

MSA SC 5881-1-245

MARYLAND

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE



MARYLAND STATE NORMAL SCHOOL 1874

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
BALTIMORE

March • 1967

IN 1907_____

when we reached the age of 28

The B&O Locust Point pier under construction in the Patapsco River collapsed, killing seven persons and causing damage estimated at \$400,000.—*April 27.*

The University of Maryland began a three-day observation of the 100th anniversary of its founding.—*May 30.*

In 1965_____


. . . we occupied our new office and warehouse especially constructed to utilize the most modern equipment and techniques.

MOVING—We are Maryland's largest agent for Allied Van Lines, with the experienced personnel and facilities for any moving job—local or long distance. Our expert packers prepare anything from household furnishings to precious art treasures for safe handling in transport or in storage, using customized containers and new, clean packing material.

STORAGE—Our especially designed one-level storage warehouse reduces handling to a minimum. All goods are packed into room-size portable containers, sealed against light, dust or moisture and stored in the sprinkler-protected, fireproof building that permits lowest possible insurance rate.

Our motto is: "WE CARE"

Agent for Allied Van Lines, the World's Largest Moving Organization

Monumental-
**ecurity STORAGE CO.**

3006 Druid Park Drive, Baltimore, Md. 21215
Phone 664-1664

Salisbury, Md. Office & Warehouse: 815 Benny St.
Phone: PI 9-7117

Serving Maryland and the Nation Since 1879

\$\$\$

\$\$\$

\$\$\$

\$\$\$



NOW OFFERING HIGH-DIVIDEND SAVINGS CERTIFICATES

in denominations of \$12,000 and up, earning the maximum rate permitted by the Federal Home Loan Bank

and

\$3,000 minimum, upward, certificates, also earning a very high rate. (Additions may be made in multiples of \$1,000.)

FOR A LIMITED TIME ONLY

The more flexible Fraternity Federal Savings passbook accounts earn a generous return also, including that EXTRA 1/4% per annum.

For full particulars, call LE. 9-1313 or HO. 5-5445

FRATERNITY FEDERAL *Savings*

AND LOAN ASSOCIATION

Main Office:

764-770
Washington Blvd.
Balto., Md. 21203

Branch:

Normandy Shopping Ctr.
Route 40 West
Ellicott City, Md.



INSURED to \$15,000 by the
Federal Savings and Loan
Insurance Corp., GOV'T. Agency

- ★ *Postage-FREE SAVE-by-MAIL Service—
CERTIFICATES may be purchased by mail.*
- ★ *DRIVE-UP Windows at main office—At-the-door
PARKING LOTS at both offices*
- ★ *Economical SAFE DEPOSIT BOXES at both offices*

AN IDEAL GIFT TO ALUMNI

A History of the University of Maryland

By GEORGE H. CALLCOTT

Associate Professor of History at the University

THE FIRST full history of the University since 1907.

Based on complete access to all University records but not subjected to "censorship" or official "approval." 407 pp. plus index and 16 pp. illustrations.

THE AUTHOR NARRATES:

the stories of some of the first and finest of American professional schools—Medicine, Law, Divinity, Pharmacy, Dentistry and Nursing;

the development of the institution at College Park from a college for the sons of aristocratic planters, through the impact of the Civil War and industrialization, to new ideals of democracy, public service and excellence;

the evolution of student life—from serious scholars hiding from hostile mobs, to second-hand Confederate uniforms, to raccoon coats, big-time football and today's post-Berkeley mood;

the spectacular and controversial age of "Curley" Byrd;

the present drive for quality in the midst of quantity.

\$7.50 plus tax and postage

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

201 W. Monument St. • Baltimore, Md. 21201

Library Closing

Because construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial addition to the headquarters of the Society is behind schedule, library service will continue to be curtailed. Scholars faced with publication deadlines will be assisted to the fullest extent possible considering that the staff is engaged in inventorying the book collection and reorganizing the manuscript collection.

BENEFACTORS AND CONTRIBUTORS TO THE FUNDS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE YEAR 1966

Anonymous—For conservation of the Latrobe Papers	\$ 10,000.00
Francis F. and Rosamond Beirne—For undesignated library fund	25.00
Mr. and Mrs. Marion V. Brewington—Restricted for display cases for Maritime Collection	1,000.00
Frederick W. Brune—For undesignated library fund	1,500.00
Charles P. Crane—For undesignated library fund	250.00
Jacob and Annita France Foundation—Unrestricted	2,500.00
Kent Roberts Greenfield—Unrestricted	25.00
Sarah Lilian Greif—Restricted for purchase of costume display case	1,932.65
Historical Society of Harford County—Restricted for arrangement of Harford County historical papers	100.00
Norris and Winifred Harris—Contribution toward portrait of the late James W. Foster	100.00
C. A. Porter Hopkins—For undesignated library fund	100.00
Samuel Hopkins—For undesignated library fund	35.00
H. H. Walker Lewis—Unrestricted gift	100.00
Middendorf Foundation—Unrestricted gift	2,500.00
National Society Daughters and Founders of Patriots—Restricted for restoration of Key Papers	50.00
John M. Nelson, Jr., Foundation—Unrestricted	200.00
John Gilman D'Arcy Paul—Restricted for arrangement of Harford County historical papers	100.00
Mary Robertson—Restricted for restoration of Clement Hill Papers	50.00
Karl Singewald—Unrestricted bequest (Endowment Fund)	1,000.00
A. Russell Slagle—Unrestricted gift	200.00
Society of the Cincinnati in Maryland—Unrestricted gift	200.00
Julia E. Spilcker—Unrestricted bequest (Endowment Fund)	3,588.03
Donald Stewart—Restricted for new stand of colors for "The Star-Spangled Banner" niche	113.25
Dr. Jerome P. Webster—Unrestricted gift in memory of Mrs. Jerome P. Webster	100.00
John Campbell White—Restricted for library	1,000.00
Woman's Eastern Shore Society of Baltimore—Unrestricted gift	100.00

For the gift of objects, books and papers, far too numerous to list here, which have been received in the century and more since it was founded, the Society records this expression of its lasting gratitude. These contributions from countless members and friends have made the Society a major storehouse of state and national treasures.

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES OF THE
MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

elected at the Annual Meeting, February 13, 1967

President

COL. WILLIAM BAXTER

Chairman of the Council

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

Vice-Presidents

J. GILMAN D'ARCY PAUL
BRYDEN BORDLEY HYDE
ABBOTT L. PENNIMAN, JR.

Corresponding Secretary

WILLIAM B. MARYE

Recording Secretary

H. H. WALKER LEWIS

Treasurer

SAMUEL HOPKINS

Trustees of the Athenaeum

CHARLES L. MARBURG, *Chairman*

HOWARD BAETJER
HUGO DALSHHEIMER

EDGAR W. GARBISCH
A. A. HOUGHTON, JR.

LUCIUS R. WHITE, JR.,

Committee on the Gallery

FRANCIS H. JENCKS, *Chairman*

MRS. MICHAEL A. ABRAMS
J. R. HERBERT BOONE
WILLIAM V. ELDER, III
MRS. HAROLD DUANE JACOBS

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

MRS. GEORGE WEEMS WILLIAMS

Committee on the Library

DR. HUNTINGTON WILLIAMS, *Chairman*

THOMAS F. CADWALADER
PAUL S. CLARKSON
CURTIS CARROLL DAVIS
HARRY S. DICKEY
ARTHUR J. GUTMAN

EDWARD G. HOWARD
LESTER S. LEVY
THOMAS G. MACHEN
G. ROSS VEAZEY
JOHN CAMPBELL WHITE

Committee on Finance

ROBERT G. MERRICK, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN H. GRISWOLD, III
J. WILLIAM MIDDENDORF, JR.

JOHN E. MOTZ
THOMAS S. NICHOLS

TRUMAN T. SEMANS

Committee on Publications

CHARLES A. BARKER, *Chairman*

MISS RIKIDA M. DORSEY

AUBREY C. LAND

HAMILTON OWENS

Committee on Membership

CHARLES P. CRANE, *Chairman*

GEORGE W. CONSTABLE
JAMES W. McELROY

JOHN P. PACA, JR.
GEORGE M. RADCLIFFE

ROBERT LEE RANDOLPH

Committee on Addresses

HOWARD BAETJER, II, *Chairman*

RICHARD F. CLEVELAND

PLEASANTON L. CONQUEST, III

ROBERT L. WEINBERG

Committee on War Records

J. RIEMAN McINTOSH, *Chairman*

GARY BLACK

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM C. PURNELL

ROGER BROOKE HOPKINS

LT. GEN. MILTON A. RECKORD

Committee on Education

THOMAS G. PULLEN, JR., *Chairman*

HARRY BARD

THE RT. REV. NOBLE C. POWELL

FREDERICK W. BRUNE

A. RUSSELL SLAGLE

Committee on Relations with Other Societies

MRS. FRANCIS F. BEIRNE, *Chairman*

ROYDEN A. BLUNT

MRS. WILLIAM S. HILLES

ALEXANDER S. COCHRAN

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

Committee on the Maritime Collection

RICHARD H. RANDALL, SR., *Chairman*

MARION V. BREWINGTON

ROBERT E. MICHEL

S. VANNORT CHAPMAN

G. H. POWDER

CHARLES P. CRANE

J. DAWSON REEDER

R. HAMMOND GIBSON

CHARLES E. SCARLETT, JR.

WILLIAM E. HILL

JOSEPH L. STANTON

WILLIAM B. MATTHEWS, JR.

WILLIAM C. STEUART

AUGUST MENCKEN

FREDERICK L. WEHR

H. GRAHAM WOOD

The Building Committee

ABBOTT L. PENNIMAN, JR., *Chairman*

MARTIN E. BOESSEL, JR.

MRS. W. WALLACE SYMINGTON, JR.

J. GILMAN D'ARCY PAUL

LUCIUS R. WHITE, JR.

RICHARD STEPHENS

MRS. GEORGE WEEMS WILLIAMS

Women's Committee

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

MRS. WILLIAM G. BAKER

MISS LOUISA M. GARY

MRS. KENNETH A. BOURNE

MRS. W. T. DIXON GIBBS, JR.

MRS. WALTER B. BUCK

MISS JEAN H. GILMOR

MRS. RICHARD F. CLEVELAND

MRS. BRYDEN BORDLEY HYDE

MRS. EDWARD K. DUNN

MISS PECHIN INGLE

MRS. SWEPSON EARLE

MRS. NICHOLAS B. MERRYMAN OF J

MRS. J. WILLIAM MIDDENDORF, JR.
MRS. B. FRANK NEWCOMER
MRS. WILLIAM H. PITCHER
MRS. EDWIN C. POND
MRS. J. CREIGHTON RIEPE

MRS. RICHARD C. RIGGS
MRS. J. NICHOLAS SHRIVER, JR.
MRS. PAUL P. SWETT, JR.
MISS MARY GORDON THOM
MRS. CHARLES A. WEBB

MRS. GEORGE W. WILLIAMS

Special Projects Committee

C. A. PORTER HOPKINS, *Chairman*

THOMAS M. ANDERSON, JR.
HUGH BENET, JR.
WALTER W. BREWSTER
GEORGE D. HUBBARD
W. BOULTON KELLY, JR.

JOHN W. NOBLE, JR.
ORLANDO V. RIDOUT, IV
ARTHUR W. SHERWOOD
W. CAMERON SLACK
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

WILLIAM CUSHING WHITRIDGE

Seminar—Maryland History Committee

KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD, *Chairman*

MISS RHODA M. DORSEY
JACK PHILIP GREENE
C. A. PORTER HOPKINS

WILBUR H. HUNTER, JR.
AUBREY C. LAND
MORRIS L. RADOFF

HAROLD R. MANAKEE, *Director*

Honorary Members

THE EARL OF AVON

DR. LAWRENCE C. WROTH

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

Vol. 62, No. 1

March, 1967

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Political Parties in Revolutionary Maryland 1780-1787 <i>Jackson T. Main</i>	1
Public Education in Maryland in the Progressive Era <i>Raymond S. Sweeney</i>	28
The McNeill Rangers and the Capture of Generals Crook and Kelley <i>John W. Bailey, Jr.</i>	47
Portraits by Sir Joshua Reynolds Return to Tulip Hill <i>J. Rainey Kelly</i>	64
Sidelights	68
A Speculative Footnote to XYZ <i>Peter P. Hill</i>	
Reviews of Recent Books	73
Wright, ed. <i>The Prose Works of William Byrd of Westover</i> , by John Carter Matthews	
Nye, <i>Here Come The Rebels!</i> , by Richard R. Duncan	
Barnby, <i>The Prisoners of Algiers: An Account of the Forgotten American-Algerian War. 1785-1797</i> , by L. D. Geller	
Forman, <i>Early Nantucket and Its Whaling Houses</i> , by R. Ham- mond Gibson	
Lee, <i>The Lower Cape Fear in Colonial Days</i> , by William H. Wroten, Jr.	
Whitehill, Garrett and Garrett, <i>The Arts in Early American History: Needs and Opportunities for Study</i> , by Anna Wells Rutledge	
Hoggan, <i>The Myth of the 'New History': The Techniques and Tactics of the New Mythologists of American History</i> , by William H. Wroten, Jr.	
Brown, <i>Sword and Firearm Collection of The Society of the Cincinnati</i> , by Hugh Benet, Jr.	
<i>The Sounds of History, Record 3: 1789-1829, The Growing Years</i> , by Katharine L. Brown	
Notes and Queries	86
Contributors	88
Annual Report	89

*Annual Subscription to the Magazine, \$4.00. Each issue \$1.00. The Magazine
assumes no responsibility for statements or opinions expressed in its pages.*

Richard Walsh, *Editor*

Published quarterly by the Maryland Historical Society, 201 W. Monument Street,
Baltimore 1, Md. Second-Class postage paid at Baltimore, Md.

PUBLICATIONS



Studies in Maryland History

<i>His Lordship's Patronage: Offices of Profit in Colonial Maryland.</i> By Donnell M. Owings. 1953	\$ 6.00
<i>Baltimore as Seen by Visitors, 1783-1860.</i> By Raphael Semmes. Illustrated. 1953	\$ 4.00
<i>William Buckland, 1733-1774.</i> By Rosamond R. Beirne and John H. Scarff. 1958	\$ 7.50

Texts and References for School Use

<i>The War of 1812 On The Chesapeake Bay.</i> Illustrated paperback. By Gilbert Byron, 1964	\$ 2.00
<i>My Maryland.</i> By Kaessmann, Manakee and Wheeler. History of Maryland, Revised edition	\$ 4.50
<i>The Star-Spangled Banner.</i> Illustrated booklet. Description of the writing of our National Anthem by Francis Scott Key	\$.50
<i>Indians of Early Maryland.</i> By Harold R. Manakee. 1959	\$ 1.80
<i>Maryland in the Civil War.</i> By Harold R. Manakee. 1961	\$ 4.50
<i>Early Explorations of the Chesapeake Bay.</i> By Gilbert Byron, 1960	\$ 1.00
<i>Wheeler Leaflets on Maryland History.</i> (24 titles) each	\$.10

Miscellaneous

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

World War II

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

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

201 W. Mounment Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Postage and tax,
if applicable, extra.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

A Quarterly

Volume 62

MARCH, 1967

Number 1

POLITICAL PARTIES IN REVOLUTIONARY MARYLAND 1780-1787*

By JACKSON T. MAIN

A well-known revolutionary leader observed, "There is no government in which parties do not sometimes arise, and party as naturally creates factions, as summer produces heat, or winter cold."¹ James Madison in 1788? No, Samuel Chase in 1781. Obviously Chase was referring not to a present-day party, with its formal organization, but to a group of people taking sides. A party in this sense of the word—which is used here—was familiar to Maryland politicians. During the colonial period, the "court" or proprietary" party, with its stronghold on the eastern shore, had contended with the "country" or "popular" party. That align-

* A version of this paper was read by the author at the 1966 Meeting of the Southern Historical Association at Memphis, Tennessee.

¹ *The Maryland Gazette*, June 7, 1781.

ment, however, disappeared before 1776. By 1781, when Chase wrote, new parties had formed.

Parties were not mentioned in Maryland's constitution of 1776. Instead, its architects were concerned with the traditional theories concerning a balanced government. A Senate with high property qualifications protected the state's elite. Chase, who was one of the principal framers, was complimented by another founding father, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, for having "opposed popular prejudices" and possessing "courage enough to encounter, and defeat the opposition of those, who wished our constitution to be more democratical."² The democratic element was supplied by the House of Delegates. The property qualification of £500 current money of course eliminated most Marylanders, but it admitted anyone who owned, for example, a few hundred acres. Every county was allotted four delegates, while the towns of Annapolis and Baltimore chose two apiece.

During the years with which we are concerned the Delegates seem to have reflected public opinion reasonably well. They did not comprise a cross-section of the people, but most of the state's major economic and social groups were represented. A majority of Marylanders earned their living from agriculture, and so did about seventy percent of the delegates.³ These farmers can be divided into three groups. Not far from half were large landowners, with 1,000 acres or more. About a

² *Ibid.*, Aug. 23, 1781.

³ The following table omits those representatives who attended only briefly.

	number	% of known		number	% of known
merchants & traders	14	8	wealthy	37	23
lawyers	17	11	well-to-do	55	35
doctors	8	5	substantial	32	20
other non-farm	11	7	moderate	35	22
farmers & planters	109	69	unknown	3	
unknown	3				

Biographical data have been drawn from many sources. Eleanor Phillips Passano's invaluable *An Index of the Source Records of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1940) contained references to local histories and genealogies. There is an index to the *Maryland Historical Magazine* in the Maryland Historical Society, which also contains manuscript biographical material and important tax lists (Scharf papers). Many obscure men can be traced through probate records and other sources in the Hall of Records, Annapolis.

fourth were substantial farmers owning between 500 and 1,000 acres, and the rest were plain "yeoman" farmers with less than 500 acres. The delegates who were not primarily farmers may also be divided into three groups. One-third were engaged in trade, one-third were lawyers, and the other third were doctors, officials, millers, and miscellaneous enterprisers.

The state's various economic classes, except for the poor, were also present. Any dividing line between classes is artificial, but since some standard is needed for analysis, the legislators may be separated into four categories. Those with £5,000 worth of property are here considered wealthy. About one-fourth of the delegates qualify; these were the great planters or the most prosperous merchants and lawyers. A slightly larger proportion were well-to-do, owning estates of £2,000. Therefore about sixty percent of the delegates belonged to what may be called the upper class of Maryland, a class which comprised roughly ten percent of the white population. A third group of representatives, numbering about one-fifth of the total, may be called "substantial," with property worth £1,000—the requirement, incidentally, for a Senator. Finally another fifth of the delegates owned "moderate" estates of less than £1,000.⁴ Obviously the House was not a truly representative sample of the voters, to say nothing of the people, but the ideas of most white Marylanders, provided they had some property, found expression. Delegates came from every level of wealth above the lower strata, and from all of the principal occupations. If parties grow out of such economic differences they had fertile ground in the Maryland House of Delegates.

How can these parties—these groups of men taking sides—be discovered, defined, and described? Did they, indeed, exist at all? Letters and controversial pieces in the newspapers identify a few issues and reveal the names of a few major protagonists together with the arguments with which they justified their positions; but we learn little concerning the attitudes of the great majority of delegates or of the reasons why they

⁴ A wealthy planter, according to the definition in the text, would characteristically own about 2,000 acres and 50 slaves. The well-to-do individual would own about 1,000 acres and a score of slaves. For discussion of these categories see Jackson Turner Main, *The Social Structure of Revolutionary America* (Princeton, 1965).

acted as they did. Fortunately, Maryland's House had traditionally called and recorded the votes on most important questions, and each session produced anywhere from a couple of dozen to over fifty close divisions of the House. About three hundred and fifty such votes are available to us, furnishing ample materials for a study of political alignments.⁵ The first step, then, in any analysis of Maryland's political parties, is to determine whether the delegates voted at random, or whether there were persistent divisions within the legislature. If the former was true, then of course we must acknowledge that parties or factions did not exist, that politics was atomized and can be understood only through study of the individuals who comprised the political world. If however we do find consistent patterns in voting behavior, if we discover delegates voting together year after year, if we have such parties at Chase referred to, then we must seek the reasons for their existence.

The procedure, in the present case, was quite simple. Every roll call vote was recorded except when there was only a small minority (for we were interested in issues upon which there was conflict, not harmony). Then for each session the presence of a pattern was tested. And patterns did emerge.⁶ During the session of 1784/85 all but three of the thirty-six roll call votes correlated highly with one another. That session may serve as the extreme example of an alignment, the existence of which is apparent year after year.

The votes show that the legislature of 1784/85 contained two major sides, or parties: let us call them A and B. Side A consisted of 22 individuals, side B of 28, while 12 men were neutral, and half-a-dozen cast too few votes for classification. Two members of side B cast each of their thirty-three votes in a way typical of their group, while two members of the opposite side cast thirty of their thirty-one with the same consistency. As a rule the delegates did not follow quite so strictly

⁵ The journals of the legislature were published, and are available either on microcard as part of the "Early American Imprints" series (see listings in Charles Evans' *American Bibliography*) or on microfilm through the Library of Congress's "early state records" project.

⁶ The following pages duplicate, first, one of the four sheets on which were recorded the votes taken during the 1784/5 session (compare the record of James Steel of Dorchester with that of Archibald Job just below), and second a preliminary analysis of one party's votes.

their "party lines," but voted by some such margin as 19-4 or 22-8 in favor of the positions taken by their side. Those who did not support one or the other party by a margin of at least two to one are considered neutral. When we eliminate these, the remaining members voted with a consistency of about six to one—a display of regularity which would do credit to a modern-day legislature with its formal party organizations.⁷

The same kind of alignment persisted year after year. There were always two major groups, and often the same men composed them. During the entire period about 62 percent of the votes were significant in revealing these divisions. Of all the delegates for the whole period 52 men belonged to group A, 70 to group B, and 40 were neutral. For example David M'Mechen of Baltimore city and Lawrence O'Neale of Montgomery County served throughout the period beginning in 1780. They voted on the same side 49 times and on opposite sides 233 times. So also Nicholas Carroll and John Stevenson agreed 18 times and disagreed on 87 questions over a period of four years. On significant questions, the first pair divided 98 to 18 and the second, 66 to 12.⁸

Maryland's legislature, then, did indeed contain parties in Chase's sense.

What was the nature of this alignment? Three lines of investigation can be followed: we may examine the constituencies which the men represented, the characteristics of the delegates themselves, and the nature of the issues which divided them.

First, the men clearly voted according to their geographical origin. Representatives from the eastern shore voted on side

⁷ The regularity of voting behavior varied from session to session, being highest in 1784/85 and lowest the previous year, when only half of the votes showed a clear pattern. The definition of what constitutes a pattern is necessarily somewhat subjective, but in general if the difference between the two sides was on the order of about two to one the vote was considered significant. Usually the contrast was much sharper. During the whole session of 1780/81, 25 out of the 37 divisions of the house were significant, the B group, which consisted of 26 persons, casting 365 votes on their own side, 97 on the other, while group A (14 individuals) voted the other way, 244-57. Thus the ratio of regularity was about four to one. Naturally if all votes, whether significant or not, are included, the ratio was much less, standing at about three to one.

⁸ Before these figures were obtained, an effort was made to minimize the distortions caused by a series of votes on a single issue. In the 1785/86 legislature, for example, three votes were taken on December 31 concerning a petition by A. C. Hanson. The A group almost unanimously opposed Hanson's request, while the B group supported him. These three votes were counted as one.

B by a margin of about four to one. Joining them were delegates from the lower Chesapeake and Potomac River areas and from the two towns. In contrast, men from counties of the northern Chesapeake, the upper Potomac, and in general the "west" voted overwhelmingly with side A (see map).⁹ Counties which lay on the border between these two major areas were divided politically. The southeastern counties had been settled first, formed the heart of the old plantation country, and still contained most of Maryland's slaves. All depended immediately upon tobacco exports, and their close connection with commerce is also indicated by their political alliance with Baltimore and Annapolis. Although most of the eligible voters in these counties must have been farmers of modest property, the influence of the long-established planter class remained great, while men in trade and the professions were important economically and socially. In contrast the counties of the northern Chesapeake and upper Potomac were newer, contained less wealth, and had fewer slaves and a more equal distribution of property. They contained fewer towns, and were based economically upon a diversified agriculture. Clearly these regional variations helped to polarize the delegates.

A second method of studying Maryland's parties is to determine whether the delegates composing the two sides differed in their economic, social, cultural, or other characteristics. And indeed major contrasts appear, especially in the occupations and wealth of the protagonists (see Table I).

Among the 162 men whose votes are here discussed, not over three-tenths had an occupation other than farming. This minority, however, greatly increased its political influence because it was concentrated almost exclusively in party B. Among the thirty-eight merchants, lawyers, and doctors who voted during those years, only three supported party A. On the other

⁹ Counties here designated as "eastern shore" included Kent, Queen Anne's, Caroline, Talbot, Dorchester, Somerset, and Worcester. The lower or southern Chesapeake and Potomac River counties were Calvert, St. Mary's, and Charles. Counties of the northern Chesapeake were Cecil, Harford, Baltimore, and Anne Arundel, while those comprising the "west" were Prince George's, Montgomery, Frederick, and Washington. Prince George's county of course might be considered part of the lower Potomac area, and it was in fact transitional politically, voting equally on both sides, so that it could be indifferently assigned to either. The same is true of Kent and Queen Anne's counties.

Table I
Geographical and Economic Composition of the Parties*

	Type B				neutrals %				Type A					
	most con- sistent	%	next most con- sistent	%	others	%	others	%	next most con- sistent	%	most con- sistent	%		
merchants	1	8	5	22	3	9	2	5	1	4	0	0	1	8
lawyers	5	38	5	22	4	12	2	5	1	4	0	0	0	0
doctors	0	0	3	13	4	12	1	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0
other non-farm	1	8	2	9	2	6	4	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	1	7	1	8
large landowners	3	23	4	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	34 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	32	10	43 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	43	1	8
large farmers	2	15	3	13	4	12	8	21	5	22	3	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	23
farmers	1	8	1	4	5	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	24	6	26	4	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	54
unknown	0		0		0		2		0		1		1	
wealthy	5	33	7	30	6	18	9	23	5	22	4	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	7
well-to-do	6	50	11	48	14	41	10	25 $\frac{1}{2}$	8	35	4	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	14
substantial	1	17	4	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	8	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	17	2	15	4	29
moderate	0	0	1	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	31	6	26	4	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	50
unknown	1		0		0		1		0		1		0	
eastern shore	7	54	11	48	16	47	15	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	13	0	0
southern Ches. & Potomac	2	15	7	30	10	29	7	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	13	1	7	0	0
the towns	2	15	2	9	2	6	1	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	0	0	0
northern Ches.	1	8	0	0	2	6	7	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	47	6	43
western	1	8	3	13	4	12	10	25	6	26	5	33	8	57

* Percentages are of those known, and are rounded.

hand thirty belonged to side B; indeed they constituted half of its adherents including many of those who voted most consistently.

In contrast, party A was made up almost entirely of farmers. The yeomen and lesser planters in particular preferred that side by a margin of nearly two to one, furnishing over half of its membership. The great landowners, however, were distributed equally between the two parties. Perhaps some were led toward side A because they shared its agrarian bias, while others thought of themselves as entrepreneurs, whose interests linked them with the merchants and professional men of group B.

The explanation for this difference in occupation might seem at first sight to lie in the sectional nature of the two parties. Since the stronghold of the A group was more purely rural while that of party B was more commercial in nature, the former might be expected to limit its choice to farmers while the latter would logically select some business and professional men. But in that case, type B delegates elected in counties which normally chose men of type A ought to have been farmers like the members of group A. Instead, out of eleven such men two or perhaps three were merchants, three were lawyers, and two were doctors. Similarly, type A delegates chosen from counties which generally supported side B were not business and professional men, but farmers with one exception. The evidence therefore is conclusive that group A was distinctively agricultural whereas party B was strongly influenced by business and professional men.

The contrast by economic class is statistically less significant than that by occupation and may be due less to differences in wealth as such than to the fact that farming was less profitable than trade or the law. Still, the tendency of small farmers to support party A whereas large landowners were divided suggests that class did have some influence. Nearly twice as many wealthy men belonged to group B as to group A, although the former, being larger, contained only a slightly larger percentage. Delegates who were well-to-do supported side B by a margin of more than two to one. Those with substantial properties were equally divided, but among the men worth less than £1,000, the overwhelming majority adhered

to party A. These last two groups, the smaller property owners among the delegates, made up more than half the membership of party A whereas they furnished about three-tenths that of type B. Therefore the less wealth a delegate had, the greater the probability of finding him voting on side A.¹⁰

These characteristics assumed their extreme form at opposite ends of the political spectrum. The most consistent members of the two groups revealed most decisively the essence of their types. On side B a baker's dozen averaged 66 votes for and 9 against the positions taken by their group, while fourteen delegates supported party A by an average of 63 to 6. Although one leading member of side A was a wealthy iron manufacturer and great planter, and a reliable adherent of side B was nothing more than a substantial farmer, these men taken as a whole were the two types incarnate. All fourteen leaders of group A came from the northern Chesapeake and upper Potomac; only one leader of group B did so. The latter included five men of wealth, six who were well-to-do, and none of moderate property, whereas the A group contained only one man who was rich and two who were well-to-do, but there were six with moderate estates. No small farmer was among the thirteen most consistent members of party B, but the A archetypes included at least six; while on the other hand six or seven of the B group had a non-farm occupation whereas all but two or three of the A group depended upon agriculture. Thus these men, more than one-fifth of the whole number, vividly display the qualities of their kind.¹¹

Besides differences based on section, occupation, and wealth, a few other attributes of the delegates are evident. Members of Maryland's prominent old families were inclined to support group B. On the other hand men new to the state, or of unknown parentage, tended toward group A. Self-made men,

¹⁰ Party affiliation of delegates, by economic rank:

	<i>% supporting B</i>	<i>% neutral</i>	<i>% supporting A</i>
wealthy	48.7	24.3	27.1
well-to-do	56.4	18.2	25.4
substantial	43.7	25.0	31.3
moderate	17.1	34.3	48.6

¹¹ The same sharp contrast could be extended through an even greater number of men, who supported their type by a majority of four to one.

who rose from humble backgrounds to affluence, almost always voted on side B, but since most of the wealthy men were on that side the point may be inconsequential. Delegates of wider experience preferred party B. College men, and men who seem to have intellectual interests usually favored that side, as did representatives who had fought in the continental army, or who had held federal offices. On the other hand militia officers and soldiers divided equally. Delegates of type A often held local offices but seldom state or federal posts, and in general their experience seldom extended beyond the state's borders. Finally, those who voted with side A almost always became Antifederalists whereas members of group B almost always favored ratification of the federal constitution in 1788, Samuel Chase being one of the rare exceptions. Among the archetypes on either extreme, six of the A group became Antifederal, two Federal, while of the B group seven became Federal and one Antifederal.¹² Thus geographic origin, occupation, economic status, previous experience, and political conviction appear to be among the fundamental factors which distinguished the two parties.

A third method of analyzing the nature of the alignment is through a study of the issues which divided the delegates, especially by focusing upon those votes which found the two groups most nearly unanimous. There were 130 test votes which particularly demonstrate the solidarity of type A delegates.¹³ Few of these concerned such social and cultural matters as slavery, religion, or education. Questions of that sort did arise, but not often, and the division upon them usually followed no pattern at all or one which differed from the dominant alignment. Rather, the significant votes were economic and political. Most important were those concerned with monetary policy, including the getting and spending of money, prices, and the currency supply.

¹² Put differently, among the delegates who became Antifederalists, 82% were on side A, 18% were on side B, and none were neutral; while of those who favored ratification 54% belonged to type B, 27% to the neutral group, and 19% to type A.

¹³ The term "votes" here must be understood to include groups of votes. Delegates of party A were unanimous on 24 votes and on 38 only one man voted in opposition.

The largest number of motions which polarized the delegates dealt with government spending. Type A representatives were determined to limit expenditures. Perhaps because they or their constituents saw less hard cash than did their opponents, they tried to reduce the fees collected by certain officials and the salaries paid to the Governor, the Judges, the Chancellor, clerks of the legislature, the Intendant, and the members of Congress, among others,¹⁴ although they were not reluctant to grant money to themselves.¹⁵ On one occasion they voted against the entire civil list.¹⁶ At various times they refused to allow the Governor money for moving expenses and furnishing a house,¹⁷ rejected a special grant to an army doctor for services rendered,¹⁸ denied a plea by residents of Baltimore that they be reimbursed for quartering troops,¹⁹ and vetoed appropriations for a road connecting Baltimore with the Susquehanna and for a lighthouse.²⁰ They would not establish a permanent fund for the salaries of professors at Washington College.²¹ They thought A. C. Hanson asked too much when he requested £750 for collecting and digesting the laws of the state,²² and they denied a petition of some citizens that they be reimbursed for tobacco burned by the enemy.²³ Similarly they tried to limit the number of officeholders, especially disliking the office of Intendant.²⁴

Consistent with their frugality, members of A group tried to reduce taxes, or perhaps more accurately to shift the tax burden onto others.²⁵ They were especially anxious to minimize the tax on land and agricultural products, or on commonly

¹⁴ May 3, Dec. 19, 1780, Jan. 29, 1781, Jan. 20, 22, Nov. 12, 13, 20, 1782, Nov. 21, Dec. 23, 25, 1783, Dec. 2, 1784, Jan. 6, 7, Nov. 28, Dec. 9, 1785, Jan. 23, Feb. 21, 1786, Jan. 9, 10, May 23, 26, Nov. 28, Dec. 5, 1787.

¹⁵ For example, June 7, 1782.

¹⁶ Jan. 22, 1782.

¹⁷ Nov. 27, 1783.

¹⁸ Jan. 14, 1785.

¹⁹ Dec. 5, 1786.

²⁰ Jan. 18, Nov. 30, 1785.

²¹ Nov. 30, Dec. 3, 1784.

²² Dec. 31, 1785.

²³ June 4, 1782. See also Jan. 17, Dec. 13, 1787.

²⁴ Jan. 17, 22, May 30, 1782, Jan. 30, Nov. 30, 1783.

²⁵ April 25, 1780, Dec. 20, 1781, Nov. 21, 1782, Jan. 6, 1785. But see an exception, March 1, 1786.

used articles such as salt,²⁶ while perfectly willing to assess stock in trade or commerce.²⁷ They supported high prices for farm products except for tobacco.²⁸

Monetary policy has a dull sound, but some of the most exciting battles of the period were fought over it. Maryland, like other states, was confronted with a surplus of paper money during the war and then a serious shortage after the peace. The type A delegates preferred to maintain a large supply of paper currency which would be legal tender, and which creditors could be compelled to accept.²⁹ They also demonstrated a pro-debtor bias in favoring passage of a bill making possible the payment of debts by installments.³⁰ They were anti-speculator, and unsympathetic with the owners of the state's public securities. For example they twice voted against accepting bills of credit at par with specie in payment for confiscated British property.³¹ On other occasions, they tried to defeat a motion that men owing money to the state could pay in paper,³² and they succeeded in blocking a bill to protect the rights of the state's creditors.³³

Other attitudes of the type A group are similarly revealed by occasional test votes. An anti-urban bias is sometimes perceptible, especially in matters of taxation and expenditure.³⁴ These delegates were unsympathetic with nonjurors (those who refused to take an oath of allegiance),³⁵ and were unfriendly to Loyalists.³⁶ A certain narrowness of view is suggested by

²⁶ See the attempt to have land assessed at a low rate, Dec. 3, 1783, and Jan. 5, 1785; to eliminate a duty on home-made spirits distilled from fruit, April 26, 1780; and to strike out import duties on salt, flour, wheat, and tobacco, Jan. 12-13, 1785, May 26, 1787.

²⁷ Dec. 23, 1782. Their attitude toward import and export duties seems to have depended upon what was being taxed. They approved of a general 5% impost (Dec. 22, 1782), but later when they failed to eliminate the tariff on certain articles they voted against a similar law (Jan. 22, 1785). They voted against a duty on tobacco exported (May 7, 1787). They tried to prevent an import duty on bar iron but did not oppose the final bill (Jan. 8, 1787).

²⁸ Dec. 20, 1780, Jan. 8, 29, 1781, Dec. 18, 1782.

²⁹ May 4, Nov. 30, 1780, Dec. 10, 1785, Dec. 12, 15, 1786.

³⁰ May 15-22, 1787.

³¹ Dec. 4, 1781, Dec. 25, 1783.

³² May 24, 1787.

³³ Dec. 14, 1787. On another important issue, they voted against a committee report which favored the holders of continental bills and which called for taxes to pay the public debt. April 25, 1780.

³⁴ For example, Jan. 7, 1781.

³⁵ May 3, 1780.

³⁶ Dec. 6, 1781, Nov. 27, 1783.

their defeat of a strong measure, during the dark spring of 1780, which would have given the Governor and Council power to raise and supply troops, and by their refusal in 1782 to allow the state's militia to be out of the state for as long as three months.³⁷ No doubt the soldiers approved of this, as they surely did of group A's support of a measure reducing the price of vacant land, if bought by soldiers, to $3/2$ per acre.³⁸

Few crucial votes on continental matters were taken, but these few show that type A representatives were less inclined than their opponents to support Congress financially or to grant Congress power.³⁹ In the spring of 1787 they voted 16-1 to postpone naming delegates to the Federal Convention until their constituents had been consulted, and the next fall they voted to postpone until April the election of delegates to a ratifying convention.⁴⁰ As already remarked, most of these men whose opinions are known became Antifederal in 1787 as did three of their strongholds among the counties (Harford, Baltimore, and Anne Arundel). Later the Republicans were to draw strength from some of the same men and counties.⁴¹

The adherents of party B supported with the greatest unanimity the opposite policies. They almost always voted in favor of whatever appropriation was being debated, pressing for higher salaries, fees, and per diem allowances.⁴² They were willing to spend money for the Governor's house, for roads, for A. C. Hanson and his digest of laws, and for the support of officials generally. They unanimously rejected an attempt to tax office holders.⁴³ Ordinarily they were intent upon in-

³⁷ May 3, 1780, Jan. 4, 1782.

³⁸ Jan. 7, 1782.

³⁹ April 25, 1780, March 2, 1786.

⁴⁰ Jan. 15, Nov. 26, 1787.

⁴¹ A few other questions which caused the group A men to coalesce may be noted. They refused to exempt the Governor and other officials from military duty (Dec. 4, 23, 1782). They unanimously opposed an effort to revise the constitution so as to modify a loyalty oath (May 27, 1783). They voted three times against financial support to Washington College on the eastern shore (Nov. 30, Dec. 3, 30, 1784), and a bill encouraging a college on the western shore met with no greater success (Nov. 18, 22, 1785). Newspapers contained some attacks on the colleges as aristocratic institutions, and in fact party A favored 19-3 a bill to establish the University of Maryland instead of the colleges (Dec. 10, 1785).

⁴² In addition to the votes cited above, see May 3, 1780, Jan. 20, 1782, Nov. 21, 1783, Jan. 5, 1785, May 26, 1786.

⁴³ Dec. 21, 1781.

creasing taxes to meet the high cost of government, including payment of the public debt.⁴⁴ They defended payment of taxes in specie and pressed for prompt collections, voting a penalty on collectors who refused to act.⁴⁵ On the other hand the non-farm origin of many may have influenced their almost unanimous rejection of a tax on artisans' tools.⁴⁶ They also successfully pushed through an act to encourage the manufacture of nails, which their adversaries tried to prevent.⁴⁷ The presence of more slaves in their stronghold is shown by their attempt to lower the assessed valuation of slaves for tax purposes.⁴⁸ They were somewhat more favorably disposed toward speculators, permitting them to use state paper money for taxes and public debts,⁴⁹ and they were more friendly toward non-jurors.⁵⁰

On one important issue the delegates of group B acted with more unity than those of group A. This was a much-disputed bill for a general tax to support the Christian religion, which was debated during the 1784/85 session and was supported by a large majority of the type B delegates.⁵¹ Party A might have been defending the taxpayers, or perhaps the dissenting sects were stronger in the counties dominated by group A whereas the stronghold of group B was heavily Anglican. The religious affiliations of the delegates themselves did not differ significantly.

On another equally important issue the B group was divided whereas the A group was more nearly united. This was the paper money controversy, which reached an acute state in

⁴⁴ As above, and see Dec. 23, 1783, Jan. 15, 1785. They voted for duties on home-made spirits, salt, tobacco, and iron, for higher taxes on land, for an export tax on vessels and a tax on interest bearing bonds, but opposed one on trade. Feb. 4, 1786, Dec. 24, 1782.

⁴⁵ Dec. 12, 1782. The A group opposed this, 5-10.

⁴⁶ Dec. 9, 1782.

⁴⁷ Dec. 23, 1787.

⁴⁸ Feb. 3, 1786.

⁴⁹ March 2, 1786, May 24, 1787.

⁵⁰ May 3, 1780, Jan. 15, 1785. On such issues as the college question and the revision of the constitution they adopted the converse of the position taken by group A.

⁵¹ Jan. 8-14, 1785. When considerable opposition appeared to the tax—for the A group voted against it by a three-to-one margin—an address was circulated among the people. This step was approved by group B, 16-2, and opposed by group A, 6-11. In the next session the two parties continued to disagree.

1785-86. Paper money was favored by most of the type A delegates, and they were joined by about a third of the type B representatives, notably Samuel Chase. Chase was ordinarily, like Carroll in the Senate, a steady and influential member of party B. On this issue, however, he broke with his party, as he was presently to do on the federal constitution. The defection of men such as Chase made possible the victory of the paper money forces.⁵²

The information conveyed by these votes confirms and extends what has already been discovered about the party alignment. Economic issues in particular seem to have been important. One side clearly adopted an agrarian policy and tended to be somewhat local in its interests; the other favored the

⁵² Several votes on the paper money question were taken. On Dec. 13, 1785, the house defeated an attempt to postpone the measure, and on Dec. 22 the act passed. The next year another bill was introduced and again two votes were recorded, consisting first of an effort to limit the amount which would be issued and finally on the bill's passage. The alignment of the two parties on these votes was as follows, the consistent pro-paper money pattern being against—for—against—for:

	<i>A group</i>		<i>B group</i>		<i>neutrals</i>	
	<i>for</i>	<i>against</i>	<i>for</i>	<i>against</i>	<i>for</i>	<i>against</i>
to postpone	3	17	14	7	4	7
passage	16	5	8	14	11	1
restriction	3	14	18	6	4	8
passage	17	0	8	16	7	5

Obviously group A was the pro-paper money group but B, though anti-paper by a margin of about two to one, was more evenly divided. The explanation lies in the defection of men such as Chase. Chase's political career is a curious one, for he shifts—depending upon one's definition of terms—from radical in pre-war days to conservative during the period after 1776 to Antifederalist in 1787-88 to Federalist ever after. Chase's record as a strong party B man (150-30) makes clear that his shift on the paper money and ratification issues were aberrations, and his later Federalism was a reversion to type. Chase was joined by a number of other delegates six of whom, in fact, were among the otherwise more consistent leaders. Chase and David McMechen—another city lawyer and future Antifederalist—excepted, these defectors were farmers rather than townsmen, well-to-do rather than wealthy, from the eastern shore, who on this issue joined the agrarian party to which they were closely related by economic interest. At least four of these men had bought confiscated property. On the other side the major defectors from group A were two wealthy great planters from Anne Arundel county. In a way the history of this controversy is as informative about the nature of political alignments as is the analysis of other votes upon which the party differences were more perfect.

business and professional men and the larger property holders, and took a broader view.⁵³

The conclusions to be derived from this material apply, immediately, to the particular history of Maryland and also, by implication, to the history of the period as a whole. On the particular level we perceive, first, that the roughly 18,000 individual votes which we are considering, make a pattern. This fact is of basic importance, for if the delegates simply voted at random, individually, as mavericks, then no general explanation of political behavior could be sought, and our attention would be restricted to the motives of each considered separately—to Chase and Carroll. Next, this pattern consists not of a large number of separate parts, but of two: the members of the House formed not a series of factions each of which had its peculiar qualities, but two big parties. Indeed, three-fourths of the delegates can be assigned clearly and positively to one side or the other. Moreover this pattern is valid for most of the votes, not just a few—specifically for five out of eight. And even more; identification within these groups was not occasional or sporadic but frequent and persistent, for the delegates who belonged to them voted about 80 percent of the time with their party, and this performance was repeated year after year. Such a clear and continuing pattern must be due to general principles of political behavior which are valid for most of the delegates most of the time. The pattern cannot be sought in the pressures arising from party organizations, for none existed. We must look beyond political institutions.

The search for principles has taken three forms, all of which have led to positive results and which confirm one another. First, the pattern is clearly sectional. One side, which has

⁵³ Certain other issues, important at the time or in retrospect, but which did not so clearly divide the two groups, deserve some comment. A bill repealing the act which had prohibited delegates to Congress engaging in trade was opposed by a majority of group A, favored by group B. Several bills friendly to debtors, which stirred up much debate, divided the representatives in no set fashion. A bill granting a theatrical company permission to perform in Annapolis passed with the support of most party B delegates over the opposition of party A. A motion rejecting petitions for the abolition of slavery was favored by both sides, the division following no evident pattern. A statement explicitly declaring the 1783 treaty with England to be the supreme law of the land, which in some other states served to intensify party divisions, did not do so in Maryland.

been denominated B, drew almost its entire strength from the eastern shore and the counties of the lower Chesapeake-Potomac. These were the oldest, most thickly settled parts of the state, were or had been the wealthiest, still contained practically all of the slaves, and were characterized by tobacco plantations. The representatives of Annapolis and Baltimore town strongly supported that party. Side A, in contrast, was based primarily on the counties of the northern Chesapeake Bay and the western part of the state. These sections were more recently settled, had accumulated less wealth and far fewer slaves, contained principally men engaged in diversified, often self-sufficient agriculture, and had fewer great plantations. Towns were rare, and when a townsman was chosen he was apt to vote with party B. The need for detailed research into local history is obvious, but we may postulate the existence of important social and economic contrasts, and at the same time we recall that this sectional antagonism had previously existed for many years and was to endure for many more.

When we turn from the delegates' constituencies to the men themselves, we find further reasons for our pattern. The most striking fact is that the overwhelming majority of type A delegates were farmers, most of whom owned less than 1,000 acres. In contrast half of their opponents, including most of the consistent leaders, were men in trade or the professions. The orientation of group A was entirely rural, that of B, partly urban. Indeed if the large landowners are viewed as basically entrepreneurs rather than farmers, party B was composed almost exclusively of business and professional men. In any case this orientation toward the wide world of commerce, on the one hand, and toward the more limited economy of agriculture, on the other, corresponds with the regional characteristics of the alignment. In the same way the greater wealth of side B is related both to the fact that the southeastern counties were richer than the relatively new section to the northwest, and to the higher incomes which merchants, lawyers, and great planters earned. Although both parties contained rich men, 70 percent of the type B delegates were at least well-to-do, whereas more than half of party A's members owned less property.

Other differences between the delegates may be related to these same geographical and economic contrasts. Side B contained most of the men of prominent old families of good education, and broad political, military, and intellectual experience: they were more apt to "think continentally." Few such supported party A. Its leaders were men of limited education whose experience was restricted and local.

A final type of evidence which indicates the nature of the alignment is drawn from the issues which created the parties. Most of the votes were on political or economic questions, and the position taken by the two groups shows a consistent attitude. The measures favored by group A reveal a familiar agrarian bias. Above all they tried to keep down expenses and to reduce taxes. They were unsympathetic with the needs of townsmen and the desires of speculators, but favored their own objectives such as higher prices for farm products and a good supply of paper money. They were willing to support Congress but opposed a strong central government. They were, obviously, potential Jeffersonians. The delegates of group B of course followed an opposite policy, oriented on the whole toward the needs of the business or commercial interests, and anticipating the Federalism of the next decade.⁵⁴

These conclusions have certain broader implications. They can be formulated into a set of general hypotheses which apply, of course, only to Maryland at that particular period, but may prove to have a wider significance. They are far from novel, but a restatement of them seems demanded by the evidence.

One: the legislators did not vote at random but in accordance with certain principles.

Two: upon economic and political issues, the legislators tended to vote according to their economic and political interests, or those of their constituents. They did not invariably do so. One-fourth of the delegates belonged to neither side, and

⁵⁴The counties which became Federalist strongholds in the 1790's (following Dauer's analysis) had produced 44 B delegates, 13 A delegates, while those which became Republican centers had chosen A representatives by a margin of 25-9. Divided counties had been divided earlier. The only reversal of importance occurred in the upper Potomac counties which belonged to group A (13 to 4, with 8 neutral) but leaned toward Federalism later.



Party Voting in Maryland
1780-1787

few delegates were entirely consistent, so that factors such as ideology or personal influences played an important role.

Three: therefore even in the absence of formal party organizations, the legislators formed parties, or sides. Which is to say, then, that in Maryland parties developed naturally and inevitably rather than adventitiously.

Finally, while the influence of personalities and ideology was important, the delegates acted within a larger and more decisive framework. The explanation of political alignments in Maryland is to be found primarily by analyzing the underlying economic and social environment, with particular attention to the needs and objectives of geographical areas, of classes, and of social and occupational groups. The clash of personalities—of Chase and Carroll—is fascinating; but let us not forget that Chase and Carroll were usually on the same side.

APPENDIX

THE LEADERS

The following twenty-seven men cast at least thirty votes, and supported their group by a margin of at least 6:1. Sources for the information are given only if they are not indicated in footnote 3.

TYPE B

Nicholas Carroll, nee Maccubin, of Anne Arundel (77-3) (1723-1783), of an old and fairly prominent family, related by marriage to Samuel Chase, was a merchant in Anne Arundel County who married the only daughter of Dr. Charles Carroll. She inherited her father's large property and her sons, Nicholas and James, inherited not only this estate but the fortune of her brother Charles Carroll, Barrister. Nicholas and James thereupon took the name Carroll in 1783. Nicholas (Maccubin) Carroll married Ann Jenings (daughter of Attorney General Thomas Jenings). He was an Annapolis lawyer, attended the Inns of Court, and was chosen Delegate for Anne Arundel County in 1780, 1783, and 1784. His voting record was the most consistent of any man on either side of the fence. He voted for ratification in 1788.

Peter Chaille, of Worcester (53-5), of a prominent French Huguenot family, fled to England in 1691. His sons Peter and Moses

immigrated to Maryland in 1710 and became substantial landowners. The third Peter (1725-1802) held over a thousand acres, twenty slaves, and fifty cattle in 1783, his taxable property being assessed at £2,221. He was, therefore, a typical well-to-do planter of the eastern shore. He was active locally in the revolutionary movement, sat in the state's constitutional convention, acquired the title of Colonel, served in the House during 1784-1786, and voted for ratification in 1788.

Alexander Frazier, of Calvert (43-7). Frazier was a large farmer whose property of 740 acres and 18 slaves in 1786 may just qualify him for the adjective well-to-do. Nothing is known of him beyond his public record. Perhaps he was the son of Dr. Alexander Frazier, of Annapolis, who died before 1746, or of the Reverend Alexander Frazier, who died in 1760. He himself is not listed in the 1790 census.

John Gale, of Somerset (45-7). Gale sat in the legislature continuously beginning in 1784. He is not listed in the census of 1790 and the Somerset tax records have disappeared, so we know little about his economic status or indeed about anything else. Evidently he was a grandson of John Gale who died in 1775, leaving his namesake several hundred acres. He served as Captain in the continental army, joining the Society of Cincinnati. Later he became a Major, and in 1784 was building two ships, which perhaps qualifies him as a shipbuilder rather than a farmer. He voted for the ratification in 1788.

William Hindman, of Talbot (76-9). Hindman's father Jacob was a prominent planter who held over 1,000 acres. William graduated from the College of Philadelphia and studied law in London. He was active in the early revolutionary movement, became Treasurer of the Eastern Shore, and served in Congress, both under the Articles and the Constitution. He strongly favored ratification in 1788 and supported the Federalists later. By 1790 he had acquired 61 slaves.

Thomas Johnson, of Frederick (55-3). Johnson was a poor orphan whose father had been a farmer. He studied law, married a daughter of Thomas Jenings, and became exceedingly prominent long before independence, serving as a leader of the country party. In 1779 he was elected Governor, and later he was to become a judge of the United States Supreme Court. He favored ratification in 1788, though by 1796 he was supporting Jefferson. He has been described as a philosopher, but his philosophical inclinations did not prevent him from acquiring a fortune.

Philip Key, of St. Mary's (63-10). The founder of the Key family was Philip, an English lawyer who immigrated in 1720, accumulated a very large estate, and was elevated to the Council. Councillor Philip's son Dr. John, who was trained in Edinburgh, died when the young Philip was five. The latter was educated in England and practiced law, serving in the House of Delegates in 1773 and on local radical committees. He married a daughter of the Virginia leader Col. Richard Bland. Although he belonged to the colony's elite he seems to have been well-to-do rather than wealthy, owning 1948 acres and 25 slaves in 1783. He was acting as a factor in 1785 (*Md. Gazette*, May 12, 1785). His son, Philip Barton Key, was a Federalist.

David McMechen, of Baltimore-town (125-24). Captain William McMechen immigrated before the revolution with his children, one of whom was David. The father apparently went west to the Ohio River while the son remained behind to become a lawyer in Baltimore. He served on the local committee of observation in 1775 and in the House of Delegates every session during the 1780's. Eventually he acquired a large fortune but there is no indication of wealth during these earlier years. According to one source he was an Antifederalist in 1788. He has been confused with a David McMechen of Newark, Delaware. See Maria McMechen Buchanan Sullivan, "A Record of the Buchanan and related Families," typescript, Maryland Hist. Soc., pp. 88-89.

Allen Quynn, of Annapolis (172-31). Allen Quynn, like McMechen, was elected to the House every year during the 1780's, yet little is known about him. He reputedly was born in what was to become Washington county, in 1727. By 1765 he was a Coroner in Anne Arundel County, and later held other judicial offices. Above all he represented Annapolis in the legislature every year from 1778 until his death in 1803. He seems to have been a merchant; in any event he was certainly a satisfactory representative of the town.

James Steel, of Dorchester (44-7). Henry Steel of Cumberland, England, moved to Maryland with his tenants before 1750. He acquired a very large estate, including about 6500 acres, most of which he left to his eldest son James, who became one of the wealthiest men of the eastern shore. James seems to have been of no consequence, though he was chosen to the House in 1784, 1786, and 1787.

John Stewart, of Somerset (32-4). Stewart's ancestry is unknown.

One of the name was an innkeeper in Dorchester county in 1770, but there is no mention of him in Somerset sources. He was a Major of the militia in 1776 and became Colonel in 1781. By 1783 he had £1340 worth of taxable property including 31 slaves but only 150 acres, a ratio which suggests some occupation other than farming. He voted for ratification in the 1788 convention.

Francis Jenkins Henry, of Worcester (30-1). Robert Jenkins Henry, father of the delegate, was the son of a Presbyterian minister and a Councillor's daughter, who married exceedingly well, became a great landowner with property in three colonies, was chosen to the Council, and died in 1764. Francis Jenkins was also a wealthy planter with over 3,000 acres on the eastern shore. He owned 50 slaves in 1790. His political career was undistinguished.

Richard Waters, of Somerset (38-2). In 1722 a Richard Waters mentioned in his will three sons, William, Richard, and Littleton. He owned a sloop, some land, and property in England. Probably it was his sons Richard and William who owned 1810 and 790 acres respectively in 1774. Our Richard was presumably the son of one of these. He served as a Captain in the continental army, after which he retired to his 276 acres. The farm was small but valuable, with a good brick house on it, and he owned twenty-two slaves, his taxable property totalling £1600. Later he was to achieve the rank of Colonel and serve as Quartermaster-general for the state in 1814.

TYPE A.

James Bond, of Harford (47-9). The Bond family is a large one and there were four James Bonds living in Harford in 1790. One of these had eight slaves. One served as a Lieutenant in 1776. Clearly the delegate, whichever he was, was a small property owner too unimportant to earn special mention in the local histories.

Edward Burgess, of Montgomery (80-5). The Burgess ancestry was prominent and wealthy if one goes back far enough. Col. William Burgess was a member of the Virginia Council, and left several thousand acres. Capt. Edward Burgess eventually obtained most of this and also married well. He had two sons, Samuel and John, both of whom must have been wealthy. John had eight sons of whom Edward was sixth in line. As a result he was only a substantial farmer rather than a great landowner, owning in 1783 (evidently) about 700 acres and 15 slaves valued, all together, at £1484. Another Edward Burgess had a small farm. Burgess sat in

the house every year but one beginning in 1781 and was almost unbelievably consistent in his voting habits. He was otherwise undistinguished, unless it is a distinction to have been defeated as an Antifederalist candidate for the ratifying convention.

Edward Cockey, of Baltimore (33-1). Cockey belonged to a lesser branch of a large and distinguished family. His father, Capt. John, was a shopkeeper, tanner, and large landowner who left a personal estate of £3090 at his death in 1746. The property was divided among six sons, and either Edward received some of the poorer land or he was not a very good manager, for in 1783 he had only 200 acres and 4 slaves. The 1790 census lists him with six negroes. His local reputation must have been good, for he was a vestryman, Colonel of the militia, member of the House for several years, and a member of the 1788 convention, where he voted against the Constitution.

Benjamin Edwards, of Montgomery (48-7). Edwards was born in Virginia and moved across the Potomac to Georgetown, where he engaged in trade, acquiring £124 worth of land and seventeen slaves. He crossed party lines to vote for ratification in 1788, later served briefly in Congress, and ultimately moved to Kentucky where he died in 1829. He is classified here as possessing substantial means rather than as well-to-do, since men of large property usually acquired more real estate and left a deeper mark.

Charles Greenbury Griffith, of Montgomery (65-9). C. G. Griffith was, like Cockey, a member of a large family. The immigrant, William, arrived in 1675 (and incidentally married a daughter of John Maccubin, the great-grandfather of Nicholas Carroll) and had three sons. One of these was Orlando, who married an heiress and was able to furnish good estates to his five surviving sons, including Charles Greenbury. Either he, or someone of the same name had £2065 worth of taxable property in 1783, including about 900 acres, 38 slaves, and a grist mill. His career was undistinguished except that he sat for four years in the House, and he or a namesake served on the local committee of observation, held the title of Colonel, and was chosen to the vestry.

John Love, of Harford (71-9). Nothing is known of Love's background. During the revolutionary years he became a leader, attending the provincial Congress, attaining the rank of Lieutenant Colonel, acting as justice of the peace, and joining his friend and neighbor Ignatius Wheeler in the legislature regularly beginning in 1783. He voted against ratification in 1788. His £1295 worth

of taxable property included ten slaves and 868 acres, placing him among the large farmers.

Jeremiah Magruder, of Prince George's (34-3). The Magruders were in Maryland by 1652. Jeremiah's father, one of the third generation, was a substantial farmer. Jeremiah himself owned only 363 acres in 1772 but he may have inherited more when his father died a few years later. By 1790 he owned 36 slaves which suggests that he held at least a thousand acres. He was a delegate for two years but otherwise was obscure.

Thomas Ogle, of Frederick (27-4). The Ogles came from Germany in the 1660's. Major Joseph, a grandson of the immigrant, moved west to Frederick County and had six sons. He was a farmer and left a small estate of £354, not including some "desperate" debts. Thomas was only seven when his father died, and never surpassed him in wealth, dying at the age of 41 when his children were still under age. He had a house in Frederick town, which suggests that he was an artisan or shopkeeper of some sort, as does the long list of inventoried debts which, like those of his father, were mostly desperate. Yet he did not own any tools of a trade and had the usual possessions of a small farmer, his personal property totalling £183 plus £20 in separate debts. He had 363 acres in 1773. Almost nothing else is known about him.

John Oglevee, of Cecil (54-2). Oglevee's father, also named John, was a small farmer who left a personal estate of only £119 in 1744, including an indentured servant but no slaves. John Jr. served briefly in the House, acquired the title Captain, bought two slaves and some books, but remained a farmer, leaving £550 in personal property at his death in 1797.

Lawrence O'Neale, of Montgomery (152-18). O'Neale's father William was a planter of Prince George's county probably of limited means, who married a tailor's daughter and died in 1759 when Lawrence, the eldest son, was just of age. O'Neale's marriage to Henrietta Neale allied him to some of Maryland's most prominent families. He became sheriff of Frederick county in 1774, and served as a delegate every year throughout the 1780's. Presumably he retained his office by an exceptionally consistent voting record. He was a farmer with about £1,000 worth of taxable property. In 1788 he stood for election to the ratifying convention as an Anti-federalist but was defeated. See the *Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine*, XIX (1954), 176-177.

Charles Ridgely, of Baltimore (78-8). Ridgely's voting record is similar to O'Neale's but he was in other respects an opposite type. His grandfather, a lawyer, laid the basis for the family fortune, which was enormously increased by his father, Col. Charles, a merchant who acquired over 7,000 acres and a flourishing iron business. Charles the younger began his career as a mariner, becoming a Captain in the English trade by 1757. Fifteen years later he inherited 2,000 acres and the ironworks. By 1783 he himself owned about £9,000 worth of taxable property and his two iron companies were worth twice as much. He (or perhaps his heir) had 117 slaves in 1790. Meanwhile he had been a prominent "radical" in revolutionary days, served in the legislature annually after 1783, and became an Antifederalist.

John Sellars (Cellars, Sellers), of Washington (66-8). Sellars' background is unknown. A Pennsylvania family included some of the name, who moved into Virginia, but the Marylander seems to be of a different origin. We only know of him that he was on the committee of observation in 1775, became a Captain and a justice of the peace, served in the house annually beginning in 1783, was a defeated Antifederalist candidate in 1788, and died or moved away before the census of 1790.

John Stevenson, of Baltimore (89-7). Several John Stevensons lived in the area. The most prominent, a doctor of Baltimore-town, died when our John was still a legislator. The doctor left a nephew, John Jr., but our John was never referred to in this way and moreover he represented the county, not the town. Probably he was the son of Edward (d. 1760), a substantial farmer. If so he was a farmer owning four slaves in 1783. Perhaps it was he who died in 1786 leaving a personal estate of £274 and five sons, including still another John.

Nicholas Swingle (Swingly), of Washington (30-1). Johan Nicholas Zwingli, a Swiss from Saarbrucken, Germany, immigrated to Philadelphia in 1740 with his sons Nicholas, 20, and George, 16. Nicholas possessed a single slave in 1790. Presumably he or his brother erected "Swingles Mill," which existed in 1795.

The following lists include those delegates who voted with a consistency of at least 4:1, the approximate ratio being given in parentheses. Some of them were more consistent than the leaders, but cast fewer than thirty votes.

GROUP B

- John Cadwalader* (6:1) of Kent, wealthy merchant.
James Lloyd Chamberlain (6:1) of Talbot, wealthy merchant and large landowner.
Samuel Chase (5:1) of Annapolis, well-to-do lawyer and entrepreneur.
David Crawford (5:1) of Prince George's, wealthy merchant and large landowner.
John Dashiell (6:1) of Somerset, well-to-do large farmer.
John De Butts (5½:1) of St. Mary's, wealthy large landowner.
Henry Dennis (5:1) of Worcester, well-to-do large landowner and privateer.
John Done (14:1) of Somerset, well-to-do lawyer.
Arnold Elzey (8:1) of Somerset, well-to-do doctor (?).
William Fell (9½:1) of Baltimore town, wealthy lawyer and large landowner.
William Fitzhugh, Jr. (5-1) of Calvert, wealthy landowner.
Erasmus Gantt (6:1) of Prince Georges, substantial farmer (?).
Thomas Hardcastle (5:1) of Caroline, well-to-do large landowner.
James Hindman (5:1) of Talbot, well-to-do or wealthy merchant.
Edward Johnson (6:1) of Calvert, substantial doctor.
William Keene (9½:1) of Caroline, well-to-do large farmer.
Peter Mantz (all) of Frederick, evidently a substantial businessman.
John Parnham (6½:1) of Charles, well-to-do doctor.
Gillis Polk (6:1) of Somerset, moderate large farmer.
Gustavus Scott (11:1) of Dorchester, well-to-do lawyer.
John Somerville (all) of St. Mary's, wealthy merchant and large landowner.
Thomas Stone (all) of Charles, well-to-do lawyer.
Zephaniah Turner (7:1) of Charles, substantial (?) official.

GROUP A

- John Beatty* (8:1) of Frederick, moderate (?) farmer (?).
Thomas Cockey Deye (4½:1) of Baltimore, wealthy large landowner.
Richard Cromwell (all) of Washington, substantial large farmer.
Jacob Funk (5:1) of Washington, well-to-do pioneer entrepreneur.
Rezin Hammond (9:1) of Baltimore, wealthy large landowner.
John H. Harrison (all) of Charles, unknown.
William Holmes (12:1) of Montgomery, moderate farmer.
Thomas Hughlett (5:1) of Caroline, moderate farmer (?).
Josiah Johnson (5:1) of Kent, moderate farmer.

- Peter Lawson* (5:1) of Cecil, well-to-do large landowner.
James M'Comas (10:1) of Harford, substantial large farmer.
John Stull (5:1) of Washington, well-to-do large farmer.
Ignatius Wheeler (6:1) of Harford, well-to-do large landowner.
Nicholas Worthington (4:1) of Anne Arundel, wealthy large landowner.
Samuel Worthington (4:1) of Baltimore, wealthy large landowner

PROMINENT NEUTRALS (votes with B given first)

- Thomas Beatty*, of Frederick (47-36), substantial farmer (?).
Benjamin Brevard, of Cecil (55-75), moderate farmer.
George Digges, of Prince George's (53-37), wealthy large landowner.
John Hall, of Anne Arundel (35:43), wealthy lawyer and large landowner.
James Kent, of Queen Anne's (46:38) moderate farmer.
Charles Ridgely of William, of Baltimore (43-44) moderate farmer.

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN MARYLAND IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

By RAYMOND S. SWEENEY

Public education in the period 1900-1920 reflected the goals and values of the Progressive Movement; as Progressivism in general represented an effort to realize the ideals of America, so educational Progressivism in particular stood as an attempt to better the lives of the people by increasing the efficiency and expanding the roles of the schools. Progressive Education—Progressivism *in* education—originated shortly after the Civil War; its ideas gained currency among the intellectual and educational leaders about 1900; by 1915 the movement had expanded and gained political power. The concern of the Progressives for social reform and scientific objectivity found expression in the field of public education in the form of the survey movement—a series of investigatory reviews of educational organizations at all levels which sprang from the muckrakers' exposés in the 1890's. The coming of the survey movement to Maryland in the nineteen-teens heralded the arrival of Progressive Education and significant reform in the public schools of the state.¹

By 1913, some educators in Maryland had been aware of many of the problems of the state schools for years. Three men in particular had worked to advance public education in the state; their ideas and examples established the base on which later reforms were built.

Martin Bates Stephens was State Superintendent of Schools from 1900 to 1920. Although he worked hard to improve the

¹ Lawrence Arthur Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (New York, 1962), viii-ix, 3-5, 21-22, 88, 179-185; Joseph Meyer Rice, "Our Public School System: Evils in Baltimore," *Forum*, XIV (October, 1892), 145-158; Edward Franklin Buchner, *Educational Surveys*, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1918, No. 45, 3-4.

state's educational complex, Stephens was a slow moving reformer. He emphasized increasing the efficiency of the educational organization from within rather than the reformation of the laws which were its foundation; Stephens sponsored highly publicized school-day "rallies"—complete with parades, speeches, and athletic contests—published and distributed yearly reports of the Board of Education, and conscientiously enforced legislation already enacted. Under the existing, confining school codes he could hardly have done more.²

After the reform of Baltimore's city charter in 1899 resulted in the appointment of a forward-looking City Board of Education, this board elected James H. Van Sickle of Denver as City School Superintendent. The board and Van Sickle then began to revamp the city's schools, and during the next twelve years they made a great deal of progress. Professional standards of teachers were raised; attendance improved; many inefficient and ill-trained officials and teachers were dismissed; and the quality and extent of supervision were increased. By 1911, however, several politically motivated appointments had been made to the board, and an administrative accident allowed Mayor Preston, a spoilsman unfriendly to Van Sickle's policies, to shift the balance against the progressives. Baltimore city lost its fine superintendent and the remaining reforming members of its Board of Education in spite of the eleventh-hour publication of a U. S. Bureau of Education report scoring the mayor's position and substantiating that of Van Sickle. The superintendent left, but his work had been effective; not only did the city of Baltimore profit by his twelve-year tenure, but the state itself waited less than five years before adopting measures similar to those he instituted.³

The third leading educator to appear in the state at the turn of the century was Albert S. Cook, who served as Superintendent of the Baltimore County Schools—totally unrelated

² Abraham Flexner and Frank Puterbaugh Bachman. (*Public Education in Maryland* (New York, 1916), 22-29; *Baltimore Sun*, 21 October 1913; 29 October 1913; Stephens to Governor Goldsborough, March-November, 1914, Governor's Correspondence, Hall of Records, Annapolis.

³ George Drayton Strayer, "The Baltimore School Situation," *Educational Review*, XLII (November, 1911), 325-345; U. S. Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commission Appointed to Study the System of Education in the Public Schools of Baltimore*, Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1911, No. 4.

to the Baltimore city system—for twenty years. Cook initiated in the county virtually all the measures associated with Stephens and Van Sickle. He had, in addition, some national stature as a result of the many articles he wrote for educational journals. He led the campaign in Maryland to establish “summer institutes” for retraining teachers, and he conscientiously sought and got public support for his actions by providing for wide distribution of county reports.⁴

Stephens, Van Sickle, and Cook injected a note of change and progress into the realm of Maryland’s public schools. Three minor school surveys served to reinforce this note and further to prepare the state for large-scale investigation and reform.

In 1908, Governor Austin Crothers appointed a commission to study the “general educational interests” of Maryland. This ten-man commission—Superintendent Stephens being the only prominent educator appointed to it—met five times and issued a report in 1910. Although centering about state book-keeping methods, the commission’s recommendations also touched on the need for more and better-trained teachers and supervisors, for additional courses in industrial and agricultural education, and for more co-ordination between the public schools and the colleges. Two of the more significant suggestions—which may have incensed opposition to the 1915 survey—were that state aid to higher education be channelled not directly to the colleges of the state but to students in the form of scholarships, and that state funds be allocated to the counties more on the basis of school attendance than on school-age population.⁵

The Federal report which endorsed Van Sickle’s position in Baltimore city was merely one indication of an increasing interest in public education being displayed by the U. S. Government. This 1911 account and a 1913 survey of Montgomery County Schools both emphasized the need for “practical” instruction, especially in industrial and agricultural subjects;

⁴ *Baltimore Sun*, 11 February 1914; 5 June 1920; Amy Cooper Crewe, *No. Backward Step Was Taken* (Baltimore, 1949), 61-83; “The Maryland School Superintendency,” *School and Society*, XI (19 June 1920), 739-740.

⁵ Maryland, Department of Education, *A Report of the Maryland Education Commission, Department of Education Bulletin, 1910, No. 2, 1-10.*

emphasis on the practical came to be the hallmark of educational Progressivism. The Montgomery County study criticized the county's slowness in consolidating rural schools and its run-down physical plant. The Bureau of Education inquiries not only popularized the survey idea in Maryland but also pointed up the advantages inherent in criticism by an out-of-state agency.⁶

Although these studies played some role in preparing the state for the coming of general educational reform, it took a report which hit at Maryland's pride to get real action. In early 1913, the Russell Sage Foundation released a bulletin, *A Comparative Study of State School Systems in the Forty-Eight States*; Maryland ranked thirty-sixth in "general efficiency," and as low as forty-sixth and forty-seventh in average school attendance and in money spent per child. The great impact the report had was probably linked to the statement by the Sage Foundation that it had sent copies of the publication to every member of every state legislature which met during that year.⁷

The publication of the Sage report was a landmark in the history of education in Maryland. Before 1913 people associated with the schools of the state were more or less divided into two groups: those who were directly involved—superintendents, teachers, members of educational associations—some of whom wanted to bring about reform but lacked the power to effect significant state-wide change; and those who had power—state legislators, the Governor, high-ranking politicians—but who evidenced little strong or co-ordinated desire to bring about broad revision. After 1913, however, it became more difficult to distinguish one group from the other; those with power began to accept progressive values and thus executed a major revolution in the state system of public instruction.

Though the Sage rating was significant, neither it nor any

⁶ Cremin, *The Transformation*, 88; "A Civic Center School in Baltimore," *School and Society*, IX (28 June 1919), 781-782; Hermann Nelson Morse *et al.*, *An Educational Survey of a Suburban and Rural County; Montgomery County, Maryland*, U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1913, No. 32, 1-68.

⁷ *Baltimore Sun*, 5 January 1913; 14 February 1914; 8 February 1914.

other one report or speech or action was responsible in itself for the new school codes of 1916. The Sage bulletin was a catalyst; it marked the beginning of a movement which, until the appearance of the report, had manifested itself almost exclusively within the ranks of professional educators. When the educators who had paved the way were joined in their demands for reform by the Governor, some state legislators, and the powerful *Sun* papers, they were able to fire the idea of a state educational survey with the spirit of the times and use it as an engine of reform.

Since the Legislature of Maryland did not meet in 1913, Governor Phillips Lee Goldsborough—Republican, 1912-1916—made the initial political moves toward revised legislation for the schools. Speaking at the commencement exercises of the University of Maryland, the Governor announced that he would appoint yet another commission of businessmen and educators to study Maryland's schools. At that time—throughout the year, in fact—the emphasis was on unifying the colleges of Maryland and making a large state university the “nucleus” around which a new school system could develop. Thomas Fell, Provost of the University of Maryland, had visited the University of Wisconsin at Goldsborough's request; Fell's report of his trip led to the idea of a commission. The Governor's commencement speech was the first move by the state government in the direction of an effective educational survey of Maryland.⁵

The most significant reaction to the commencement speech came when a Marylander on the faculty of Teachers College Columbia University took Goldsborough seriously and suggested positive steps to bring about an objective study. John Montgomery Gambrill corresponded with the Governor throughout the remainder of 1913 concerning the possibility of expanding the commission idea to include an impartial survey by an outside organization. Gambrill had connections with the Carnegie Foundation, which was currently involved in a well-publicized survey of the schools of Vermont. Goldsborough was in direct touch with the Carnegie Foundation that autumn, trying to convince the Secretary that Maryland would

⁵ *Baltimore Sun*, 1 June 1913.

be a likely subject for the next state-wide survey after Vermont. Although the reaction of the Foundation was negative at first, and although Fell and Stephens had suspicions concerning any out-of-state agency, the Governor persisted well into the next year with his efforts to get the Carnegie people to undertake the study.⁹

Others took up and publicized the idea of doing something during the coming legislative session about Maryland's dated educational codes. School rallies, backed by Goldsborough and Superintendent Stephens, were held in support of such measures as compulsory attendance laws and a lengthened term. In an extended interview with *The Baltimore Sun*, State Senator William Milnes Maloy stated that he would submit a plan calling for a commission to investigate the state's educational system. Maloy's aims—the union of some of Maryland's colleges and their coordination with public instruction—had a familiar ring; they were nearly identical to those voiced by the Governor in the University of Maryland commencement address. (Active cooperation between Goldsborough and Maloy at this stage may only be inferred; as the Governor's correspondence makes clear, however, there existed a liaison of considerable proportions between the two in the summer of 1914.) Now the survey had the backing of a member of the state Legislature as well as that of the Chief Executive.¹⁰

Increasingly *The Sun* featured articles and news stories about the possibility of a survey. A prominent editorial by J. Montgomery Gambrill of Columbia University appeared in December, 1913, apparently with Goldsborough's blessing, which emphasized the Carnegie Foundation's Vermont inquiry, the probable benefits to Maryland of a similar study here, and the Governor's efforts with the Foundation. The following day *The Sun* printed an editorial agreeing with Gam-

⁹ The following letters are from the Governor's Correspondence, Hall of Records, Annapolis: Gambrill to Goldsborough, 9 June 1913; 13 October 1913; 1 December 1913; 13 December 1913; Goldsborough to Gambrill, 14 June 1913; 15 October 1913; 1 December 1913; 5 December 1913; Fell to Goldsborough, 6 March 1914; Goldsborough to Fell, 7 March 1914; *Baltimore Sun*, 1 December 1913; 17 February 1914; 4 June 1914.

¹⁰ Fell to Goldsborough, 29 June 1914; Maloy to Goldsborough, 18 May 1914; Goldsborough to Maloy, 19 May 1914; 1 June 1914; *Baltimore Sun*, 21 October 1913; 19 November 1913; 1 January 1915.

brill and lauding the Governor's efforts. During the next six months the paper made it a policy to highlight educational news and consistently to urge the Governor and the law-makers to push for a survey bill. As the legislative session approached, the movement for a survey assumed more and more the character of a Progressive-style campaign.¹¹

Later in December a joint conference of the legislative committees of the State Board of Education, the State Teachers' Association, and the School Commissioners' Association met. Drafts of bills approved by this conference provided for higher standards for new teachers, a compulsory attendance law, additional training for teachers already on the payroll, and a scale of minimum wages for teachers. Although similar resolutions had come from these organizations for the preceding several years, this joint action underlined the need of Maryland's school system for a thorough investigation.¹²

The Maryland Legislature of 1914 was committed to reformist values; the school survey was only one of several Progressive measures to receive favorable attention. The Democratically-dominated Maryland Senate and House of Delegates revised their own procedural rules in such a way as to lessen the power of committee heads and to make the Legislature more sensitive to the will of the people of the state. An oyster conservation regulation, a new road construction law, and new public health codes were among the legislation passed in 1914. The spirit of the session and its ties to the mood of the nation were exemplified by an editorial cartoon by McKee Barclay in *The Sun*: in a variation on the RCA trademark, a donkey ("Maryland Democrats") sat attentively before a gramophone ("The New Freedom") which broadcast "Honesty! Efficiency! Service! Progress! Pledges!"¹³

Pressure for a survey bill mounted after an address by U. S. Commissioner of Education Philander Priestly Claxton to

¹¹ Gambrill to Goldsborough, 13 October 1913; 1 December 1913; Goldsborough to Gambrill, 5 December 1913; John Montgomery Gambrill, "Maryland's Educational Problem," *Baltimore Sun*, 1 December 1913; 2 December 1913.

¹² *Baltimore Sun*, 20 December 1913; Maryland, Board of Education, *Forty Fourth Annual Report, 1910*, 94-97; *Forty-Eighth Annual Report 1914*, 90-93, 96-103, 147-150.

¹³ *Baltimore Sun*, 5 January 1914; 7 January 1914; 8 January 1914; 9 March 1914; 7 April 1914; 8 April 1914.

a joint hearing of the Committees of Education of the state Legislature. Senator Maloy, concerned over Maryland's rating in the Sage Foundation report, had invited Claxton to speak. Although sympathetic with Maryland's problems, the Commissioner supported the findings of the Sage Foundation. He suggested that the Legislature appoint a commission to study the educational needs of the state and recommend new laws. Claxton also described his ideal school board—long-termed, non-partisan, and professional— and suggested raising standards for hiring new teachers. *The Sun* published a detailed article about the Carnegie Foundation Vermont investigation and urged the Legislature to refrain from passing additional school laws until a first-rate examination had been made in Maryland. Moved by *The Sun's* article and Claxton's talk, Senator Maloy issued a long statement on a possible educational inquiry. Maloy agreed with *The Sun's* editorial and said he would try to scrap most of the pending school legislation plans except for the State University bill and a survey measure. The Governor, prompted by the editorial, made a statement in which he endorsed the paper's position and revealed more details of his correspondence with the Carnegie Foundation. Another influential voice was added to the call for an investigation when Dr. Edward F. Buchner of Johns Hopkins University spoke out in favor of such a study. By February enough powerful people backed the idea to make it a reality; a survey bill moved toward realization, supported by Governor Goldsborough, state Senator Maloy and *The Baltimore Sun*.¹⁴

During the next two months the proponents of the measure succeeded in pushing it through the Legislature. Claxton spoke again in Maryland in early March; *The Sun* kept urging the Governor and the State House to act; Goldsborough consulted with the state's educators. Superintendent of Schools Stephens submitted a draft—striking in its similarity to the final bill—to the Governor; Senator Maloy introduced his bill and, against formidable opposition, guided it through both houses. Clyde Furst, Secretary of the Carnegie Foundation,

¹⁴ *Baltimore Sun*, 14 February 1914; 15 February 1914; 16 February 1914; 17 February 1914.

addressed Baltimore's City Club, and it appeared that it would be Furst's organization which would conduct the survey. With the final enactment of the Maloy Bill, the Free State committed itself to a review of its educational system.¹⁵

As passed, the legislation provided for a three-man Survey Commission, appointed by the Governor, to study thoroughly Maryland's school complex, including all non-public institutions which received state funds. The Legislature provided \$5,000 for expenses, but no money for salaries. The Commissioners would be free to call in outside agencies and to hire investigators, and officials of the public schools were directed to cooperate fully with them. The Commission, once created, had full investigatory powers but very little money; it would have to find an organization willing to pay its own expenses if the survey were to be thorough.¹⁶

Opposition to the Survey Bill by Maryland's institutions of higher learning points out the peculiar relationship which then existed between the colleges and the state, a relationship which may have retarded the advancement of the public schools. There were many colleges receiving public assistance in Maryland, but none was wholly under the state's control or fully a part of its educational system. Professional and accrediting organizations were exerting great pressure on these institutions to come together under the auspices of the state and to form a true university. Thomas Fell, one-time head of both the University of Maryland in Baltimore and Saint John's College in Annapolis, favored a state-sponsored, voluntary association. Others, including Governor Goldsborough, preferred a mandatory union. The colleges opposed the school survey because they feared that such a review, especially from an out-of-state agency, would result in legislation forcing a fusion of the institutions; they resisted consolidation because Maryland's Legislature had fallen into the habit of allocating funds to the various schools in a manner which made it advantageous for each to remain separated from the others. Every

¹⁵ *Baltimore Sun*, 6 March 1914; 19 March 1914; 20 March 1914; Fell to Goldsborough, 6 March 1914; Goldsborough to Fell, 7 March 1914; Stephens to Goldsborough, 11 March 1914.

¹⁶ *Baltimore Sun*, 19 March 1914; Flexner and Bachman, *Public Education*, vii.

two years the Legislature met and decided which schools would get how much money; the result was a great deal of undignified lobbying on the part of scholars, a continued lack of public control over the colleges, and a large group of administrators and faculty members with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. The smaller colleges feared the survey because it might threaten their independence, the larger ones because it might threaten their incomes. Governor Goldsborough and Senator Maloy felt they had sufficiently powerful public support to overcome the opposition when they earnestly began their campaign for a survey in February, 1914. The combined influence of the colleges, of spoilsmen such as Mayor Preston and of those such as Dr. Stephens who feared the lack of understanding of an out-of-state group was nearly enough to defeat the Maloy Bill. There were, however, only two apparent compromises made in order to get it through the Legislature: the Commission had to be composed of Marylanders, and the appropriation was cut from an original \$10,000 to \$5,000. In the end the act passed the Legislature and was signed by the Governor. The conservative, vested-interest nature of its opposition served only to underline the Progressive thrust of the bill's intent.¹⁷

Actual preparations for the study consumed the remainder of the year. The Governor appointed the three members of the Survey Commission. B. Howell Griswold, a prominent Baltimore banker and friend of Goldsborough, became chairman; he was assisted by a retired Army Colonel and the Mayor of Hagerstown. Both *The Sun* and Senator Maloy approved of the Governor's choices. Continued attempts by Goldsborough and the Commission to get the Carnegie Foundation to conduct the survey proved fruitless. The Commission next contacted the General Education Board, an adjunct of the Rockefeller Foundation which was attempting to further progressive educational policies in the South, and was successful

¹⁷ George Hardy Callcott, *A History of the University of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1965), 276-280; *Baltimore Sun*, 7 February 1914; 16 February 1914; 17 February 1914; 19 March 1914; 28 March 1914; 29 March 1914; 8 April 1914; Fell to Goldsborough, 2 January 1914; 6 March 1914; 29 June 1914; Goldsborough to Fell, 7 March 1914; 1 July 1914; Strayer, "Baltimore School Situation," 333-345.

in obtaining its services. The \$5,000 appropriation made by the state was supplemented by an additional \$7,500 contribution from the General Education Board. By the end of the year, definite arrangements were completed for an investigation to begin in January, 1915.¹⁸

Chairman Griswold had agreed that the Board would have an entirely free hand to conduct the study and that the findings and conclusions of the Rockefeller unit would be published regardless of whether they were in accord with those of the state Commission. Before the survey began, therefore, the state had pledged itself, if not necessarily to accept its conclusions, at least to cooperate with and publish the results of a study of its system of public education conducted by an out-of-state agency. Publicity about the actual investigation was, by an agreement between Goldsborough and Griswold, kept at a minimum while it was in progress.¹⁹

As the survey got under way, the state Commission and the General Education Board further narrowed its scope. The 1914 law had been passed with the intention of reviewing all branches of Maryland's educational complex which received state funds, but the survey as it was carried out covered only the public schools of the counties; the academies, higher education, and the schools of Baltimore city were not considered. Since the state Commission earnestly recommended in its final report that further studies should be made which would include Baltimore and the colleges, and since there is apparently no evidence to the contrary, this last-minute limitation probably represented a mutual agreement between the Commission and the Board; it was no doubt more a result of financial and personnel factors than of pressures from the anti-survey forces.²⁰

Abraham Flexner, Chairman of the General Education Board, exercised general supervision of the operation from

¹⁸ Cremin, *The Transformation*, 81; Flexner and Bachman, *Public Education*, viii; *Baltimore Sun*, 12 April 1914; 28 May 1914; 2 June 1914; 4 June 1914; 23 December 1914; Griswold to Goldsborough, 6 March 1914; 5 November 1914; 20 November 1914; Goldsborough to Griswold, 7 March 1914; 20 November 1914; Maloy to Goldsborough, 28 May 1914.

¹⁹ Flexner and Bachman, *Public Education*, vii-viii; Griswold to Goldsborough, 15 January 1915; 29 January 1915.

²⁰ Flexner and Bachman, *Public Education*, viii-x.

New York. Frank P. Bachman took charge of the actual investigation in Maryland, and did much of the research and interviewing himself. Flexner and Bachman, who had conducted the negotiations with Goldsborough and Griswold on behalf of their organization, were both experienced with other surveys, and each had published educational research before. A statistician and an experienced field agent in Negro education assisted Bachman in collecting and evaluating information. In the course of his work, Bachman visited every county in Maryland and interviewed over 16% of the white and over 10% of the Negro teachers in the state. The only major criticism of the survey's methods voiced at the time was that newly developed standardized tests were not used in order to determine the level of training of teachers more objectively. With the understanding that the state definitely anticipated no increase in educational expenditures, apparent full cooperation between Bachman's team, the state Commission, and Superintendent Stephens' Department of Education marked the progress of the study.²¹

The Survey Commission presented its findings to Governor Goldsborough in 1915, during his final days in office. Aside from the brief preface, in which the Commission concurred with the conclusions and recommendations reached by the Board, the General Education Board wrote the entire report.

The criticisms published by the Survey Commission centered about two major contentions—that the school system of the state was “in politics,” and that laws regulating the operation of the system itself were ineffective, mostly because of inadequate provisions for supervision and attendance.

The Maryland school complex of 1915 was based on statutes which provided for apportionment of seats on the State Board of Education according to which party won local elections. “Senatorial courtesy” and the necessity of Senate approval of gubernatorial appointments gave each state senator full control over the school board membership of his county. The result was that senators “appointed” school board members on a strictly partisan basis; the county boards of education tended

²¹ Flexner and Bachman, *Public Education*, vii, xviii; “Educational Writings,” *Elementary School Journal*, XVI (April, 1916), 400-406.

to select county superintendents by the same method; and superintendents generally were not above filling positions in the schools in like manner. A front-page cartoon by McKee Barclay in *The Sun* portrayed accurately the general reaction to this state of affairs when the results of the survey were published: a well-fed gentleman ("State School System") was shown straying from the path leading "To Economy and Efficiency" arm-in-arm with a painted floozy ("Polly Ticks"); the outraged matron ("Tax Payer") looked on and commented, "This'll bear lookin' into!"²²

The operational flaws in Maryland's public schools, aside from those directly associated with the political problem, included few qualified supervisors and teachers, low standards set for hiring personnel, poor attendance by students, inefficient methods of allotting state funds to the counties, and poor physical facilities.²³

The report did compliment the state on its use of the county—instead of the electoral district or some other division—as the basic unit in public education. This commendation and occasional praise for Superintendent Cook's efforts in Baltimore County did little to blunt the generally critical thrust of the review.²⁴

That there were distinct similarities between the faults found by Bachman and his team and those which individual school leaders in Maryland had been pointing out since about 1910 indicates that the state's educational needs were not unknown; they were simply neglected. Now, however, Maryland's deficiencies had been documented by a disinterested party and published—to be read by educators throughout the country. Now the Free State would have to do something.²⁵

The 1916 Legislature did do something. With the support of recently-inaugurated Governor Emerson C. Harrington (Dem-

²² Flexner and Bachman, *Public Education*, xi-xii, xvii, 8-9, 32-34, 43-44; *Baltimore Sun*, 7 February 1916; 8 February 1916; 9 February 1916.

²³ Flexner and Bachman, *Public Education*, xv-xviii, 26, 28-29, 44-45, 58-79, 89-102.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 30-32, 45-56.

²⁵ Maryland, Board of Education, *Thirty-Ninth Annual Report, 1905*, 123-128; *Forty-Fifth Annual Report, 1911*, 94-97, 154-158; *Forty-Ninth Annual Report, 1915*, 90-93, 96-103, 147-150.

ocrat, 1916-1920) and the editorial backing of *The Sun*, the law-makers quickly passed a sweeping new set of school codes—drawn up by the Survey Commission and incorporating most of the suggestions of the General Education Board.²⁶

The only traces of overt opposition to the new laws came from Allegany County. Some members of the county Democratic Committee objected to the continuance in office of Republican appointees of Governor Goldsborough which would result when the new laws became effective.²⁷

The new school codes effectively removed the state and county school boards from the cock's pit of local politics by abolishing the necessity of senatorial consent for gubernatorial appointments and by lengthening and staggering board members' terms. The new laws provided minimum standards, such as graduate work or teaching experience for nearly all offices in the State Department of Education. The state and county school boards and supervisors received more power to enforce their policies. In the balance of authority between county and state, the latter gained; every county was required to have a county superintendent, and all teachers were henceforth certified only by the state. The first effective, state-wide compulsory attendance laws were part of the package, and each county had to enforce them with at least one full-time attendance officer. To encourage voluntary compliance with the attendance statutes, the state shifted its system for apportioning funds from one based wholly on school-age population to one based partially on the percentage of the school-age population actually attending classes. The final major laws abolished all appropriations to the privately-controlled academies, established a minimum salary scale for white school teachers and officials, and lengthened the minimum school year for Negro children—this last measure is notable because it was the only reform provision designed exclusively to improve Negro education.

²⁶ *Baltimore Sun*, 7 February 1916, 26 February 1916, 14 May 1916.

²⁷ The following correspondence is from Legislative Letters, 1916, Hall of Records, Annapolis: Dr. J. Marshall Price to Hugh McMullen (Comptroller of the Treasury and a state Democratic party leader), 17 March 1916; E. A. Browning and J. W. Holman to Governor Harrington, 16 March 1916; Olin R. Rice to Harrington, 17 March 1916.

With the passage of this legislation, Maryland took a giant step forward in the field of public instruction.²⁸

In later years, the school survey of 1915 assumed the place of a landmark in the development of popular education in Maryland. A decade and a half afterwards the State Board of Education, in summing up the progress made in the preceding ten years under Governor Albert C. Ritchie and State Superintendent Cook, pointed with pride to new laws and improved administration, the roots of which reached back to the enactments of 1916. Another publication of the State Board quoted Frank P. Bachman, director of the 1915 survey, as having said of the 1916 statutes that "Maryland now has the best legally established, the most unified, the most efficient and the most professional state school system in America." Even granting that Bachman had some interest in seeing the seedling he helped plant bear fruit, still this was high praise from the man whose earlier investigations had been so critical. The next state-wide study of the public schools of Maryland came in 1941; it was conducted by a team of professors, mostly from Teachers College, Columbia University. Summarizing the 1916 legislation, the authors gave what may be the most authoritative estimate of the value of the 1915 investigation: "Over the years the recommendations which grew out of that study have been of tremendous value in giving direction to the expansion of the Maryland school system." The survey of 1915 has taken its place in the history of public education in Maryland as the foundation on which the twentieth century schools of the state are built.²⁹

Some advances in Maryland's school system which resulted from the 1915 survey and the 1916 laws are subject to measurement. The most striking improvements took place in attendance and enrollment—despite some resistance to the attend-

²⁸ Beginning with the second edition, Flexner and Bachman included the new school codes of Maryland as an appendix to *Public Education*, 177-230; *Baltimore Sun*, 7 February 1916, 26 February 1916, 14 May 1916.

²⁹ Maryland, Department of Education, *A Decade of Progress in Maryland's Public Schools 1920-1930*, Maryland School Bulletin (October, 1930), Vol. XII, No. 2, 1-24; Maryland, Department of Education, *Progress in Education in Maryland*, Maryland School Bulletin (October, 1938), Vol. XX, No. 5, 7-8; Maryland, State School Survey Commission, *The 1941 Survey of the Maryland Public Schools and Teachers Colleges*, 17-18; Crewe, *No Backward Step*, 5.

ance laws by rural parents who felt that the family and not the state should determine whether a child goes to school. Between 1916 and 1920 the number of Negro children in county high schools more than quadrupled. Overall high school enrollment increased 51.1% from 1915 to 1920, and attendance increased 47.9% in the same period; by 1923, enrollment had risen 146.9% above the 1915 level and attendance 148%—showing, perhaps, an acceleration in enforcement under State Superintendent Cook. The increase in number and quality of school supervisors is also notable. In 1914, 10% of the white elementary school teachers and principals had education beyond the high school level; by 1922, 40% and by 1931, 95% had had normal school or college training. In 1914, no Negro elementary school teachers or principals had post-high school instruction; by 1922, 32% did, and by 1931 the figure had risen to 92%. In elementary schools, only three counties in 1916 had superintendents; by 1920, nineteen of the twenty-three had one or more full-time elementary school superintendents. An increase in state funds to schools, an expansion of the number of school libraries, and growing popularity of summer institutes for teachers—all indicate that the improvements resulting from the 1915-1916 codified changes were but the skeleton of an increasingly healthy body of school reform.³⁰

The apparently sudden alterations in Maryland's school system, though of great significance to the state, did not occur in a vacuum. Given the context of the national and state-wide Progressive Movement and the nucleus of progressive educators in the state; given the growing popularity of Progressive ideas within Maryland's educational community and the continued and accelerating program of the twenties; given all this, and the years 1914-1916 may be seen best, perhaps, as the point in time at which the tide finally turned in the schools of Maryland. Between the Civil War and the turn of the century, the state scarcely stirred in education; between 1900 and 1914 it

³⁰ School Survey Commission, *The 1941 Survey*, 32; Maryland, Department of Education, *Accomplishments and Shortcomings of Maryland Schools*, Maryland School Bulletin (November, 1924), Vol. VI, No. 2, 6-7; Maryland, Department of Education, *Measurable Evidence of Progress in Maryland Public Schools, 1923*, Maryland School Bulletin (April, 1924), Vol. V, No. 12, 30-32.

prepared to move; in 1914 motion began; and by 1920 Maryland was forging ahead, fully committed to continuous educational progress.

Discovering whether or to what degree the school reforms in Maryland in the Progressive Era were democratic is a complicated problem. Simple, yes-or-no answers do not exist, and only by carefully delineating context, examining evidence, and defining terms may one draw any conclusions at all.

At the time, the word "democratic" in association with the survey and the ensuing legislation was hardly used. When it was linked with school laws, the concept of democracy seemed to have a somewhat different meaning then than it does now. For example, an article in an educational journal characterized Baltimore city's planned use of a school as a civic center as "a distinctive contribution to the service of democratic education." In an educational context, at least, "democratic" in the Progressive Era seemed to emphasize sensitivity to popular control less and service to the public more.³¹

The school reform movement in general and the survey idea in particular, if not obviously considered democratic at the time, were surely seen then and may be seen now as one facet of Progressivism. Progress as an end and reform as a means appeared to be basic assumptions of the age. The discussion of the survey and the school laws revealed, moreover, that those who favored such measures emphasized thrift and utilitarianism more than democratic ideals. The drive for economy was evident when the advice of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations was sought partly because these beneficent institutions would be willing to pay part of the bill, and when the Survey Commission made it clear that it wanted improvements without an increase in taxes. Utilitarianism was stressed when more industrial and agricultural courses were demanded, when wider use of the school plant for civic pur-

³¹"Quotations: A Civic Center School in Baltimore," *School and Society*, IX (28 June 1919), 781-782; U. S., Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1916*, I, 354; U. S., Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1914*, I, Ch. 24; *Baltimore Sun*, 12 April 1914; U. S., Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commission Appointed to Study the System of Education in the Public Schools of Baltimore, Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1911, No. 4*, 102-104.

poses was praised, and when *The Sun's* editorials championed the use of business-like methods to cut costs and increase the quality of education. This drive for economy and usefulness also expressed itself as a near-reverent attitude toward the scientific; statistical tables and quantitative testing were definitely in vogue. At one point, even, a "School Index Number" was developed so schools and school systems could be compared on a numerical scale. This was the tone of the educational reform movement in Maryland: if there was a byword for this revolution, it was not "democracy," but "efficiency."³²

The Progressive nature of the school reforms of the nineteen-nineteens was underscored also by the almost total absence of attempts to improve the lot of Negro Marylanders. The lengthened school year stood alone as legislation designed *per se* for Negroes. Although Maryland's non-white pupils certainly benefitted from the new laws, improved schooling specifically for Negroes was a neglected cause. U. S. Commissioner of Education P. P. Claxton voiced the temper of the times when he advocated better schools for Negroes as an alternative to a higher crime rate. That attempts to improve the quality of Negro education were most noteworthy by their absence accentuates both the Progressive complexion of the school reforms and the essentially white-supremist character of Progressivism.³³

First-hand documentation indicating that the 1914-1916 school measures were democratic in the sense that they had wide public support is not abundant. A sampling of the Governors' correspondence and legislative letters reveals no great number of letters from citizens either for or against educational measures. A group of Baltimore Negro ministers wrote Governor Goldsborough in 1913 after the University of Maryland commencement address, commending him for the survey idea, and a women's club wrote Governor Harrington in 1916 en-

³² Above, 5, 11-12, 15; Maryland, Board of Education, *Forty-Fifth Annual Report, 1911*, 1-8, 110-114, 124-131; Maryland, Department of Education, *Measurable Evidence of Progress in Maryland Public Schools, 1923*, Maryland School Bulletin (April, 1924), Vol. V, No. 12, 18-19; Flexner and Bachman, *Public Education*, viii-ix; *Baltimore Sun*, 5 January 1914; 7 January 1914; 17 January 1914; 9 March 1914; 8 April 1914; 14 November 1914; 21 January 1918; 27 January 1918; 23 April 1920.

³³ Above, 19-21; *Baltimore Sun*, 14 February 1914.

dorsing the compulsory attendance law. Of several hundred letters examined, only these two came from citizens' groups sanctioning educational reform.³⁴

Second-hand sources provide most of the indicators that progressive educational legislation was founded on a popular consensus, but these sources are subject to ambiguous interpretation. The school rallies of Stephens, the statements of Maloy and Goldsborough to *The Sun*, and the editorials of that paper—all lead to the same question as to their significance: to what degree were they attempts to generate public support, and to what degree were they reflections of existing approbation?³⁵

The strongest evidence of popular approval is negative or deductive in nature. First, there was no indication at all of wide-spread public opposition to the 1914-1916 school measures; had such existed, it should have been evident. Second, the "tone" of the reform did fit in perfectly with the Progressive mood of the state. Third, the nature of such opposition as did appear was so conservative that popular sympathy for the measures may nearly be inferred. Finally, the very fact that the 1914 and 1916 laws *did* pass the Legislature says something about the extent of the public's endorsement of them. It is highly unlikely that the Delegates and Senators of Maryland voted for regulations that might have resulted in their losing at the polls. If extensive backing did *not* exist for the school reforms, it is nearly certain that Maryland's legislators *thought* it did.³⁶

Progressive without a doubt, there is only one way in which the new school laws can be seen as unequivocally democratic, and that is by considering who profited most by their passage. Those who gained from the new statutes lend them without a doubt a quality of democracy, for the primary beneficiaries were those who received, year after year, more and better quality education—the school-children and consequently the people of the state of Maryland.

³⁴ Reverend A. L. Gaines to Goldsborough, 5 June 1913, Governor's Correspondence, Hall of Records, Annapolis; Mary F. Strasser to Harrington, 8 March 1916, Legislative Letters, Hall of Records, Annapolis.

³⁵ Above, 2, 6-9; Stephens to Goldsborough, 20 April 1914; *Baltimore Sun*, 16 February 1914.

³⁶ Above, 12-13, 18, 21.

THE MCNEILL RANGERS AND THE CAPTURE OF GENERALS CROOK AND KELLEY

By JOHN W. BAILEY JR.

On February 22, 1865, Cumberland, Maryland, was the scene of one of the most daring episodes of the American Civil War. In the cold of early morning before sunrise a group of southern partisan guerrilla fighters, called McNeill's Rangers, marched brazenly into the snow-covered Federal stronghold of Cumberland, captured the two top ranking officers of the Department of West Virginia who were stationed there, and successfully made their escape. This event was of minor significance to the total war effort on either side but illustrated the southerners' willingness to fight even at this late date in the hostilities. At this time the war might have seemed a lost cause to many, but McNeill's men tenaciously held onto the hope of gaining a local victory that would satisfy their need for revenge and possibly would bring them a certain amount of glory.

Generals George Crook and Benjamin Kelley, the two Union officers captured by the southern raiders, had spent the past several years attempting to rid the Cumberland area of troublesome partisan fighters, the most annoying group being McNeill's men. General Kelley was active in western Virginia¹ at the beginning of the war. In the battle of Philippi he received a severe wound which limited his battlefield activities. As the war progressed his responsibility revolved primarily around the defense of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in West Virginia.²

General Crook had a particularly enviable record against

¹ Now present day West Virginia which was separated from Virginia and gained its statehood on June 20, 1863.

² Charles H. Ambler and Festus P. Summers, *West Virginia, The Mountain State* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1958), p. 43; Mark Mayo Boatner III, *The Civil War Dictionary* (New York, 1959), p. 450.

southern guerrilla fighters during the war, and his capture was very embarrassing to him. While serving in West Virginia during the earlier stages of the war, he demonstrated his ability in counter-guerrilla leadership. In Nicholas County near the town of Summerville many Confederate partisans operated in an environment ideally suited for "bushwhackers." The land was heavily timbered with thick underbrush and dense laurel thickets. Here the guerrilla could attack unsuspecting soldiers and civilians alike, plunder his victims, and vanish into the forest. The lives and property of all Union sympathizers became fair game for the Rebels, thereby creating a need for numerous Union troops to serve as escorts. It became a military necessity to vanquish the Confederate guerrillas and Crook set out to accomplish this task.³

First, he selected some of his best men and sent them into the surrounding countryside with instructions to study its terrain for possible hiding places and to learn the loyalties of its inhabitants. Crook's men searched the forests for the enemy and captured many prisoners. General William S. Rosecrans, Crook's superior officer, ordered that the prisoners be confined to Camp Chase, near Columbus, Ohio. Soon these same "bushwhackers," who had been paroled from prison or exchanged for Union prisoners, began to return to the Summerville area in fine health and high spirits. These men were confident of themselves and defiant of the Union soldiers. Crook and his men became discouraged. Now they knew the identification of the southerners, but it seemed useless to capture them again and return the arrogant Rebels to Camp Chase. In a short time, however, the Federal soldiers had solved this problem once and for all.

When the soldiers returned from a scouting trip, they invariably reported that they had caught a "bushwhacker" but that he had died in an unfortunate accident. At one time it was disclosed that a prisoner had slipped and broken his neck while crossing a stream. Similar "accidents" were reported frequently until the guerrilla problem was solved around Summerville.⁴

³ George Crook, *General George Crook, His Autobiography*, Martin F. Schmitt (ed.), New Edition (Norman, 1960), pp. 86,87.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

Crook rounded up "bushwhackers" and thieves in other areas of West Virginia, in Georgia, and in northern Alabama. Besides his guerrilla encounters, he also fought in several major battles: Second Bull Run, Antietam, Chattanooga, and Chickamauga, to name a few. In 1864 the General was ordered back to the Potomac Valley to command the Department of West Virginia with headquarters in Cumberland, Maryland.⁵

Again he served in an area where Confederate guerrillas were active and well organized. Never before had they been suppressed to any lasting degree in this general area of northern Virginia, western Maryland, and northeastern West Virginia.⁶ John Mosby and his renowned guerrillas dominated the area east of the Shenandoah River; Harry Gilmor and his men fought in the Valley of Virginia; and John McNeill and his Rangers with their principal headquarters at Moorefield, West Virginia, raided along the upper Potomac River and its south branch.⁷

Moorefield, a quiet town of about 1500 people, was located in the center of the rich farming area of the South Branch Valley, which was surrounded on either side by high, rough, heavy-timbered mountains. Through this picturesque valley flowed the clear, wide south branch of the Potomac River. Born in this mountainous setting of Scottish parents, John Hanson McNeill grew to be a mild-tempered, industrious farmer.⁸ After marrying Jernima Cunningham in 1837, John took his wife to Kentucky and later to Missouri where the couple acquired a 300-acre farm. With the start of the Civil War, pro-Confederate Governor Claiborne F. Jackson of Missouri commissioned John McNeill to raise a militia company and to join General Sterling Price's outfit.⁹

During the following months McNeill and his sons fought with Price in the battles of Carthage, Wilson's Creek, and Lex-

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 85-113.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁷ John B. Fay, *Capture of Generals Crook and Kelley by the McNeill Rangers* (Cumberland, 1893), p. 1.

⁸ Simeon Miller Bright, "The McNeill Rangers: A Study In Confederate Guerrilla Warfare" (Unpublished Master's Thesis, West Virginia University, 1950), pp. 6-8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 11; W. D. Vandiver, "Two Forgotten Heroes, John Hanson McNeill and His Son Jesse," *Missouri Historical Review*, XXI (April, 1927), p. 406.

ington. In the latter engagement John McNeill was wounded, and his son George was killed. After the battle John and another son, Jesse, remained behind the front lines resting with friends in Boone County, Missouri. Here they were captured by a Union horse guard and imprisoned in St. Louis. Soon Jesse escaped and made his way to Hardy County, West Virginia; his father followed shortly thereafter.¹⁰

After a month of inactivity the grim but mended warrior, dressed in a worn Confederate uniform and with dark whiskers extending almost down to his waist, decided to organize a guerrilla outfit to operate out of Moorefield.¹¹ John took the higher rank of captain and Jesse, a raw, unmanageable youth, served as lieutenant. Although the Federal troops referred to McNeill's Rangers and other similar groups as "bushwhackers," they were actually organized under the Ranger Act passed by the Confederate Congress in Richmond, Virginia. These partisan rangers were set up to cooperate with southern armies but to be independent in command.¹²

During the course of the war there were 210 names on the McNeill roster of which no more than two thirds were active at any one time.¹³ These adventurers furnished their own arms and clothing, most of which were captured from the enemy. Many Rangers wore parts or all of the blue uniform of the Union soldier throughout their service. The partisans never stayed for more than one or two nights in any one location. Ravines, ridges, and gorges in the familiar mountains served as their homes. The men usually did not build fires which the enemy might spot. Of necessity the Rangers raided small Federal camps at mealtime in order to drive the soldiers from their camp and acquire small amounts of hard tack, corned beef, and coffee.¹⁴

The life of the guerrilla fighter did not appeal to many, but there were other factors to be considered. Loyalty to the Confederate cause or personal admiration for Captain McNeill

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 405, 406; Bright, "McNeill Rangers," 10-13.

¹¹ Vandiver, "Two Forgotten Heroes," p. 404.

¹² Bright, "McNeill Rangers," pp. 15, 16; J. W. Duffey, *McNeill's Last Charge* (Moorefield, 1944), pp. 24, 25.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 25.

¹⁴ Bright, "McNeill Rangers," pp. 16, 17; *Moorefield Examiner*, March 4, 1915.

was reason enough for many to serve in the Rangers. Others sought adventure or a share in the loot of a successful raid. Some were just plain ornery and wanted a good fight. Drinking from a seemingly bottomless well of hard mountain liquor, the life of a partisan fighter seemed bearable and even romantic at times.¹⁵

The McNeill Rangers carried out their objectives with a high degree of success. Of general importance was to create havoc among Federal troops in the area. More specifically they endeavored to interrupt traffic and communications on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. The Rangers also served as scouts for Confederate forces and were helpful in supplying large numbers of beef cattle to their armies in the Shenandoah Valley.¹⁶

The southern partisans built their method of attack around the element of surprise. They assaulted their enemy preferably at daybreak, tried to cripple him before he could grasp the situation, and almost always succeeded even when outnumbered two or three to one.¹⁷ The effectiveness of Captain McNeill's tactics was illustrated by action that took place near Romney, West Virginia. The weird Rebel yell sounded from the brush as twenty-three guerrillas attacked a Federal supply train guarded by 150 soldiers. The surprised defenders became entangled in confusion, and McNeill's men captured twenty-seven wagons, seventy-two prisoners, 106 horses, and other valuable equipment. Confederate General Robert E. Lee stated that "this is the third feat of the same character in which Captain McNeill had displayed skill and daring."¹⁸ Even Union General Philip Sheridan called McNeill "the most daring and dangerous of all bushwhackers."¹⁹

In other engagements the Rangers were equally successful. The partisans captured the city of Romney from the Federals

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Bright, "McNeill Rangers," p. 18.

¹⁷ J. W. Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped* (Moorefield, 1944), p. 6.

¹⁸ *War of the Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, Vol. XXV, Part II (Washington, 1881-1900), pp. 642, 643.

¹⁹ Ambler, *West Virginia*, p. 228; Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, p. 4.

several times and held it for short periods of time.²⁰ The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad was idle on numerous occasions in McNeill's country while repairs were made on tracks and culverts that had been destroyed by the Rangers.²¹ Southern estimates claim that during the war over 25,000 Federal troops were diverted from the battlefield to guard the railroad against the Rangers.²²

General Benjamin F. Kelley, at one time commander of Federal forces in the Department of West Virginia, proclaimed in a frustrated and fiery manner, "I want McNeill killed, captured, or driven out of this valley."²³ On another occasion General Kelley advised that, "McNeill crossed the river below Oldtown and robbed several stores at that place last night. . . . You must keep yourself fully posted in regard to McNeill's movements, or your command will be all gobbled up some of these fine mornings."²⁴ These prophetic words were realized a little over a year later when Generals Crook and Kelley were "all gobbled up" by partisans under the leadership of Lieutenant Jesse McNeill, serving in his deceased father's capacity as leader of the Rangers.

The tragic death of Captain McNeill occurred in October, 1864 shortly after he had led a raid on a Federal company guarding a bridge near Mount Jackson, Virginia. In the ensuing battle one of his own men accidentally wounded Captain McNeill. The injury was inflicted under circumstances similar to those which occurred when General "Stonewall" Jackson, his hero, was killed. On the battle scene the mortally wounded Captain told his twenty-three year old, daredevil son to "take command and show yourself a man."²⁵ The Rangers did not disperse after Captain McNeill's death, but instead they rose to great heights with the raid on Cumberland in early 1865.

²⁰ *Official Records*, XLIII, Part I, pp. 726, 956; *Ibid.*, XXXIII, p. 1067; Hu Maxwell and H. L. Swisher, *History of Hampshire County* (Morgantown, 1897), p. 551; Morris Purdy Shawkey, *West Virginia In History, Life, Literature, and Industry*, II (Chicago, 1928), p. 161.

²¹ Festus Paul Summers, "The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad: A Study in The Civil War" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, West Virginia University, 1933), pp. 207, 208; *Official Records*, XXXVII, Part I, p. 69.

²² Duffey, *McNeill's Last Charge*, pp. 4, 5.

²³ *Official Records*, XXXVII, Part I, pp. 522, 523.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, XXXVII, Part II, pp. 517, 518.

²⁵ Duffey, *McNeill's Last Charge*, p. 3; Vandiver, "Two Forgotten Heroes," p. 409.

Rather than serve under the command of the young lieutenant several men did leave the Rangers to join Blake Woodson's Company, another band of Confederates operating in the area; but the strength of McNeill's men was not weakened appreciably.²⁶

The Rangers continued to raid in West Virginia by disrupting local elections and by destroying railroad tracks and equipment.²⁷ In Cumberland General Kelley was determined to destroy the Rangers. He proclaimed to the citizens of the South Branch Valley that if they continued to harbor and feed McNeill's men "the whole valley will be laid waste like the Shenandoah Valley." Colonel R. E. Fleming and fifty cavalrymen attempted to "capture, destroy, or otherwise annihilate McNeill," but to no avail.²⁸

In December, 1864, the Confederate Government revoked the charter of the McNeill Rangers. Southern officials ordered the partisans to join Gilmore's Company located in that area in an attempt to consolidate their efforts. Most of McNeill's men refused; as a result they became legally the "bushwhackers" that the Federals claimed they had been all during the war.²⁹

Adding to the troubles of the Rangers at this time was the fact that Jesse McNeill fractured his ankle, forcing a period of confinement on the otherwise active lad. He spent several weeks convalescing near Moorefield in the home of his friend, Felix Welton. Here Jesse planned an attack on Cumberland to capture Generals Kelley and Crook.³⁰ The reason that he aimed the attack at Crook and Kelley is not certain. Perhaps it stemmed from an old plan Jesse's father had made to revenge an uncourteous act by General Kelley to Mrs. McNeill.³¹ Or

²⁶ *Official Records*, XLIII, Part I, pp. 652-653.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, XLIII, Part II, pp. 522, 542.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, XLIII, Part I, pp. 662, 663, 667, 669; Vandiver, "Two Forgotten Heroes," p. 412.

²⁹ *Official Records*, LI, Part II, p. 1061.

³⁰ *Cumberland Daily News*, April 20, 1946.

³¹ Mrs. McNeill was in Ohio during the early part of the war and wished to visit her husband in Moorefield. General Kelley refused to issue her a passport; but instead ordered her arrested and kept in Ohio. Mrs. McNeill eventually made her way to Moorefield without the benefit of a passport but John McNeill never forgot the incident. William H. Lowdermilk, *History of Cumberland* (Washington, 1878), p. 420; Vandiver, "Two Forgotten Heroes," p. 413.

perhaps Jesse planned it in retaliation for the bad treatment that he claimed the Federals gave to two of his Rangers when they captured and confined them to Cumberland.³²

First, Jesse sent Ranger John Lynn back to his hometown of Cumberland to study the Union defenses and to ascertain the feasibility of his plan. Shortly thereafter the Federals captured Lynn in Cumberland, and two other partisans went in his place. Scout John B. Fay, a native of Cumberland, knew the city well. He chose as his companion scout, Charles Ritchie Hallar, a sixteen year old Missourian. The two entered the city in early February, 1865. Soon they learned the number and position of the picket posts, the exact location of Generals Crook's and Kelley's apartments, and reported back to McNeill.³³ They decided upon a tentative date for the raid and agreed that the two scouts would again enter Cumberland prior to the date set for the raid to see if the Federals had made any changes that would affect their plans.³⁴

On their final reconnaissance Fay and Hallar double-checked their information and received additional news of conditions in the city from George Stanton, an Irish secessionist and employee of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in Cumberland.³⁵ Then they hastened through the bitter cold morning of February 21 to the home of their bachelor friend, Vance Herriott, where they had a warm breakfast. Here, twenty miles from Cumberland, young Hallar prepared to take the favorable information to McNeill's camp thirty miles to the west. Fighting a blinding snowstorm, the scout finally reached Jesse's camp just north of Moorefield. McNeill was awaiting Hallar with forty-eight Rangers and fifteen other Confederate soldiers who had strayed from the Seventh and Eleventh Virginia cavalry brigades of General Thomas L. Rosser. The horses were fed and watered and the sixty-four cavalymen prepared for their long and hazardous ride into enemy territory. The

³² Virgil Carrington Jones, *Gray Ghosts and Rebel Raiders* (New York, 1956), p. 356.

³³ T. J. C. Williams and James W. Thomas, *History of Allegany County, Maryland* ([Cumberland?], 1923), p. 389.

³⁴ Lowdermilk, *History of Cumberland*, p. 421.

³⁵ J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland* (Philadelphia, 1882), pp. 296, 297.

cavalry struggled through the cold and arrived at Herriott's by sunset. Fay greeted his friends warmly. Now only twenty miles from Cumberland, the men were anxious to complete the raid.³⁶

Unsuspecting of the Rangers' plans, Generals Crook and Kelley continued their normal duties in Cumberland. Military matters took up much of their time, but the two were also engaged in the social whirl of the city. General Kelley enjoyed the company of the beautiful and talented Mary Clara Bruce, who was recognized as the future Mrs. Kelley. Miss Bruce sang at a local theatre, entertaining the homesick soldiers and weary townsmen. It was possible that two future presidents of the United States were among her theater admirers. Brigadier General James A. Garfield and Major William McKinley of Crook's staff were present in the city during the latter stages of the war.³⁷

General Crook had met and perhaps courted the daughter of the proprietor of the hotel in which he lived. Young Mary Dailey from Oakland, Maryland, must have accompanied the General to several military dances and parties. Her brother, James Dailey, served as a member of McNeill's group, as they approached Cumberland on the frigid night of February 21. The city of eight thousand people slept, as did many of the Federal troops stationed there.³⁸

McNeill and his men moved over the snow-covered ground trying to avoid formidable snow drifts. Each man was dressed warmly to ward off the intense cold. Through the clear night they traveled over the Middle Ridge, across the valley to Patterson's Creek, and over the smaller ridges to the base of Knobly Mountain. Here the men dismounted and made a path for their horses through deep snow drifts. The ascent to the top of the mountain was strenuous. Farther on at the Sam Brady farm George Stanton again gave a favorable report on conditions in the city.³⁹ From the farm the men forded the

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 297; Duffey, *McNeill's Last Charge*, p. 21; Bright, "McNeill Rangers," pp. 56, 57; Williams, *History of Allegany County*, p. 389.

³⁷ Jones, *Gray Ghosts*, pp. 361, 362.

³⁸ Williams, *History of Allegany County*, pp. 389, 390.

³⁹ Duffey, *McNeill's Last Charge*, p. 21; Bright, "McNeill Rangers," pp. 57, 58.

Potomac River leaving West Virginia and entering Maryland. When only five miles from Cumberland they had a choice of two routes. One was a short cut over New Creek Road which was well guarded. The other was the unpicketed National Road which entered the city from the west by way of the Narrows through Wills Mountain.⁴⁰

Since this route was twice as long as the New Creek Road and unforeseen delays occurred, the raiders did not have time to follow Fay's route through the Narrows and complete the raid before daylight. McNeill called a halt to the procession and presented several alternatives to Fay's plan. They could give up the project and return home, hazard the pickets on New Creek Road and attempt to carry out the attack, or put off the project and raid the pickets at a railroad station at near-by Brady's Mill.⁴¹ McNeill favored the attack at Brady's Mill, but the Rangers voted down his proposition almost unanimously. Fay blamed McNeill for what he felt were several unnecessary delays which made Fay's plan impractical and caused bad feeling between the two men. Finally, the group reached the decision to risk the pickets on New Creek Road and to attempt to carry out the raid on Cumberland.⁴²

Since the Rangers could not pass the pickets peacefully without the countersign, they would have to overpower them. An advance guard of McNeill and Sergeant Joseph Vandiver led the way, followed closely by Fay and Sergeant Joseph W. Kuykendall. The main body under Lieutenant Isaac Welton brought up the rear. The frozen snow crust crackled under the weight of the horses' hoofs, as the raiders approached the first picket. Time was valuable since there remained only one hour and a half before dawn.

"Halt! Who comes there?" challenged the Federal guard by the road. Two other Union guards were huddled around a small fire under a temporary shelter about one hundred yards from the road. The Rangers came to a halt. The men's and horses' warm breath condensed as it contacted the cold air which gave it a steamy effect. "Friends from New Creek,"

⁴⁰ Sylvester Myers, *Meyers' History of West Virginia* (Wheeling, 1915), I, p. 482.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 482.

⁴² Williams, *History of Allegany County*, p. 390.

was the response from a Rebel. "Dismount one, come forward and give the countersign," instructed the guard. Without a word McNeill impulsively put spurs to his horse. Being unable to stop in front of the Union guard, Jesse fired his revolver near the startled picket's face. The other raiders followed quickly and secured the unharmed guard and his two comrades.⁴³

The Confederates brought the three captured pickets to the middle of the road and demanded that they divulge the countersign. When the Union soldiers refused, McNeill realized that immediate action was imperative. First he threatened each with death, but the men remained silent. Then he questioned each man individually but to no avail. Next McNeill placed the muzzle of his pistol between the eyes of one soldier and prepared to pull the trigger if the desired information was not forthcoming. The man stood petrified in this tense moment. Breaking the uneasy silence a Confederate suggested that they hang the picket and choke the countersign out of him. Swiftly a halter was placed around the guard's neck and to the relief of all he blurted out in broken English, "Bull's Gap."⁴⁴

Armed with the countersign the Confederates continued along the road, taking the captured pickets with them. Unhappy with McNeill's careless reaction of firing his gun and perhaps giving them away, the men agreed that Fay and Kuykendall would lead the advance guard with the understanding that there would be no more shooting except in extreme emergency. Over the next hill and perhaps a mile away the raiders came upon a second picket station. Five guards were stationed at this post, playing cards around a blazing log fire. As the Confederates advanced in the dark, one picket left the card game, picked up his musket as he advanced to meet the strangers, and demanded the countersign.⁴⁵

Kuykendall, stalling for time as several other raiders moved up close to the fire, replied that they were cavalry returning

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 391; Maxwell, *History of Hampshire County*, pp. 676, 677; Jones, *Gray Ghosts*, pp. 9, 10.

⁴⁴ Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, p. 10.

⁴⁵ Williams, *History of Allegany County*, p. 391.

from New Creek. The picket ordered him to dismount and give the countersign. It was not needed for now the Union soldiers were surrounded and quickly captured. The raiders destroyed the pickets' guns and ammunition and left them unguarded with instructions to remain there until the troops returned.

The Rebels moved toward the slumbering city as daylight approached. Soon the Confederates could see the lights of the city. At the outskirts McNeill called a momentary halt in order to appoint two squads of ten men each. Sergeant Kuykendall headed the squad that would capture General Kelley, who lived in the Barnum House.⁴⁶ Kuykendall had once been a prisoner of Kelley's and therefore knew the General.⁴⁷

The Revere House where General Crook resided was one hundred yards down Baltimore Street, the main thoroughfare in downtown Cumberland. Sergeant Vandiver headed the squad appointed to capture Crook. Sergeant James Dailey, the future brother-in-law of General Crook, accompanied Vandiver's group, as well as Jacob Gassman, a former clerk at the Revere House. Fay, Hallar, and others were delegated to cut the telegraph lines in the nearby telegraph office.⁴⁸

With these assignments the Confederate raiders crossed the chain bridge over Wills Creek. Moving at a careless gait, they clattered past the Federal horse stables on Baltimore Street. Slowly they moved down the main street, some dressed in captured Union pants and overcoats, while others wore parts of Confederate uniforms. In the dim light one could make little distinction between blue and gray. Several raiders whistled Yankee tunes, while others exchanged greetings with patrols and with people going to work in the predawn hours. The head of the column passed the Barnum House and stopped in front of the Revere House, with its ranks trailing down the street to General Kelley's quarters.

A lone sentry stood guard in front of each hotel, showing no apparent concern to the halting troops which seemed to

⁴⁶ Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, p. 11.

⁴⁷ Williams, *History of Allegany County*, p. 392.

⁴⁸ Maxwell, *History of Hampshire County*, pp. 678, 679; Williams, *History of Allegany County*. P. 392.

be a returning scouting party. Sprigg Lynn, a native of Cumberland, was the first to dismount. Quickly he captured and disarmed the sentinel in front of the Barnum House. The surprised guard gave directions to General Kelley's room inside the hotel. Lynn, Kuykendall, and John H. Cunningham proceeded to the second floor, but by mistake entered the room of Kelley's adjutant general, Major Thayer Melvin. When asked for the location of Kelley's room, Melvin nervously answered that it adjoined his. Entering the other room the raiders quickly awakened the General and told him that he was a prisoner. Sleepily Kelley inquired to whom he was surrendering. Kuykendall replied, "to Captain McNeill, by order of General Rosser."⁴⁹ Silently Kelley and Melvin dressed. Then the Rangers led them down the street and ordered each to share a horse with a Ranger.

At the Revere House a similar scene took place. The Rebels captured the guard and moved up the stone steps to the hotel door, which they found locked. A small Negro boy, George Cooper, unlocked the door from the inside, and the men pushed in. When they asked the frightened lad if General Crook was in the hotel, he replied: "Yes sah, but don't tell 'em I told you. What kind o' men is you all, anyhow?" He received no reply.⁵⁰

While Vandiver and Dailey obtained a light from an office below, Gassman proceeded to Crook's apartment, number 46. Thinking the door was locked, he knocked several times. "Who's there?" was the response. "A friend," answered Gassman. Crook invited Gassman into his room as Vandiver, Dailey, and another Ranger arrived. The four entered and moved toward the bed.

"General Crook, you are my prisoner," Vandiver said in a pompous manner. "What authority do you have for this?" asked the startled General. "The authority of General Rosser, of Fitzhugh Lee's division of cavalry," answered Vandiver. "Is General Rosser here?" asked Crook as he rose up in bed. "Yes," lied Vandiver, "I am General Rosser. We have surprised and

⁴⁹ Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, p. 11; Williams, *History of Allegany County*, p. 393.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 393; Maxwell, *History of Hampshire County*, pp. 680, 681.

captured the town." With this information Crook surrendered to his captors.⁵¹

While the two kidnappings were taking place, Fay and Halar entered the telegraph office which adjoined the Revere House. There they found the operator, A. T. Brennaman, sound asleep. He awoke when the raiders pulled a table from under his outstretched legs. Then the two men tied up Brennaman, destroyed the telegraph facilities, and rejoined the main group outside the Revere House. Other Confederates captured the headquarters' flag and more war booty.⁵²

As Crook and his captors reached the sidewalk, a young clerk who had been asleep in the hotel rushed outside. Holding up his lantern to get a good look, he asked, "How many Johnnies have you caught?" Noticing the men's dress, he suddenly realized his mistake. A nearby Rebel grabbed the clerk and searched his pockets. Then raider W. H. Maloney yanked his coat up over his head and left the dumbfounded boy on the sidewalk.⁵³

The Confederates quickly retraced their steps, pausing at the chain bridge to obtain additional horses from the Federal stable for their prisoners. McNeill tried to hurry the men as much as possible and became very excited with the delay. He ordered Fay to lead them out of the city by the shortest route. Moving down the Canal Street Road, the mounted soldiers sighted a dozen or more pickets. Quickly the Rangers subdued them and destroyed their arms and ammunition. As the raiders galloped off, the helpless Yanks were left standing in the road.

The next obstacle appeared about one mile out of the city, where more pickets guarded the canal bridge. Vandiver led the group as they approached the post. One Union guard shouted to his superior, "Sergeant, shall I fire?" Vandiver interrupted in an angry voice, "If you do, I will place you under arrest. This is General Crook's bodyguard, and we have

⁵¹ Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, p. 11; Maxwell, *History of Hampshire County*, pp. 680, 681; Williams, *History of Allegany County*, p. 393.

⁵² Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, pp. 12, 13.

⁵³ Later this youth, John B. Chamber, served the community as a prominent merchant and magistrate in nearby Frostburg, Maryland. *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 12.

no time to waste. The Rebels are coming, and we are going out to meet them.”⁵⁴ The Rangers hastily galloped past the startled guards, handily avoiding conflict at the last outpost on this route.

Crossing over the Potomac River the much relieved raiders were on West Virginia soil again, putting as much distance as possible between themselves and the scene of their astounding capture. When the men were four or five miles from Cumberland, they heard a cannon explosion which gave the alarm of their raid. Soon the morning sun began to melt the snow, making it difficult for the tired horses.

Riding bareback, General Crook was showing signs of distress with the fast pace. Finally, he asked Ranger Maloney to ride ahead and secure a saddle. The Ranger replied that he did not know where he would find one. The General laughed and said, “Take one from the first Yank (you see) and tell him General Crook ordered you to take it.”⁵⁵ Maloney rode ahead to Jacob Kyle’s farm, where he threatened to burn his house down unless he got a saddle. Soon Maloney rejoined the Rangers, and a grateful Crook welcomed his resourcefulness.

Onward the Rangers rode, passing through Romney with their captured headquarters’ flags flying; the citizens were confused when seeing the mixture of blue and gray uniforms. Leaving the city, the raiders chose an obscure road running along the south branch of the Potomac.⁵⁶ Several miles south of Romney two Rangers, Joseph Sherrard and John Poland, stopped at the farmhouse of William B. Stump. Later the Federal cavalry arrived, wounded Poland, and captured the two raiders. These proved to be the only Ranger losses during the entire raid.⁵⁷

The raiders had spotted a mounted force of Federals before they had entered Romney, and now this group gained on the Rangers. The fleeing Rebels raced along one side of the South Branch River out of range of the Federal cavalry on the other side. McNeill’s rear guard held off the Federals for one hour

⁵⁴ Maxwell, *History of Hampshire County*, p. 682.

⁵⁵ Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, pp. 12, 13.

⁵⁶ Later this youth, John B. Chamber, served the community as a promi-

⁵⁷ Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, p. 16.

at a strategic point, but the melting snow made the fast pace extremely difficult for the Rangers and their tired mounts.

Having fresh horses, the Yanks gained on the raiders. McNeill soon realized that they would be cut off before they reached Moorefield, where they had hoped to display their booty and prisoners before the hometown folks. Evening was starting to settle over the valley when the Rangers were only two miles from the city. At that point McNeill led his men into the woods and onto a trail which they followed over back ridges to a spot seven miles east of Moorefield. Here in a little-known gorge in the mountains the men made camp.⁵⁸ Feeling weary but safe, they reflected happily on the activities of this memorable day. They had accomplished the almost impossible task of capturing two top-ranking Union generals from a city guarded by six to eight thousand Federal forces. During this twenty-four hour period, they had ridden over ninety miles through mountainous country in intense cold and deep snow in the presence of extreme pressure and danger.

Early the next morning a protective escort of Rangers led the prisoners away to Harrisonburg, Virginia. The Federals had spent the night in Moorefield and had received reinforcements from General Sheridan in Winchester, Virginia. The next day the prisoners and their escorts completed the 154 mile trip to the headquarters of General Jubal Early in Staunton, Virginia, where they were fed adequately and lodged comfortably. The main force of the Rangers remained in the mountains for several days after the raid, waiting for the diligence of the Federal pursuit to wane.⁵⁹

In Cumberland the reaction to the raid was one of astonishment and mirth. Citizens called it the biggest joke of the war. Many speculated as to whether the generals would be recaptured. Miss Bruce, General Kelley's intended, appeared on a local stage the night after the raid and started to sing her first selection, "He Kissed Me When He Left." She was interrupted by an inebriated soldier in the audience who shouted, "No, I'll be damn if he did . . . McNeill didn't give

⁵⁸ Maxwell, *History of Hampshire County*, p. 683.

⁵⁹ Duffey, *Two Generals Kidnapped*, pp. 17, 18; Bright, "McNeill's Rangers," p. 69.

him time." This outburst ended Miss Bruce's performance for the night, as she withdrew from the stage.⁶⁰

Most agreed that McNeill's raid was bold and far-reaching. General Crook called it "the most brilliant exploit of the war!"⁶¹ Colonel John Mosby commented in Richmond, Virginia, where the two captured generals were imprisoned, that "this surpasses anything I have ever done. To get even with you boys, I have got to go into Washington and carry Abe Lincoln out."⁶² The praise was generous but the deed proved of little consequence. Confederate officials soon paroled Crook and Kelley; and Crook participated in the closing battles of the war at Petersburg, Richmond, and Appomattox.

After the war many of the personalities that were involved in the raid settled in the Allegheny Mountain area. Jesse McNeill and many of the raiders acclimated themselves to a more peaceful life and lived to celebrate several reunions of the Rangers. General Kelley secured a civil service post after the war and lived on his farm in the Alleghenies with his wife, Mary, until his death in 1891. Major Melvin became a distinguished member of the West Virginia bar and a fine circuit court judge.⁶³ Mrs. Mary Dailey Crook spent many of her remaining days in western Maryland awaiting the visits of her frontier soldier husband who was fighting and negotiating with the Indians of the Great Plains. They could remember well the lesson in guerrilla warfare that the General had learned in that area of one of the first American frontiers—the Allegheny Mountains.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 18, 20.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 18, 19.

⁶² Vandiver, "The Forgotten Heroes," p. 418.

⁶³ Fay, *Capture of Generals Crook and Kelley*, p. 6.

PORTRAITS BY SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS RETURN TO TULIP HILL

By J. REANEY KELLY

FOLLOWING PUBLICATION of an article "Tulip Hill, Its History and Its People" in the December 1965 issue of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*,¹ attempts were made to find the two Sir Joshua Reynolds' portraits of Mr. and Mrs. Sylvanus Groves² of London that had hung at Tulip Hill for over one hundred years before being sold in 1882. After an unsuccessful search in galleries, historical societies, and the Adams Papers in Boston and the Frick Art Reference Library in New York, a chance inquiry in Washington, D.C., finally led to their discovery. Now, after eighty-five years, they have not only been located but have been returned to Maryland and again hang at Tulip Hill where they were sent as a gift soon after the house was built in 1756.

After the sale of the West River estate in 1877 Mrs. Anne Sarah Hughes, the last owner by descent from Samuel Galloway III, the builder, gave or sold to relatives and friends³ some of the furnishings of her old home. However, when the elderly widow moved to Washington, she took with her the two Reynolds' portraits and several pieces of fine furniture which her father, Virgil Maxcy, had brought to America from Europe where he had been chargé d'affaires to Belgium.⁴ An armoire, escritoire, and the paintings were bought by Mrs. Henry Adams, wife of the noted historian, in 1882. Mrs. Adams tells an exciting story of the inspection, purchase and the au-

¹ J. Reaney Kelly, "Tulip Hill, Its History and Its People," *Md. Hist. Mag.* LX. (December, 1965)

² The name appears as Grove in many of the Tulip Hill records.

³ Wallace's Monthly, "The Godolphin Arabian," by the editor, III, IV (May, 1877), pp. 289-298. Microfilm at Hall of Records, Annapolis.

⁴ Galloway, Maxcy, Markoe Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Vol. 42, fol. 17,287.



Sylvanus Groves



Mrs. Sylvanus Groves

thentication of the pictures in her contemporary letters published in 1936.⁵ She cried "Eureka" when experts announced they were genuine and that Mr. and Mrs. Groves were listed as sitters for Sir Joshua in London in August 1755.

Mrs. Adams described the Reynolds' portraits in a letter to a friend in 1882, soon after they were acquired. She wrote: "The lady, snub-nosed and pale in pink satin with blue gauze scarf and pearl ornaments, hair drawn up over a cushion; Mr. Groves stout and handsome in powdered whig, gray brocade coat and white neckerchief." Henry Adams is quoted as saying: "Yes, they are charmingly modelled and very dignified." The portraits were also described as being of Kit-Kat size, twenty-four by thirty inches.⁶

Tradition in the Galloway family has always been that Samuel Galloway and Sylvanus Groves, his factor or London representative, arranged to exchange portraits of themselves and their wives possibly when the former was in London in 1755.⁷ Galloway and Groves had a successful business relationship and their families were close friends. When two of Galloway's sons attended school in London they resided with the Groves.⁸ Galloway named two of his sailing vessels the *Grove*, one of which was registered as a ship and the other as a brigantine.⁹ That the Reynolds' portraits were a gift to the Galloways and hung at Tulip Hill is well documented. When the paintings were registered at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, April 3, 1877, it was recorded: "Possessor Mrs. A. S. Hughes to whose Great Grand Parents Mr. & Mrs. Sam. Galloway these Portraits were sent as a 'Present' and were among the first of Sir Joshua Reynolds' paintings to be sent to America."¹⁰ A visitor to the West River estate in the Mid-19th Century wrote as follows: "On June 26, 1849 we rode to Mrs. Maxcy's, widow of Virgil Maxcy—formerly our Minister

⁵ *The Letters of Mrs. Henry Adams 1865-1883*, Ward Thorn, ed. (Boston 1936), pp. 349, 351. Also see Kelly *loc. cit.*, pp. 399-401.

⁶ *Ibid.* The name Kit-Kat was first associated with the half-length paintings of the members of the noted Kit-Kat Club of London.

⁷ G.M.M. Papers, *loc. cit.*, Vol. 1, fol. 8167.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, fol. 8377 and 8425; Vol. 7, fol. 9143; Vol. 9, fol. 9520.

⁹ Vaughan W. Brown "Shipping in the Port of Annapolis 1748-1775" (U.S. Naval Institute, Annapolis), Sea Power Monograph #1, 1965. Also see *Maryland Gazette*, March 22, 1753.

¹⁰ Information on back of portraits.

to Belgium but who lost his life on the ill-fated warship Princeton.¹¹ The house is very old, much of the furniture came from Europe, some of it over two hundred years old. Among the other treasures they have two portraits by Sir Joshua Reynolds."¹²

Portraits of Samuel Galloway and Anne Chew Galloway, his wife, were painted by John Wollaston about 1753.¹³ However, they were not sent abroad. They remained at Tulip Hill until probably 1877 when the estate was sold, and are now owned by Galloway descendants at nearby Cedar Park.¹⁴ A reason why these paintings were not sent to London as planned was the untimely death of Mrs. Galloway in December 1756.¹⁵ Possibly, her husband then decided to keep the only known picture of his devoted wife who did not live to see the completion of the house that was to have been her new home.

In the summer of 1966 inquiry at the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., revealed that it had been the custodian of the two Reynolds' portraits from 1886 to 1895, gift of Mr. Henry Adams. According to "Board papers" on February 4, 1896, "At the request of Mr. Henry Adams the portraits were returned to the owner, Miss Mary Markoe." Another notation found in an old register made while the pictures were in the gallery reads as follows: "These portraits are said by Mr. Henry Adams (donor) to have been painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds and were sent as a 'present' to a friend in Maryland."

Identification of Mary Markoe (a neice of Mrs. Hughes), as owner, in 1896, quickly led to locating the portraits in the possession of Galloway descendants in Pennsylvania. Finding them was timely as they were being expertly cleaned and restored, and the owners were considering offering the pictures for sale.

This brought to six the number of paintings, now extant,

¹¹ Kelly, *loc. cit.*, *Quakers in the Founding of Anne Arundel County, Maryland* (Baltimore, 1963), pp. 390-391.

¹² Thomas John Hall, III, *The Hall Family of West River* (Denton, Md., 1941), p. 321.

¹³ John C. Groce "John Wollaston (FL, 1736-1767), A Cosmopolitan Painter in the British Colonies," *The Art Quarterly* (Summer, 1956), p. 138.

¹⁴ Owned by Mr. and Mrs. E. Churchill Murray.

¹⁵ *Maryland Gazette*, December 23, 1756.

known to have hung at Tulip Hill in the third quarter of the 18th Century. In addition to those by Reynolds is the portrait of Jane Galloway Shippen by Benjamin West, *circa* 1757, which is owned by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. A full size copy is now at Tulip Hill. The Wollaston paintings of Samuel and Anne Chew Galloway were probably the first to grace the walls of the historic house. Finally, there is the picture of Godolphin's Arabian, "in oil and apparently on some kind of paper glued to canvas."¹⁶ It is a copy of a painting by John Wootton of the famous horse and was brought to West River by Galloway in 1755. Mrs. Hughes gave the picture to Dr. James H. Murray of nearby Cedar Park in 1877, where it still hangs.

Mr. and Mrs. Lewis R. Andrews, owners of Tulip Hill since 1948, purchased the Reynolds' portraits in their original 18th Century frames late in 1966. Now, 212 years after being painted, they have again been given a place of honor, adding both beauty and historical authenticity to one of Maryland's finest houses.

¹⁶ Wallace's Monthly, III, IV, pp. 287-389.

SIDELIGHTS

A SPECULATIVE FOOTNOTE TO XYZ

BY PETER P. HILL

A fluke of timing and a personal mistrust among the overseas emissaries of John Adams may have been decisive elements in sparking the quasi war with France, 1798-1800.

The crisis began when Congress learned in April, 1798, that the American envoys to Paris had been asked for a "douceur" as a prerequisite to treaty-making.¹ These bribe-seeking overtures from Talleyrand's agents, Messieurs X, Y and Z, became known to the public when the House of Representatives demanded to see the diplomatic correspondence.² The XYZ despatches, as they were called, made exciting reading. The Congress, convinced that American honor had been sullied, responded with full-scale preparations for war. What followed was the period of Franco-American naval hostilities known as the quasi or naval war with France.

In retrospect the arrival-time of the despatches would seem to have heightened their effect on Congressional reaction. Although the American envoys, Charles C. Pinckney, John Marshall and Elbridge Gerry, had written as early as October 22, 1797, of their first encounter with X, Y and Z, their first despatch had not ar-

Permission to draw this piece from the author's recently accepted doctoral dissertation, "The Political and Diplomatic Career of William Vans Murray, 1760-1803," has been granted by the Graduate Council of the George Washington University.

¹ Although it was the French request for bribe money that inflamed public opinion, Pinckney and Marshall were primarily put off by the simultaneous French demand for a loan. See Stephen G. Kurtz, *The Presidency of John Adams* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957), p. 298. For the despatches see *State Papers and Publick Documents of the United States* (Boston: Thomas B. Wait, 1819), III, 475-499; IV, 1-32.

² House Republicans, suspecting that the administration had bungled the French negotiation, carried a motion on April 2 requesting the correspondence. Adams submitted the despatches the following day, and on April 6 the House voted to publish 1200 copies. See *Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States* (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1834-1856), 5th Cong., 2nd Sess., pp. 1357-1363, 1371, 1375, 1380.

rived in Philadelphia until the evening of March 4, 1798. Four more despatches arrived during the next two days.³ Thus, when the House called for the correspondence on April 2, members could read the whole story of the envoys' "humiliation" from beginning to end. The emotional impact was tremendous, and the warlike response commensurate.

Had the despatches from Paris come piecemeal throughout February and March, possibly the story of XYZ would have had a less exciting effect. President Adams, already chafing at the laggard attitude of the House toward his preparedness program, would almost certainly have leaked the despatches to Congress had they arrived earlier.⁴ Moreover, that body was fully capable of gradations of reaction short of war. Even with the XYZ despatches in hand, the Federalist warhawks were unsure enough of public support to hold back from an outright war declaration.⁵ Had the XYZ story been "serialized," i.e., disclosed bit by bit, its effect on Congress might not have been so intense. An illustrative precedent can be found in the Congressional actions which preceded Jay's mission to London in 1794. Here a steady accumulation of grievances against Britain had led, by stages, from "Madison's Resolutions" to an embargo and ultimately to proposals for debt sequestration.⁶

Given the possibility of a more gradual and less provocative escalation of hostility, an interesting question poses itself: Could Pinckney, Marshall and Gerry have relayed the news of their Paris

³ Secretary of State Timothy Pickering, Philadelphia, March 5, 1798, to William L. Smith, U. S. Minister to Portugal, Instructions to U. S. Ministers, IV, National Archives; see also Pickering to Rufus King, U. S. Minister to Great Britain, April 26, 1798, *ibid.*

⁴ On six separate occasions during his first year in office Adams urged Congress to improve the nation's defenses. In addition to complying promptly with Congressional requests for information, Adams in at least three instances conveyed materials relating to national defense without being asked. When the first batch of XYZ despatches arrived he forwarded one of them (dealing with a recent French decree against neutral shipping) within 24 hours. With the hook baited, Adams then sent a message to Congress on March 19 in which he noted the failure of the Paris mission but made no offer of the correspondence. When Congress asked for it, however, he again acted within 24 hours. See James D. Richardson, ed., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (Washington: GPO, c. 1897), I, 228-265, *passim*.

⁵ Charles Francis Adams, ed., *Works of John Adams* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1850-1856), IX, 304-305; Fisher Ames to Oliver Wolcott, Dedham, Mass., June 8, 1798, George Gibbs, *Memoirs of the Administrations of Washington and John Adams* (New York: William Van Norden, 1846), II, 51-52; John C. Hamilton, ed., *Works of Alexander Hamilton* (New York: John F. Trow, 1850-1851), VI, 298-299.

⁶ *Debates and Proceedings*, 3rd Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 155-156, 442, 529-530, 535, 561.

encounter any earlier? The answer is yes—had they shown greater trust in the Adams Federalist who manned the diplomatic post at The Hague. The latter was William Vans Murray, a former three-term Congressman from the Maryland Eastern Shore who had served as U.S. Minister to the Batavian Republic since June, 1797. Had the despatches been routed through Murray at The Hague, instead of William L. Smith at Lisbon, the first installment of XYZ would have arrived February 3, a full month earlier than they did.⁷

The readiest explanation of why the envoys chose Lisbon rather than The Hague is that communications sent by way of Portugal would be less likely to be intercepted by British men-of-war.⁸ Inasmuch as the despatches were written in code, this precaution would seem to have been unnecessary. Moreover, if security were the reason, why did the envoys not risk the same disclosures to Murray that they made to Rufus King? King, our minister in London, knew the substance of the XYZ affair as early as December 23, and was advising the Paris mission not to deal with France on the basis of loans and bribes.⁹ At The Hague, meanwhile, Murray was kept wholly ignorant of what was transpiring. Talleyrand's agents had made their overtures on the evening of October 18. During the next ten days all three of the Paris envoys wrote letters to Murray, but not one told him explicitly what was happening.¹⁰ Had they done so, Murray's letter to the State Department of November 5 would have brought the news to Philadelphia on February 3. Not until mid-January, 1798, did Murray learn (possibly from Pinckney) that "the French want a forced loan

⁷ Murray to Pickering, No. 21, The Hague, November 5, 1797, Netherlands Despatches, I, National Archives, answered by Pickering to Murray, No. 1, Philadelphia, February 3, 1798, Instructions to U. S. Ministers, IV. Some idea of Pickering's agitation can be seen in his letter to William L. Smith, written the day before the first XYZ despatch arrived. Pickering wrote: "We have not received one line from our Envoys since they left Holland! almost six months ago! . . . we must conclude that they have sufficient inducements to stay. But why not write? Or are all their letters and messengers intercepted? The latest from *Mr. Murray* is only down to Nov. 5." No. 3, Philadelphia, March 3, 1798, *ibid.*

⁸ Rufus King, for example, warned the envoys that France was delaying the departure of American vessels from French ports. King to the U. S. Commissioners, London, December 9, 1797, Charles R. King, ed., *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900), II, 248.

⁹ Same to same, London, December 23, 1797, *ibid.*, pp. 262-263.

¹⁰ Marshall to Murray, Paris, October 21, 1797, attached to Murray's No. 16 to Pickering, The Hague, October 28, 1797, Netherlands Despatches, I; reference to letters from Pinckney and Gerry in Murray's No. 21 to Pickering, *op. cit.*

from the United States." Not until May 28 (1) did he learn the whole story from Rufus King.¹¹

The envoys' neglect of The Hague as a channel of communications is, of course, susceptible to other explanations. They may have minimized the need for haste or under-estimated the slowness of the Lisbon route. Such miscalculations might be laid to the diplomatic inexperience of Marshall and Gerry, but Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who had been in Europe nearly a year, should have known better.

Distrust of Murray, therefore, would seem to explain the envoys' failure to use his services. Because the despatches were coded, they were safe from British detection—safer certainly than the uncoded letters that went to Rufus King. Moreover, The Hague was well known to be one of the swiftest routes for transmitting communications to Philadelphia.¹² Why, at least, weren't duplicate copies of the despatches sent via The Hague? Was it because Murray might have expected a disclosure of their contents—an expectation which the envoys, out of courtesy to a fellow diplomat, might have felt they could not refuse? Or was it because Murray had a key to Pinckney's "cipher" and might have learned their contents for himself? These questions are unanswerable, but they point to distrust.

If, as appears likely, Murray was deliberately kept uninformed, the envoys' reason was probably partisan. During his Congressional career the Marylander had only occasionally been privy to the inner circle of Federalist policy-shapers.¹³ While usually loyal to party measures, Murray had never hesitated to cross the party line whenever his conscience or his broader view of the national interest lay on the other side. His occasional irregularity as a Federalist Congressman plus his outspoken campaigning for John Adams in 1796 (at a time when some Hamiltonians were working for the election of Thomas Pinckney) had, in short, put him on the outer fringes of the Federalist establishment. In an era when the slightest deviation from the party line did not go unnoticed, and a Congressman's aye or nay in roll call was often the test of his "soundness," William Vans Murray might well have been

¹¹ Murray to John Quincy Adams, The Hague, May 29, 1798, Worthington Chauncy Ford, ed., "Letters of William Vans Murray to John Quincy Adams, 1797-1803," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1912* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1914), pp. 410-411.

¹² Closer to Philadelphia in sailing time than either Paris or Berlin and more central to the major European capitals than either Madrid or Lisbon, the American legation at The Hague was rivaled only by its counterpart in London as a point from which intelligence could be transmitted quickly.

¹³ Hill, "Political and Diplomatic Career of William Vans Murray," Ch. 4-13, *passim*.

viewed from Paris as a security risk. He obviously had little rapport with Elbridge Gerry who, to his disgust, was too willing to believe the best of the French Directory.¹⁴ But neither did he appear to have the confidence of Pinckney and Marshall.¹⁵ The silence from Paris, therefore, might be taken as a measure of what Murray's colleagues believed to be his political untrustworthiness.

In sum, a procedural oversight or, more likely, a crisis of confidence caused a month's delay in the news of XYZ reaching Philadelphia. What this delay might have signified in terms of Congressional reaction remains one of the imponderables of the period.

¹⁴ Murray to JQA, The Hague, October 1, 1797, *AHA Report of 1912*, p. 362; Gerry to Murray, Paris, October 9, 1797, Misc. Letters, Murray MSS, Library of Congress.

¹⁵ Later, for example, on learning that Marshall had opposed the Alien and Sedition acts, Murray recalled that Marshall's credentials as a Federalist had never been impressive. He also remembered that Pinckney, while at The Hague between missions, had often differed with him "on some points of federal doctrines." Murray to JQA, The Hague, March 22, 1799, *AHA Report of 1912*, p. 530.

REVIEWS OF RECENT BOOKS

The Prose Works of William Byrd of Westover. Edited by LOUIS B. WRIGHT. Cambridge: the Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1966. viii, 438. \$9.75.

For those of us who went to college before the Second World War, back in the days when the academic literati deigned to teach survey courses in American Literature, the name of William Byrd of Westover and the excerpts from the *History of the Dividing Line* and *A Progress to the Mines* which we read, evoke memories of a green and pleasant oasis in the desert of dry New England worthies otherwise relieved only by Thomas Morton of Merrymount. For those who have suffered through and even some of those who teach required English courses in these latter and not necessarily better days of the *genre* approach, Byrd is all too often unknown. That is a pity, for William Byrd of Westover was an urbane gentleman of affairs, a gentleman at home in the company of the great in London and equally at home beyond the frontier in the Virginia of the 1720's.

Although Byrd wrote as if to entertain his friends, he was too much of a perfectionist to send his pieces to the printer, and although the existence of the manuscripts was known and parts read by various people, including Thomas Jefferson, the longest of the four works in the present volume, the *History of the Dividing Line*, was not printed until Edmund Ruffin brought out an edition in 1841. Thomas Hicks Wynne brought out a more carefully copied edition in 1866. In 1901 John Spencer Bassett and in 1929 William K. Boyd published new editions based on the Wynne text. In 1929 Mark Van Doren edited an edition based on the Ruffin text. All of these editions were based directly or indirectly on the manuscript then at Westover and now in the Library of the Virginia Historical Society. There is another manuscript of the work in the Library of the American Philosophical Society with slight variations from the Westover manuscript. The present edition seems to be the first one in which the two versions are collated.

This book also contains the second printing of the *Secret History of the Dividing Line*. This work, in which Byrd gave the members of the surveying party fictitious names, and then had fun with a gently satiric account of their foibles and mishaps, was printed by Boyd along with the longer work in 1929. It is based on a manuscript in the American Philosophical Society Library.

The other two pieces in this book, *A Progress to the Mines* and *A Journey to the Land of Eden*, have also appeared before, most recently in somewhat condensed form as addenda to *The London Diary 1717-1721* edited by Dr. Wright and Mrs. Marion Tinling and published in 1958.

Although Byrd's place in literature will probably be determined mainly by his *Diaries*, written in a private shorthand and for no eyes but his own, and transcribed by Mrs. Tinling and edited by Dr. Wright and Professor Maude H. Woodfin (1941, 1942, and 1958), the material in this book can stand on its own. Byrd's account of the surveying of the line between Virginia and North Carolina is interesting description of virgin territory, and his comments on people are useful social history and amusing in their own right. Byrd was a keen observer, interested in everything, and he wrote about both what he saw and what he thought about it in an easy, pleasant style.

Dr. Wright has provided a useful introduction, "William Byrd as a Man of Letters." There is an interesting Appendix, "Notes on the Text and Provenance of the Byrd Manuscripts" by Kathleen L. Leonard. The book is well made with an inclusive index and a pleasant absence of typographical errors. The only error this reviewer could find is that "Berkeley" in the note on p. 51 should be spelled "Berkley," and the only reason the reviewer knows it is that he is married to the granddaughter of Lycurgus Berkley for whom the area is named.

In conclusion, there are books which must be read by students of colonial history and American literature. And there are also books which are fun to read. Here we have the definitive edition of a work which is, as Edward Gibbon would put it, "instructive and amusing."

JOHN CARTER MATTHEWS

Towson State College

Here Come The Rebels! BY WILBUR STURTEVANT NYE. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965. xvi, 412. \$7.95

The Gettysburg campaign has received extensive treatment by historians, but in *Here Come the Rebels!* the reader is surprisingly rewarded with a new approach to an old subject. This study describes the movements of Ewell's corps as it moved towards Gettysburg and northern public reaction to this advance.

A northern invasion offered several attractive considerations to Lee in June, 1863. Pennsylvania would easily provide a source of needed food and forage, while the destruction of communication

lines would prove disruptive to the Union. Tactical and strategic reasons also dictated the necessity of a major decision. In the preparation for the campaign, Lee reorganized his army and divided it into three corps. In this undertaking Nye feels that Lee's administrative ability and accomplishments have been neglected by historians and deserve more praise and consideration.

Northern intelligence failed badly to determine Lee's intentions following Chancellorsville. The author is especially critical of General Pleasonton, commander of the Union cavalry, for failing to perform as directed and to provide Hooker with needed information. Federal authorities merely believed that a large cavalry raid was under preparation, while Pennsylvania officials, reacting to military operations in West Virginia, at first believed that Pittsburgh was to be threatened. Governor Curtin soon became alarmed that Harrisburg was the intended objective and called upon Washington for aid. The ensuing dialogue between state and federal authorities reveals an interesting complexity of political considerations.

Nye's treatment of Ewell's corps as it moved northward will delight the student of military operations. The capture of Winchester is presented as a model movement, while many of the lesser battles and cavalry skirmishes have been rescued from relative obscurity. His treatment of such engagements as Stephenson's Depot, Aldie, and Upperville give a greater dimension to the campaign.

Col. Nye, a former chief of the Army's Historical Division in Europe, has managed to blend his past military career and academic training into a book remarkable for its insights, military details, and judgments. Among the controversial matters, that he re-examines, is Hooker's plan to attack Richmond in case Lee attempted an invasion of the North. Nye feels, contrary to Hooker's critics, that the Lee-Davis dispatches justify the plan and would have forced Lee to give up his expedition. Not all historians will agree with his judgments, but they make for a provocative book.

Marylanders will be somewhat chagrined that more material was not included on their state's reaction in the crisis, and a reader may well also feel a regret that Nye did not complete the story by describing Lee's masterful retreat back into Virginia. Col. Nye's mastery of detail leads him at times to include extraneous matters which detract from his narrative. Despite these minor criticisms, the author's blend of scholarship, judgment, and literary style make this book an excellent addition to Civil War literature.

RICHARD R. DUNCAN

University of Richmond

The Prisoners of Algiers: An Account of the Forgotten American-Algerian War. 1785-1797. By H. G. BARNBY. London, England: Oxford University Press, 1966. pp. 318. \$7.50

H. G. Barnby's book opens in the year 1785 with America just two short years removed from the Peace of Paris ending the American Revolution. No doubt the popular slogan of 1797, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute" personified the rage of a bumptious but diplomatically impotent nation apprized of the seizure of American Nationals by Barbary Coast Pirates. Barnby's work is, therefore, a history of the perils, the futility, and frustrations of negotiating out of weakness. It also provides a new insight into the diplomacy under the Articles of Confederation. His work seems to give further evidence, from the point of view of foreign affairs, to the pleas of such Nationalists as Hamilton, Jay, and Madison for a strong central government.

The sailors who fell into Algerian hands in 1785 became prisoners not so much because of a powerful and tyrannical Dey of Algiers, but from circumstance. Barnby's account of the lives of these unfortunate captives is largely seen through the eyes of one James Cathcart, himself a precocious and self-seeking prisoner of the Dey. Through the use of the Cathcart papers and numerous French and British diplomatic sources, the author has pieced together a first-rate account of the social, political and chiefly, the new financial life of Algiers in the 18th Century.

Barnby points to the fact that none of the American diplomats entrusted with the mission of redeeming hostages had the slightest notion of the sometimes irrational but always money-lusting genius of the Dey. The difficulty and, of course, the tragedy of the American seamen who became slaves in Algiers was that three secretaries of state and numerous ambassadors had no conception and even less understanding of Algerian affairs. The man who finally cut the gordian knot of eleven years of captivity and numerous unsuccessful attempts to negotiate was the poet and Connecticut wit, Joel Barlow.

Barlow, as minister ex-officio, ingratiated himself with the Jewish banking community and through it, made important financial contacts, chiefly with the House of Baring, the powerful London investment banking firm. Barlow vigorously pursued a financial settlement with Algiers unlike some of his ambassadorial predecessors.

In order not to be overly harsh to the seven ambassadors and

three secretaries of state who attempted to redeem the captured Americans, Barnby indicates that communication hampered successful diplomatic overtures. He states that the "administration in Philadelphia was completely out of touch with the whole Algerian affair." Thus, when anything vital occurred, it was dead news by the time it reached Philadelphia. This only accentuated the confusion of the Algerian tangle. Attempts by the Articles of Confederation Government to encourage the major European powers to intervene on its behalf were hopelessly wrecked by America's feeble, post-revolutionary diplomatic status. The British naturally would not take America's part so soon after 1783. The French were uninterested once the Americans gained independence and no longer fought England.

With an ever insistent cry in the United States today for the country to negotiate with her enemies, H. G. Barnby's book may have a measure of modern relativity. Negotiations from a position of strength can alone prove a satisfactory situation for a National State in troubled times.

L. D. GELLER

Madison College

Early Nantucket and Its Whaling Houses. BY HENRY CHANDLEE FORMAN. New York: Hastings House, 1966. ix, 291. \$12.50.

This profusely illustrated book is in two parts, the first few chapters telling of folk lore and history, the later chapters of architecture. The first part is delightful in a slightly haphazard way, the gleanings of a long time summer visitor. The second part is a technical analysis, the result of eleven years of application. The author's experience, patience and travel blend into that particular style all his own. The photographs running from 1860 to 1960 are valuable, but not so much so as the inimitable free-hand plans, profiles and sketches, carefully measured and dated as to period. Town plats and derivations, or phases, of house enlargements are also ingenious.

It is understandable how one could love a house or an area of Nantucket, but to completely survey fifty houses is phenomenal, collecting measurements, changes, court records, and making the drawings. Since Dr. Forman has been an archeologist, a teacher of art, an architect in the style of the early American, and a lifelong summer resident, his background of lore is pervasive as the salt wind and fog that weather the shingles.

If an aura of glamour had glossed over the hardships, he tells us just how rugged it once was, for he grew up with the legend.

If the Quakers come in for special mention, it is of their time that Dr. Forman writes, and their faults as well as their homespun virtues are confessed. The find of many photographic plates in an attic contributes to the folk history, and may have inspired the opening chapters. His review of past periods increases interest in building methods. The complete analysis of everything standing in 'Sconset, and some no longer there, arouses admiration for his thoroughness.

It is here that the casual tourist's interest will lag, and that of the trained architect will be aroused. Special trips to Wales and parts of England confirmed the author's belief that these houses were a continuation even from the Saxon "wattle and daub." His use of Welsh names such as "baulk" and "crog-loft" seems a bit narrow; poor men might have used their materials to best advantage in the same way in Cape Breton or Tennessee, and such houses as survived in Wales might have been universal in Northern Europe. In Nash's "Mansions of England in the Ancient Time" the Great Hall (hangover Saxon) has first a rood screen, then the lord's chambers, then the musicians' gallery above, even before a chimney. Calling a room eleven feet square the Great Room is fascinating, but one wonders whether the builders used that term. Use of such words as "wart" and "out-shut" and hangover "medieval" are familiar to those who have enjoyed his books; with the free-hand elevations and plans they form the mystique of his style. A primitive supply produced a culture, which at first could not have differed from the fish-flakes and huts of Cape Breton or elsewhere. The use of wooden shakes and shingles was by that time rare in Britain, but is still found in Scandinavia, Switzerland, the Black Forest or Poland, a style developed from the building materials available.

The mainstream of architecture in Nantucket town is bypassed except for a few houses prefabricated on the mainland, marked with Roman numerals for convenience, indicating dearth of wood. The term Whale House means first of a type in this instance, for even in early days most of their catch must have been cod, mackerel and such. The lucrative whaling that redeemed these houses is not mentioned in the book, nor does the author trace transition of ownership from fishermen to summer residents. He mentions that the floor plan was added to at first in a set plan, and that 'Sconset is the oldest summer resort in America. The engraving of 1791 entitles it a "fishing village" only; whalers had begun building

larger vessels than sloops, which had escaped taxation in Colonial days. The greatest wealth came in between 1820 and 1840. The schematic chart of Phases implies that fishermen enlarged their bedrooms when whale houses became family homes in the latter part of the 18th Century.

Phase III in early 19th Century shows much larger kitchens at the North end of each, together with nostalgic names hinting at summer occupancy by Nantucket town people. Summer residence by the author's family indicates that they only in 1910 found Nauma in 'Sconset a suitable summer home.

This reviewer has read of shore whaling in light pulling boats with snubbing post and swivelled harpoon line by the Madeirans today, and it was so described by Pliny in Roman times. From them the Dutch and English learned, after shaking off the Spanish yoke, and took their whaling ships to Spitzbergen in the 17th Century. Japanese prints show shore operations about that time, with equipment as primitive as the American Indians. Even in Colonial days the intercourse of trade was not confined to any one country, and in 1746 an old sailor, Nathan Wilbur, designed a windmill after a Dutch fashion.

Mistakes in the book are few, some of them in the format. There are twelve consecutive pages without numbers, which mars the use of the Index and Footnotes, if one must keep two fingers between the pages. Following the many additions through a maze of drawings is as quaint as a ramble through Nantucket itself. Pictures have been shunted to pages other than indicated. Minor errors are gunwhale for gunwale, and sprit for spritsail.

The thing commemorated is the survival of this full-grown little village "Sconset," presumably due to its use as a summer resort by wealthy owners of whale ships, and later by "off-island" people like the author's family. We reread the folk-lore chapters to renew our acquaintance with names met in the foot-notes. We are fortunate in having such a faithful and detailed account of *Early Nantucket and Its Whaling Houses*.

R. HAMMOND GIBSON

Easton, Maryland

The Lower Cape Fear in Colonial Days. BY LAWRENCE LEE. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965. xiii, 334. \$6.

The Lower Cape Fear In Colonial Days is a scholarly but most readable account of the history of southeastern North Carolina. As the title indicates, Professor Lee has written a history of a

region—a parochial history. Yet for a local history it is not completely narrow in scope. Professor Lee has often explained local events in the light of contemporary events elsewhere, and thus has related the character of the area to the broad context of the general history of the times.

Here is a careful presentation of local narrative history from the early days of exploration to the end of the American Revolution. The story is told of the region's place in the British colonial system and also of the people who conquered and developed southeastern North Carolina. The author is really at his best when dealing with people and their activities; at least such chapters were the most readable and enjoyable.

Professor Lee seems somewhat inclined to repetition, yet there is little to criticize in the presentation of the narrative. Unlike many local histories, *The Lower Cape Fear in Colonial Days* is well-balanced, the main narrative is neither pushed aside by a national theme nor lost in poorly organized details. In fact, except for a few unanswered questions, this is a local history which could well serve as a model for others interested in writing the history of a small region within a state.

WILLIAM H. WROTEN JR.

Salisbury State College

The Arts in Early American History: Needs and Opportunities for Study. An essay by WALTER MUIR WHITEHILL; bibliography by WENDELL D. GARRETT AND JANE N. GARRETT. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg. xv, 170. \$4.50

Mr. Whitehill's "Foreword" is delightful, and one wishes that others had the taste and knowledge to do as well; the *Essay* makes widespread the interests of such seminars as that which gave rise to it. The paragraphs and points make one wish to comment further.

That *Americana* is being fitted into a wider field and that the concept that "there is nothing new under the sun" is being brought to bear on the subject is a relief. "United States *Americana*" in the arts in their widest sense, as well as archaeology and artifacts, is so much "the thing" now that it may become emphasized *ad absurdum*. The amount of tangible material in our part of the New World

(in the various aspects spoken of) in scale, quantity and quality, as well as in time and space, is infinitesimal when compared with the tangible western past from the 17th century onward. That a knowledge of this past, as background and for comparison, is being pressed by Dr. Whitehill is most fortunate. His mention of *American landscape* should be four-starred, and as *uniquely American only*. Let Mr. Whitehill go on mentioning this—and a lot more.

The apt phrases of the Garrett and Garrett *Bibliography* are diverting to one in the field, but far more useful to those well-on than “the Young,” I think. Cross-filed indices, the perusal of books and articles, and picture books produce cumulative manuscripts with endless footnotes; but such personnel as they produce are often without the “feel” of a people and the things of a particular locale. This may result from their having had the misfortune not to have handled or organized old collections and records.

There are many important, interesting and entertaining angles to the subject all across the board. Another seminar seems indicated.

ANNA WELLS RUTLEDGE

S. C. Hist. Soc.

The Myth of the 'New History': The Techniques and Tactics of the New Mythologists of American History. BY DAVID L. HOGGAN. Nutley, N.J.: The Craig Press, 1965. vi, 250. \$4.50

The Myth of the New History is an attempt by Professor Hoggan to illustrate “that there is a choice to be made between our tried and true principles from the past and certain more modern panaceas.” The techniques and tactics of the so-called “New Mythologists of American History” are illustrated by accounts of eight major military crises—that is, eight major American crises which ended in war. The eight examples are (1) The American Revolution, (2) The War of 1812, (3) The Mexican War, (4) The American Civil War, (5) The Spanish American War, (6) The First World War, (7) The Second World War, and (8) The Korean War.

In brief discussions of each major crisis, Professor Hoggan has attempted an analysis in light of historical scholarship. He recounts what some American historians have written of war guilt, and the people and forces largely responsible for each crisis and the war that followed.

As the author has stated, this is not an exhaustive study but one

that is tentative and suggestive, with an attempt to present some problems of values and meanings connected with the writing of American history. The study is neither a complete nor unbiased evaluation of these crises and historians; but the ideas and opinions expressed by the author should be carefully analyzed. The author's theses are valuable, at this time, as springboards to a possible re-evaluation of scholarship in the writing of American history.

Although this book seems aimed primarily at the professional historian and the serious student, it undoubtedly will prove of interest to many amateurs in the field.

WILLIAM H. WROTEN, JR.

Salisbury State College

Sword and Firearm Collection of The Society of the Cincinnati.

By JOHN BREWER BROWN. Published by The Society of the Cincinnati, Washington, District of Columbia, 1965. xiv, 120. ill. \$7.00.

This 120 page museum catalog is unique. In addition to excellent photographic illustrations of each item in the entire collection by Lowell A. Kenyon, each picture of the weapon is accompanied by a complete and accurate technical description which puts to shame those appearing in most such works. The latter is due to the good fortune of the author in obtaining the assistance of Harold L. Peterson, doyen of American sword collectors, as a technical advisor, as well as the help of a number of other learned consultants, all of whom are listed in the acknowledgements section of this splendid little book.

The most important part of the collection consists of swords used by members of the Cincinnati during the American Revolution, and each sword presented is accompanied by brief but complete biographical notes regarding its owner's military career. Of particular interest are the swords and exploits of Lieutenant Colonel Tench Tilghman and Colonel Nicholas Ruxton Moore, of distinguished memory.

Of value to the casually interested historian as well as the scholarly collector, the catalog is a credit to the Society of the Cincinnati as well as its author.

HUGH BENET, JR.

Ruxton

The Sounds of History, Record 3: 1789-1829, The Growing Years.
A Supplement to Volume 3 of *The Life History of the United States*.

The editors of Time-Life have enlisted some of the finest music and dramatic talent in America in the production of this record. Side 1, "Documents," consists of eighteen short selections from letters, books, speeches, and poetry by participants in the unfolding American drama, from Washington's Farewell Address to Jackson's address to the Senate. Frederick March and Florence Elderidge are excellent in their interpretations of Jefferson, Abigail Adams, dour Timothy Dwight, and spunky Dolly Madison, while Charles Collingwood unifies the sections with historical commentary. Unfortunately, most of the passages are taken out of context and are far too brief.

Side 2, "Music," is more limited in scope and more successful. Here several outstanding students of the American folk song, including Jean Ritchie, Robert Spiro, and Jane Wilson, present a musical sampler of American folk tunes and religious music from the Southern Appalachians, the Erie Canal, the New England country schools, and the high seas, interspersed with instrumental versions of patriotic marches and airs.

This record should be particularly appealing to the high school teacher of American history as supplemental illustrative material, and as a welcome change of pace from the textbook.

KATHARINE L. BROWN

Johns Hopkins University

BOOKS RECEIVED FOR REVIEW

- New Revised History of Dorchester County, Maryland.* By ELIAS JONES. Cambridge, Md.: Tidewater Publishers, 1966. 603. \$15.
- The Indian Boundary in the Southern Colonies, 1763-1775.* By LOUIS DE VORSEY, JR. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966. xii, 267. \$7.50.
- Patrons and Patriotism: The Encouragement of the Fine Arts in the United States, 1790-1860.* By LILLIAN B. MILLER. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966. xv, 335. \$8.50.
- The History of Jackson County, Missouri, Containing a History of the County, Its Cities, Towns, etc.* Cape Girardeau, Missouri: The Ramfre Press, 1966. xi, 1006. Indexed ed. \$15.
- The Academic Mind and Reform: The Influence of Richard T. Ely in American Life.* By BENJAMIN G. RADER. Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1966. vi, 276. \$7.50.
- John P. Holland, 1841-1914: Inventor of the Modern Submarine.* By RICHARD KNOWLES MORRIS. Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1966. xviii, 211. \$8.50.
- Abraham Lincoln, a History.* By JOHN G. NICOLAY and JOHN HAY. (1886-1890, 10 vol.) Abridged and edited by PAUL M. ANGLE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966. xix, 394. \$8.50 cloth; \$3.45 paper.
- The History of the Conquest of Mexico.* By WILLIAM H. PRES-COTT. (1843, 3 vol.) Abridged and edited by C. HARVEY GARDINER. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966. xxvi, 413. Cloth, \$8.50; paper, \$3.45.
- The History of the United States of America from the Discovery of the Continent.* By GEORGE BANCROFT. (1876-1879, 6 vol.) Abridged and edited by RUSSEL B. NYE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966. xxvi, 386. Cloth, \$8.50.
- History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850.* By JAMES FORD RHODES. (1907, 5 vols.) Abridged and edited

- by ALLAN NEVINS. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966. xxvi, 576. Cloth, \$10; paper, \$3.95.
- The Eleventh Pillar. New York State and the Federal Constitution.* By LINDA GRANT DE PAUW. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966. Published for the American Historical Association. xiv, 328. \$6.50.
- Technology in Early America.* By BROOKE HINDLE. With a directory of Artifact Collections by LUCIUS F. ELLSWORTH. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966. "Needs and Opportunities for Study" series. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va. xix, 145. \$4.50.
- The Memoirs of John Durang, American Actor, 1785-1816.* Edited by ALAN S. DOWNER. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966. Published for the Historical Society of York County and for the American Society for Theatre Research. xix, 176. \$7.
- The Amazing Pennsylvania Canals.* By WILLIAM H. SHANK. York, Pa.: The Historical Society of York County, 1965. Illustrated. Paper.
- The Story of Surnames.* By L. G. PINE. Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle Co., Inc., 1966. 152. \$4.75.
- The Story of Heraldry.* By L. G. PINE. Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle Co., Inc. 1966. 164. \$4.75.
- Forgotten Voices: Dissenting Southerners in an Age of Conformity.* Edited by CHARLES E. WYNES. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967. xi, 138. \$4.50.
- Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical.* By WILLIAM HENRY FOOTE. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1966. (Reprint). 616. \$12.50.
- Old Somerset on the Eastern Shore of Maryland: A Study in Foundations and Founders.* By CLAYTON TORRENCE. Baltimore: Regional Publishing Company, 1966. (Reprint). xvi, 583. \$12.50.
- Bookbinding in Colonial Virginia.* By CLEMENT SAMFORD and JOHN M. HEMPHILL, II. Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, 1966. (Williamsburg Research Series #8). xxi, Paper. \$4.
- American Maps and Map Makers of the Revolution.* By PETER J. GUTHORN. Monmouth Beach, N. J.: Philip Freneau Press, 1966. Illustrated. 48. \$6.95.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Society's War Records Division Commended—The Vermont Historical Society, through its Trustees' meeting on November 11, 1966, passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved:

That we commend the Maryland Historical Society for its successful publication, at the request of the Adjutant General of Maryland and with adequate financing in the state budget approved by the Governor, of the attractive volumes which preserve for posterity the participation of Marylanders in World War Two. And to the Director [Harold R. Manakee], War Records Division, Maryland Historical Society, we express gratitude for his unstinting help in generously preparing the way for Vermont to attempt to match his publication.

And furthermore we extend to Brigadier General R. M. Cram, Vermont's acting Adjutant General, a commendation for initiating during the last biennium a pilot study for determining the long-range problems which require more than intermittent attention if Vermont is to bring up-to-date the roster of all our modern Green Mountain Boys, by resuming the type of publication last issued by the Military Department in 1929 and 1933. We invite him to bring to the attention of appropriate legislative and executive authorities the fact that to date his appropriations for this purpose amount to less than six percent of those that were approved in order to complete the history of Maryland in World War Two. And we endorse such continuing efforts as will plainly be necessary to achieve publications in our tradition of patriotic service ungrudgingly recognized.

The Baltimore Museum of Art—The Museum is preparing an exhibition of Maryland furniture of the Queen Anne and Chippendale periods. Any information on Queen Anne and Chippendale pieces with a Maryland provenance and pieces that can be attributed to a known cabinetmaker will be most appreciated. The cabinet making centers of Annapolis and Baltimore will be emphasized, but attention will also be given to the Eastern Shore and Southern Maryland. Please address replies to: William V. Elder, Curator of Decorative Arts, The Baltimore Museum of Art, Wyman Park, Baltimore, Maryland 21218.

Boggs Family—I wish to contact anyone with records of the family of John Boggs who married Margaret Key. He came from Ireland and settled in Maryland in 1704. Issue: Nancy, James,

Joseph (RW), Aaron (RW), Isbella, Catherine and John. I believe that the youngest son, John, was my third great-grandfather, John M. Boggs, who married Martha Oliver, daughter of Thomas Oliver, and came "from the eastern shores of Md." Issue: Lilburn W. Boggs (b. 1796), fifth Governor of Missouri; Dr. Joseph Oliver Boggs; John McKinley Boggs; Thomas Jefferson Boggs, Attorney; and Dr. James Coleman Boggs, my great-great-grandfather, who settled in Leon Co., Texas in 1845.

Stephenie H. Tally-Frost
3909 Live Oak
Corpus Christi, Texas 78408

Maryland House and Garden Pilgrimage—The schedule for 1967 is as follows: *April 27*: Warrenton Road Walking Tour (Baltimore Suburban); *April 28*: Carroll Co.; *April 29*: Anne Arundel Co.; *April 30*: St. Mary's County and Patuxent River Boat Trip; *May 2*: Washington Co.; *May 3*: My Lady's Manor (Baltimore County); *May 4*: Worthington Valley (Baltimore County); *May 5*: Kent Co.; *May 6*: Queen Anne's Co.; *May 7*: Talbot Co.; *May 13* and *May 14*: Chesapeake Bay Cruises and Walking Tour of Oxford, Md.

Errata—in the "Notes and Queries," Dec., 1965, p. 367, George H. Callcott, not Collcott. In the Bibliographical Notes are several typographical errors, a list of which is on file with the editor. R.W.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION (*Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code*) 1. Date of Filing: Sept. 27, 1966. 2. Title of Publication: Maryland Historical Magazine. 3. Frequency of Issue: Quarterly. 4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor. Publisher: Maryland Historical Society, 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201; Editor: Dr. Richard Walsh, Department of History, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007; Managing Editor: Harold R. Manakee, 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 7. Owner: Maryland Historical Society. No stock-non-profit organization. 8. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and Other Security Holders Owning or Holding 1 Percent or More of Total Amount of Bonds, Mortgages or Other Securities: None. 9. A. Total No. Copies Printed (Quarterly): 3,800. B. Paid Circulation (1.) Sales Through Dealers and Carriers, Street Vendors and Counter Sales: None; (2.) Mail Subscriptions (Memberships): 3,220. C. Total Paid Circulation: 3,220. D. Free Distribution (Schools and Libraries): 450. E. Total Distribution: 3,670. F. Office Use, Left-over, Unaccounted, Spoiled After Printing: 130. G. Total: 3,800.

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

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Harold R. Manakee, *Director*

CONTRIBUTORS

JACKSON T. MAIN is Professor of History at Stoney Brook College, Long Island, of the State University of New York. He is author of the prize-winning *The Anti Federalists* (1961), a significant study of the people who ratified, but chiefly of those who opposed, the constitution. His recent *Social Structure of Revolutionary America* (1965) has also received the accolades of the scholarly world. He has contributed many reviews and articles to the *William and Mary Quarterly* and other noteworthy periodicals. This article is the result of his continuing research in the Revolutionary Era.

RAYMOND S. SWEENEY is a National Defense Fellow in history at the University of North Carolina where he is studying for the Ph.D. This article began in Dr. George Hardy Callcott's seminar at the University of Maryland in the Spring of 1966.

JOHN W. BAILEY is Assistant Professor of History at Allegany Community College, Cumberland, Maryland. He received the M.A. degree in history in 1961 from the University of Maryland. At present he is a candidate for the Ph.D. at the University of Nebraska in Western American History. He is working under the direction of Dr. James C. Olson.

J. REANEY KELLY is author of *Quakers in the Founding of Anne Arundel County, Maryland* (1963) and of articles in the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, including one on "Tulip Hill" which appeared in the December 1965 issue.

PETER P. HILL is Assistant Professor of History at the George Washington University from which he received the Ph.D. in 1966. A former reporter for the *Concord Journal* (Massachusetts), the *Concord Colonial* and the *Washington Post*, he also taught English and Social Studies on the preparatory school level before beginning his professorial career.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Annual Report for 1966

CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL

FARSEEING and highly constructive vision prompted prominent citizens of Maryland in 1844 to plan and create a Maryland Historical Society at the corner of St. Paul and Saratoga Streets in a specially erected building. In it our Society and two others, kindred in nature, were housed. Soon the Maryland Historical Society was the sole occupant and owner. In time we outgrew the home but still continued to perform valuable services.

December 15, 1916 was a highly important day in the history of our Maryland Historical Society. I will never forget my feelings of surprise and delight that evening when Mr. Douglas Thomas, President of the Merchants National Bank, confidentially told me, then secretary of the Society, that Mrs. H. Irvine Keyser would announce through him that she would buy the old Enoch Pratt home, repair it and add to it a wing containing an art gallery and a library, all this at her expense, to provide a home for the Maryland Historical Society as a memorial to her late husband.

This totally unexpected and generous gift was accepted joyfully, for it enabled the Society to render services previously impossible and opened a new era of development for the Society.

In time the H. Irvine Keyser Memorial Building became seriously crowded; additional funds, more space and equipment became increasingly essential. Mr. William Thomas, an outstanding, history-minded lawyer of Baltimore, carefully surveyed the situation and became convinced that the Maryland Historical Society could and would render greatly increased service if given the opportunity. His bequest in 1947, supplemented fourteen years later by that of his brother John, provided over \$3,000,000 to supply the Society with larger quarters. Adjoining land was bought, the site for the structure

was carefully selected, plans were prepared, and construction, soon to be completed, began in 1964.

For years we have had to hold our meetings in cramped quarters, but the Jacob and Annita France Auditorium, named for those very generous donors to the Society, will give us a beautiful and comfortable meeting place with modern equipment. Thus the combined facilities of the Keyser Memorial Building, the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, and the Jacob and Annita France Auditorium will enable the Society to operate more effectively than ever before. We are confident that much needed financial support will follow, as another era of tremendous opportunity faces our Society.

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, *Chairman*

THE PRESIDENT

The past year has seen sound and steady, but not swift, progress in the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building which has brought nearer the day when the Society can expand into its large and fine additional quarters and can, as we hope and believe it can do, materially increase the usefulness of its collections. It will probably be a matter of another two months before the builders will be ready to turn the new building over to us (though I hesitate to name any specific date), and there will then come the task of actually moving many of our possessions and a period of adjustment and readjustment of offices and work. This may well extend to late spring or early summer.

In speaking of the new building I wish to acknowledge again the great indebtedness of the Society to Mr. Abbott L. Penniman, Jr., one of our Vice Presidents and the Chairman of our Building Committee, for his tireless and extraordinarily capable work in connection with the construction of that building. He has given it constant attention and has met and solved countless problems which arise in such an undertaking. In addition to that work, he has also taken upon his shoulders the problem of ascertaining what needs to be done to preserve and restore to first class condition the Society's present quar-

ters. Not all of this work has to be done at once; fortunately, it can be spread over a period of years, since the anticipated cost is estimated at a very substantial amount.

Returning to the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, I believe that as it nears completion, we can see in brick, mortar, stone and glass, even more clearly than in the plans, the soundness and handsomeness of the design of the architects and the skillfulness with which they have succeeded in blending the new with the old into a harmonious whole. Though the interior is still far from completion, enough has now taken definite form to enable us to appreciate the usefulness of the new building for the purposes of the Society for which it was designed as well as to enjoy its esthetic merits.

A new project concerned with our expansion is just getting under way. This is under the aegis of the Women's Committee and is for the use and beautification of the land to the west of the new building. Here, as in much of the other work and undertakings of the Society, the problems of costs are an important factor. Planning is still in a very preliminary stage, and there is little that I can say at this time except to express my appreciation of the interest and enthusiasm of the ladies in the matter and of Mr. Bruce Baetjer's help.

Mention of the above area leads naturally to what was actually the last major transaction of the year which has elapsed since our last annual meeting. This was the acquisition of the land and the two-story building thereon at the southeast corner of Howard and Monument Streets. This property adjoins the property to the east of it which was already owned by the Society. The acquisition of this property, which was offered for sale in the course of the settlement of an estate, was deemed desirable for the Society at this time as an investment and also as a protection. Though there are no plans whatever in contemplation or in prospect for the possible future use of this property for the conduct of the Society's own activities, if occasion should ever arise for such use, the ownership of this property could be quite advantageous to the Society. The Society now owns all of the property along the south side of Monument Street between Park Avenue and Howard Street to a depth of roughly one-half of the block.

Our frontage on Park Avenue is somewhat greater than on Howard Street, as we own the area now used as a parking lot south of the east-west alley behind the Society's buildings.

This parking lot, too, should be mentioned in this report. We terminated the lease of it to the Baltimore and Annapolis Railroad Company, which had used it primarily for its buses. Thanks again to Mr. Penniman and also to Mr. W. Burton Guy, a member of this Society, and to his organization, a lease of this property to a new tenant has been entered into, the condition and appearance of the lot have been greatly improved, the buses are gone, the Society is receiving a larger rent, and a most convenient parking place is available (at usual rates) immediately adjacent to the Society's quarters.

In both of these real estate matters and in other matters, too, we have had the able assistance of our counsel.

Our physical plant is of vital importance to the Society, and so are our various collections and our loyal and able staff. One effect of our building operations has been to curtail seriously, but fortunately only temporarily, our exhibitions and the use of our library. As regards the latter, advantage has been taken of the opportunity which this period of limitation of use has given, to make great progress in the cataloging of our manuscripts, which is a very important work. This has been accomplished under the immediate direction of Mr. P. W. Filby with the enthusiastic support of the Library Committee and of our Director, Mr. Harold Manakee. Mr. Filby and his staff have done a splendid job.

Concurrently with this work, and also under the supervision of Mr. Filby, but in Philadelphia rather than in our own premises, a most important work of preservation has been completed. This is the de-acidifying, lamination and binding of the Latrobe Papers, which constitute some of our most valued treasures. Many of these papers were in deplorable condition where any handling of them, no matter how careful, was almost sure to make matters worse. This work of preservation was made possible by the very generous gift of a donor who prefers to remain anonymous, and we are most grateful to him. The work has been done in a manner which has, I think, won the admiration of all of us who have seen it.

In spite of the difficulties arising from our being unable to hold meetings in our own quarters during the later stages of our building operations, we have thus far been able to maintain satisfactorily, I believe, our program of evening addresses. For this we are indebted both to our speakers and to our kind friends who have graciously allowed us to use their facilities for our meetings. We are deeply grateful to the Methodist Historical Society and the Lovely Lane Methodist Church and to Emmanuel Church for their cordial hospitality.

Financial problems are always with us. I shall not attempt to cover ground which is much better covered by the report of our able and hard-working Treasurer. I regret that for our last fiscal year which ended September 30, 1966, we again incurred a deficit in our usual operations. We have also incurred a substantial loss so far in our publication fund through the publication of "A History of the University of Maryland." This has recently received favorable reviews in several scholarly quarterlies and there has been some improvement in sales in recent weeks. It is hoped that the deficit from this publication will continue to be reduced and will eventually disappear. Our publication funds have derived some profit from the sales of other publications, chiefly from *My Maryland*.

I am glad to be able to report that effective as of January 1, 1967, we have been able to make some increase in the compensation of the members of the staff of the Society, which I regard as very well merited. It has been a pleasure to me to be associated with this fine group of people, and I greatly appreciate the full cooperation which they have afforded me.

The period of construction now nearing its end has been a period of transition. I am confident that with the opening of the new building, a new era will dawn for the Society in which it can go forward to greatly expanded activity and usefulness. It has been, in my estimation, impracticable to undertake any large scale effort to increase our membership or to seek substantial additions to our funds during this transition period. After we do move into our new building, the attractions of membership in the Society may be more readily seen, and our financial needs can be more accurately measured and fairly definite objectives can be set. Without waiting until

the move has been made, I think that it can safely be stated that we shall need substantial amounts of additional and unrestricted funds for the general work of the Society. May I bespeak your sympathetic interest and generosity whenever an appeal for such funds may come. I also wish to express my thanks to those who have given generously to the Society during these years when there has been no general campaign for funds.

In concluding this report, I further wish to express to the members of the Society my deep appreciation of the honor which you have conferred upon me by electing me to the office of President, and to my fellow officers and other fellow members of the Council, and to the Committees of the Society, my pleasure in working with them, and my gratitude for all that they have done for the Society and for the cooperation which they have generously extended to me, and to repeat my thanks to every member of the staff of the Society. I also wish to express my special appreciation of the services of our Recording Secretary, Mr. Lewis, of our Treasurer, Mr. Hopkins, of the Secretary's Secretary and the Treasurer's Treasurer, and the President's right hand, Miss Bokel, and of Miss Kriete, who has doubled and tripled her services as secretary for all of us who needed help.

Finally, my congratulations and best wishes to our new President who is about to be elected!

FREDERICK W. BRUNE, *President*

DIRECTOR

My pleasure at the over-all progress of the Society in the past year is equalled by my concern for its future, for I believe that the imminent expansion into the Thomas and Hugg Memorial addition will challenge the Council, the committees, the membership and the staff to more intensive effort and support.

For years the Society has been short of staff. It is short of staff now, and, notwithstanding the authorization by the Council of ten new positions upon occupation of the new building, it will remain short of staff. Despite some recent

advances, the Society's low salaries and lack of fringe benefits do not attract applicants for positions. In addition, some of our possessions need attention. The new building will be equipped with modern lighting that will glaringly emphasize the need for the repair or restoration of many paintings, frames and pieces of furniture. Operating costs will increase because of the modern lighting and the conveniences of an elevator and air conditioning. Overdue renovation of the Keyser Memorial Building is planned, but it will be costly.

Furthermore, many of the programs of the Society need revaluation. Rapid growth in recent years has outstripped the ability of the Society to assimilate the demands made upon it. Much of that growth has been in accordance with policies formulated years ago—good in their day, but now outmoded.

Respectfully, but urgently, therefore, I suggest that in the immediate future, serious consideration be given, first, to increasing the income of the Society and, second, to a self study, under the guidance of a consultant, of its policies and operation.

The year's accomplishments and events have been so ably presented by other contributors to this annual report that I can add little to them. Those members of the staff who are concerned with business and maintenance operations do not fall within the jurisdiction of a standing committee, but they should be recognized for their loyal and productive work. They include Miss Martha Bokel, Business Manager and Membership Secretary; Miss Alice Kriete, Administrative Assistant; Mrs. Lucille Bulin, Bookkeeper; Mrs. Davie Harrell, Receptionist and Order Clerk; Miss Madeleine Wells, part-time Receptionist; Mrs. Enolliah Brown, Housekeeper, and Mr. Russell Sheppard, Porter. Miss Bokel's decision to retire April 1, after 42 years of devoted service, is a blow that the Society will take in its stride only with great difficulty.

Committee chairmen have pointed out in their reports the invaluable contributions made by volunteer workers. To the thanks of the chairmen I add my own. Mr. Abbott Penniman's attention to the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building has been expert, meticulous and time consuming. Messrs. Edward G. Howard and Lester S. Levy have

contributed highly specialized knowledge and hours of work—even including vacation time—to assist in the reorganization of the Library. Mr. Richard Randall's faithful attendance and his knowledge have benefitted not only the Maritime Collection, but also the Library. Mr. R. Hammond Gibson continues to clean and repair ship models and to keep detailed records of the Maritime Collection. Beginning in mid-summer and continuing through the year Mrs. Robert H. McCauley, Jr. several times weekly has driven from Bethesda to volunteer her service to the reorganization of the Manuscripts Division. Without such contributions the work of the Society would be seriously impeded.

Attendance at the Society totaled 9,981 during the year.

HAROLD R. MANAKEE, *Director*

THE TREASURER

Ten Light Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

The Board of Directors
Maryland Historical Society

We have examined the accompanying statement of assets, liabilities and fund balances of the Maryland Historical Society at September 30, 1966, and the related statements of current fund revenues and expenditures and changes in fund balances for the year then ended, all prepared on the modified cash basis as described in Note 1 to the financial statements. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion the statements mentioned above present fairly the assets, liabilities and fund balances of the Maryland Historical Society at September 30, 1966, current fund revenues and expenditures and the changes in fund balances for the year then ended, on a modified cash basis with that of the preceding year.

The accompanying supplementary information has been subjected to the tests and other auditing procedures applied in the

examination of the financial statements mentioned above and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all respects material in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY

November 18, 1966

STATEMENT OF ASSETS, LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES

September 30, 1966

ASSETS

Current fund:

Cash:

Operating fund	\$ 12,391
Building fund	431
State programs (restricted)	2,593
Cash on hand	100
	<u>15,515</u>

Real estate	113,504
Books	1
Manuscripts and prints	1
Paintings and statuary	1
Furniture and fixtures	1
	<u>1</u>
TOTAL CURRENT FUND	<u>129,023</u>

Special fund:

Cash	\$ 43,762
Due from current fund	4,554
TOTAL SPECIAL FUND	<u>48,316</u>

Restricted fund:

Cash	10,257
Due from current fund	5,000
TOTAL RESTRICTED FUND	<u>15,257</u>

Endowment fund:

Cash	2,280
Cash deposit--Baltimore Equitable Society	90
Mortgage receivable	5,436
Real estate, at cost	584,710
Securities, at cost or donated value (market value \$1,281,667)	1,091,976
Due from current fund	49,384
TOTAL ENDOWMENT FUND	<u>1,733,876</u>

TOTAL ALL FUNDS	<u>\$ 1,926,472</u>
-----------------	---------------------

LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES

Current fund:	
Due to special fund	\$ 4,554
Due to endowment fund	49,384
Due to restricted fund	5,000
Payroll taxes withheld	1,934
Receipts from state applicable to subsequent periods	5,863
Reserve for Latrobe Papers repair fund	553
Current fund balance	61,735
TOTAL CURRENT FUND	129,023
Special fund:	
Special fund balance	\$ 48,316
TOTAL SPECIAL FUND	48,316
Restricted fund	
Restricted fund balance	15,257
TOTAL RESTRICTED FUND	15,257
Endowment fund	
Endowment fund balance	1,733,876
TOTAL ENDOWMENT FUND	1,733,876
TOTAL ALL FUNDS	\$ 1,926,472

STATEMENT OF CURRENT FUND REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

Year ended September 30, 1966

Revenues:	
Dues and contributions	\$ 32,827
Investment income	59,446
From the State of Maryland	31,900
Other Income	1,190
	<u>125,363</u>
Expenditures:	
Salaries and wages	66,984
Library	5,881
Gallery and museum	371
Publications	9,431
Building maintenance	9,376
State funds	26,682
Other expenditures	9,442
	<u>128,167</u>
EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES OVER REVENUES	\$ (2,804)

TRUSTEES OF THE ATHENAEUM

Repairs were made to the large window on the circular stairway and to the one in the art gallery in the Keyser

Memorial Building. In the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial addition, it was found necessary to underpin the west wall of the Pratt Mansion and to clean and point up the brickwork. The cost of this work was paid from the Society's general funds.

With the cooperation of Mr. A. L. Penniman, Jr., a budget estimate was obtained from the Consolidated Engineering Company as to the cost of thoroughly renovating the Keyser Memorial Building.

CHARLES L. MARBURG, *Chairman*

THE GALLERY COMMITTEE

Early in the year Mrs. George W. Williams was compelled to resign the chairmanship upon advice of her physician, but fortunately she remained a member of the committee. She was succeeded by Mr. Francis H. Jencks.

In frequent meetings the group—with the addition of Mrs. W. Wallace Symington, Jr., Chairman of the Women's Committee, and Messrs. Gilman Paul and Bryden Hyde, co-chairmen,—concerned itself mainly with planning for the decoration and furnishing of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building. The committee recommended, and the Council approved, the retaining of Mr. Norman Cousins of the Chambers Company as consultant. The group approved for use in the building samples of carpeting, wall covering, teak, serpentine marble, floor tile, chair fabrics, terrazzo and curtains. With a view toward economy, items already held by the Society were examined for possible use. It was decided to use the large entrance lobby for orientation purposes, and the committee conferred with Mr. Richard Randall, Chairman of the Maritime Committee, as to the maritime items to be placed there.

During the year the organization and personnel of the gallery staff remained unchanged. With most of the period rooms closed because of the construction work, the staff concerned itself with preparations for occupying the new addition. Assisted by Mrs. Enolliah Brown, Housekeeper, Mrs. Virginia Swarm, Registrar, has brought order to the present crowded storage areas by dint of much assembling, inventorying and wrapping. Many items have been packed, ready for the move.

Miss Eugenia Holland, Assistant Curator, has made a substantial beginning in compiling a checklist of Maryland clockmakers. Because of the use of the gallery for the cataloging of the manuscripts collection, exhibits were sharply curtailed, but Mr. Eader of the library staff and Mrs. Swarm set up an exhibit in the Hochschild Kohn department store in connection with a city-wide observation of British-American trade relations. During the year 239 items were lent to other institutions or organizations, including an extensive loan to the annual meeting of the Garden Club of America. On the afternoon of Sunday, December 4, the Director and Miss Holland opened the Society for the Holly Tour of the Mount Vernon area sponsored by the First Presbyterian Church. Nearly 300 visitors attended.

Miss Holland continued her liaison activities with groups whose interests are allied with those of the Society, and she represented the Society in Princess Anne, Maryland, during the 300th anniversary of the formation of Somerset County.

Gifts to the Society totaling 571 items from 89 donors have been recorded in *Maryland History Notes*. Among the more outstanding were: a six-piece silver teaset made by S. Kirk 1824-1830, from Miss Adelaide Lowe Jenkins; a bronze bust of Enoch Louis Lowe, Governor of Maryland, 1851-1854, signed "F. Volck, 1862," also from Miss Jenkins; oil portraits of William Pechin (1773-1849) and Mrs. William Pechin (Catherine Anthony) (ca. 1776-1829), each attributed to John Pechin ca. 1812, from Madame Marie Maurice Masson de Belleville; a miniature portrait of Mrs. Arthur Tilghman Jones (Anna Maria Chew Hollyday) (1796-1823) at the age of about four years, by Robert Field, signed and dated "R. F. 1799," from Mrs. Richard H. Woodward; a painting, "Conversation Piece," of the Duke of Windsor and Her Highness, the Duchess (Wallis Warfield), done by Trafford P. Klots in Palm Beach, Florida, in 1960, from Mr. Klots; a mahogany lap desk with brass trim and several secret compartments from Mr. Layton Rogers Colburn of Delray Beach, Florida; three oak side chairs with original webbing, ca. 1730, from Mr. and Mrs. George Thomas of "Deep Falls," Chaptico, Maryland; a mid-19th century harp made by J. F. Browne & Co., London

and New York, from Miss Elizabeth D. Steuart; a paste knee buckle of Charles Carroll of Carrollton from Mrs. J. Albert Key of St. Louis, Missouri; and a pair of Bristol decanters with 12 matching sherry glasses from Mrs. B. Frank Newcomer.

FRANCIS H. JENCKS, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

On June 1, 1966, for the first time in its 122 years, the Library closed its doors for an indefinite period to all but scholars faced with impending publication deadlines. The decision was taken reluctantly but in recognition that the printed materials would have to be inventoried and the manuscripts fully catalogued before either could be used most effectively. The problem resulted from the recent rapid growth of the collections, particularly manuscripts; and it could not have been solved if the Library had remained open, for the staff—like the staffs of the past—could not have performed these arduous tasks and served readers simultaneously.

It is now clear that the closing, which regrettably inconvenienced many of our members and other readers, has been a success. Almost all collections have now been treated, as described below; and those readers who have suffered from this cause will soon be gratified, the Committee believes, by the major improvements in Library service and in the availability of materials that the closing has made possible.

Readers

From January 1 to June 1, 1966, there were 1,200 readers—an average of ten a day. Holiday periods and Saturdays were most heavily patronized; genealogists outnumbered historical researchers by three to one. Of those who signed the register, 20 per cent were members. Nonmembers paid a daily fee of one dollar, and the resulting total of \$260 was used to restore genealogical materials. Bona fide students of history were allowed free access at all times. Notwithstanding the closing to the general public, about 800 historians, students, and writers with publication deadlines were assisted after June 1, and as far as is known, the closing did not impede any scholarly project. But telephone calls and correspondence trebled, causing extra burdens on the entire staff.

Personnel

The staff was both skilled and industrious, but more help was needed. In response to recommendations from the Committee, the Council authorized an increase in staff and made money available for additional summer workers on the manuscripts project. This has been the key to the solution of the problem.

During 1966 Miss Sandra M. Kamtman was employed to take charge of the manuscripts project. Following her marriage she was replaced by Mrs. Timothy Pedley, who had been working on a similar project at the Cambridge University Library. Mrs. Sidney Painter, after retiring from the Peabody Library, came to give her expert knowledge on the serials and periodicals collections and also to assist in the indexing of manuscripts. Miss Susan Towles assisted on the manuscripts cataloguing for almost eight months. Miss Kathleen Reinsfelder came as Secretary to the Librarian, replacing Mrs. Forrest Lord, who retired but who continued her assistance as a volunteer. The generosity of a member of the Committee made it possible to engage a junior assistant, and the post has been held successively by Robert Kesting, Philip Remare, and James Cabezas.

The Library relies heavily on the generosity of volunteer workers. For almost a year Mrs. Robert H. McCauley, Jr., has journeyed from Bethesda to assist in the cataloguing of manuscripts. The Dielman Biographical File has been kept up by Miss Mary C. Hiss, assisted by Miss Nancy Ridout, Miss Eliza Funk, Miss Jessie Slee, Mrs. G. W. Cauthorn and Mrs. Charles W. Ayres, Sr. Miss Madeleine Wells helped with the mounting of clippings. Miss Selma Grether, docent, continued to maintain the subject files, assisted by Miss Louisa Gary and Mrs. B. F. Newcomer.

Others giving generously of their time included Miss Helen Sellman, Mr. R. Hammond Gibson and Miss Anna D. Ward. Seniors from the College of Notre Dame assisted in library projects for much of the school year and since this probably will become a recurring source of assistance, special work will be planned for them.

Miss Betty Adler continued her preparation of the cumulative index to the *Magazine*, completing during the year work

on volumes 30-41, inclusive. Additional editorial tasks connected with this project, such as filing cards and elucidating specific questions posed by Miss Adler, could not be undertaken by the Society's staff. A means of performing these tasks is being sought.

The annual indexes to the *Magazine* were prepared by Mr. Frank F. White, Jr., and the index card entries for the Society's existing file were entered in the *Magazine* card index by Miss Wells.

General Staff Activities

The increase in staff has permitted the allotment of personnel to the following specific tasks:

(a) *Manuscripts*. The holdings are estimated to be about 1,000,000. Hitherto the collections were inadequately housed, largely unprocessed, and had outgrown the locating system. After the library closed, all of them were moved to a more accessible area where an average of 12 assistants (including staff, volunteers and students of Goucher and other colleges) examined and reboxed the collections.

Apart from a brief mention of the more important collections in Hamer's *Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States*, the Society's collections have been virtually unknown to scholars. Following discussions with staff members of the Library of Congress it was decided to catalogue the collections in accordance with rules applicable to the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections*, which is printed annually and distributed throughout the world. Although not all our collections will qualify for NUCMC, most will be entered and data sheets for the remainder will be uniformly completed so that most questions can be answered quickly.

During February and March, Miss Kamtman and the Librarian examined the manuscript systems of the Library of Congress, the New-York Historical Society, William and Mary College, Harvard University, Eleutherian Mills, the State Library of Virginia, and the Virginia Historical Society. To staff members of these institutions, and particularly to Mr. John M. Jennings, Director, Virginia Historical Society, the Committee records its thanks, for from those visits evolved the

new system, which is admirably simple and which is designed to encompass after-acquired materials, as well as those on hand, without alteration.

By the end of the year, 1,500 of the 1,600 collections, or about 920,000 of the 1,000,000 documents, had been catalogued and data sheets sent to the Library of Congress. Now the task of indexing the findings on catalogue cards is beginning. The forms have been duplicated so that they may be filed by name of donor, by subject, in chronological sequence by decades, and by names of the principal people around whom each collection was formed. Finally, a printed handlist of all collections with a copious index will be available.

Much of the material has been boxed in special Permalife boxes, and several thousand documents have been placed in deacidified folders, thus protecting them from deterioration.

Following discussions with Mr. William Barrow, a world authority on paper, at his laboratory in Richmond, it was decided to cease silking documents and instead to laminate them for preservation purposes.

Special funds for the restoration of manuscript collections were generously provided by the Maryland Chapter, Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America, and by the Society of Daughters of Colonial Wars in the State of Maryland. Since many thousands of papers urgently need restoration, these gifts were much appreciated.

The Latrobe letterbooks, which were in a brittle condition, were laminated and bound by a firm working in close conjunction with Mr. Barrow. Three microfilm copies were made, one of which is stored in a safe deposit box. The cost of this and further work has been generously borne by a member of the Society.

At the completion of the Thomas and Hugg building, most of the work will be finished, but it must be borne in mind that the manuscripts have been only catalogued. About one quarter, 250,000, have been read and indexed; the remainder are still unread, and in many cases need arranging. There is still a pressing need for accurate and careful indexing of the entire collection, a task that will take years.

Arrangements were made with the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Maryland in 1966 whereby the Maryland Diocesan

Library manuscripts will be deposited with the Society when it takes possession of the Thomas and Hugg Building. The collection has over 50,000 papers, many expertly indexed by Mr. F. Garner Ranney, Curator. The acquisition of this collection, with the benefit of Mr. Ranney's knowledge, is welcomed. Requests for assistance should be addressed to Mr. Ranney at the Society.

The papers of the Historical Society of Harford County, deposited with the Society are now being examined and refurbished by Mr. Henry Hoffman, with funds provided by the Harford Society and Mr. J. G. D'Arcy Paul. Considerable progress has been made.

An article, *Manuscripts in the Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore*, written by Sandra M. Kamtman and the Librarian, appeared in *Manuscripts*, Volume XVIII, No. 3, Summer 1966.

The Librarian attended the annual conference of the Manuscript society held in Boston in September 1966. The Manuscript Society will hold its 1967 annual conference in Baltimore from September 14 to 17, using the Thomas and Hugg Memorial as its headquarters. Members attending will join the Society on its annual Bay Cruise on September 16.

(b) *Printed material*. Books, periodicals, pamphlets, broadsides, bound volumes of newspapers, sheet music and miscellaneous printed items total about 90,000. The closing of the Library allowed the taking of an inventory through which it was determined that no major loss had occurred, but over 100 books, missing for some years, were found misplaced on the shelves. The project showed also that as of the end of 1966 the Society had over 4,000 printed items still uncatalogued, some of which have been in that condition for a decade. The inventory was carried out most efficiently by Miss Rich, Miss Grether and Mrs. Lord.

Cataloguing of current accessions naturally lessened and only 740 volumes, of 609 titles, were processed in 1966, as against an average of 1,200 in previous recent years. Nevertheless, all new and important books were catalogued currently.

The Society has a fine collection of sheet music, much of it given by Mr. Louis H. Dielman. The Librarian has made this a special project, and with the expert advice of a member of the Committee, Mr. Lester S. Levy, accessions have been

examined and weeded. Of the 4,000 pieces examined, there was one outstanding find, listed elsewhere, and several rare pieces. Of these, 3,000 still have to be checked against the main collection, but all have been placed in special Permalife boxes. The collection is now immediately available to scholars.

Much of Mrs. Painter's time was spent in the efficient reorganization of the serials and periodical collection. Broken out-of-state and several out-of-scope sets were weeded, and many useful sets were completed. Many runs were bound, in the belief that any periodical worth keeping should be bound. Over 250 volumes were sent to the bindery in 1966.

(c) *Graphics*. Included in this category are maps (2,500), photographs (75,000), prints (2,500), framed pictures (300), genealogical family charts (1,500), architectural drawings (2,000), plats (1,000), slides (400), and ephemera (including menus, tickets, programs, cards, paper money, calendars, etc.) (70 boxes). The entire collection has been capably reorganized and catalogued by Mr. Eader during the year. All items have been placed in suitable boxes or cabinets.

During 1966, 250 photographic orders were filled, resulting in a total of \$215, plus \$575 in reproduction fees, a sum only slightly less than in 1965, when the Library was open throughout the year. These funds were devoted to Library purposes.

An arrangement was made with the Winterthur Museum whereby our picture collection will be greatly augmented. Mr. John Hill of Winterthur has examined our collection and will photograph those items not already in our photograph collection; a negative and a print of each item will be given to the Society and one will be deposited with Winterthur, but control will remain in the Society's hands.

(d) *Miscellaneous*. Mr. Eader spent a week at the New York State Historical Association seminars in Cooperstown, New York, and reported in detail upon his return. He prepared a special exhibition for the Hochschild Kohn Department Store in October 1966 to commemorate British-American relations. During the year the Librarian spoke at historical societies and library meetings on 17 occasions. He also attended Bibliographical Society of America, Manuscript Society, Grolier Club, and American Library Association meetings and conventions.

Miss Anna D. Ward has been working in the library and at home, compiling a list of all known sources of signers of the Oath of Allegiance.

Sumner A. and Dudrea W. Parker Genealogical Contest

The Parker Genealogical Contest continued to attract excellent entries, and another five genealogical works were submitted in 1966. The thoughtfulness of Mrs. Sumner A. Parker in making money available for prizes is much appreciated, and the genealogical collection has been considerably enriched by entries since the inauguration of the contest in 1946.

Accessions

During the year 592 "lots" of material were accessioned, as against 505 in 1965. The year's accessions have been reported in detail in *Maryland History Notes*. The following list, therefore, is but a brief resume of some of the outstanding ones:

PRINTED MATTER

Acquired from various funds a representative collection of American bibliography and art reference works.

The Anacreontic Song, London c. 1780, the first sheet music edition of the tune which later was used for *The Star-Spangled Banner*. Six copies only are known. This was discovered by Mr. Levy during his search through the Society's unsorted collections.

MANUSCRIPTS

John Henry's Survey of Worcester County, 1742-1754. (MS. No. 1111) (Purchase).

Orndorff Family Papers, given by Mrs. Mary Ridgely Ryan, in memory of her father, Captain James Ridgely Orndorff. (MS. No. G-5080).

Brune-Randall Papers, given by Mrs. H. R. Slack (MS. No. 1132).

Kennedy-Boone-Klots Papers, given by Mr. Trafford P. Klots (MS. No. 1136).

Ridgely Family Papers, given by Mr. D. Stewart Ridgely (MS. No. 1127).
Levy lists of various Maryland Counties, 1776-1825. (Purchase) (MS. No. 1117).

MISCELLANEOUS

Many books and other materials from: Mrs. Frank R. Kent, Mr. Richard H. Randall, Sr., Mr. Curtis Carroll Davis, Mr. Robert G. Torrence, Mr. Archibald M. Hart, Mrs. G. H. Dieke, and Mr. Louis E. Shecter. Approximately 600 Baltimore & Ohio Railroad prints and negatives (gift of the company through Mr. Robert M. Vogel, Smithsonian Institution).

Maritime Materials

As in previous years, the regular attendance of Mr. Richard

H. Randall, Sr., has been of great service. His knowledge of all things maritime is invaluable.

Rationalization of the Collections

For years the library stacks have contained piles of books which were duplicates or were out of scope. There were also many volumes of pamphlets which bore no relation to Maryland or were clearly unnecessary for the Society's collection, e.g., *The Flora and Fauna of New Guinea; A Soldier's Life in India*. These and other books were checked against bibliographies and dealers' catalogues, and over 5,000 have been consigned to auction houses in New York. Duplicates of Maryland and peripheral state items were sold to local libraries or in lots to dealers.

The money so far raised has been used in purchasing desiderata or books which could not be bought from the annual budget, as well as for binding, for the purchase of much-needed map and file cases, and for special boxes for the proper housing of the sheet music and other collections.

Library Committee

Early in 1966 the Librarian presented the Committee with a comprehensive report which underlined the poor state of much of the collection and the need for vigorous action to restore it and to prepare for the move to the new building. The Committee, composed of bookmen, most of whom are regular users of the Library, met whenever necessary. Throughout, the members have realized that the chief needs were new equipment and additional staff, and it is through their efforts and those of the Director that much has been accomplished.

The Librarian, Mr. P. William Filby, wishes to place on record his appreciation for the way in which the staff surmounted all difficulties in this crucial year. Without them nothing could have been achieved. He also records his gratitude to the Director and the Library Committee for their understanding of the needs and for their work in achieving what seemed impossible a year ago.

The Librarian

The foregoing portion of this report is based on a draft submitted by the Librarian, and it therefore omits any direct

reference to the quality and extent of his services to the Society.

At the close of 1966, the Librarian had been with the Society for about 14 months. During that short period, however, he has displayed extraordinary qualities of industry and imagination, and has combined with them a talent for getting things done. The remarkable achievements of 1966 recorded herein are essentially his.

EDWARD G. HOWARD, *Acting Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Your Committee on Finance has the general responsibility of advising the Society in the management of its finances including the investment and reinvestment of funds given or left to the Society by members and friends to provide the facilities and income to carry on the Society's purpose of keeping alive the understanding and appreciation of the historical and cultural development of Maryland. In investing the Society's funds your Committee seeks to obtain the best current income which can be produced by prudent management. We also seek growth of both principal and income. The long term gradual rise in the Society's investment income which is based primarily on additions to endowment has been boosted by rising dividend payments on common stock holdings and in the last few years by good yields on new bond purchases. Our present policy is to invest approximately 40% of our funds in bonds and 60% in common stocks.

Upon completion of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building in 1967 an estimated \$1,300,000 will be available for the endowment fund provided under the wills of William S. Thomas and John L. Thomas. Our present estimates are that the \$55,000 in additional income which this fund will provide will be barely sufficient to operate the new building and to carry on and finance the expanded program which the new building makes possible.

In view of the prospective tightness of the Society's finances on completion of the Thomas and Hugg Building your Committee strongly urges that every effort be made to increase the

Society's income sufficiently to take care of its needs and opportunities. This calls for more members and more membership income, additions to our endowment and the searching out of other new sources of income.

BOOK VALUE OF ENDOWMENTS, INCOME FROM ENDOWMENTS,
DUES AND CONTRIBUTIONS

	1966	1965	1956
Book Value of Endowments	\$1,733,876	\$1,728,184	\$482,789
Net Income, Endowments, Etc.	59,446	55,465	26,385
Dues	26,217	26,089	17,072
Contributions	6,610	4,550	3,050

ROBERT G. MERRICK, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

Early in the year upon the unanimous recommendation of the Committee the Society published *A History of the University of Maryland* by George H. Callcott, Assistant Professor of History at the University. It has been well received by reviewers. Later in the year the Committee formulated a policy relative to the continuation of the publication of the *Archives of Maryland* which the Council unanimously adopted. Several manuscripts were reviewed and one, "Quakerism on the Eastern Shore," by Dr. Kenneth L. Carroll, was recommended for publication as soon as possible.

CHARLES A. BARKER, *Chairman*

MEMBERSHIP

Following are the membership statistics for 1966:

<i>January 1, 1966</i>	Individual	1820
	Contributing	305
	Husband and wife	1074
	Sustaining	54
	Donor	18
	Life	92
	Patron	2

3365

<i>New Members, 1966</i>	Individual	167	
	Contributing	15	
	Sustaining	1	
	Donor	1	
			184
			<u>3549</u>
<i>Members Lost, 1966</i>	Deaths — Life	1	
	Other	65	
	Resignations	107	
	Lapsed for two years	91	
		<u>264</u>	
<i>December 31, 1966</i>	NET TOTAL MEMBERS		3285
	Individual	1795	
	Contributing	310	
	Husband and wife	1009	
	Sustaining	56	
	Donor	20	
	Life	91	
	Patron	4	
		<u>3285</u>	

The net loss of 80 members is attributable, in part, at least, to the severe curtailment of the activities of the Society during the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building. Your Committee is confident that a membership drive, planned to coincide with the opening of the new building, will bring favorable results.

CHARLES P. CRANE, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON ADDRESSES

Because of problems related to the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, the customary afternoon series of lectures on arts and crafts in Maryland was not held. Evening membership meetings, however, were held as follows:

January 17—Joint meeting with the Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities. Mr. Orlando Ridout IV, Presi-

dent of the Maryland Historical Trust, spoke on "Preservation in Maryland."

February 14—Annual meeting covering the election of officers and committee members. Reports on the past year's activities were made by chairmen of the committees concerned with the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building. The rooms of the Society were opened for inspection and recent accessions were on display. Refreshments were served.

March 21—Mr. C. Keating Bowie spoke on "Augustine Herrman."

May 23—In cooperation with the Committee for World Trade Week a film titled "The History of the Port of Baltimore" was shown.

October 24—As guests of the Methodist Historical Society a meeting was held in the Sanctuary of the Lovely Lane Methodist Church, at which Mr. Lester M. Levy spoke on "American History as Reflected in Sheet Music."

November 21—At the same location the Honorable George Henderson, former Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Allegany County, gave an illustrated address on "The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal."

The Society records its gratitude to our hosts on the two last-named occasions.

HOWARD BAETJER, II, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR II RECORDS

During the year the War Records Division completed the publication of the 5-volume *Maryland in World War II—Register of Service Personnel* which lists name, rank, branch of service, serial number and community address for approximately 237,000 veterans of the State. Sets of the volumes were distributed in accordance with directions received from the Board of Public Works. The remaining copies will be stored at the Society and are for sale at \$20.00 a volume.

By means of a formal resolution the Maryland Society was

commended by the Vermont Historical Society for the scope and thoroughness of its War Records program. In an effort to institute a similar program, the Vermont Society and The Adjutant General of that state will submit the Maryland project as a model to the Vermont legislature.

Following a general tidying-up of the division's specialized library, the project will end as of June 30, 1967.

J. RIEMAN McINTOSH, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The Committee did not meet formally during the year but, in accordance with the directions of its Chairman, the Director held several conferences with school officials as to a possible widening of the Society's educational program. Upon completion of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building guided tours of school groups will be resumed, slide-illustrated lectures to pupils on Maryland subjects will be given by appointment during school time, and, it is hoped, informal courses in Maryland history will be offered to teachers.

During the year the school text *My Maryland* was reprinted and additional titles in the series of Wheeler Leaflets on Maryland History were planned.

During the coming months the Education Committee will consider the advisability of sponsoring a state-wide meeting of local school superintendents, librarians, and historical group chairmen to determine methods of closer cooperation in educational programs pertaining to state and local history.

THOMAS G. PULLEN, JR., *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH OTHER SOCIETIES

The Society regrets that during the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building and the necessary closing of the library and the art gallery, its hospitality to other groups had to be curtailed. During the year, nevertheless, the following groups met here on one or more occasions: Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities; National Society of

the Colonial Dames in the State of Maryland; Woman's Eastern Shore Society; Civil War Union Room Committee; Confederate Room Committee of the United Daughters of the Confederacy; and the Society of the *Ark* and the *Dove*.

The annual meeting of the Association of Historical Societies in Maryland met September 24 at Brick Meeting House, Calvert, with the Historical Society of Cecil County as pleasant and efficient hosts. One hundred forty representatives of 21 different organizations attended the morning meeting and made the afternoon tour of historic homes and sites.

In accordance with a recommendation of the Director of the Society, who is also the State Chairman of the awards program of the American Association for State and Local History, the Association presented an Award of Merit to former Senator George L. Radcliffe, Chairman of the Council, "for inspired, devoted and productive service for more than half a century in all matters pertaining to Maryland history."

When the auditorium and the smaller meeting room in the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building became available, it is hoped that more groups with interests allied to those of the Society will meet here.

ROSAMOND R. BEIRNE, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON THE MARITIME COLLECTION

The current chairman assumed office in February and during the year three members—Messrs. William E. Hill, Robert E. Michel and Frederick W. Wehr—were added to the committee to bring the total to fifteen. The chairman represented the committee at all meetings of the Council of the Society except for a few occasions when he was out of town, and he has been at the Society about 30 hours per week to continue the compilation of his maritime library files.

Though the committee met only once, at that session it outlined a program for the year relating mainly to the purchase of display cases, the nature of the collection and the method of its exhibition in its larger quarters after removal to the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building. During the year a sizable loan was made to the Garden Club of America. Acquisitions have been acknowledged periodically in *Maryland History Notes*.

At its June meeting the Council approved a motion that the Committee sponsor and receive the profit of the Annual Bay Cruise. Messrs. Steuart and Scarlett with the cooperation of the Steamboat Trade Association are endeavoring to secure a tug boat pilot house as a feature of the expanded exhibit. By the year's end sufficient display cases for the new maritime area had been delivered or were on order and additional ones will be made available if necessary. Acquisitions during the year totaled 13 "lots" of 46 items, including purchase of the reserve steering wheel and the engine-room end of the bridge telegraph of the *City of Norfolk*, the last passenger steamer to leave the Chesapeake Bay. A noteworthy gift from Mrs. W. Guy Delahay of Baltimore was a power-boat racing trophy presented by the *Sunpapers* in 1932 to Messrs. Ernie Chase and John Bramble. The trophy, cast in bronze, stands three feet high and was made by Jack Lambert, well known Baltimore sculptor. The base carries the inscription: "1634-1934 Year of Tercentennial."

Three committee members deserve special gratitude: First, Mr. Marion V. Brewington who, with Mrs. Brewington—for the second consecutive year—has given the Society \$1,000 allocated to the maritime collection, and who also presented 1,000 copies of his booklet *Sailing Craft on the Chesapeake Bay* to be sold for the benefit of the collection. Mr. Brewington has also given or deposited a number of other items. Second, Mr. R. Hammond Gibson, curator, who devotes many hours to the cleaning and repair of models and to arranging their display. Mr. Gibson has also made scale drawings of the layout of the new exhibits as well as kept detailed records of the collection. Finally, Mr. Graham Wood, who handles all matters relating to steamboats and who is the committee's most active member in procuring new acquisitions.

RICHARD H. RANDALL, *Chairman*

THOMAS AND HUGG MEMORIAL BUILDING COMMITTEE

At the end of 1966 the Thomas and Hugg Memorial addition to the headquarters of the Society was about 78 percent complete. Bad weather and an extreme shortage of skilled labor

has slowed the construction, but both materials and workmanship are superior. With the building closed in for the winter, and with plastering and the installation of decorative marble well under way, the work should move more rapidly.

A. L. PENNIMAN, JR., *Chairman*

THE WOMEN'S COMMITTEE

As the year began, interests of the Women's Committee centered on the new building. Two of its members, Mrs. Williams and Mrs. Symington, served on the Decorating Committee of which Messrs. Hyde and Paul were co-chairman. Several members inspected materials and colors used in various new buildings in the city, and reported their findings to the Decorating Committee. Gifts totaling \$220 were presented to the Committee by two of its members.

Volunteers from the Committee will prepare a series of pamphlets on costumes, portraits, furniture, china, and possessions of famous people held by the Society. Work on this is necessarily in abeyance while so many of the Society's possessions are in storage. However, Mrs. Earle has completed a pamphlet on costumes, since she has been weeding out costumes for cleaning.

Several activities of the Committee have necessarily been interrupted. Still being pursued, however, are the clipping of the *Baltimore Sun* by Miss Gary, the clipping of the *Evening Sun* by Mrs. Newcomer, and maintenance of the scrapbook by Mrs. Gibbs.

The usual fall tea for new members was postponed until the occupation of the new building.

KATHERINE S. SYMINGTON, *Chairman*

THE SEMINAR IN MARYLAND HISTORY

A reminder of the services offered to historical authors by the Seminar in Maryland History was sent to the *News-Letter* of the American Historical Association, and the *Journal of American History* early in the year. This renewed notice elicited several inquiries; but no draft studies were submitted for discussion.

Research in the Society's papers, except on an "emergency" basis, has had to be suspended during the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, and this necessity may help to explain why we have had no grist brought to our mill. But the existence of the Seminar has served to signify the welcome the Society offers to historical investigation, especially to research in its holdings. Such research should receive a fresh impulse from the reorganization and cataloguing of our holdings by Mr. Filby, which is at last well advanced toward accomplishment thanks to the advantage he has taken of the shut-down incident to their impending transfer. Meanwhile, the Director of the Seminar is working with the Chairman of the Publications Committee and Mr. Manakee on proposals for closer cooperation between all the Committees that represent the interest of the Society in research, writing, and publication.

One step in that direction already taken has been to constitute the Editor of the *Magazine* a member of the seminar ex officio. This has added Dr. Richard Walsh to our regular panel.

The Seminar has been further strengthened by the appointment of Professor Jack P. Greene, Professor of Early American History in the Johns Hopkins University, as a member to succeed Dr. F. Wilson Smith.

KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD, *Chairman*



**TONGUE, BROOKS
& COMPANY**

I N S U R A N C E

Since 1898



**213 ST. PAUL PLACE
BALTIMORE**

**TRADITIONAL
FURNITURE**

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

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

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

**The American College of Arms
Invites You**

To register your arms. Matriculations and new grants of arms are now possible, for the first time in the United States. All arms we register will be protected by an instrumentality of the government. All arms registered will eventually appear in the *American Armory*—a copyrighted authority on AMERICAN HERALDRY.

WRITE, OR PHONE
VE 7-1776



The American College of Arms,
AMERICAN COLLEGE OF
HERALDRY & ARMS, INC.

HARBOURMASTER'S BLDG.
HERALD'S MEWS
BALTIMORE, MD. 21202

OLD STAMPS

BOUGHT AND SOLD

Old letters written before 1845 and 1870 often bear valuable stamps. Consult us before disposing of any old letters.

WE ALSO BUY STAMP COLLECTIONS

PERRY W. FULLER

Bowen & King Building

405 North Charles Street

Baltimore, Md. 21201



PRINTERS OF THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

GARAMOND/PRIDEMARK PRESS, INC.

714 E. PRATT ST. ✦ BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21202 ✦ TEL: AREA CODE 301 727-7070 ✦ WASHINGTON TEL: 393-5676

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Activities

Provides library reference service to about 4,000 patrons yearly—scholars, writers, genealogists, students, collectors, artists. Mail and telephone inquiries double the figure.

Conducts lecture tours of its museum for an annual average of about 8,000 school students. Another 10,000 casual visitors, including tourists, view the collections, in addition to many museum students, collectors, hobbyists and authorities in given fields who utilize stored items for study.

Advises and assists 23 local historical societies in the counties, the work culminating in an Annual Conference of the Association of Maryland Historical Societies.

Maintains liaison with such allied groups as patriotic societies.

Acts as consultant to civic and governmental groups relative to publications and commemorative occasions.

Publishes the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, and *Maryland History Notes*. Circulation over 3,500 each.

Publishes scholarly works and low-cost school books and leaflets on Maryland history—over 50 different titles.

Holds meetings, open to the public, for lectures by authorities in various fields, including prominent government officials.

Stages special exhibits with timely themes.

* * *

For the Government of the State at cost

Edits, publishes and distributes the *Archives of Maryland*. 70th volume in preparation.

Conducts a program of marking historic sites with roadside signs.

Indexes important, original papers relating to Maryland history.

Preserves and publishes data pertaining to Maryland's contribution to World War II.