered from migraines, worked long hours in hugely creative bursts of highs, collapsing into lows such as the one that confined him to bed in Baltimore when his debts seemed insurmountable.

It is quite likely that he accomplished as much as he did because of his second wife, Mary Elizabeth Hazlehurst, who not only bore him three children but cared for the two children by his first wife as if they were her own. As Baker has done in her other biographical works, which have focused on women from Margaret Sanger, to Mary Todd Lincoln, to American suffragists, she gives full measure to the crucial role Mary Elizabeth played in furthering her husband’s career and enriching his home life. Thanks to her as much as her husband, they left a family of achievers as architects, engineers, and politicians, with one grandson becoming mayor of Baltimore seven times.

There is very little to fault in this work. Unlike previous biographies it is accurate and well-footnoted. It is based on a meticulous and effective use of the voluminous papers and diaries Latrobe left behind, now at the Maryland Center for History and Culture, which have been edited and annotated by Edward C. Carter, his associates, and successors in the Latrobe Papers project, in association with Yale University Press. She does mistakenly identify Robert Goodloe Harper, Latrobe’s good friend and client, as a senator from South Carolina, when he was only a representative. She might also have written more about Latrobe’s ties to St. Mary’s College in Baltimore, whose professors taught Latrobe’s son Henry, among them his erstwhile partner Maximilian Godefroy, who taught drawing, and Elisha DeButts, who taught chemistry. Henry became an architect in his own right, managing his father’s waterworks project for New Orleans.

Latrobe continued to draw on his associations at St. Mary’s well into the last years of his life. One of the letters that he wrote to a client, the U.S. Navy hero Stephen Decatur, sought a government contract for Professor Elisha DeButts, who had developed his own formula and manufacturing process of white lead. The letter sold recently for $6,000 (the equivalent of $488 in 1819), a sum that Latrobe well could have used that year to fend off his many creditors.

Still, these inconsequential musings do not detract from the triumph of this work. Both Benjamin Latrobe and his biographer Jean H. Baker will be remembered for
their roles in “building America,” one for his lasting contributions to architecture and engineering, the other for her mastery of readable and lasting biography.

Edward C. Papenfuse
Baltimore, Maryland


In his impressive study *Masters of Violence*, Tristan Stubbs provides “as full a picture as possible of the eighteenth-century overseer” (7). Actually, he provides more than this. The author points out that overseers were “supervisors but supervised . . . at once autonomous and dependent,” since they worked for planters and oversaw bondspeople (102). Consequently, in providing a thorough study of eighteenth-century overseers, Stubbs also details how they interacted with those around them, how white Southerners regarded overseers, and how overseers’ roles increased over the course of the century. In order to provide this complete picture, Stubbs provides important insight into the larger context of eighteenth-century plantations.

Although the work and profile of many overseers would have been similar, there was some diversity among them. In addition to overseeing enslaved people who were doing agricultural labor, overseers kept accounts, sold produce, bought provisions, advertised land for sale, and provided the enslaved with a degree of medical care. They were typically men in their twenties or early thirties who were not affluent. They included former indentured servants, carpenters, coopers, and blacksmiths, as well as farmers in need of money. Others, however, were young men of the gentry who were preparing for careers as independent planters. Some enslaved men in Virginia worked as overseers, because oftentimes there were not enough white men to fill the jobs. Sometimes, there was greater productivity under black overseers than with white ones.

Popular perceptions of overseers became increasingly negative as the century progressed. Early on, most white Southerners regarded overseers with some esteem. In 1705, for example, Robert Beverley characterized the typical overseer as having attained “the Skill and Character of an experienced Planter” (5). Later on, however,
planters were increasingly likely to complain that the overseers they had hired were untrustworthy, incompetent, or both. Much of this resulted from the growing degree of planter absenteeism. As planters became increasingly likely to live elsewhere, overseers gained greater control of day-to-day operations and were thus likely to be blamed for problems. Also, with the planter away, many underpaid overseers committed thefts, which contributed to the negative perception. Meanwhile, planters were buying more and more land and bondspeople. This increased the overseers’ responsibilities as they sought to ensure that the plantations were profitable.

Absentee arrangements also led to “more and crueler violence.” Harsh punishments of the enslaved became so common that many white Southerners concluded that overseers tended to be “ignorant and cruel,” as a Georgian opined in 1779. George Washington criticized overseers for treating enslaved people “inhumanly” (3). Some overseers raped enslaved women. Planters opposed these violations because they caused animosity that threatened the plantation’s stability.

Stubbs also traces anti-overseer sentiment to the fact that they focused on the profit that the cash crops would generate, while many planters preferred to play down the commercial aspects of their estates. Many planters perceived themselves as enlightened patriarchs who provided for others, and they therefore believed they deserved the loyalty and labor of those they enslaved. Although overseers played a part in increasing planters’ wealth, they also provided an unwelcome reminder of the commercial dimension.

Stubbs presents the overseers’ situation effectively, without implying that they deserve sympathy. As he notes, absentee planters regarded overseers as responsible for “economic success and societal order” (2). Planters would criticize overseers if punishments were excessive or if, as a result of leniency, bondspeople ran away. (Some overseers granted “petty privileges” as an alternative to punishment.) Planters also saw overseers as responsible if finances fell into disarray. Eliza Lucas Pinckney, for example, accused “ignorant or dishonest Over Seers” of mismanaging her late husband’s affairs (5).

By blaming overseers for problems including discord and violence, planters preserved an image of themselves as blameless, beloved patriarchs. As Stubbs points out, patriarchs “benefited from a system that removed them from the everyday horrors of slavery” (125). Therefore, some failed to see their involvement in slavery’s exploitative nature, and overseers received the criticism. For this reason, Stubbs concludes that overseers were of “central importance in the development of the ‘enlightened patriarchal’ ideas that presaged antebellum paternalism” (160).
A real strength of *Masters of Violence* is its exploration of the power dynamics on plantations. Although some overseers kept the same job for years, for example, their contracts were typically short-term. This arrangement ensured that they would not undermine their employers. It also, however, made it less likely that overseers would gain valuable experience, incorporate innovations, or develop a strong sense of loyalty to their employers. Many female plantation owners saw overseers as protecting them from the commercial world, but some overseers refused to recognize the women’s authority. Sometimes, enslaved people would complain to planters about overseers, even contradicting the overseer directly in the planter’s presence. Because overseers were held in low esteem, planters sometimes sided with the enslaved.

Stubbs focuses on the eighteenth century because the Revolution’s impact was so significant. During the war, enslaved people were increasingly likely to run away, and overseers were blamed for those escapes. Also, opposition to violent punishment increased after the Revolution, as did the notion that the slaveowner’s affection was a reward. Increasingly, overseers were regarded as malicious figures. The perception of overseers as sadistic would be highlighted in nineteenth-century works including *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and the writings of Frederick Douglass. Sometimes, their depravity would be contrasted with planters’ benevolence.

*Masters of Violence* is a fascinating study of an important and understudied topic and a valuable addition to the scholarship of eighteenth-century plantations.

Elizabeth Kelly Gray
Towson University


Children’s literature and non-fiction books have not traditionally had a major focus on history, let alone provided a unique lens on social justice and racial inequality. Even those publications that do, tend to highlight nationally known stories, rather
than the local context. However, this gap has increasingly been filled as authors and publishers alike realize the need for young minds to process what they see occurring in their communities today. This is particularly useful as parents, educators, and librarians look for new materials in the time of pandemic-related homeschooling and hybrid education.

Sharon Langley and Amy Nathan co-authored a wonderful resource to fulfill these goals with *A Ride to Remember: A Civil Rights Story*, released in early 2020. Both authors are Baltimore natives, who only later in life came to understand the significance of the events described in the narrative. Readers are also treated to the artwork of Floyd Cooper, an acclaimed African American illustrator known for deftly depicting scenes in children’s literature.

Maryland is not always cited as a central location in the civil rights movement, but it should be. Though considered by some to be more aligned with progressive, northern ideology when it comes to race relations, communities and facilities in our state were often strictly segregated even into the 1960s. Private venues for recreation were at times the earliest to integrate, while others stubbornly stuck to discriminatory policies barring African Americans. Gwynn Oak Amusement Park was one such business, located along the western border between Baltimore City and Baltimore County.

*A Ride to Remember* places the reader into that era, when equal rights activism was becoming commonplace in many parts of the country. Sharon Langley brings a fascinating perspective to storytelling in this book. Not only is she an educator herself, but Langley is also a central figure in the story. The first-person narrative infuses a child’s point of view, which is no easy task when addressing racial injustice. Langley frames the narrative with some historical context, presented through a conversation between her father, mother, and younger self. The story accurately recounts that by this time, “kids could go to the same schools and libraries, restaurants, and some movie theaters, too—no matter the color of their skin.” The Baltimore area was certainly unique in how such changes did not occur all at once, and discriminatory policies often had to be challenged one by one.

The authors describe how the Gwynn Oak example fit into this landscape. A multi-racial cohort comprised of ministers, rabbis, college students, and adult activists decided that July 4, 1963, was the perfect day to strike a blow for freedom and equality. Those protesting the park’s segregation policy were met with angry opposition from white patrons, and were also mistreated by law enforcement. Some activists were bloodied, while hundreds were arrested during two days of protest.
Partially due to negative media attention (from the New York Times as well as local outlets), and significant political pressure, Gwynn Oak Park’s owners reluctantly agreed to drop the segregation policy.

The timing of these events also coincided with developments on the national stage. On the same day Langley’s family helped to integrate the amusement park, Martin Luther King Jr. delivered the iconic “I Have a Dream” speech during the March on Washington. Ironically, the carousel from Gwynn Oak Park is now located on the National Mall in Washington, D.C., where visitors of all backgrounds can enjoy the attraction.

As I read the book to my nearly five-year-old daughter, it struck me just how impactful such stories can be in shaping young minds. Her excitement at recognizing the narrative’s location in Maryland was a great hook, stunted by the realization that we were learning about how unfair and cruel our fellow Americans were toward African Americans and others that did not look like them. It may be some years before she can fully understand these circumstances, and grasp the impact that racially based discrimination has had on American communities. However, A Ride to Remember is a very useful starting point for these conversations. The book’s content is appropriate for children as young as pre-K, while the reading level is suitable for most elementary school students who could absorb the story more independently. The new release complements the previous work of co-author Amy Nathan, addressing similar content and different audiences.

Nathan’s earlier title Round & Round Together: Taking a Merry-Go-Round Ride into the Civil Rights Movement provides educators, young adults, as well as other interested adult learners a useful primer in this local history. Published in 2011, the book covers not just the desegregation fight for Gwynn Oak Amusement Park, but also the broader movement for racial equality in early-to-mid-twentieth-century Maryland. Ms. Nathan covers a great deal of material highlighting the efforts of activists to expand access in public accommodations, education, employment and recreational venues.

She does an excellent job connecting those local efforts to developments within the national civil rights movement, which was more focused on the Deep South. The author emphasizes how in many cases Maryland activists pioneered strategies, including organizing sit-ins and boycotts of businesses, before they were utilized in other parts of the country. The book covers the immense contributions of the Baltimore NAACP chapter, as well as the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and students from then Morgan State College. First-hand accounts from many Marylanders involved in the movement are drawn from oral history interviews in
the McKeldin-Jackson Collection at the Maryland Center for History and Culture, including those from local leaders Marion C. Bascom, Juanita Jackson Mitchell, and Walter Sondheim Jr.

*A Ride to Remember* and *Round & Round Together* are both invaluable tools for engaging in challenging conversations about our nation and state’s history. Now more than ever, Americans would be well served to acknowledge our fraught past and apply those lessons as we navigate yet another divisive time. The youth especially will need this knowledge and accompanying resources, as they will be the leaders who shape what values define our country for years to come.

Interested researchers can learn more about these resources and how to access them from the H. Furlong Baldwin Library at the MCHC, mdhistory.org/collections/oral-histories.

Educators can access digital lesson plans and relevant collections, as well as learn more about virtual and onsite programming for K-12 students at the MCHC, mdhistory.org/learn.

David Armenti
Maryland Center for History and Culture


This smart and thought-provoking book joins a growing list of recent high-quality publications examining antebellum Baltimore that grapple with the causes and implications of Baltimore’s seemingly pervasive violence. It should become a must-read for anyone interested in the subject.

While other authors have seen an implicit tension between Mobtown’s violence and the growth and development of what was then America’s third city, Malka argues that the violence was a natural outgrowth of Baltimore’s liberal foundation. He concludes, “All of this arresting, all of this imprisonment, and

---

all the violence were the result of liberal freedom’s peculiar development in a slave society” (247).

For Malka the issue of race is always at the heart of the connection between freedom and imprisonment, and rights and violence. Far from a comprehensive history of policing in Baltimore, his book is a meditation on what Foucault might describe as the intersection between race and discipline, which is certainly a timely topic for Baltimore and the nation.

The first third of The Men of Mobtown examines antebellum Baltimore, a city which for most of the period appeared to have very minimal policing, with only a small ragtag force of constables and night watchmen. Malka argues that these appearances are deceiving, for policing was understood to be a public responsibility, particularly of free, propertied white men: “There was policing in early Baltimore—quite a bit of it. It just happened to be performed by a loose confederation of individuals who would no more have used the word ‘official’ to describe themselves than they would the word ‘ordinary’” (20).

This arrangement had a number of advantages, including cost-effectiveness, but the downside was the very violence for which the city was notorious. Riots, in Malka’s view, were part and parcel of citizens’ vigilance rather than attacks on the system. But as they became a threat to property, for example in the 1835 Bank Riot, the city and state instituted a fairly well-known series of reforms that ultimately established a system of professional policemen. Nevertheless, private citizens remained an integral part of the policing system as they continued to make citizens’ arrests, track down criminals for rewards, and perform other vigilante functions, often against free black people. Ordinary citizens were in fact difficult to differentiate from the actual police, and, likewise, “police forces in cities like Baltimore often looked very much like mobs.”

The second reform was the institution of prisons designed to prevent crime and reform criminals through work and instruction. Both police and prisons were part and parcel of liberalism: “If the policemen worked to liberate the streets of disorder so that rights-bearing free men could govern their properties as they wished, prisons taught inmates how to bear rights and be free” (79).

Malka’s middle section examines how Baltimoreans policed the workplace, the household, and black criminals. Workplace riots, particularly those in shipyards, were frequent in late antebellum Baltimore. Many, particularly the well-known caulkers’ riots, were directed at free black workers. Malka notes, “It was no coincidence that native-born white workingmen launched their assault upon free black
workers just as police reform reached full fruition.” The force had been created to protect property rights, at least of its allies, which included white workingmen who considered their labor to be their most valuable property. Thus, Malka concludes, “Baltimore City’s new policemen played a critical role in making the city’s workforce whiter” (120).

Baltimoreans expected both household members and the criminal world to be policed largely by propertied male patriarchs. These expectations were confounded to some extent by the existence of free black men who might technically be propertied heads of household but were still suspect to much of the white population. As a result, a disproportionate share of public policing was aimed at controlling the free black household and suspected black criminals. Legislation limited supposedly unruly gatherings by free black people and courts essentially allowed black children to be taken from their families due to the suggestion of family poverty, all of which severely limited the authority of free black men. Alleged black criminals were rarely imprisoned; the penitentiary and prison were aimed primarily at reforming white citizens. Instead, they were patrolled by white vigilantes and punished by short-term slavery or corporal means.

After Emancipation both the prison system and the police were increasingly directed at disciplining the city’s African American population, as Malka discusses in the final section. While Malka recognizes that the legal codes were de-racialized and the freed people made very real gains during these years, he notes that “new freedoms also brought new forms of compulsion” (218). Prison populations that had once been disproportionately white now became disproportionately black. For a time, a legal loophole continued to allow the state to seize black children into apprenticeship. A turn to convict leasing further limited black people’s freedom. But Malka concludes, “The black carceral state arose in freedom’s name, not in opposition to it,” meaning that white men believed it was necessary to protect the property rights that were the center of liberal ideology” (248). Although this is a bleak picture, if anything Malka may be underestimating the persistence of white vigilantism by ignoring the post-bellum history of lynching in Maryland. While none occurred in Baltimore City proper, no doubt lynchings that occurred nearby sent powerful messages to Baltimore’s freed people.

Lawrence A. Peskin
Morgan State University

In 1969, Florence Howe, an English professor at Goucher College, responded to her students’ pleas for more female-authored books by organizing the Feminist Press. Its original mandate was to unearth female writers whose works merited study and to publish books that might be used in the classroom. Still viable even in the harsh book publishing environment of 2020, the Feminist Press has amply fulfilled its founder’s intentions. As Gloria Steinem explained, without the Feminist Press “we might not have known that women have always been writing our hearts out . . . women have been speeding along on their own.”

Parole Femine: Words and Lives of the Woman’s Literary Club of Baltimore, edited by Jean Lee Cole and published by the Apprentice House Press of Loyola University, is a collection of the writings of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century women who were indeed writing their hearts out and speeding along on their own. (The Latin title of the volume is the second half of the archaic Maryland state motto “Fatti maschii, parole femine,” that is, “manly deeds and womanly words.”) In this case, the Woman’s Literary Club of Baltimore (WLCB) collected the writing of female authors, sometimes actually reading the offerings in meetings, at other times discussing the works as reviewers might, and at all times providing encouragement for women interested in literature, many of whom were already published authors.

Founded in 1890, the specific intention of the WLCB, one of those late nineteenth-century manifestations of the female club movement, was “to further the intellectual development of the women of Baltimore and to promote social relations among those of similar tastes.” Meeting every Tuesday afternoon from October through May, from 1890 to 1941, at first in the classrooms of Woman’s College of Baltimore (renamed Goucher College in 1910), these mostly middle-aged, privileged white women provided a social and vocational space for the discussion and creation of female authors. In an age when most colleges were closed to women, the founders established membership criteria that “those only should belong who had sufficient interest in literature to have devoted some time and thought to original work for either newspapers and magazines or of a more lasting nature.” They intended to encourage, according to their first president Frances Litchfield Turnbull, “exact and

noble thinking among our women . . . , the keener instincts of pure womanhood and a broad and not less loving and believing heart.” Authors included suffragists and their opponents, believers in white supremacy and progressives, supporters of Christian socialism, and neo-Confederates. Thus the WLCB became an example of something akin to a writing center and a book club, with an added social atmosphere. The members of the club adopted violet for its club color, chose the peacock as its mascot, and organized social occasions.

This hefty anthology of over 700 pages includes the various efforts of 42 women whose writing was read in committee sessions from 1890 to 1920. Some of the authors were members of the club; others, perhaps the most gifted among them, were honorary members. Topics ranged from local history—Emily Lantz authored peppy short pieces on Baltimore neighborhoods such as Roland Park—to historical essays that emphasized royalty, short stories heavy on romance that showcased the independence of women, a novella by Katherine Woods, and poetry by the best-known of these literary women, Lizette Woodworth Reese.

This volume of Parole Femine begins with the recognition of its lead editor Jean Lee Cole, a professor of English at Loyola College, that the records of the WLCB, housed at the Maryland Center for History and Culture, deserved publication not just online (though they now appear there as the Aperio project) but also in a published volume. “[The club’s] history,” she writes, “has been buried under decades of forgetting, aided and abetted by both the continuing dominance of male-centered historiography and the female Club members’ internalization of the patriarchy.” Over the years necessary to transcribe the documents, research the lives of the authors, and provide explanatory endnotes, Cole recruited students at Loyola, and this became a collaborative project, though whoever was in charge of the endnotes needed to align them with the proper author and the discussion of the lives of the authors is sketchy.

The usefulness of this volume, beyond its service to the twenty or so students who learned research skills, is two-fold: first, the analysis of the workings of the WLCB adds to our understanding of women during the Progressive movement in a border state; and secondly, the writings themselves mirror attitudes and values of these women authors. As Steinem has said, “women were indeed writing their hearts out,” and what they wrote is a mirror onto their society and culture.

Jean Baker
Goucher College (emerita)
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