

THE LONG ISLAND HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Page 15 - A. 10. L. 1. 3.



EXECUTION ROCKS LIGHTHOUSE,
ca. 1850

Spring 1999

Volume 11 • Number 2



"Starting from fish-shape Paumanok where I was born..."

Walt Whitman

Spring 1999

Volume 11 • Number 2

**Published by
the Department of History
State University of New York at Stony Brook**

copyright 1999 by the *Long Island Historical Journal*

ISSN 0898-7084

All rights reserved

**Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in
Historical Abstracts and *America: History and Life*.**

The editors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Office of the Provost and of the Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences, USB. We thank the Center for Excellence and Innovation in Education, USB, and the Long Island Studies Council for their generous assistance. We appreciate the unstinting cooperation of Gary J. Marker, chair, Department of History, USB, and of past chairpersons Wilbur R. Miller, Joel T. Rosenthal, and Fred Weinstein. We also thank Wanda Mocarski for her technical assistance.

The *Long Island Historical Journal* is published twice a year, in May and November. Annual subscriptions are \$15, single copies \$8. Address articles, correspondence, books for review, and subscriptions to:

The Editor, *LIHJ*
Department of History
University at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4348

We publish original studies of any aspect of Long Island history. Submit manuscripts in duplicate (no carbons) on 8½" x 11" stock, double spaced, with generous margins, and written on only one side of each page. If possible, also submit an IBM-compatible disk. Notes should be numbered consecutively, assembled at the end of the text, and modeled on examples in the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

The State University of New York at Stony Brook is an affirmative action/equal opportunity educator and employer.

THE LONG ISLAND HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Editor: Roger Wunderlich, USB.

Associate editor: Richard P. Harmond, St. John's University.

Assistant editor: Christopher Gennari, USB:

Undergraduate editor: Kevin Keenan, USB

Editorial Board: Charles F. Howlett, Amityville Mem. High School; Eric E. Lampard, USB; William McAdoo, USB; Wilbur R. Miller, USB; Joel T. Rosenthal, USB; Geoffrey L. Rossano, Salisbury School; Eli Seifman, Center for Excellence and Innovation in Education. USB; Donald E. Simon, Monroe College; John A. Strong, Long Island Univ., Southampton Campus; Fred Weinstein, USB; Luise Weiss, Middle Country Public Library.

Advisory Board: Barbara Mazor Bart, Walt Whitman Birthplace Assoc.; Susan L. Battley, USB; Antonia Booth, Southold Town Historian; Wallace W. Broege, Suffolk County Historical Society; Edwin G. Burrows, Brooklyn College; Mitzi Caputo, Huntington Historical Society; Floris B. Cash, USB; Steven R. Coleman, Columbia Univ.; Robert E. Cray Jr., Montclair State College; Marlyn H. Dalsimer, Adelphi Univ.; Mildred M. DeRiggi, Glen Cove Historical Society; Elizabeth Ewen, SUNY College at Old Westbury; Dean F. Failey, American Furniture & Decorative Arts, Christie's; John A. Gable, Theodore Roosevelt Assoc.; John A. Hewlett, Half Hollow Hills School District; Kenneth T. Jackson, Columbia Univ.; Deborah Johnson, Museums at Stony Brook; Barbara M. Kelly, Long Island Studies Institute, Hofstra Univ; Paul E. Kerson, Queens Historical Society; Gerald S. Kessler, Friends for Long Island's Heritage; Jeffrey A. Kroessler, historian; Ned C. Landsman, USB; Robert B. MacKay, Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities; Mary Anne Mrozinski, Rufus King Manor; Philip F. Palmedo, Long Island Research Institute; John G. Peterkin, Cedar Swamp Historical Society; John W. Pratt, USB; Alice Ross, USB; Elly Shodell, Port Washington Public Library; Sr. Joan Ryan, St. Joseph's College; Vincent F. Seyfried, Garden City Historian; Edward J. Smits, Nassau County Historian; Gaynell Stone, Suffolk County Archaeological Association; R. L. Swanson, Marine Sciences Research Center, USB; Francis J. Turano, USB; Evert Volkersz, USB Library.

Cover: *Execution Rocks Lighthouse*, ca. 1850. Architect's rendering, watercolor and ink on paper, courtesy National Archives Cartographic Branch (record group 26).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENT

CREATING A NEW COUNTY:

NASSAU

By Edward J. Smits - 129

BEACONS FOR ALL: A HISTORY OF LONG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSES

By Joshua Ruff - 145

FROM THE DOMESTIC TO THE PUBLIC ARENA:

LONG ISLAND WOMEN TAKE PART IN THE U.S. SANITARY COMMISSION

By Sandra Roff and Diane DiMartino - 161

IMMIGRANTS, INDIANS, AND IDLE MEN:

LONG ISLAND'S "RABBLE IN ARMS" IN THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR

By John G. Staudt - 178

WILLIAM WALLACE TOOKER:

A NEW LOOK AT

LONG ISLAND'S PIONEER ETHNOGRAPHER

By Lois Beachy Underhill - 190

JAVITS V. ROOSEVELT:

THE 1954 RACE FOR

NEW YORK STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

By Michael Kelly - 203

Secondary School Essay Contest Winners - 223

NAZIS ON LONG ISLAND

By Lucas Hanft - 223

REVIEWS - 231

Deborah Johnson, ed. *William Sidney Mount,
Painter of American Life.*
By Robert W. Kenny

Newsday. *Long Island: Our Story*
By Edwin G. Burrows

Joann P. Krieg. *A Whitman Chronology.*
By Maxwell Wheat

M(ildred) H(ess) Smith, with the assistance of Jeanmarie DiNoto.
Garden City, Long Island in Early Photographs, 1869-1919.
By Vincent F. Seyfried

Shirley G. Hibbard. *Rock Hall: A Narrative History*
By Stephen J. Sullivan

Linda B. Martin. *Nassau County at 100:
The Past and Present in Photographs.*
By Diane Perry

BOOK NOTES - 241

COMMUNICATIONS - 242

CONTRIBUTORS

Diane DiMartino is coordinator of graduate services in the City University of New York's Baruch College Library.

Michael Kelly teaches American History at SUNY at Stony Brook, where he recently earned his Ph.D. for his dissertation on the life of the late Senator Jacob K. Javits, whose biography he currently is completing.

Sandra Roff is the archivist of the City University of New York's Baruch College.

Joshua Ruff, the history curator at The Museums at Stony Brook and adjunct history instructor at Dowling College, is the curator for his museums's current Lighthouses of Long Island exhibition.

Edward J. Smits, Nassau County Historian and former Director of Museum Services for Nassau County, is now coordinating the planning and construction of the Museums at Mitchel Center.

John G. Staudt, a doctoral candidate in American history at George Washington University, teaches U.S. history at the University College at Hofstra University, and also at Kellenberg Memorial High School.

Lois Beachy Underhill is the author of *The Woman Who Ran for President, the Many Lives of Victoria Woodhull* (Bridge Works 1995, Penguin 1996). Her article on William Wallace Tooker grew out of her account of Tooker's life in the *East Hampton Star*, 23 July 1998.

Secondary school essay contest winner.

At the time of submission,

Lucas Hanft was a junior at Paul D. Schreiber High School, Port Washington.

The Center for
Excellence and Innovation
in Education
of the
State University of New York
at Stony Brook

Committed to teacher education,
educational research and development,
and partnership programs with schools
in the Long Island region,
is pleased to support the
Long Island Historical Journal



Long Island Studies Council

An interdisciplinary membership group of scholars, teachers, librarians, archivists, historians, and others interested in the study of Long Island and its heritage, invites readers of the Long Island Historical Journal to its dinner-lecture meetings and site visits.

For information, contact
Natalie A. Naylor, President
Long Island Studies Council
202 Roosevelt Hall
103 Hofstra University
Hempstead, NY 11550
(516) 463-5846: fax, (516) 463-4382

CEDAR SWAMP HISTORICAL SOCIETY

TO RESEARCH, EXPOSE, AND PRESERVE NATIONAL HISTORY AND THE HERITAGE
OF THE 17th CENTURY SETTLEMENT OF CEDAR SWAMP
(EAST OF HEMPSTEAD HARBOR)
CEDAR SWAMP, LONG ISLAND 11545



MEMBERSHIP

SINGLE\$15
FAMILY\$25
PATRIOT\$50
BENEFACTOR\$100
LIFE\$500

PROTECT
OUR HISTORY
AND
ENVIRONMENT



PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO AND MAIL TO:

CEDAR SWAMP HISTORICAL SOCIETY
CEDAR SWAMP, LONG ISLAND 11545



—ABSOLUTE CHARTER FROM STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND BOARD OF REGENTS—

**Two Important Exhibitions at
THE MUSEUMS at STONY BROOK**

1) Lighthouses of Long Island

A NEW EXHIBITION
EXPLORING the HISTORY and SIGNIFICANCE of
The LIGHTHOUSES of LONG ISLAND

Through 31 October 1999

2) William Sidney Mount: Painter of American Life

AN EXHIBITION
FEATURING the ORIGINAL PAINTINGS of
WILLIAM SIDNEY MOUNT

Through 26 September 1999

THE MUSEUMS at STONY BROOK
1208 Route 25A, Stony Brook, NY 11790

Call: (516) 751-0066, ext. 241
Fax: (516) 751-0353

Wednesday-Saturday 10 A.M. to 5 P.M.
Sunday Noon to 5 P.M.
Adults \$4; Seniors \$3

Students six to seventeen and college students with ID, \$2;
Free for children under the age of six and museum members.

Subscribe to the Long Island Historical Journal

\$15 a year

Published Fall and Spring

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

Please make checks payable to LIHJ, and mail to:

**LIHJ
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
SUNY AT STONY BROOK
STONY BROOK, NY 11794-4348.**

THIS READER-SUPPORTED JOURNAL DEPENDS ON YOU

READERS' REMARKS

We welcome comments, proposals for articles or reviews, or offers to help in whatever phase of our work you select.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

A brief summary of purpose.

The mission of your journal is Long Island as America, a phrase created by our associate editor, Richard P. Harmond, and his colleague, James E. Bunce. Long Island as America is the premise that the history of the Island reflects as well as contributes to most major phase of national life, from precolonial times to the present. Within this context, we study Long Island's evolution through its four distinctive periods:

- 1) Native American—the long era before the arrival of Europeans;
- 2) Rural—from seventeenth-century Dutch and English settlement until 1910, during which the Island remained almost totally countrified, even though adjacent to the nation's largest city;
- 3) Suburban—after 1910, when the LIRR tunnel beneath the East River, augmented by Robert Moses' parkways and crossings, transformed the rural Island into the "bedroom of New York City";
- 4) Postsuburban—from 1965-1970 on, the self-sufficient, high-tech period of easily accessed industrial parks, office complexes, educational facilities, shopping malls, and housing developments, in which the vast majority of employed people not only lives but works on Long Island.

This issue.

We observe the hundredth birthday of Nassau County with its historian, Edward J. Smit's, analysis of its creation. Joshua Ruff reviews the history of our lighthouses, the subject of the current exhibit, of which is curator, at The Museums at Stony Brook Two Baruch College historians, Sandra Roff and Diane DiMartino, examine Long Island women's aid to the Union Army during the Civil War; John G. Staudt submits little-known information concerning the Island's rank and file soldiers who fought in the French and Indian War; Lois Beachy Underhill contributes a fascinating biography of William Wallace Tooker, Long Island's pioneer ethnographer; and Michael Kelly surveys Jacob K. Javits's 1954 victory over Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. for the position of attorney general of New York State. In addition, we present a held-over high school essay contest paper by Lucas Hanft of Port Washington, and an outstanding collection of reviews of a new book on William Sidney Mount, *Newsday's Long Island: Our Story*, and many more.

Expect your subscription reminder around the first of June. We have kept the price at \$15, a far from easy job. Please renew promptly, it helps a great deal: this reader-supported journal depends on you.

CREATING A NEW COUNTY: NASSAU

By Edward J. Smits

*Editorial note: We thank Edward J. Smits for this revision of his original booklet, *The Creation of Nassau County*, and his article with the same title that we published ten years ago, now revisited, in the author's words, "with deeper consideration of the effect of New York City's political change upon the creation of Nassau."*

As the metropolitan area plans to enter the new millennium, both New York City and Nassau County celebrate their respective centennials in 1998 and 1999. The reorganization of the more than fifty cities, counties, and towns, including the city of Brooklyn (then the third largest in the United States) into Greater New York, promoted for more than three decades by the civic leader Andrew Haswell Green, resulted in the creation of the second largest city in the world, with more than 3.4 million residents, in 1898. The late nineteenth century was a period of rapid urban growth, fueled by massive immigration and the new technologies of elevators, telephone service, and subways. While this economic giant was stirring, the adjacent rural, agricultural eastern towns of Queens County remained a placid backwater of farming, maritime, and small resort villages.

However, the political considerations influencing New York City's governmental change in the late 1800s also affected the future structure of those rural towns, and, ultimately, was directly related to Nassau County's creation out of Queens County. The mutual rural-urban antipathy between the areas was further aggravated by differences among the officers of the city, towns, and county governments, and between the Democratic and Republican parties. Further clouding a clear understanding of the political dynamics, members of each party also held opposing views and positions on city consolidation and the future role of the rural part of Queens County.

The roots of local government change actually began during the American Revolution, when the Loyalist-Patriot split within Queens County's population impacted its local government. Colonial Queens was made up of the towns of Jamaica, Flushing, Newtown, Oyster Bay, and Hempstead. In September 1775, the largely Loyalist town of Hempstead refused to elect delegates to the Patriot Provincial Congress, whereupon the Patriot communities of Great Neck, Manhasset, and Roslyn seceded and formed the town of North Hempstead, a separation ratified by the legislature on 16 April 1784. While the bill was pending, a joint town meeting in April voted to hold two separate meetings, and to divide the town property. The act to divide the town provided that:

All that part of said township of Hempstead north of the country road

(present day Jericho Turnpike) that leads from Jamaica nearly through the middle of Hempstead Plain to the east part thereof, shall be included in one township; and be hereafter called and known by North Hempstead.

The remaining part was called South Hempstead, then changed back to Hempstead in 1801. The act enabled inhabitants of either town to enjoy rights of oystering, fishing, and clamming in the waters of the other. Town government provided most local services pertaining to roads, economic regulations, and record keeping, while the county functioned basically for judicial, land title, and legal services.²

Queens County's court was held originally at Jamaica, in a courthouse and jail building built in 1670. After much agitation, the building was altered in 1724, but during the Revolution the British tore it down for lumber. As soon as peace was declared, both the eastern and western towns petitioned the state legislature to have the new courthouse erected in their respective areas.

Since a preponderance of the county's population was in the eastern towns, the legislature passed an act on 31 March 1785, allowing £2,000 to be raised to erect a new building on a site in the geographical center of the county. The courthouse and jail was constructed in a sparsely populated area within a mile of Windmill Pond, near the house of Benjamin Cheeseman on the southerly bounds of the town of North Hempstead. Operations of this court were severely criticized by Cadwallader D. Colder, assistant attorney general, in January 1799:

the court of Queens County is at all times the least orderly of any court I was ever in. The entry of the courthouse is lined on court days with the stalls of dram sellers and filled with drunken people, so as to be almost impassable.³

The courthouse was surrounded by bleak farm lands, provoking the contemporary criticism that:

the village called North Hempstead where the courts are held...hardly deserves a local name or notice but that the courts are held there. The location of this public building upon an almost naked and barren heath, remote from the conveniences of more populous districts, furnishes an admirable comment on blind adherence to geographical centers.⁴

In 1844, the county board of supervisors called a vote to determine whether a new courthouse should be erected. The referendum, which did not specify a location, was turned down by the disinterested voters. However, dissatisfaction continued to grow among lawyers and judges, and by 1860 a strong demand existed for removal of the courthouse to Jamaica.

Other than the courthouse, there were no other county office buildings until 1833, when the clerk and surrogate obtained offices at Jamaica. Before this, they conducted official business from their homes. The county officers during the

nineteenth century were a county judge, district attorney, sheriff, coroners, treasurer, county clerk, school commissioner, superintendent of poor, and plank road inspectors. Administration was mainly centered in the field of judicial functions, with supervision of the poor and schools regulatory rather than administrative.

The clerk registered deeds and wills and functioned much as county clerks do today. Public works projects before the Civil War were limited, and the road network was maintained and constructed primarily by the towns. The county inspected and regulated the numerous private turnpike companies that were well-organized in Queens. As early as 1818, the Jericho Turnpike Company was formed, and, with the North Hempstead Turnpike and Merrick-Jamaica Plank Road, provided three main arteries through the north, center, and south of the county.

Although county functions were becoming more significant, the town meeting continued as the primary government force in the early nineteenth century. However, new developments were to have profound influence. For a long time, the population of Queens increased slowly. Little effort was made to induce settlement, and since roads were extremely poor, reliance on horse-drawn wagons and carriages made interaction with Brooklyn or Suffolk difficult and time-consuming.

In 1855, Hempstead was the most populous area of Queens, with 10,477 of the county's 46,266 residents. The Civil War and industrial growth in New York City rapidly changed this, so that by 1865 the combined population of Flushing, Jamaica, and Newtown was five thousand larger than that of the three eastern towns. During this period, the eastern towns remained practically the same in size, although, after North Hempstead began selling its common lands in the early 1800s, some settlement occurred. Hempstead sold none of its common lands until 1869, when 7,170 acres of the Hempstead Plains were sold to the wealthy merchant, A. T. Stewart, for development of Garden City as a planned suburban village. This and other Hempstead communities grew slowly in the late nineteenth century, along the three lines of the Long Island Railroad, the North Side, South Side, and Long Island Central.⁴

The disposal of common lands was a continual campaign issue between Whigs and Democrats in the early nineteenth century; at the annual sheep parting celebration the Whigs always displayed a large poster, "Opposed to Selling the Marshes and Plains." Through mid-century, the political scene in Queens County was turbulent and fractured, as it was in most of the country. In 1818, the Federalists Daniel Kissam, Stephen Carman and John A. King were elected to the assembly over the Tammany candidates. Stephen Carman was a remarkable candidate. Standing for election to the legislature from Hempstead from 1788 to 1819, he won twenty-one times. In the election of 1825, the Republican slate was opposed by candidates nominated at a meeting "friendly to the rights of the people." This unidentified party went on to defeat the Republican slate. Supporters of Andrew Jackson won the county elections in 1828. The ethnic composition of the populous at this time was revealed by a slogan of Daniel

Smith, an independent candidate for coroner of the town of Hempstead:
"Every Dutchman, Scot and Yankee
Give me your vote and I'll humbly thank ye."⁵

In 1844, the Locofocos (progressive Democrats) ran a winning ticket in Oyster Bay, while the Whigs captured Hempstead and North Hempstead remained Democratic. Ten years later, the Democrats gained Oyster Bay, while the Whigs kept Hempstead and won North Hempstead. The Democratic Party was securely in the majority during these years, but had a hard campaign in 1856 to defeat the nativist American (Know-Nothing) Party's ticket. In that year, William H. Onderdonk, a popular lawyer, ran contrary to the tide and won as district attorney on the Know-Nothing slate. His election was typical of the cases of many popular candidates, who, in these small communities, could and did run well ahead of their parties. When the Republican Party was born in 1854, large numbers of residents joined. All the counties of New York called mass meetings, such as that of 9 August at the courthouse in North Hempstead. John A. King, of Jamaica, called the meeting to order and led an excited group of two hundred persons strongly voicing disapproval of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which repealed the Missouri Compromise and opened the territories to slavery.⁷

A county committee was formed with William T. McCoun of Oyster Bay, Warren Mitchell of North Hempstead, and John W. DeMott of Hempstead representing the eastern towns of Queens County. In 1856, John C. Frémont, the first Republican candidate for president, ran last in traditionally Democratic Queens. In 1860, however, although Abraham Lincoln lost the county, the Republicans carried the towns of Hempstead and North Hempstead. In addition to the Republican, John A. King, who won the governorship in 1857, the area was represented in Albany by a Democrat, David Richard Floyd-Jones, who served in both the assembly and the state senate, as secretary of state in 1861, and as lieutenant governor in 1863.

During the decade of the Civil War and Reconstruction, the new Republican party became most strongly entrenched in the eastern towns. However, as the growing population of the western towns threw the county's political balance in their favor, the farmers of eastern Queens lost their potent political power. Their strong sense of independence, nurtured since their ancestors obtained self-government from the Dutch and English, was to be aggravated by the encroaching dominance of the developing Long Island urban areas adjacent to New York City.

In 1851, New York County's board of supervisors was reorganized into a twelve-member body with equal representation by six members of each party. William M. Tweed ascended to leadership of the Democratic Tammany organization in 1857, remaining as the dictatorial boss until 1870 when the city charter was changed again to provide for an elected mayor. Subsequent exposes of corruption and vice, combined with the mystique of urban evils fostered by the Tammany machine, turned rural residents against the politics of the city.

On 3 November 1859, a *Queens County Sentinel* editorial suggested the need for a new county, consisting of Huntington, Hempstead, North Hempstead, and

Oyster Bay:

The western towns are closely united in their sympathies with the office of New York and Brooklyn and a great proportion of the crime which fills our jail, and which is on the increase comes from this direction. This division would settle the question as to location of the Court House.⁸

Although this did not lead to specific action, the seed of discontent between the regions was growing, with the years after the Civil War to be ones of conflict, politically based but geographically oriented.

As soon as the echoes of the Civil War had died down, discontent among western Queens towns over the county courthouse location flared into the open again. During 1868, strong efforts were made to gain support for movement of the county buildings. A bill introduced in the state legislature in February 1869, with the powerful support of western Queens residents, provided that \$200,000 could be raised to erect a new courthouse, and named a board of appointed commissioners who would have complete authority concerning the location and construction of the buildings.

The eastern towns were not to be defeated so easily. They began a counter attack on 9 February 1869, at a meeting at Searing's Hotel, in Mineola. William T. McCoun, a popular and respected leader who served several terms as president of the Queens County Agricultural Society, was appointed chairman, with Samuel Jones of Oyster Bay and George H. Shepard of Huntington chosen as secretaries. Excited discussion took place on the possible formation of a new county named Nassau. The meeting endorsed the idea, and George S. Downing, of Oyster Bay, suggested that the adjacent Suffolk towns of Islip and Smithtown be asked to join. This proposal provoked a heated debate, with much uncertainty over including towns outside of Queens County. James A. Searing and William T. McCoun were appointed to draft a bill to create the new county. A local citizen bemoaned that, "It is not generally known by the outside world what kind of country Long Island really is." Because many believed it was "some sort of a great sandy desert region," he favored creation of a new county to improve this image.⁹

Queens County Assemblyman James B. Pearsall introduced a bill in the legislature for the creation of a county from the three eastern towns of Queens and the Suffolk towns of Huntington, Smithtown, and Islip. Before much momentum was built up, representatives from the Suffolk towns indicated that their constituents were opposed. At the assembly committee hearing on the bill, Elizur B. Hinsdale, of Flushing, presented a resounding attack, while Benjamin D. Hicks and James Searing spoke in favor, contending that residents of the area affected desired the change.

At public meetings in February, residents of Smithtown and Islip expressed opposition, as did Seaman Snedeker, a Hempstead Democrat. Support was voiced in Mineola, while Gideon Frost, of Glen Cove, declared that he approved but objected to the inclusion of the Suffolk towns. Committees organized in many school districts of Suffolk demonstrated mixed attitudes. Cold Spring Harbor,

Huntington, and Northport meetings furnished support, citing lower taxes and saving the time and expense of long trips to Riverhead, the county seat, but meetings in Islip and Babylon were negative.¹⁰

The bill was strongly supported by Hempstead Town Supervisor Carman Cornelius, and in early April was ordered to a third hearing without opposition. However, this move by the assembly proved meaningless when the state senate committee handling the bill dealt the death blow by contending it violated the constitutional provision against dividing assembly districts. Thwarted in their efforts to create a new county, the eastern county political leaders nevertheless were victorious in defeating a measure for a new courthouse, which also died in committee.

Since the end of the Civil War, the Democratic party had almost complete control of the Queens County government. Strongly organized in the western towns, it won the countywide offices and usually two of the three supervisorships of the eastern towns. To counteract pressure from western county Democrats for movement of the county seat to the western part of the county, North Hempstead Republicans now had a bill introduced in the legislature to move the county seat of Queens to Mineola and appoint seven commissioners to erect a new courthouse and jail. The bill included controversial sections providing that the buildings would be located in the village of Mineola, and naming the present board of county supervisors as the commissioners. Residents immediately opposed the proposal. The Hempstead and Jamaica Democratic organizations strongly protested, and a non-partisan petition signed by one thousand people from Oyster Bay was presented against the bill. Adding irritation to the situation was the fact that, in fall 1871, the board had already spent as much as \$8,000 on renovating the old court house. Moreover, the naming of board members as commissioners, when they were not seeking reelection in the spring, led to the feeling that this was a means of retaining office.

The bill was supported at the assembly hearings by Isaac Cocks, Henry Eastman, and John H. Searing, all Republicans from North Hempstead. District Attorney Benjamin Downing spoke of the necessity for a new building. However, due to the vociferous opposition, a clause was inserted providing that the board of supervisors could provide another site within three months after passage of the act. The outgoing board had actually selected a site in 1871, but had not acquired title to it.

The new board, unanimously Democratic, voted down a motion to fix the location at Hempstead by a vote of six to one. Several attempts at conciliating the interests of the different areas were made by the majority party, but it could not change the prevailing attitudes. Both sections meant to have the county seat, and were determined to persevere. Finally, on 2 August, the last day of the deadline, the board met at Mineola. After four unsuccessful ballots for a majority for any location, the supervisors adjourned for an hour and a half for dinner. Upon their return, on the eighth ballot, Long Island City was chosen when Supervisor Henry P. Remsen of North Hempstead broke ranks and voted with the three western supervisors.¹¹

During the construction of the building, considerable friction occurred between the commissioners and the board of supervisors, which felt that its powers were being usurped. In 1874, the supervisors were unsuccessful in having the act repealed, but the following year they succeeded in ousting the commissioners. After the supervisors took over, it was found that although the commissioners had spent \$18,000 more than their original appropriation, an additional \$100,000 would be needed to complete construction. Such large-scale spending was scandalous to residents of the towns of Hempstead, Oyster Bay, and North Hempstead. Their supervisors repeatedly refused to approve the extra money, but finally, at a meeting lasting until midnight on 18 March 1876, the Jamaica supervisor switched from his economy stand with the eastern towns and voted for the measure. The opening of the new courthouse on 28 March 1877 signaled the final political triumph of the increasingly urban western area over the county's rural eastern half.

During the courthouse struggle, separation supporters started a new drive to divide Queens County. Political affairs had continued to deteriorate in New York City. After Boss Tweed's corruption was exposed by the *New York Times* in 1871, he was jailed, jumped bail to Spain, and was extradited in 1876. Many independent, reform-minded citizens were disgusted with both political camps in the city. As one observer noted, the Democratic and the Republican parties, each a machine controlled by a boss, "have no idea of being in politics except for the purpose of obtaining office...and getting money directly or indirectly out of the city treasury." Benjamin D. Hicks, who realized the effort would be difficult, wrote Henry Onderdonk in January 1876, "I do not feel at all sanguine as to the success of Division. There are a few figures that stand in our way...We must not shout until we are out of the woods." Hicks, a respected young Quaker active in community affairs, was a businessman, banker, and historian responsible for publication of Hempstead Town records. He provided continued leadership for the next twenty years in seeking a separate county, much as Andrew H. Green stimulated the city consolidation movement.¹²

After the Republicans won the supervisorship of North Hempstead, along with an assembly seat, in the 1876 elections, they began a serious campaign. At a meeting in early December, Hicks was chosen chairman of a committee in charge of the project, replacing George S. Downing. Later that month, the *Roslyn Tablet* sounded the herald call, declaring,

As our forefathers fought against the usurpation of a tyrant, so we do not intend to have our rights trampled upon, our taxes unwisely and uselessly enhanced, our local government unscrupulously managed, our representation unequal.¹³

Hicks and Assemblyman Elbert Floyd-Jones led the fight. After public meetings discussing the name in January, and the addition of Suffolk towns in February, a bill was introduced in the legislature providing for the formation of "Ocean" County from the three eastern towns of Queens plus the Suffolk towns

of Huntington and Babylon. Losing no time, the Queens board of supervisors held a special meeting on 13 February 1877, attended only by the western town supervisors. The group resolved;

Whereas, no good or sufficient reason has been presented, or is known to this Board, why Queens County should be dismembered, but, on the contrary every reason exists why no such action should be taken by the present legislature; now therefore Resolved, that this Board do most emphatically protest against the Division of Queens County, and earnestly urge our members of the Assembly...to prevent the passage of said bill.¹⁴

At the next meeting, the supervisors of Hempstead, Oyster Bay, and North Hempstead entered a strong protest against the "proceedings of some members of the Board of Supervisors purporting to be a meeting of said board...as being illegal and...that the same being held in a different place from the place named in the minutes of the clerk of February 5." North Hempstead Supervisor Samuel Willets, the lone Republican on the board, was supported fully by popular opinion in his town, including that of the prominent Roslyn resident, William Cullen Bryant, who wrote Assemblyman Jones that "the people in Roslyn and its neighborhood are strongly in favor of the project. As for my part, ...are in favor of the new county." At a special meeting on 14 February, former Assemblyman Stephen Taber offered a resolution, seconded by Benjamin Hicks, stating that "the people of this town have on various occasions heretofore expressed their almost unanimous approval of the erection of said new county, both by petition and by resolution when in town meeting."¹⁵

At the first committee hearing on the bill, which now was for a "Nassau" County, former Oyster Bay Supervisor and now Assemblyman Townsend D. Cock presented a resolution adopted at the last Hempstead town meeting, along with a petition from Huntington, favoring the proposed county. Support for the proposal also came from George S. Downing, the Democratic supervisor of Oyster Bay. However, opponents from Suffolk, led by Elbert Carll, supervisor of the town of Babylon, opposed the measure, contending that they had not had sufficient notice of the meeting and asking for a second hearing. In western Queens the opposition organized, with the Newtown and Jamaica boards passing resolutions denouncing the division, although State Senator L. Bradford Prince indicated he would stand neutral. The opposition was aroused for this meeting on 15 March, when representatives from Suffolk County berated the plan. John M. Crane, of Jamaica, attacked the proposal:

In approaching the discussion of the bill, I am reminded of the old woman whose husband had for a long time been extremely ill and to whose dissolution she appeared to look forward with emotion of the most poignant grief, but who on hearing that he would probably recover, held up her hands and cried, "Lor' of Mercy, how the old fellow hangs on"...It is a subject, Sir, that has irritated and agitated...our people for more than a

quarter of a century.¹⁶

At the final hearing of the State Committee on Civil Divisions, a long parade of leaders from the eastern towns presented support, while petitions were filed in opposition from Huntington and Babylon. Support in the eastern towns was based on the fiscal disparity between the western and eastern sections, in which eastern residents were over-assessed and two-thirds of the paupers and criminal business of Queens came from the western half. Adherents pointed out that reorganization would result in the three Long Island counties having almost equal populations of between forty and fifty thousand.

The bill met vigorous opposition in the legislature. Assemblyman George E. Bulmer, of Jamaica, addressing the assembly on 15 May 1894 satirically attacked proponents who charged that it was unduly expensive to stay overnight in the city:

This law will make it no more convenient for residents to get to the Court House...I have heard of a man from that section (eastern Queens) who once, by mistake gave a hostler, for holding his horse, a twenty-five cent piece instead of a nickel, and when he discovered his mistake he drove back sixteen miles to rectify the error, and with a borrowed horse at that.

He went on to charge that the division would be financially bad and would destroy one of the finest agricultural societies in the state.¹⁷

Although Assemblyman Jones made a strenuous effort to get the bill passed, it was defeated on the third reading, fifty-six to forty-two. The opposition of the powerful Democratic forces in western Queens and the unfortunate inclusion of the Suffolk towns had spelled doom for another attempt to create a new county. Making the victory more bitter, the Queens County supervisors then proceeded to repair and refurbish the old courthouse, near Mineola, for use as the Queens County Insane Asylum, the nineteenth century's harsh name for a psychiatric hospital. More than a hundred patients were accommodated in the antiquated building, which continued in this use until the mid-1890s.

In addition to other functions, the county government now began to develop an extensive road system. Private turnpikes had become unprofitable, with maintenance now extremely sparse. To placate the demand for inter-town roads of equal quality, the county started to take over some main arteries of travel in the 1880s. By the early 1890s, the Jericho Turnpike, Merrick Road, and other major thoroughfares had been taken into the county system, with extensive construction work begun, much of it in the undeveloped eastern towns.

In the early 1890s, the legislature authorized a committee to investigate the organization of Greater New York. Under the chairmanship of Andrew H. Green, it recommended consolidation, but the legislature refused to act until 1894, when it passed a law for a referendum by the people affected. The proposal was approved, although in Queens County, except for Long Island City, only 51 percent voted yes. The eastern towns were not included in the bill, and did not vote.¹⁸

Despite Green's long preparation, doubts of the benefits of incorporation existed, causing considerable opposition from such political figures as William L. Strong, a reform Republican and Brooklyn mayor, and other important leaders. However, incorporation gained a new and immensely powerful champion in Senator Thomas C. Platt, the long-time Republican boss of New York State, who, after becoming a U.S. senator in 1881, controlled federal patronage, dominated the party, and determined government policy, including state legislation. He held court on Sundays in the Fifth Avenue Hotel, in a corridor off the main lobby that came to be known as the "amen corner," where subordinates and favor-seekers "from every city and county in the state there came, met and conferred," and stamped approval of his decisions. Platt became a vigorous and the most instrumental supporter of the consolidated city's creation, believing it would reduce the Democratic dominance of Manhattan. Over persistent vetoes by the mayors, he rammed the legislation through the assembly in March 1896, and obtained Governor Levi Morton's approval. Platt also realized, in 1898, that the next Republican governor, Frank S. Black, would have trouble gaining reelection because of scandals associated with the Erie Canal. He then decided that Theodore Roosevelt, who returned from Cuba that summer as the nationwide Rough Rider hero of the Spanish-American War, should be the party's candidate for governor and secured his nomination.¹⁹

The final boundaries of the consolidation act included all of the western towns of Queens and a small section of Hempstead along its western edge. But the legislation left out the three eastern towns of Queens, apparently in response to concern that they would not only offer little to the city but would continue to need a great deal of public spending. A contemporary historian, Peter Ross, reflected this feeling, remarking that, "chapters might be written of the cowpaths that were paved by granite blocks." A petition to the legislature from Seth Low, of Brooklyn (the reform Republican past mayor of Brooklyn who became mayor of New York City in 1902), and other members of the City Club, had protested that the consolidation bill would force annexation of territory "that has been deprived for a long time of local improvements."²⁰

Passage of the measure reactivated concern and action in the eastern towns of Queens. A series of meetings was planned in 1897 once again to promote creation of a new county and review whether it should include Huntington and Babylon Towns. On 1 January 1898, about one-third of Queens County became a borough of New York City. Because the three eastern towns still were part of Queens County but outside the city's jurisdiction, the citizens immediately united to change this intolerable situation. On 22 January, a countywide meeting was held at Allen's Hotel, in Mineola.

The hall was crowded as P. Halstead Scudder called the meeting to order and indicated the alternatives that faced the residents of the towns. The possibility of annexation to Greater New York was dismissed, to the cheers of the audience, as entirely out of the question. Another alternative, the idea of creating a new county by combining Queens County's eastern towns with different towns of western Suffolk seemed unlikely of adoption. Scudder concluded that the only solution was

the organization of a new county. Before general discussion began, the citizens chose as chairman Benjamin D. Hicks, of North Hempstead, who had been at the forefront of the drive for a new county for twenty years. It is he who deserves to be called the "Father of Nassau County" for his long years of striving for an independent county. Archer B. Wallace, son of Assemblyman George Wallace, was elected secretary of the meeting.

J. B. Coles Tappen, of Oyster Bay, began the discussion with a motion: "Resolved that it is the sense of this meeting that the towns of Hempstead, North Hempstead and Oyster Bay withdraw from the county of Queens, and that a new county to include the said towns be formed."²¹

A few dissidents brought up the question of other possible action. William W. Cocks, of North Hempstead, favored annexation to Suffolk County, while John H. Carll wanted to join New York City, but neither proposal received support. Inclusion of Huntington and Babylon in a new county was urged by Fred Herzog Sr., of Oyster Bay. General James Pearsall, of Glen Cove, who had been a member of the assembly in an attempt twenty years before to create a new county, declaring that it would be impossible to get such a measure through the legislature, urged exclusion of any Suffolk area. Many agreed with Edward N. Townsend, of Hempstead, that "The county would be an inexpensive one to govern." James H. Ludlam, of Oyster Bay, also stressed the economy aspects, indicating that people from his area wanted lower taxes. P. Halstead Scudder also rejected the option of including any portion of Suffolk. In appropriate Long Island fashion, D. N. Munger closed the subject by stating that, "they should consider not what should be taken in but what barnacles should be taken off." When the chair called the question, Tappen's resolution carried with only a few dissenting votes. James Ludlam then offered a motion which was unanimously adopted:

Whereas, it is for the best interests of the citizens of the town of Hempstead, North Hempstead and Oyster Bay to withdraw from the County of Queens,

Resolved that...Supervisors Underhill, Smith and Denton be requested to obtain authority...to expend a sum, not exceeding \$250 for each town in defraying any expenses in drafting and preparation of such bills as may be necessary to carry into effect the desire of the people to have a county free from entangling alliance with the great city of New York.²²

To pursue the action, a committee was appointed composed of P. Halstead Scudder of Oyster Bay, Lott Vanderwater and William G. Miller of Hempstead, Joseph H. Bogert and Wilbur Lewis of North Hempstead, and James Pearsall and James H. Ludlum of Oyster Bay. The meeting closed with the proposal of the following names for the county: Matinecock; by Edward N. Townsend, of Hempstead; Norfolk. by J. B. Coles Tappen, of Oyster Bay; Nassau, by Archer B. Wallace. of Hempstead; and Bryant, by William G. Miller, of Hempstead.²³

The committee met at Pettit's Hotel, Jamaica, on 5 February, and adopted the draft of a bill. After spirited and protracted debate, the name Nassau was agreed

upon, and the introduction of the measure was assigned to Assemblyman George Wallace. The Democratic leadership of Queens could not reconcile itself to losing this large area from its control, and moved to oppose the bill. The headlines in the *Long Island Farmer*, a Democratic newspaper in Jamaica, protested: "New County Nonsense, Some More Fool Bills." The paper contended that a number of prominent men asked that the area be taken into Greater New York, and that District Attorney William Youngs (a Republican who later became Theodore Roosevelt's gubernatorial campaign manager) had expressed himself as against the creation of a new county.²⁴

After submitting their bill to the Statutory Revision Committee for an opinion on its constitutionality, Wallace introduced it in the assembly on 17 February 1898. It was referred to the Internal Affairs Committee, which held a hearing on 4 March at which only supporters appeared. Assemblyman Cyrus B. Gale, of Jamaica, fought the bill bitterly when it was reported to the floor on 30 March, during the last week of the session. There was some movement among Democrats to support annexation to New York City, but most residents of the affected towns supported the new county since it "doesn't seem possible that extravagance can be any greater than it has been." After passing both houses, it was sent to Governor Frank S. Black.²⁵

On 26 April, the supervisors from Queens voted to appear before the governor to oppose his signing the bill. Black received the Queens delegation, together with one consisting of citizens from the eastern towns at the same time. Townsend Scudder, counsel to the Queens County board of supervisors and younger brother of P. Halstead Scudder, argued against the bill because it would be too expensive. He also contended that Nassau County would have no public property, and that the timing was wrong because of the war. Despite an agreement with Benjamin Hicks to share the audience, Scudder consumed all the time allotted to both delegations. Hicks then simply assured the governor that it was a wise measure, desired by the taxpayers of the territory included in the new county.²⁶ Governor Black signed the bill providing for the formation of Nassau County on 1 January 1899.

In spring 1898, Republicans Smith Cox and Augustus Denton had been elected supervisors of Hempstead and North Hempstead, while Oyster Bay chose William H. Jones, a Democrat. These men would constitute the first board of supervisors, but the remaining county officers had to be selected at the general election in November. On 4 October, both parties held nominating conventions at Mineola. The Democratic convention, which was harmonious, nominated, for the two most important offices, Robert Seabury for county judge and James P. Niemann for district attorney.

In contrast, the Republican convention, held in Fireman's Hall, Mineola, was the scene of a fierce intraparty battle. A former senator, John Lewis Childs, the chairman of the county committee, controlled the convention. His slate was vigorously opposed by William Youngs, Republican state committeeman and district attorney of Queens County. Childs's candidate for county judge, George Wallace, defeated Youngs's on the first formal ballot, thirty-nine to thirty-three. Edward Cromwell, Childs's choice for district attorney, also won. Although badly

defeated, Youngs moved to make the nominations unanimous. Theodore Roosevelt, the foremost resident of Nassau County, had taken no direct part in this battle, but after his election he appointed William J. Youngs as his confidential secretary. This undoubtedly indicated where his sentiments were, but actually helped Republican unity in the county by removing one source of friction.

This intraparty strife was the beginning of trouble for the Republicans. Queens County Clerk John Sutphin would not accept their nominations until court proceedings were instituted and Justice Wilmot Smith decided favorably on Nassau's constitutionality. The election campaign was tightly fought, with the Republicans harassed not only by the split in their ranks but also a scandal that erupted in the administration of justice of peace courts.²⁷ Burdened by these handicaps, the G.O.P. carried a majority of county offices but lost the most critical two. In Democratic victories, James P. Niemann captured the district attorney's office by seventeen votes, 4,749 to 4,732, and Robert Seabury won as county judge, 4,818 to 4,702.

Republicans won the remaining four offices: Thomas Patterson as county clerk; Henry N. W. Eastman as county treasurer; William Wood as sheriff; and George D. Smith as superintendent of the poor. In this election voters also decided the location of any county buildings. They had a choice of a spot one mile from the station of the Long Island Rail Road in the villages of Hempstead, Hicksville, or Mineola. The towns of Oyster Bay and North Hempstead supported Mineola, which won with 5,280 votes, as opposed to 3,396 for Hempstead.

Thus, Nassau County came into existence on 1 January 1899, encompassing an area of 274 square miles. At the first meeting of the new board of supervisors, the truck house of the Mineola Hook and Ladder Company was chosen as the temporary home of the county court. The board also adopted a coat of arms and seal for the county. Colors of orange and blue were selected for the flag and other purposes. The seal, a crest with the golden rampant lion of the House of Nassau on an azure blue field, encircled by seven gold bars, represented the county's Dutch and English heritage.

Salaries were determined for the various officials: the treasurer, clerk, and sheriff were voted \$2,000, the district attorney \$1,500, and the superintendent of the poor \$500. Carrie Hicks was designated as county stenographer and librarian. When differences arose among the supervisors concerning the appointment of a clerk to the board they tabled the matter until their third meeting, when J. Seymour Snedeker was chosen. The Garden City Company, which controlled the vast project started by A. T. Stewart, offered the county a large site for county buildings. Although this land actually was in Garden City, in the town of Hempstead, it lay within a mile of the Mineola railroad station, and was accepted.

The new county government immediately buckled down to work. Ahead loomed the pressing problems of debt, personal property taxes, land apportionment with Queens County, and the institution of governmental services and facilities for the whole county. A major problem was immediately resolved by legislation, in 1899, introduced by Assemblyman G. Wilbur Doughty, to return to Nassau a small portion of western Hempstead, from Elmont south to Inwood, that

had inexplicably been included within the city's borders. Doughty eventually became the Republican leader of Nassau County. County officials smoothly effected the transfer, and within two years the cornerstone of a new courthouse was laid by Governor Theodore Roosevelt on 13 July 1900, symbolizing the permanence of the new county.

For more than thirty years since the Civil War, residents of the towns of Hempstead, North Hempstead, and Oyster Bay had chafed under the domination of the western towns of Queens County. Despite several serious attempts, the eastern towns were unable to achieve the united political support necessary to pass legislation to create a new county. Finally, with city, state, and local officials faced with the untenable administrative nightmare of governing rural towns left out of the newly incorporated greater New York City, but still located within its Queens County, Nassau's future citizens were able to secure the political support to act and create a new county.

Ironically, it is quite possible that the decisive moment for the creation of Nassau County occurred on a Sunday morning in the Fifth Avenue Hotel's amen corner. Having consolidated absolute control over the G.O.P. and all state legislation, Republican boss Thomas C. Platt was able to ram through the state assembly the incorporation of New York City, accomplishing quickly something reformers had sought for thirty years. While that legislation may have been decided in the amen corner, it can also be surmised that, in view of Platt's total legislative control, the creation of Nassau was also discussed and its fate determined there. However, as there is known record or reference to this having occurred, it remains an unsolved historical enigma. In any case, the creation of New York City created an unforeseen opportunity for the citizens of the eastern towns. After thirty years of struggle, they seized the opening and were able to spin off and create their own Nassau County.

NOTES

1. See Edward J. Smits, *The Creation of Nassau County* (1962; rev. ed., Mineola, 1990), and "The Creation of Nassau County." *LIHJ* 1 (Spring 1989): 170-82.
2. Henry G. Onderdonk Jr., "North Hempstead," in *History of Queens County* (New York: W. W. Munsell, 1882), 413, 415.
3. *Ibid.*, "History of Queens County," 52.
4. Horatio G. Spafford, *A Gazetteer of the State of New York* (Albany: H. C. Southwick, 1813), 225.
4. For Garden City, see M(ildred) H(ess) Smith, with the assistance of Jeanmarie DiNoto, *Garden City, Long Island in Early Photographs, 1869-1919* (1987; reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1998, reviewed in this issue of the *LIHJ*).
5. Daniel M. Tredwell, *Persona/ Reminiscences of Men and Things on Long island* (Brooklyn: Charles Ditmas, 1912) 1:38.
6. *Ibid.*

7. *Long Island Democrat*, 17 Aug. 1854; for the origin of the Republican Party, see Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970); for the Democratic Party in the Civil War era, see David Osborn, "Queens County and the Secession Crisis," *LIHJ* 5 (Spring 1993):132-45.
8. *Queens County Sentinel*, 3 Nov. 1859.
9. *Long Island Democrat*, 16 Feb. 1869
10. *Queens County Sentinel*, 25 Feb. 1869.
11. *Ibid.*, 6 Aug. 1872.
12. Matthew P. Breen, *Thirty Years of New York Politics* (New York: M. Breen, 1899), 826; Benjamin D. Hicks to Henry Onderdonk, 22 Jan. 1876 (Collection of Long Island Studies Institute, Hofstra University).
13. *Roslyn Tablet*, 22 Dec. 1876.
14. *Proceedings of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Queens* (Jamaica, 1877), 186, 188.
15. *Queens County Sentinel*, 16 Mar. 1877; Benjamin D. Hicks, ed., *Records of Towns of North and South Hempstead*, 8 vols. (Jamaica, 1904) 8:56.
16. George Weeks, "Birth of Nassau County," *Long Island Forum* 3 (November 1943): 229.
17. George E. Bulmer, *Against the Creation of the New County of Nassau* (Jamaica, 1877) 2.
18. Queens approved, 7,712 to 4,741, with razor-thin margins in Flushing, Jamaica, and Newtown imbalanced by Long Island City's favorable vote of 3,529 to 792; for Queens and consolidation, see Jeffrey A. Kroessler, "The Greater City and Queens County," *LIHJ* 11 (Fall 1998):1:14.
19. Harold F. Gosnell, *Boss Platt and His New York Machine* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1924), 56-59; Edmund Morris, *The Rise of Theodore Roosevelt* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1980), 666-67; Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999), 1234; for Roosevelt and the Rough Riders, see Richard P. Harmond, "The Spanish American War and Montauk Point...", *LIHJ* 10 (Spring 1998 (139-42).
20. Peter Ross, *A History of Long Is/and*, 3 vols. (New York: Lewis Publishing, 1903) 1: 527; Allan Nevins and John A. Krout, eds., *The Greater City, New York, 1898-1948* (New York, 1948), 54.
21. *Queens County Sentinel*, 27 Jan. 1898.
22. *Ibid.*
23. The eventual choice of Nassau stemmed from the Crown's renaming Long Island Nassau Island in 1692, in honor of William of Orange, of the house of Nassau, invited by Parliament to become king of England in the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 (however, the designation

seldom was used).

24. *Long Island Farmer*, 2 and 11 Feb. 1898.

25. *South Side Observer*, 4 Feb. 1898.

26. *Ibid.*, 28 Apr., 1898.

27. *Long Island Forum* 4 (January 1941): 2,; letter by Elvin N. Edwards.

BEACONS FOR ALL: A HISTORY OF LONG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSES

By Joshua Ruff

To many of you the stately towers marking the rocky headlands or lurking sand bars of our coasts are familiar and striking features of the landscape, especially during these vacation months. To others they are known only from picture or romantic tale, but to all of you, I am sure, the very word 'lighthouse' will at once suggest the ideals of reliability and service.

— Harold D. King, Deputy Commissioner,
Bureau of Lighthouses, 1930¹

Sailors hail you as a speck on the horizon:

"There's the Coffee Pot."

*You mean a safe return and the prospect of
a warm meal.*

Everybody loves a lighthouse.

— Eugenia Sheppard, 1971²

Although lighthouses were created with a utilitarian purpose, they later assumed additional aesthetic significance. These structures were erected on Long Island and other American coastlines to aid the early republic's burgeoning shipping and commerce. Illuminating dangerous passages for navigators to and from the port of New York was a high priority of the First Congress, which, in 1789, as its ninth official act, placed responsibility for erecting and maintaining lighthouses with the Treasury Department. At the turn of the twentieth century, beacons towered protectively from Montauk to Coney Island; by 1903, twenty-two had been built on Long Island.³

This article examines the development of lighthouses on Long Island, and how they became more than merely aids to navigation. While many lives were saved by their mechanical ingenuity and the lonely, hard-working heroes who served as keepers, the role of the region's lighthouses became far more expansive than service to mariners. The Island's lighthouses have captured the imagination of tourists, artists, the public, and, recently, historic preservationists. Indeed, these beacons endure as cultural icons because of their indelibly recognizable architecture, their prominent place in scenic surroundings, and their connection to Long Island's maritime heritage.

Earliest Lighthouses:**Montauk to Execution Rocks, 1796-1850**

Although several notable lighthouses were constructed during the colonial era—Boston Light in 1716 and Sandy Hook, New Jersey in 1764—not until the 1790s were beacons erected through a concerted, federally supported effort. The motivating factors were economic and practical; securing the extensive traffic on the nation's waterways would protect the trade and transportation of thousands. Lighthouses, like bridges, tunnels, canals, and roadways, were integral to improving the nation's expanding infrastructure. Beacons on Long Island were especially vital because of New York City's growing primacy in shipping and trade. By the late 1790s, New York moved ahead of Philadelphia as the nation's leading port of entry, dominant in both exports and imports. New York had the advantage of a deep and directly accessible harbor, in which enormous ships with large cargoes could maneuver with relative ease. In addition, the city benefitted from a group of transplanted New England entrepreneurs who helped establish New York as the center for transatlantic trading and shipbuilding. Aids to navigation were clearly necessary to support the flow of ever-increasing traffic.⁴

Montauk and Eaton's Neck were Long Island's first lighthouses, each located at a strategically important place. Montauk Point was rocky and dangerous; equally important, it was already a landmark for businessmen and mariners. In 1795, William Allibone, of Philadelphia, wrote in support of Senator Ezra L'Hommedieu's chosen location of Turtle Hill, the cliff-elevated site of Montauk Light: "Its elevation is such as makes it a Key to a Great portion of the Foreign trade both to New York and Several of the eastern states and to all the Coasting trade in that quarter."⁵

Contemporaries also realized the vital need for a beacon at Eaton's Neck, near Huntington. Many shipwrecks had occurred along this stretch of land, which featured what a surveyor, Joshua Hart, called in 1795, "a great reef of rocks dangerous to shipping." The location of the most shipwrecks on the North Shore, Eaton's Neck Reef was responsible for one more in late December 1790, when the brig *Sally*, out of Stamford, Connecticut, went down taking ten lives in icy waters. The danger of this reef was exacerbated by the fact that the Long Island Sound in this era was, in the words of one historian, a "nautical L.I.E." Traffic on the Sound included New York City service, routes from North Shore communities to Connecticut, and destinations throughout New England. A lighthouse at Eaton's Neck would alleviate some concerns with the deadly terrain and congestion. In 1798, ten acres were ceded to the United States by John Gardiner (a descendant of Lion Gardiner) and his wife Johanna. (Their nineteen-year-old son, John H. Gardiner, eventually became the first keeper at Eaton's Neck Lighthouse.)⁶

John McComb Jr. (1763-1855), the architect selected to build the Montauk and Eaton's Neck lighthouses, is also known for later achievements in New York City, where he was responsible for building both City Hall and Alexander Hamilton's home. In addition to being low bidder, McComb won the Montauk commission for his thorough, rigorous efforts in building Cape Henry Lighthouse, in Virginia, in 1792. Tench Coxe, the commissioner of revenue who recom-

mended McComb to President George Washington, attested to the young architect's "attention, skill, and fidelity" in the construction of Cape Henry. After the completion of Montauk in 1796 (the lighthouse was lit in spring 1797), McComb became a logical candidate to build Eaton's Neck.⁷

Architecturally, the structures shared much with McComb's original lighthouse at Cape Henry. The elevations drawn for Eaton's Neck display an octagonal tower, keeper's dwellings, and a cistern vault for oil storage. A watercolor of Montauk Lighthouse, by McComb's brother Isaac in 1798, illustrated much the same design-concept from the base to the top of the tower. Despite resistance from Montauk herders who used Turtle Hill as pasture, residents of Montauk and Eaton's Neck were pleased with the results. In his 1845 history of Long Island, the Rev. Nathaniel S. Prime observed that Eaton's Neck "has always been one of the most dangerous in the Sound, and was peculiarly so, till the erection of the Light House in 1798, which is one of the most important beacons in the Sound."⁸

The next three Long Island lighthouses were established at Little Gull, Sands Point, and Old Field. Little Gull Island, which consists of twenty rocky acres at the eastern end of the Sound, was adjacent to the treacherous passage known as the Race, which is capable of current speeds in excess of five knots. Because this area marked the Sound's access to the open sea, it was extremely important to increasing shipping activity. The first Little Gull Light, composed of smooth-hammered freestone, stood sixty-one feet in height. One of its first keepers, Frederick Chase, who began his tenure in 1825, exemplified the versatility of early lighthouse keepers. A respected resident who also served as justice of the peace of the town of Shelter Island, Chase was one of the few who were willing to take on the monumental task of caretaking Little Gull Lighthouse in so isolated an area.⁹

Sands Point, approximately twenty miles east of New York City, was on the northern edge of Long Island's future Gold Coast. As early as 1790, Samuel L. Mitchell and Samuel Wood surveyed the area by chain and compass. When the federal government was slow to build Sands Point Light, the residents petitioned Congress to do so in 1805. Shortly after, a New London builder, A. Woodward, was awarded the contract, and the lighthouse was established in 1809. An anonymous contemporary watercolor, currently in the collection of the Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities, demonstrated an early appreciation of this structure, indicating that it may also have served as an inn.¹⁰

Further east, near the entrance to Port Jefferson Harbor, Old Field Lighthouse was established in 1824. Similarly to the creation of Little Gull Lighthouse, the builders deemed that stone masonry would provide lasting durability to a structure exposed to punishing weather. Notably, Old Field became one of the first American lighthouses kept by a woman when Mrs. Edward Shoemaker took the helm after the death of her husband, the first keeper. Shoemaker was the first of three women keepers at Old Field, of whom the longest serving was Elizabeth Smith, from 1830 to 1856.¹¹

While the North Shore slowly received the benefits of improved navigation and safety, Fire Island became the site of the next major lighthouse and, arguably,

claimed a position second only to Montauk's in functional and cultural significance. Again, numerous shipwrecks provided the impetus for establishing this beacon. Constructing a lighthouse at Fire Island proved especially challenging because of persistent alterations in surrounding inlets and barrier beaches. The first Fire Island Lighthouse stood eighty-nine feet high and was illuminated by fourteen lamps with twenty-one-inch reflectors for the revolving light. Lewis Roe Overton, a schoolteacher from Coram who visited the lighthouse in 1827, admired the tower's construction but was most impressed by the light itself: "the lamps appear to be of the best construction and emit a very Strong light."¹²

Five other Long Island lighthouses were raised before the formation of the United States Lighthouse Board, in 1852. Throgs Neck, which marked the eastern entrance to the East River, received its first sentinel in 1827. That same year, approximately one hundred miles east and marking the entrance to Gardiners Bay, Plum Island received its first lighthouse; in close proximity, North Dumpling Lighthouse was established in 1849. Further south, in 1839, the Treasury Department established a lighthouse at Cedar Point, near Sag Harbor. Even before this, the whaling industry maintained "stake lights" on Cedar Island, which helped ships gain their bearings near Shelter Island and Northwest Harbor. The primitive lights were usually oak poles topped with whale oil lamps. The first lighthouse, built of wood and standing thirty-five feet high, became a nineteenth-century landmark which welcomed the massive numbers of whaling crews returning from far-off expeditions.¹³

Finally, midway in the Sound between Sands Point and New Rochelle, Execution Rocks Lighthouse was constructed in 1850. No evidence supports the legend that it was named for British executions of patriot soldiers in the Revolution, killed by drowning at high tide. The lighthouse, designed by the architect Alexander Parris (1780-1852), was a short, conical tower built from masonry. Parris, ranked next in fame to John McComb Jr. among American architects of Long Island lighthouses, was also responsible for St. Paul's Cathedral in Boston and a number of federal commissions. Although Execution Rock was rather plain, the beacon was an important addition to navigational aids on the approach to New York City.¹⁴

Expansion and Restoration: Long Island's Lighthouses, 1850-1900

While the construction of earlier Long Island lighthouses made great strides toward improving safe maneuverability on the surrounding waterways, by the mid-nineteenth century there was a growing realization that much more was required—an increased number of lighthouses and improvement of existing lighting apparatus and structures. Under the Treasury Department's haphazard and decentralized supervision of lighthouses, many structures had fallen into a state of disrepair which had to be addressed. When comparing American lighthouses to those in other countries, the inadequacies became painfully obvious:

The light-houses on the coasts of England and France are so immeasurably superior to those on our own coasts, that no comparison can be made... The fact is, our whole system needs a thorough revision, and doubtless will have it. There is little or no check as to the quality of the oil, and the forms of the reflectors are defective; and, in some cases (to make the matter still worse) imperfect lenses have been placed before the lights—or, rather, pieces of glass called lenses.¹⁵

Use of a much-improved lens, invented by a Frenchman, Augustin Jean Fresnel, in 1822, had swept through Europe contagiously. The United States, however, was slow to adopt this innovation; Highlands of Navesink, on the northern New Jersey coast, was the first to use the Fresnel lens, in 1841. Despite immediate acclaim, it was some time before other beacons followed suit.¹⁶

Contemporaries also complained of keepers who sometimes were lax in their duties; a regulatory agency was needed to discipline and supervise. Stephen Pleasanton, the fifth auditor of the U.S. Treasury, was given control over lighthouses in 1820 but had too much responsibility for the economy in general to give aid to navigation the attention it deserved. Although Pleasanton set up a basic system of lighthouse contracting and helped to establish many new sentinels, a separate institution was needed to unify and provide guidance. Accordingly, several decades before the massive transition in government agencies during Reconstruction, the nation's system of navigational aids was completely revamped.¹⁷

The advent of the U.S. Lighthouse Board, in 1852, offered solutions to the numerous shortcomings. Centralized, uniform supervision meant that repairs and advancements would be implemented. The board consisted of representatives of the Navy, the Topographical Engineers, the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Survey, and a number of key scientists. With a board of specialists, the government could establish more frequent visits to lighthouses and make accurate assessments of needed changes.¹⁸

The original structures at Montauk, Eaton's Neck, Fire Island, Old Field, Little Gull, Cedar Island, and Plum Island drastically needed modernization. It had been noted in 1838 that Old Field suffered "deck leaks through its joints, and the mortar is scaling off the walls." In addition to structural repairs and replacement of parabolic reflectors with much more powerful Fresnel lenses, the Lighthouse Board also worked to ensure the construction of needed lighthouses on Long Island in locations such as Race Rock, near Little Gull Light; Horton Point, on the North Fork near Southold; and Shinnecock on the South Fork, near Southampton.¹⁹

In particular, Long Island's South Shore commanded immediate attention. Because Fire Island Light and Montauk Light, in addition to requiring repairs, were so far apart, another beacon was needed to bridge the gap. Deadly shipwrecks continued near Fire Island, among them the sinking of the *Elizabeth* in 1850, which took the life of the American feminist and author, Margaret Fuller Ossoli. It was agreed that Fire Island, after being moved from its present location, would join Montauk and a new lighthouse in the western portion of Great South

Bay in being fitted with more powerfully visible first-order Fresnel lenses. The South Shore's importance to shipping was recognized by the Lighthouse Board, whose plan for only twelve of these lenses for the entire nation included three along the dangerous edge of this much-travailed shoreline. The board was listening to ship captains who had long complained of the inadequate Fire Island signal, which flashed only once every ninety seconds.²⁰

Constant storms and erosion took their toll on Fire Island's surroundings; after a survey, the Lighthouse Board realized that the inlet had migrated half a mile west since the lighthouse was erected in 1826. In 1857, Congress appropriated \$40,000 to build a new lighthouse some two hundred yards northeast of the original structure. The circular tower, designed by a third district engineer, Lieutenant J. C. Duane, increased the height of the lighthouse to 168 feet. The first-order Fresnel lens, which produced a flashing white light, was lit on 1 November 1858. With its more powerful illumination, visible for nearly twenty miles, the lighthouse at Fire Island became "the most important light for transatlantic steamers bound for New York. It is generally the first one they make and from which they lay their course." Fire Island, Shinnecock, and Montauk Light were often the first important American structures seen by immigrants, long before they floated past the Statue of Liberty:

A huge European steam-ship crowded with returning tourists and immigrants approaches this port as evening sets in. The pilot has come on board early in the day and now stands on the bridge with the Captain. The pair frequently raise their glasses to their eyes and scan the horizon along the starboard bow. A faint flash is at length observable in that direction. A minute afterward it is followed by another flash at the same point. "There she is!" exclaims the Captain to the pilot, and the news is soon circulated among the passengers that the Fire Island Light, which is 51 miles from Sandy Hook, has been seen.²¹

Shinnecock Lighthouse, sometimes referred to by contemporaries as Ponquogue Lighthouse because it was on Ponquogue Point, was a red brick tower, also built to a height of 168 feet in 1858. Again, Lt. Duane was the principal supervisor and designer of this project, which explains its striking similarity to the new Fire Island Lighthouse. Transatlantic ships sometimes used Shinnecock instead of Fire Island, as it was a further and therefore occasionally safer distance from New York. In a terrible turn of irony, one of these liners mistook Shinnecock Lighthouse's new fixed signal for Montauk's on 18 February 1858, and the *John Milton* crashed aground, killing all thirty-three aboard. After the tragedy, continued improvements led to gradually increased intensity of the light source from Shinnecock; by 1907, the beacon's candlepower was 45,690.²²

In 1860, Montauk Lighthouse also received a number of crucial improvements to accommodate the new first-order Fresnel lens. Workers raised the tower's height by fourteen feet to add a watch room and a service room. As more oil would be required, an oil house was placed beside the tower. The enormous new lens, twelve feet high and six feet across, lit the night sky until 1903, when it was

replaced by a three and one-half order bivalve lens.²³

As a result of the concerted effort to improve this stretch of the Third District, transatlantic vessels now could plot their routes more effectively, as indicated by an 1890 article in the *Scientific American*:

Many incoming European steamers first sight Montauk Point lighthouse, the light of which is a revolving one; then about thirty miles west Quogue (Shinnecock) Light is seen, which is a steady one; then comes the revolving light at Fire Island...Excepting there be dense fogs, a vessel approaching the port of New York is never out of sight of one of these lights, and is thus safely guided to its destination.²⁴

As the enlarged and expanded South Shore lighthouses assisted economic expansion in the decades after the Civil War, so new lighthouses off Long Island Sound were built for much the same reason. The original structures of Cedar Island, Plum Island, and Old Field were replaced with new granite ones. A lighthouse at Horton Point, in Southold, established in 1857, held a third-order Fresnel lens. In original construction, the separated tower, 110 feet above sea level, was adjacent to a two-story Federal style keeper's dwelling. Like Old Field Lighthouse, Horton Point was one of the relatively small number of American lighthouses to receive the services of a woman keeper. From 1903 to 1904, Stella Prince served in this capacity; she was the daughter of an earlier keeper, George S. Prince, and took responsibility after an accident disabled the appointed keeper in 1903.²⁵

Also built in 1857, the original Lloyd Harbor Lighthouse near Huntington was a white, church-like structure with a square brick tower and an attached frame eleven-room keeper's dwelling. Its tower, forty-eight feet above sea level, cast a fixed white light powered by a fifth-order lens. Other lighthouses built off the western portion of Long Island Sound in this period included Stratford Shoal and Stepping Stones, both established in 1877, and Cold Spring Harbor Lighthouse, erected in 1890. On the South Shore, also in 1890, Coney Island Lighthouse was built at Norton Point.²⁶

Perhaps the most dramatic episode of lighthouse construction on Long Island took place at Race Rock. Despite an appropriation for a new lighthouse at this dangerous reef as early as 1838, it took forty years to build Race Rock Light because of the difficulty of construction. Hundreds of shipwrecks occurred in the area, including the sinking of the *Atlantic* in 1846, in which forty-five perished despite nearby Little Gull Island Light and the more recently added Gardiners Island Light in 1854. The challenge of building a lighthouse at this point was magnified by strong currents, low visibility, poor weather, and the fact that much of the foundation was built underwater. Tons of riprap (free stones laid at the base to prevent erosion) were ferried in before a concrete foundation could even be laid. A young engineer, Francis Hopkinson Smith (1838-1915), an artist and writer who later belonged to the Tile Club, an association of New York artists and writers whose paintings and articles popularized the East End, undertook the enormous task of building Race Rock. He was assisted by a construction foreman,

Captain Thomas Albertson Scott (1830-1907). Scott, not adverse to working in watery depths, was playfully referred to by Smith as a “bifurcated sea dog.” However, the tasks in which each engaged at Race Rock were of the utmost seriousness and danger. In an 1873 planning sketch, Smith depicted a man working underwater, in primitive diving equipment, who was solely responsible for laying the concrete foundation. The foundation was seven years in the making; it took only nine months to build the tower and keeper’s dwelling.²⁷

In the vicinity of Orient Point, three other lighthouses were erected in this period. The first was Gardiners Island Light in 1854; the next was Long Beach Bar Lighthouse in 1870, which came to be known as Bug Light for its insect-like appearance, with long stilt legs extending from the water to support the base of the Victorian structure. Later, Orient Point Lighthouse, built in 1899, also gained an affectionate sobriquet—“Coffee Pot,” for its cast-iron caisson’s circular shape and exterior truncations.²⁸

Growth of a Cultural Icon

As lighthouses continued to proliferate and become more technologically sufficient, Long Island experienced a period of rapid transition. The Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) completed its eastward extension under its entrepreneurial president, Austin Corbin, reaching Eastport in 1881 and, finally, Montauk in 1895. Tourists, impressed by the area’s natural beauty and ocean vistas, began coming in larger numbers by the late 1870s. From the 1870s to the 1890s, artists began making pilgrimages to the eastern end, forming colonies in East Hampton, Greenport, and elsewhere, lured by the abundance of waterways and points of interest, including lighthouses. Tourist brochures, postcards, magazine articles, and paintings by artists such as Thomas Moran, Edward Moran, Frederick Childe Hassam, and J. Carleton Wiggins, show that lighthouses were recognized as important Long Island landmarks similar to historic windmills. While they were still vital aids to navigation, lighthouses also became increasingly noticed by people on terra firma.²⁹

The appreciation of the aesthetic qualities of lighthouses was not a new development, as evidenced by early watercolors and eye-witness accounts. In 1858, a Long Island writer, Isaac McLellan, wrote in his poem, “The Lost Ship”:

The lanterns shine
From Montauk’s lighthouse o’er the brine;
High-looming like a sheeted ghost
That lonely column lights the coast.
On sedgy marsh, on weedy rock
On the wild sea-bird’s passing flock,
On sand-beach desolate and low,
Enshrouded by the pallid snow,
it casts a radiance serene,
illuminating the rugged scene.³⁰

However, there was a marked increase in public interest in lighthouses as the Lighthouse Board began to build more, and simultaneously, more people made Long Island their resort destination. Part of this stemmed from the attention that the popular press now gave to lighthouses. *Harpers New Monthly* ran three major articles on national beacons, from 1869 to 1874. In one that featured a cover lithograph of Fire Island Light, Charles Nordhoff detailed the enormous changes in American navigational aids since the birth of the Lighthouse Service in 1852. The United States, Nordhoff wrote, "once the worst in the world [was now] at the head of all for the excellence of its different devices for relieving navigation of risks, and making our harbors easily accessible." Three years earlier, a writer for *Harpers* traveled to Montauk Point, which he described as "a region comparatively unknown, except to a few sportsmen, attracted thither by its very wildness, and to such tourists as find especial charms in its seclusion." He ended his journey at Montauk Lighthouse, where a tour with the keeper greatly impressed him with the profession of light-keeping in general: "on their fidelity and constant watchfulness depends the safety of the many thousand vessels that annually traverse this highway of the sea."³¹

Harpers's impression of Montauk as "a region comparatively unknown" changed in the 1870s and 1880s. As previously in New Jersey, Rhode Island, and other resort areas, tourists and summer residents began streaming into the Hamptons and other parts of Long Island to enjoy oceanside leisure activities. Expanded accessibility by the LIRR and by steamship service to Greenport, Sag Harbor, Shelter Island, and elsewhere, allowed more options for travelers. Starting in the 1890s, the railroad published a series of books and pamphlets introducing tourists to the wonders of Long Island. Photographs and descriptions of lighthouses, windmills, and other scenic structures were integrated throughout these publications: "low hills, dark with wood, appear in the north, and the tall lighthouse of Ponquogue looms across the verdure on the South." These guide books, which boosted the region for "the beauty, the health, the fertility and the variety," stressed lighthouses as important points of reference.³²

The lighthouse at Fire Island was a focal point in the background of the famous Sammis Surf Hotel, opened by David S. Sammis in 1855, and visited by luminaries that included senators, state politicians, and writers such as Herman Melville, who spent much of the last four years of his life there (1887-91). The draw of both the lighthouse and nineteenth-century beliefs about the healthful benefits of ocean air helped the Surf Hotel stay successful, even during the lean years of the Civil War.³³

In a broader context, interest in the scientific advancement of lighthouses was generally on the rise in the United States by the end of the nineteenth century. Public lighthouse displays at World Fairs such as Chicago's World Columbian Exposition of 1893 and San Francisco's Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915 were in tune with the Gilded Age's enthrallment with scientific progression. The San Francisco exhibit featured lamps, flashing lenses, a fog signal canon, and was of interest to the public "both from a historical and practical point of view."³⁴

In addition to these grand scale exhibits, lighthouses were visited at an increasingly rapid rate. In October 1912, the U.S. Lighthouse Service encouraged light keepers to post rules for visitors:

Light houses and stations are of interest to the public, and permission to visit them is often appreciated and is of educational value. It is essential, however, that the admission of visitors must be under such rules and supervision as will insure against interference with the operation and efficient maintenance of the station.

The article reported that the popular Absecon Light Station in Atlantic City recorded 10,339 visitors from 30 June to 30 September that same year. Visitation was also heavy at Long Island lighthouses; at Old Field Lighthouse, Azariah Davis, the father-in-law of the keeper, George Lee, recorded nearly one-thousand in 1871. Visitors included Theodore Roosevelt, who signed the guest register at Montauk Lighthouse in 1898 upon his return from San Juan Hill, in the Spanish-American War.³⁵

Lighthouses became favorite subjects for a number of Long Island painters, who were moving beyond the simpler landscape forms that dominated the earlier genre and Hudson River School era of American art. Long Island lighthouse paintings can be seen within the larger context of the marine-theme artwork that was an ever-increasing product of the new artists establishing themselves on Long Island in the latter part of the nineteenth century. J. Carleton Wiggins (1848-1932), painted several works in the 1870s in which lighthouses were prominent elements of the background, both at Sands Point and Shinnecock. Montauk Lighthouse, in particular, received artistic attention. Sanford Robinson Gifford (1823-1880), a previous devotee of the seminal Hudson River School painter Thomas Cole, turned his attention to Long Island's coast in the later stage of his career, painting the Montauk beacon in 1877. Later, accomplished artists such as Thomas Moran (1837-1926), Frederick Childe Hassam (1859-1935), and Walter Granville Smith (1870-1938) drew inspiration from the lighthouse at the easternmost end. Moran's brother Edward, who devoted the final years of his life to depicting great epochs in American marine history, used the new Orient Point Lighthouse in the backdrop of his *Fish Pond, Orient Bay*. Later, in the early 1930s, Helen Torr (1886-1967) and Arthur Dove (1880-1946) each paint impressionistic pieces of the new Lloyd Harbor Lighthouse. Less famous and occasionally anonymous artists produced watercolors and paintings of Long Island lighthouses, including Montauk, Lloyd Harbor, Fire Island, and others. To artists, lighthouses exuded a stately presence on oil canvases that enhanced depictions of oceanic settings.³⁶

While beacons captured the attention of artists, late-nineteenth-century photographers and postcard makers did more to circulate and popularize the image of the lighthouse. The picture postcard phenomenon that swept the country from 1905 to 1915 was manifest on Long Island, typified by the mass-produced scenes of local interest published by Henry Otto Korten (1866-1915), of which lighthouses were frequent subjects. Many early twentieth century postcards are in

the collections of museums and historical societies throughout Long Island.³⁷

Endangerment and Preservation

On 22 December 1948, Army engineers and a demolition crew from Flushing drilled holes in the Shinnecock tower and ripped out a considerable portion of its foundation. After dry timber was placed within the structure, a fire was lit by the eight-eight-year-old Ellsworth Howland. When the props burned away, the lighthouse, formerly one of the major navigational aids on the Eastern Seaboard, tumbled to the ground and became nothing more than rubble. In a *Hampton Bays News* editorial, John Sutter lamented that, "there were tears in the eyes of many of the old-timers who stood around watching the old landmark pass away, powerless to save the old building."³⁸

Once the tower was replaced by automation and abandoned in 1931, a number of residents attempted to prevent the demolition. In 1936, the "U.S. Lighthouse Service which was later taken over by the Coast Guard, did consider selling the lighthouse and its dwellings and also razing... the old lighthouse, but there was so much local opposition to this proposal that it was not carried out." Nearly a year before the lighthouse was torn down, a long-time resident, Anne P. Penny, issued an eloquent plea to recognize its historic importance and save it from destruction:

Though my home is several miles away, standing at my bedroom window, I can see the top of the old lighthouse rising above the treetops. The Shinnecock lighthouse stands strong, silent, and faithful, picturesquely silhouetted against the sky though no light now casts its gleam over the Atlantic waters. It immediately commands the attention of any passer-by and provokes thoughts of the past, of its occupants, and of its work and history.

Penny and others could do nothing to prevent the razing of Shinnecock Lighthouse. In 1947, the original Lloyd Harbor Lighthouse also succumbed, this time to flames; sixteen years later, Long Beach Bar Lighthouse became victim to a fire set by vandals.³⁹

More hazardous than vandals to the future of historic lighthouses was the Coast Guard's decision to destroy all beacons that were not cost effective to maintain. While many Long Island lighthouses were automated before the Coast Guard assumed operation of aids to navigation in 1939, each faced a decisive dilemma over its future use. Technology engendered a greater reliance on buoys, while electronic steel light towers and lighthouses, which were more expensive to maintain, began slowly to be decommissioned. When their existence itself was threatened, the many citizens who had come to value their historic importance and aesthetic appeal became involved. During the 1960s and early 1970s, communities across the United States began organizing on a larger scale to prevent the destruction of historic buildings. Networks of concerned residents united to save selected structures. On Long Island, lighthouses were only one of many endangered structures: old Gold Coast mansions, such as McKim, Mead & White's

Chateau-styled Harbor Hill, in Roslyn, historic hotels, and factories all faced the perils of "progress." During the post-World War II period, the pressure of development for an exploding population coincided with the physical deterioration of many formerly splendid edifices. Of all these, lighthouses enjoyed the advantage of being accessible, public structures that a wide range of people appreciated, one possible explanation for the groundswell of support for preservation.⁴⁰

On 24 August 1968, against the backdrop of a Coast Guard threat to raze Montauk Lighthouse and erect a steel light structure, more than three thousand people came to Montauk for an organized "light-in" vigil. Protesters included "flaming baton twirlers, people with lanterns, welding torches, sparklers, wands that glowed in the dark." The event was held for three consecutive years and received attention in the *New York Times*. Also pressured by local politicians, the Coast Guard held off. From 1970 to 1987, Montauk Lighthouse especially benefitted from the tireless efforts of Giorgina Reed, who worked with other volunteers to install a stepped terrace system along the edge of Turtle Hill, thus helping to halt erosion of the bluff which supported the beacon.⁴¹

Massive fundraising efforts, such as the \$144,000 gathered to build a new Long Beach Bar Lighthouse at Orient Harbor in 1990, and the \$265,000 garnered by Paul Simon's 1991 concert to benefit Montauk Lighthouse, have also provided the means for survival and renaissance. On an even grander scale, the Fire Island Lighthouse Preservation Society played an integral part in raising money and lobbying Congress in 1984 to allocate \$2 million for improvements to this landmark. Because of the extensive efforts of preservationists, the following seven Long Island beacons were named to the National Register of Historic Places by 1994: Horton Point, Montauk, Fire Island, Eaton's Neck, Lloyd Harbor, Stepping Stones, and Execution Rocks. The projects at these sites, executed largely through the unstinting efforts of volunteers, have greatly restored lighthouses structurally, and resulted in a steadily increasing rate of visitation throughout the 1990s. Horton Point records annual visitation rates of more than fifteen thousand people since 1990, while Montauk numbers more than one hundred thousand.⁴²

Interest has been translated into iconic form in recent years, as the image of the lighthouse has been appropriated by businesses and government agencies. Serving as a virtually universal signifier, the lighthouse has come to represent Long Island. The "I" in the Long Island section of the Sunday *New York Times* is a rendering of Montauk Lighthouse. From business organizations to Suffolk County Community College, lighthouses have been incorporated as logos. In the early 1980s, the New York State Department of Transportation devised new guide signs for Nassau and Suffolk parkways to create uniformity and quick recognizability. The design features the familiar image of Montauk Lighthouse next to the first one or two letters of the parkway name, displayed in large, bold type: "the idea behind this format is that the panel itself is easily distinguishable from other types of route markers." In addition, the commodification of lighthouses in ceramics, posters, tee-shirts, and other products for gift shops and mail-order catalogues, underscores public fascination with the lighthouse image. Ironically, with the icon of lighthouses in mass circulation, most people see the image far

more frequently than the structures themselves.⁴³

And yet, the actual structures remain significant for a number of reasons. Long Island's extant lighthouses are our connections to an era when beacons were vital to the preservation of human life and early commercial endeavors. The writer Edwin Ritchie, who grew up on the North Fork, characterized Long Beach Lighthouse as "a monument to the capacity of good men to care, one for another, in a relentlessly brutal world...[and] a blessed guide to the lost, a directional to safety."⁴⁴ It may be true that lighthouses no longer serve in that latter capacity; although they still are important reference points to modern mariners; technological tools such as sonar and computerized on-board navigational systems have largely replaced beacons as agents of guidance. However, lighthouses remain enormously popular, tapping into many different interests that often are separated—science, architecture, maritime history, and general aesthetic appeal. Lighthouse preservationists argue convincingly that actual function need not be the only criterion for deciding what structures to maintain. Like other historic buildings in our midst, Long Island's lighthouses deserve our continuous efforts and attention. Legacy, beauty, and comfort in the familiar all provide powerful motivation for ensuring their survival.

NOTES

The author thanks the following people for their gracious assistance: William Ayres, The Museums at Stony Brook; John Petraglia, National Archives Cartographic Branch, College Park, Md.; Mitzi Caputo, Huntington Historical Society; Mary Beth Betts, The New-York Historical Society; Karen Martin, Three Village Historical Society; Kenneth Black, Shore Village Museum, Rockland, Me; and Terry Hamblin, Suffolk County Community College.

1. *U.S. Lighthouse Service Bulletin* 9 Sept. 1930) 35.

2. *On the Sound*, March 1971, 75.

3. *U.S. Treasury Annual Report* 2345 (1903): 25.

4. Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999) 333-352; Benjamin W. Labaree et. al., *America and the Sea: A Maritime History* (Mystic, Conn.: Mystic Seaport Museum, 1998) 277-78.

5. Robert J. Hefner, "Montauk Point Lighthouse: A History of New York's First Seamark," *LIHJ* 3 (Spring 1991): 206.

6. Howard K. Knowles, *A Light House of Stone: A History of the Eaton's Neck Lighthouse, Northport, New York* (Northport, N.Y.: Northport Historical Society) 3; Jeannette E. Rattray, *Ship Ashore* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1955), 34; Marilyn E. Weigold, "Long Island Sound: The Great Unifier," *LIHJ* 2 (Spring 1990):223, attributing much of this traffic to strong cross-Sound connections; Edward A. T. Carr, *Faded Laurels: The History of Eaton's Neck and Asharoken* (Interlaken, N.Y.: Heart of the Lakes Publishing, 1994) 23-24; Knowles, 6-7.

7. Tench Coxe to George Washington, 11 August 1795, *Correspondence of the Light-House Establishment, 1785-1852, Letter Book 1, 1792-1798*, National Archives.

8. Cape Henry, Montauk, and Eaton's Neck were stone, octagonal towers from seventy-four to eight feet high (see John McComb Collection, New-York Historical Society); Isaac McComb "A View of the Light House on Montauk Point," 1796, Cartographic Division, National Archives, Record Group 26; Nathaniel S. Prime, *History of Long Island* (New York: Robert Carter, 1845) 39.

9. Clarence Ashton Wood, "Gull Light's Keeper in 1833," *Long Island Forum* 7 (March 1944): 43-45

10. Harry W. Loweree, "Lighthouses of Nassau County," *Long Island Forum* 14 (January 1951): 4 (the property surrounding Sands Point Lighthouse was purchased by William Randolph Hearst in the 1930s); Dean F. Failey, *Long Island Is My Natton: The Decorative Arts & Craftsmen* (Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities, 1976), 154.

11. Mary Louise Clifford and J. Candace Clifford, *Women Who Kept the Lights* (Williamsburg, Va: Cypress Communications, 1993), 16-17.

12. *The Historic Structure Report: Fire Island Lighthouse and Keeper's Dwelling* 1 (Fire Island National Seashore, 1986) 14; Diary of Lewis Roe Overton, 30 June 1827, private collection.

13. *Newsday*, 10 Oct. 1989; Harlan Hamilton and Julius M. Wilensky, eds., *Lights & Legends: A Historical Guide to Lighthouses of Long Island Sound, Fishers Island Sound and Block Island Sound* (Stamford, Conn.: Wescott Cove Publishing, 1987), 141.

14. Hamilton and Wilensky, 27-31.

15. Lt. William D. Porter to E. and G. W. Blunt, 1 October 1838, *Report of the Fifth Auditor, in Relation to the Execution of the Act of 7th July Last, for Building Lighthouses* United States Treasury (24), 13 December 1838, 97.

16. Robert G. Bachand, *Northeast Lights: Lighthouses and Lightships, Rhode Island to Cape May, New Jersey* (Norwalk, Conn.: Sea Sports Publications, 1989), 6.

17. *Ibid.*, 4; Labaree et al., 246.

18. F. Ross Holland, *Lighthouses* (New York: Metro Books, 1995), 55-57.

19. *Report of the Fifth Auditor*, 13 December 1838, 51.

20. Harry W. Havemeyer, *Along the Great South Bay* (Mattituck: Amereon House, 1996), 20.

21. John A. Black and Jeffrey Kassner, "The History of Fire Island Inlet," *Long Island Forum* 47 (May 1984): 89; Bachand, 246-47; *The Historic Structure Report: Fire Island Lighthouse and Keeper's Dwelling* 1, 16 (original quotation in *U.S. Lighthouse Bureau Annual Report*, 1894); *New York Times*, 26 Nov. 1882.

22. Bachand, 241-43; for the wreck of the *John Milton*, see *Sag Harbor Corrector*, 24 Feb. 1858, and Rattray, 26-27.

23. Hefner, 213-14.

24. *Scientific American* 63, 9 Aug. 1890, 80.
25. *Horton Point Lighthouse and Nautical Museum* (Southold: Southold Historical Society, 1994); *Newsday*, 30 Nov. 1994; Bachand, 133; Clarence Ashton Wood, "Stella Prince, Lighthouse Keeper," *Long Island Forum* 11 (July 1948): 125,135.
26. Bachand, 184-87; for Francis Hopkinson Smith, see Connie Koppelman, "Nature in Art and Culture: The Tile Club Artists, 1870-1900," Ph.D. diss., SUNY at Stony Brook, 1985, 94-97.
27. Francis Hopkinson Smith, "A Plan of Laying Concrete," 1873, National Archives Cartographic Division, Record Group 26; Hamilton, 198-206.
28. *Newsday*, 6 Sept. 1990; Hamilton, 145.
29. For Corbin, see Vincent F. Seyfried, *The Long Island Rail Road: A Comprehensive History, Part Six, The Golden Age, 1881-1900* (Garden City: the author), 44-47.
30. *Sag Harbor Corrector*, 13 Mar. 1858.
31. Charles Nordhoff, "Light-Houses of the United States," *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* 48 (March 1874), 467; Charles Parsons, "Montauk Point, Long Island," *ibid.*, 43 (September 1871), 481, 491; a third *Harpers* article, M. Schele De Vere, "Light-houses," February 1869, 405-14, discussed European precedents for American lighthouse innovations.
32. *New York Times*, 6 Aug. 1882; *The Beauties of Long Island* (New York: Long Island Rail Road, 1895) 39, 1; the LIRR published guides through the late 1930s, eventually changing the series name to *Along the Sunrise Trails of Long Island* (copies are held by the Smithtown Public Library, Long Island Studies Institute at Hofstra University, Queens Borough Public Library, and other major collections).
33. Chester R. Blakelock, "The Stormy History of Fire Island State Park" *Long Island Forum* 14 (February 1951): 23-4.
34. *U.S. Lighthouse Service Bulletin* 42 (June 1915), 165.
35. *Ibid.*, 10 (October 1912), 38; Azariah Davis diary, 31 Dec. 1871, facsimile, Three Village Historical Society, Setauket; *Montauk Lighthouse Guest Register*, Long Island Collection, East Hampton Library.
36. Ronald G. Pisano, *Long Island Landscape Painting: 1820-1920* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1985), 66-69, 100; Terry Wallace Art Gallery, East Hampton.
37. Linda B. Martin and Bette S. Weidman, *Long Island Forum* 28 (November 1983): 203; the New-York Historical Society, Huntington Historical Society, Fire Island National Seashore, East Hampton Library, Three Village Historical Society, and many other institutions have copious postcard and photographic collections.
38. *New York Herald Tribune*, 23 Dec. 1948; *Hampton Bays News*, 31 Dec. 1948.
39. Meade C. Dobson, letter to the editor, *Long Island Forum* 6 (March 1943): 60; Anne P. Penny, "Venerable Shinnecock Lighthouse," *Long Island Forum* 10 (October 1947): 185.
40. For the Gold Coast estates, see Robert B. MacKay, Anthony Baker, and Carol A. Traynor, eds., *Long Island Country Houses and Their Architects, 1860-1940* (New York: Society for

the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities in association with W. W. Norton, 1997) 33; Harbor Hill, owned by Claude and Katherine MacKay, was demolished in 1947.

41. *Dan's Papers*, 30 Aug. 1996; Greg Donohue, "Erosion," *Montauk Point Lighthouse Bicentennial* (Montauk: Montauk Point Lighthouse Museum, 1996), 48.

42. *New York Times*, 5 July 1992; *Newsday*, 6 Sept. 1990; *The Fire Island Lighthouse: An Historic Treasure is Restored* (Fire Island Lighthouse Preservation Society, pamphlet), 1988; *Newsday*, 30 Nov. 1994; author's conversation with Tom Ambrosio, Montauk Lighthouse Museum, 28 Jan. 1999.

43. Joe Contegni, New York State Department of Transportation, to the author, 29 Jan. 1999.

44. *New York Times*, 2 Jan. 1995.

FROM THE DOMESTIC TO THE PUBLIC ARENA: LONG ISLAND WOMEN TAKE PART IN THE U.S. SANITARY COMMISSION

By Sandra Roff and Diane DiMartino

Prompted by Florence Nightingale's recent innovations of nursing and hygienic care on the battlefields of the Crimea, Americans during the Civil War reformed the system of medical aid and civilian support for the military. Much of the required work was performed by women who crossed the antebellum line that divided their private and outside worlds. In the words of the historian, Anne Frier Scott, "benevolent women brought their domestic habits into the public arena." Serving mainly as volunteers, they performed the daily chores of war relief, albeit in organizations whose policies were controlled by men.¹

Thousands of sewing circles and other associations of women took on the task of nursing soldiers, helping families of the dead and wounded, and doing whatever was necessary to support the men in uniform. The principal source of Civil War medical relief and other civilian services for the Union armed forces was the United States Sanitary Commission, a network of male-led women's organizations. This article focuses on the Sanitary Commission's activity on Long Island, with special attention to the Woman's Relief Association of Brooklyn.²

The start of the Civil War in April 1861 found both North and South ill-prepared to provide the needed amount of other than military supplies. Women, especially in the North, represented a great local resource about to be tapped. The war forced a shift, from the customary church- and community-based response to short, limited wars to a national web of societies that furnished doctors, nurses, and sanitary workers, as well as money, food, hospital supplies, ambulances, and assorted items from socks to arm slings.³

In 1861, Long Island zealously supported a conflict it hoped would quickly end. "The war excitement is increasing hour by hour... There seems to be universal reconciliation to the terrible trial that awaits us, but there is but one wish—that the crisis however severe may be short," reported *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle*.⁴

Brooklyn was the nation's third largest city. Although many merchants and businessmen journeyed across the East River to New York City each day, it was achieving a prominence of its own. Commerce and manufacturing were increasing, and social and cultural institutions were starting to rival New York's. In the six years from 1855 to 1861, the city witnessed the establishment of a board of education, fire department, Brooklyn City Hospital, Hunt Horticultural and

Botanical Garden, Mercantile Library Association, Academy of Music, and the collegiate department of the Long Island College Hospital. All these were in addition to a long list of public and private schools (such as Packer Institute and the Polytechnic Institute), banks, newspapers, hospitals, and charitable institutions.⁵

Except for industrial Brooklyn, Long Island was rural, supplying produce for the city's markets and gaining popularity as a resort and location for summer homes, with a growing number of schools, churches, libraries, agricultural societies, and other social and cultural institutions. Although Abraham Lincoln lost the counties of New York, Kings, and Queens and barely carried Suffolk in the election of 1860, the metropolitan region responded patriotically to the crisis.⁶

In April 1861, when news of Fort Sumter's surrender reached the Island, large numbers of volunteers enlisted to fight for the Union cause. Young recruits drilled on the Hempstead Plains or paraded through Brooklyn en route to training camps or battlefields. *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle* observed that, "The streets through which the military are expected to pass are crowded with men and women, fully equipped soldiers and raw recruits without uniforms." Large numbers of women responded to the need to supply the army with uniforms, supplies, and medical equipment. According to the *Eagle*, "The city of Brooklyn will not permit her sons to depart unprepared. When they go they will go as soldiers, fully armed and equipped, with thirty days' provisions for each man."⁷

A Queens paper, *The Long Island Democrat*, remarked that, "the spirit of patriotism which has aroused the whole country finds a full response in this generous old town of Hempstead." Soldiers marching through towns and villages received enthusiastic receptions. *The Flushing Journal* reported that:

The Regiment left Oysterbay at two o'clock P.M., and marched four miles to Syosset, and from thence by special train to Hempstead where they arrived soon after eight o'clock in the evening...Our village was all astir for their arrival, it was a new thing to hear the shrill scream of the steam whistle, with the roll of the drum, and the measured tramp of armed men in our usually peaceful village.⁸

Appeals to the women of Brooklyn resounded in sermons and the press, but, as yet, no organized effort provided medical care for the sick and wounded, or considered improving the sanitary condition of army camps. There seemed a perception, however, that women should bear some responsibility for tending to the needs of their men. An article in the *Eagle* headed "The Wounded—An Appeal to the Women," proclaimed:

There is honor to be won in the contest we are about to begin by the noble hearted women who will doubtless be ready to come forward to the aid of their brothers, their husbands and their sons who will have to brave the horrors of the battlefields...We have no doubt our city will furnish, not alone the men to fight, but women to succor those who needed their tended

ministrations.”

The same issue reported that “Forty Brooklyn ladies have volunteered their services as nurses, and are prepared to leave as soon as they can make some slight necessary arrangements.” Sewing circles and church societies made hospital bandages, with some paid by the government to make clothing. “The Thirteenth Regiment stand in need of 200 overcoats, the same number of cross-body belts, blankets and jackets. The ladies of Brooklyn are appealed to by members of the regiment, and we hope they will respond thereto promptly.” The *Flushing Journal* recounted a meeting at which,

The object was to aid in providing for families of the soldiers of the [?] Reg. Who may be called from Flushing to serve their country...From the known ability and liberal views of the ladies chosen we foresee the promptest and most efficient action.⁹

Men exempted from army duty for medical or other reasons could, through the establishment of aid societies, raise money and provide a variety of relief functions. The *Long Island Star* took note that the citizens of the Ninth Ward in Brooklyn formed the Constitutional Aid Association, for “the purpose of aiding all, who from that ward volunteer to defend the country in the war which the South has provoked.” Two days later, the *Eagle* reported a meeting of the Patriotic Relief Association of the City of Brooklyn, formed “to aid and protect the families of those persons in this city who may be drafted or ordered, or who volunteer to join the army of the United States in defense of the Government, the Constitution and the Union.” Businesses throughout the area made sizable monetary donations, with several promising support to families of workers who volunteered for military service.¹⁰

Antebellum women who participated in a host of reform organizations customarily took their direction from men. For example, the Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor in the City of Brooklyn, organized in 1844, was managed by men, who, in 1846, expressed their gratitude to,

those benevolent associations among the ladies of several of our churches which have essentially aided them both by donations, and by devoting themselves to the preparation of garments for the Poor. They recognize in this only another proof of the readiness of woman to respond to the claims of the needy, and to minister to the wants of the distressed.¹¹

The Brooklyn Female Employment Society, which later took on a major role supplying clothing for the soldiers, was run by female managers but, not surprisingly, at its first meeting, in 1855, appointed a male secretary. It was premature for women to assume the entire responsibility for organizing and managing a charity.¹²

Once the shooting started, loyal Americans recognized the urgent need to

organize medical relief. In April 1861, Elizabeth Blackwell, the first female American M.D., called a meeting at Cooper Institute, in New York City, which attracted three thousand women and the usual complement of prominent men. This gathering founded the Woman's Central Association of Relief (W.C.A.R.) to collect and coordinate distribution of goods supplied by local societies and to establish the nation's first training school for nurses. "The W.C.A.R.," observed James F. McPherson, "became the nucleus of the United States Sanitary Commission." On 13 June 1861, President Abraham Lincoln issued an executive order creating the U.S. Sanitary Commission to organize medical relief, provide sanitary inspection of army camps, furnish nurses, doctors, hospitals, and ambulance service to supplement the army's efforts, as well as gather vital statistics and auxiliary scientific data.¹³

A group of reformers, competent and bold enough to withstand stiff opposition from the outmoded Army Medical Bureau, was chosen to head the commission. The president, Henry Whitney Bellows, was a crusading New York City Unitarian minister; Frederick Law Olmsted, an outspoken critic of slavery and the nation's leading landscape architect (who, with his partner Calvert Vaux, planned Central and Prospect Parks), was the general secretary until 1863; George Templeton Strong, the Manhattan attorney most remembered for his comprehensive diary, became the treasurer; Charles Janeway Stille, of Philadelphia, a historian, professor, and future provost of the University of Pennsylvania, served as corresponding secretary and the commission's official historian. The executive committee met every day of the war but Sundays in New York City, except for Olmsted, who, from his office in Washington, "oversaw the gathering of statistics, the implementation of dietary reforms to prevent scurvy, and construction of the first pavilion hospitals to prevent contagion." The commission sought to provide the medical care and material relief needed by troops in the field. "The main object," declared Bellows, was "scientific and preventive...the secondary purpose...intelligible and popular, the relief of suffering and want."¹⁴

"The Sanitary," as the commission was called, empowered women to assume the responsibility which led to their unprecedented contribution to the war effort and their postwar ascent to leadership in a number of social institutions. A hodge-podge of church-sponsored clusters of knitters and sewers emerged into an organized, united effort. "The key word is 'organize,'" commented a modern scholar, Agatha Young, "for it was that which was new and amazing and...established the pattern of women's war work for generations to come." According to Eric Foner,

some 200,000 women were mobilized by local societies throughout the North, raising money and gathering supplies for soldiers, and sending books, clothing, and food to the freedmen. Although men controlled these organizations...the war years inculcated among these women a heightened interest in public events and a sense of independence and accomplishment, while also offering training in organization."¹⁵

Stille's history of the commission reported an October 1861 circular to "the

Loyal Women of America," urging them to form societies in every neighborhood and devote themselves to the sacred service of their country. For the first time, women were able to exercise those "gentle, domestic virtues whose...only sphere of action had been confined to the limits of the home." Many aid societies met in homes, churches, or public rooms, and converted them into "vast workshops." In his recent history of the Civil War, James M. McPherson found that , "Seven thousand locals dotted the North by 1863. The national officers and most of the five hundred paid agents of the Commission were men: most of the tens of thousands of volunteer workers were women." By 1864, the *New York Herald* stated that more than seven thousand groups of women continued to participate as auxiliary aid societies.¹⁶

In 1862, the W.C.A.R. of New York City, which had operated independently since spring 1861, was recognized as one of its branches by the Sanitary Commission. Although its name implied female management, the W.C.A.R. had equal numbers of men and women on its board, with twenty-three-year-old Louisa Lee Schuyler as its head. The association informed all local aid societies of the advantage of using the channels of distribution established by the Sanitary.¹⁷

The Sanitary Commission recognized the Woman's Relief Association of the City of Brooklyn as its Brooklyn auxiliary. At the association's formative meeting, on 24 November 1862, at the Academy of Music, both Henry Whitney Bellows and Henry Ward Beecher addressed the all-male audience. Another minister, Jared B. Flagg, gave "practical direction" by reading the names of ladies appointed,

in cooperation with the pastors of the respective churches [to] take measures to provide and make up material for the comfort of our disabled soldiers' auxiliary to the Sanitary Committee of the Brooklyn War Fund at No. 30 Court Street.

The next day, between thirty and forty women met at the Church of the Holy Pilgrims,

to confer with a delegation from the Woman's Central Association of Relief of New York City, and to adopt such plan of organization as should best secure the objects in view. In this auspicious manner the Woman's Relief Association of the City of Brooklyn, an Association seeking to unite in one patriotic stream the manifold sympathies of this Christian community towards our suffering soldiers, came into being.¹⁸

After hearing speeches from several ministers, the group elected Marianne Fitch Stranahan president and "Mrs. Dr." Duffin temporary secretary (the designation of "Mrs. Dr." in place of her given name typified the prevailing condescension toward women, accepted by both sexes). Each church would create a committee, composed of the minister and two or more women, to adopt the means of securing funds and contributions. These would be sent to a special depot

at 30 Court Street, where they would be identified, sorted, packed, and distributed daily under direction of a committee of two. All churches, aid societies, and related organizations were invited to take part in this monumental effort. The trustees of nearby Packer Institute offered rooms for weekly meetings of the association.¹⁹

Articles of Association were adopted at a 6 December meeting, with an announcement of the group's recognition as the Sanitary's Brooklyn auxiliary. Retaining Marianne Stranahan as president, with Mrs. J. N. Lewis as secretary, the Woman's Relief Association of Brooklyn proclaimed its determination to

stimulate, concentrate, and direct the philanthropic effort of the community in behalf of the sick and wounded soldiers of our armies; to obtain and distribute reliable information concerning their immediate and prospective wants; to collect supplies of hospital stores and medical comforts of all kinds, and generally to advance the views and objects of the Sanitary Committee, as appointed by the "War-Fund Committee of the City of Brooklyn and County of Kings," to which it shall be distinctly and permanently auxiliary, and to whose disposal all receipts, of whatever nature shall be subject.²⁰

The War Fund Committee of Brooklyn originated in summer 1862, when Governor Edwin D. Morgan appointed a committee of leading citizens of the second and third senatorial districts to raise a regiment of volunteers to serve three years or until the end of the war. According to the *Brooklyn Daily Union*,

in order properly to develop the patriotism and the resources of the people of this city and county in behalf of the national cause, it was indispensable that a large Central Committee should be organized for that purpose...the War Fund Committee of the City of Brooklyn and County of Kings was organized in September, 1862.²¹

The committee advertised its goals and services as:

[A]id in procuring recruits to fill up the regiments now forming here and of those in the field; to promote the objects of the Sanitary Commission; to look after our sick and wounded sailors and soldiers; to aid the families of deceased soldiers and sailors in procuring the pay or pensions to which they may be entitled; to assist the Allotment Commissioners in their philanthropic work, and generally, to use their efforts and influence to strengthen the hearts and quick the soul of our people in the National Cause.

In May 1863, the War Fund Committee of Brooklyn appealed to the county's churches for monetary contributions to purchase material for hospital clothing to be made by the women of the Female Employment Society. About \$6,000 was raised for this purpose during the summer.²²

During its first year, the Woman's Relief Association, through the Sanitary Committee of the War Fund of Brooklyn, collected approximately \$50,000 for supplies of hospital clothing. Although this was a significant amount, the Sanitary wanted to be certain that additional towns and villages of Kings County contributed. In June 1863, the association sent

written communications addressed to all existing organizations in the interest of the soldiers' cause, and to the clergymen of all denominations as well, explaining our purpose and inviting the most general cooperation with the Woman's Relief Association of Brooklyn.

In many communities, newly formed organizations contributed their efforts, while the Woman's Relief Association stood by to provide information on soldiers' needs, supply patterns for articles of clothing, distribute Sanitary Commission publications, and share information about its operations in the field. James McPherson observes that because of close ties with the

citizen volunteers who became officers of regiments, the Sanitary helped shape the hygienic conditions of army camps despite the continuing coldness of the Army Medical Bureau. 'Sanitary inspectors' instructed soldiers in proper camp drainage, placement of latrines, water supply, and cooking.²³

The Sanitary proved its political power when, in 1862, "Bellows drafted a bill to enable Lincoln to bypass the seniority system and promote younger men to top positions in the Medical Bureau." Although the army establishment caviled against reform advocated by the Sanitary Commission's "sensation preachers, village doctors, and strong-minded women," Congress passed the bill and Lincoln at once took appropriate action, thus ending the "adversarial relationship between the Commission and the army," and the beginning of an "extraordinarily productive partnership between public and private medical enterprise." To unify the semi-independent branches and multitude of local associations, the Woman's Relief Association adopted a system of canvassing by its agents, who presented statements explaining the needs of the soldiers, methods of giving relief, and the value of hospital and battlefield work. An associate manager was selected to visit the more remote places, but, for reasons unknown, only the nearer villages were reached in person. However, connections with outlying areas were kept open through correspondence. Close-by communities were visited by Marianne Stranahan and the Rev. Nicholas E. Smith, of the Middle Reformed Dutch Church, who knew many of the clergy in Bay Ridge, Fort Hamilton, New Utrecht, Gravesend, Flatbush, and Flatlands. In June, Mary Jane ("Mrs. Dr.") King, representing the Woman's Relief Association, visited Babylon, Patchogue, Hempstead, Manhasset, Belle Port, and Islip.²⁴

Throughout summer 1863, the depot at Court Street bustled with activity, but, as autumn approached, funds were needed to carry the soldiers through the winter.

In November, a reception for Henry Ward Beecher at the Academy of Music raised \$2,238. Smaller contributions continued, but plans for a more spectacular way to raise money began—a great fair, which, for the first time, would showcase Kings County, its citizenry, and the organizational skills and accomplishments of its women.²⁵

Fundraising fairs were not new. As early as the 1830s, antislavery fairs raised money for and interest in the cause. From December 1834 until the Civil War, William Lloyd Garrison's "female supporters put on annual 'Antislavery Fairs' in Boston to raise money...probably the largest source of money for the fledgling Northern abolitionist movement." Sanitary Fairs began with the opening of the Chicago Fair on 27 October 1863, organized by Jane C. Hoge and Mary A. Livermore to replenish the treasury of the Northwestern branch of the Sanitary Commission. Hailed as a great success, the fair contributed \$75,682.89. As a model for the North, it provided other cities with a feasible method of raising money and patriotic fervor. That December, a fair in Boston raised \$145,950.85. Soon after, the War Fund Committee of Brooklyn and the County of Kings and the Woman's Relief Association of the City of Brooklyn opened the Brooklyn Fair on Washington's Birthday, 22 February 1864.²⁶

The men involved in relief efforts in Kings County quickly recognized the efficacy of fairs as fundraising devices. On 27 October 1863, seeking revenue from a broader spectrum, James H. Frothingham, the treasurer of the Brooklyn War Fund Committee, sought the advice of Henry Bellows, Dwight Johnson, the chair of the War Fund Committee, and friends in Boston. At first, neither Bellows nor the Woman's Relief Association favored the project, fearing that local charities engaged in their own fairs would suffer. The Woman's Relief Association decided to wait until after the holidays. On 14 November, the women of New York City, under the auspices of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, announced their intention to have a fair beginning on Washington's birthday, 22 February 1864, for which they invited the women of Brooklyn to organize a department. On 20 November, the Woman's Relief Association of Brooklyn decided to unite with the New York fair, although concerned with the arduous four-mile trip to Manhattan. After several more meetings, the association gathered at the Packer Institute on 4 December to decide whether Brooklyn should organize its own Sanitary Fair. A card in the letter announcing the meeting advised that the object was, "to consider the question of cooperation in the proposed Metropolitan Fair on behalf of the Sanitary Commission, and a full attendance is desired."²⁷

At the meeting, chaired as usual by Marianne Stranahan, Dwight Johnson commented that, "Ours is a City of three hundred thousand inhabitants, and we should make ourselves felt and appreciated, and accomplish as much relatively as the City of New York." The meeting authorized the association to continue preparing for the fair, and empowered "the Executive Board...to add to the present members from each church [and] appoint members from outside church organizations, the whole number not to exceed one thousand." The following day, the War Fund Committee named sixty men to work with the Woman's Relief Association to organize the Brooklyn Division of the Metropolitan Fair. Other committees, gathered from members of the Sanitary Committee and a special

committee under the auspices of the War Fund Committee, planned how most efficiently to aid the women conduct the fair.²⁸

During these early days of December, the Woman's Relief Association continued its plea for supplies for the wounded, with notices in the local press. However, when the New York fair was postponed to 28 March, a decision had to be made. A meeting at Packer Institute on 30 December, chaired by Marianne Stranahan, resolved:

That Brooklyn and Long Island will open a Fair, in aid of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, on the 22d of February, at the Academy of Music, and upon the grounds adjacent to the same.

That the name of the executive Board be changed to Executive Committee of ladies and the gentlemen of the advisory Committee be requested to assume the name of Executive Committee of gentlemen.

That the Executive Committee be empowered to perform all the duties necessary to carry out the objects of the Brooklyn Long Island Fair.⁴²

The committees had parallel male and female structures. A. A. Low was president of the executive committee of four men and a general committee of thirty-two more, while Marianne F. Stranahan was president of the women's executive committee and a general committee of thirty-four.³⁰

Activity progressed rapidly, with a public meeting announced for 2 January 1864, at the Academy of Music. The *Brooklyn Daily Times* proclaimed that, "A crowded house is desired and hoped for, and the presence of ladies is especially solicited." Bitter cold kept many away, but an estimated one thousand people attended. Speeches by many illustrious Brooklynites aroused public sentiment. The Reverend E. S. Porter, of Williamsburg, told a reporter that,

He never before saw such a movement in this city, uniting all the churches, all the people who desire the success of our arms; all must enlist themselves in this movement. This combination in itself must benefit our city.³¹

Circulars and form letters were distributed to church and secular organizations, while advertisements appeared with increasing frequency in the *Hempstead Inquirer*, *Long Island Star*, *Brooklyn Eagle* and *Brooklyn Daily Times*, alerting committee members of meeting dates, and disseminating collection information and names of subscribers and donations received. Several articles in January applauded the contributions of women to the war effort. A *Brooklyn Daily Times* column, "Woman's Work In the War," noted that, "They [women] have done more in the past three years than has been done in the same direction in all the wars of the present century. Let there be no hesitation, ladies, it is your work and to you must belong the honor." The following day, a column headed "The Mission of the American Woman" urged that the "forthcoming Sanitary Fair in this city repeat

your acts of love, and re-assure our soldiers that you are with them still." Additional articles praised the women involved in the Sanitary Fair, and their abilities: "The ladies conducted their deliberations in a manner that reflected great credit upon their business capacity." Invitations to women in outer Kings County to make contributions steadily found places in the pages of local newspapers:

An Appeal to the Ladies of the E.D.—the Sanitary Commission....we hope and expect the ladies will go to work industriously to see to it that the contributions from Williamsburgh are of such a nature as will represent us favorably at the approaching Fair.³²

The *Queens County Sentinel* observed that, "We cannot take up a newspaper but we find notices of meetings, fairs, &., in aid of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, whose depots and agents are at every military center from the banks of the Potomac to the Rio grande." The article stated that Elias Lewis, of Brooklyn, appointed chairman of the committee on Long Island contributions, had issued a circular urging districts to secure the cooperation of all existing aid societies on Long Island. Hempstead women also actively solicited contributions:

At a meeting of the Ladies of several churches of this village held on Tuesday evening, Jan. 26 to consult and arrange for aiding the Long Island Fair in behalf of the Sanitary Commission to be held in Brooklyn, Feb. 22d, Mrs. John H. Seaman was appointed President, Mrs. W. H. Moore Secretary, and Miss S. J. Hendrickson Treasurer.³³

The general circular set a goal of \$150,000 to be raised by Fair activities:

We appeal to our fellow-citizens and noble women here, and throughout the Island, and to those elsewhere who may fairly be expected to sympathize with us in our undertaking, to lend their aid by personal efforts, and by the largest contribution of Material and Money, of Agricultural Produce, of the fruits of Manufacturing and Mechanical skill, of Works of Art; of anything and everything from their industry, ingenuity, or abundance, which may swell the grand result for which we look.

Donations continued to arrive at the designated depots. Women sorted them, recorded them, and tabulated their worth. Praise for the women in the Eastern District of Brooklyn appeared in the *Brooklyn Daily Times*:

The ladies having the matter in charge in this District are daily in the receipt of valuable contributions and they are still pouring in. The Directors of the Brooklyn Central, and Jamaica and Flushing Railroads have generously offered to transport all articles intended for the Fair over their roads gratis³⁴

The special committees publicized their requests in circulars and the press.

The women proposed all sorts of ways to raise money. In a letter to Minnie Burden, of Brooklyn, Henry Ward Beecher heartily approved her plan, "of forming an Album of Autographs of the distinguished friends of Freedom in all the world." On 22 January 1864, the senior class of Packer Collegiate Institute staged a play, "Woman in History," for the benefit of the Brooklyn and Long Island Sanitary Commission, dedicating "these schoolgirl efforts in behalf of the cause for which she has so faithfully labored" to Marianne Stranahan. "Amateur Dramatic Entertainment" was presented at the Brooklyn Athenaeum on 4 February, followed by an entertainment at the Brooklyn Collegiate and Polytechnic Institute eight days later. Five hundred public school children of Brooklyn gave a concert on 15 February, as communities throughout the area witnessed similar activities. The *Queens County Sentinel* reported one such event:

On Monday night our Public School gave an Entertainment in aid of the Long Island Fair, for the Sanitary Commission. The house was filled [?] overflowing, and the audience were very much pleased with the Singing, Recitations and Magic Lantern views.³⁵

Chairs of committees often publicly acknowledged generous contributions. On 19 February 1864, the *Brooklyn Daily Times* published a letter:

Dear Sir:—I have the pleasure of acknowledging your esteemed favor of the 18th inst., and the donation of elegant articles which were delivered to me last evening, through the politeness of Mr. W.B. Kendall. In behalf of the Ladies' Committee on Fancy Goods, it is my privilege to return you their sincere thanks for your generous offering and cordial sympathy in the great object of the Sanitary Fair.

Mrs. Henry Sheldon, Chairman.

The fair was ready to open on 22 February 1864, with large and small contributions duly noted and displayed. Public offices and businesses closed for the day, and flags were prominently displayed. A parade marched for more than a mile through Brooklyn, past the Academy of Music and on through Court, Joralemon, Atlantic, Nevins and Livingston Streets to Flatbush, Lafayette, Adelphi, and, finally, Myrtle Avenue. Crowds surrounded the Academy of Music and the two temporary buildings constructed for the fair. Knickerbocker Hall, adjoining the Academy of Music on a lot loaned by A. A. Low, was used as a restaurant; the other, connected to the academy by a bridge over Montague Street, housed the Hall of Manufacturers and the New England Kitchen. The Taylor Mansion, on the northeast corner of Montague and Clinton streets, became the Museum of Arts, Relics and Curiosities.³⁶

An impressive variety of goods sold at the fair included jewelry, knitted garments, hats, children's clothes, imported products, silverware, china, glass, new inventions, parlor organs, carriages, stoves, rugs, and women and men's

clothing:

A beautiful display was made in the manufactory department by the N. Y. Sewing Machine companies. The first stand was occupied [*sic*] by the Grover & Baker Company. It was tastefully decorated, and upon the platform were displayed all the varieties of machine made by this company; also a number of specimens of embroidery, braiding quilting &c... [Baker & Grover] have liberally donated the following machines which were sold by subscription for the benefit of the fair.

Flushing, too, took proud in its contributions, which included a basket made from palmettos brought from South Carolina before the war. The Hall of Manufacturers offered products of leading Long Island businesses, while the New England Kitchen sold food in the tradition of a New England farmhouse. In addition, the Museum of Arts, Relics and Curiosities charged admission to view such privately owned items as military trophies, engravings, photographs, and autographs.³⁷

The fair proved a huge success before closing on 8 March 1864. One paper reported that, "Its success, pecuniarily [*sic*], has been beyond all anticipation, and there can be no doubt that it might be contained a fortnight longer with good results to the Treasury." The Brooklyn and Long Island Fair's final contribution to the Sanitary Commission was \$400,000. According to Marianne Stranahan, "Our Fair became not alone a stimulus and a sign to the whole country, but an example to the civilization of the world." She emphasized that it originated in the spirit of loyalty, benevolence and desire to aid the Central Commission, but expanded beyond all expectations, receiving support from every class of citizen all over the Island. Meanwhile, the Sanitary Commission decided to give one quarter of the money raised to the Woman's Relief Association, to assemble hospital supplies through the Female Employment Society:

The Woman's Relief Association of Brooklyn is so zealous, methodical, and persistent, that we feel confident it will expend a hundred thousand dollars, through its regular machinery, in a manner even more for our benefit than if the money were in our own hands³⁸

The Woman's Relief Association, which had expanded with the realization of the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair, now represented 120 churches and organizations, plus affiliates throughout Long Island. Marianne Stranahan admonished:

Let us everywhere discourage the fatal illusion that enough has been done, and that henceforth the Commission may dispense with our assistance. Let us still encourage every one to give—the farmer of his crops, the manufacturer of his goods, the merchant of his gains. Let the women and children still knit and sew, and the aid societies still collect their wonted contributions from the rich and poor.

Her annual report of 30 April 1864 ended with the observation that, "Our best offering may perhaps be poor in comparison to theirs, but it is the duty woman can do, and it has been done cheerfully and thankfully."³⁹

The fair had its share of controversy. At issue were the use of lotteries to raise money, the sale of alcohol, the cost of newspaper advertising, and whether class bias influenced locating the fair in Brooklyn Heights, where the more privileged people resided. A high \$2 admission fee for the first two days, reduced to \$1 thereafter, also separated the classes attending the fair. There were even dire predictions of the results of the fair in the press:

The Fair in itself will prove a failure. The outside subscriptions and exhibitions will make it respectable in a pecuniary point of view, but it is doubtful if first cost is realized on the articles sold. I am yours, all there is left of me, after the jam,—one who came to purchase and couldn't get a CHANCE.⁴⁰

However, even with the complaints and negative predictions, the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair exerted a profound change in Brooklyn and its women. Henry W. Bellows, who had doubted the value of women's participation in relief activities, wrote in 1868 that, "Hundreds of women evinced talents...which, in other spheres and in other sex, would have made them merchant-princes, or great administrators of public affairs."⁴¹

When organizing a Brooklyn fair apart from that of New York City, the organizers, both male and female, turned to prominent men for direction. Husband-and-wife membership in the Sanitary was common, the men working on funding and business, the women on labor-intensive tasks. Although women worked mightily to prepare for the fair, the men controlled finances and receipts. According to the Fair Receipt Book of the Woman's Relief Association:

Returns of day's receipt must be made to the Treasurer between the hours of 1 and 3. Fractional currency carefully counted in packages of 45 each. Labeled with table or department number. Deposit books and tickets will be issued by the Treasurer and accounts opened with each table and department.⁴²

However, the experience gained from participation in the Woman's Relief Association of Brooklyn and other service organizations proved invaluable in developing the leadership and organizational skill to manage postwar women's associations.

Although the participation of women far outnumbered that of men, male leaders supervised the relief effort in Brooklyn and outlying areas. These men tended to be the clergy, doctors, and merchants who traditionally wielded power in the community. The custom of recording the wives of professional men as "Mrs. Dr." or "Mrs. Rev." reinforced the subordinate status of women. Marianne. F. Stranahan, president of the Women's Relief Association of Brooklyn, was the wife

of James S(amuels) T(homas) Stranahan, a prosperous railroad and dock contractor, civic leader, and extremely capable president of the Prospect Park Commission. In the words of the Brooklyn historian, Henry R. Stiles,

As the wife of the Hon. J. S. T. Stranahan, she occupied a high social position; and, ever active in every good work in the city of her adoption, she was admirably fitted by her natural abilities, . . . for the duties developed upon her in connection within the Sanitary Fair.⁴³

With a history of activity in the Presbyterian church, Marianne Stranahan was the first female director of the Graham Institute for the Relief of Aged and Indigent Females. Her coworkers were equally well-connected. Church groups were the breeding ground for what became the Woman's Relief Association of Brooklyn, to which Protestant churches, with congregants from the middle and upper social circles, were the major contributors.

The women who, with the male managers with whom they cooperated, organized the Brooklyn and Long Island Sanitary Fair and other efforts received deserved praise from local and national leaders. Progressing beyond routine church groups and sewing circles, they served the Union in time of crisis. Many who doubted their capacity to work long hours with deadlines to meet were surprised at how many women did not fit the Victorian stereotype of frail and helpless female. On Long Island and throughout the North, Soldiers' Aid Societies transferred to the community the benefits women had always contributed to their families. The seeds of a new awareness were planted. The efforts of women from varied social and economic backgrounds, from crowded Brooklyn to rural Queens and Suffolk, profoundly impacted society. As William L. O'Neill concluded in his study of American feminism:

The Union's Sanitary Commission and other relief agencies, although controlled largely by men, gave vast numbers of women public work to do. Thousands served as nurses, and daring individuals such as Clara Barton, Mary Livermore, and Louisa May Alcott . . . distinguished themselves. On the ideological front, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony formed the National Woman's Loyal League to inspire patriotism, support the Thirteenth Amendment, and secure for women an honorable role in the war effort.⁴⁴

For many women, their new immersion in social activity raised the possibility that the energy spent on the war effort might be directed to other causes in peacetime. Many women, including some from the Woman's Relief Association, were not content to return to a solely domestic life, but continued to practice their newly acquired business and organizational skill. Change was in the air during Reconstruction, as these converts to social change became founders of service agencies and other educational and reform movements. Although the Fifteenth Amendment, conferring the right to vote to black men, did not extend to women, the drive for woman suffrage gathered momentum until its fulfillment fifty years

later. In the decades that followed the war, Long Island women employed their talent to play influential roles in this new philanthropy.⁴⁵

In April 1878, its president, Henry Bellows, terminated the U.S. Sanitary Commission. Three years later, an outstanding contributor of time and effort to the cause of aid to Civil War soldiers—Clara Barton—created its unofficial successor, the American Association of the Red Cross.⁴⁶

NOTES

1. For Nightingale in the Crimean War, see Cecil Blanche Fitz Gerald Woodham Smith, *The Reason Why* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953; Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Woman's Associations in American History* (Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1991) 15; see also Lori D. Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics and Class in the 19th Century United States* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1990), 34-35.

2. Ginzberg, 97, 100, 126; this article deals only with the northern response to medical aid in the Civil War; for the southern response, see James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1988), 478-80.

3. Anne Firor Scott, "Women's Voluntary Associations From Charity to Reform," in Kathleen D. McCarthy, ed., *Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy, and Power* (New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1990), 40.

4. *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, 23 Apr. 1861.

5. Henry R. Stiles. *A History of the City of Brooklyn. Including the Old Town and Village of Brooklyn, the Town of Bushwick, and the Village and City of Williamsburgh* 3 vols. (1869; reprint, Bowie, Md: Heritage Books, 1993) 2:420-38.

6. *History of the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair, February 22, 1864* (Brooklyn: "The Union," Steam Presses, 1864), 7.

7. *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, 23 April 1861.

8. *Long Island Democrat*, 30 Apr. 1861; *Flushing Journal*, 11 May 1861.

9. *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, 23 Apr. 1861; *Flushing Journal*, 27 Apr. 1861.

10. For avoiding armed service by paying a fee, see McPherson, 601-6; *Long Island Star*, 22 Apr. 1861; *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, 24 Apr. 1861.

11. *Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor in the City of Brooklyn, Organized in 1844* (Brooklyn: Van Anden's Print, 1846), 5.

12. *First Annual Report of the Brooklyn Female Employment Society, April 12, 1855* (Brooklyn: Wm. W. Rose, 1855), 1-5.

13. George M. Fredrickson, *The Inner Civil War: Northern Intellectuals and the Crisis of the Union* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), 98-99; McPherson, 480.

14. Fredrickson, 99, 101, 103, 106; *Encyclopedia of New York City* (1995), s.v. "U.S.

Sanitary Commission"; Henry W. Bellows, "The United States Sanitary Commission," in *Johnson's Universal Encyclopedia* (New York, n.d.), 1,5,7, quoted in Clifford E. Clark Jr., "Religious Beliefs and Social Reforms in the Gilded Age: The Case of Henry Whitney Bellows," *New England Quarterly* 43 (1970):69;

15. Agatha Young, *The Women and the Crisis: Women of the North in the Civil War* (New York: McDowell, Oblensky, 1959), 67; Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 31.

16. Charles Janeway Stille, *History of the United States Sanitary Commission* (1866), 169; McPherson, 471; Suellen Hoy, *Chasing Dirt: The American Pursuit of Cleanliness* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1995), 52.

17. Scott, *Natural Allies*, 63.

18. *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, 25 Nov. 1862; *Report of the Woman's Relief Association of the City of Brooklyn* (Brooklyn, 1863), 2.

19. *Report*, 3.

20. *Ibid.*, 3-4.

21. "The War Fund Committee. Some Account of its Origin and Work," *Brooklyn Daily Union*, 3 May 1865.

22. *Long Island Star*, 15 Nov. 1862; Stille, 10.

23. Stille, 11; *Second Report of the Woman's Relief Association of the City of Brooklyn* (Brooklyn, 1864), 2-3; McPherson, 481.

24. McPherson, 482 *Second Report*, 2-3; U.S. Census, 1860, Kings County, 3^d Ward, 2^d district, 595.

25. *Second Report*, 4.

26. "Lighting the Freedom Tree," *New York Times*, 25 Dec. 1896, A27; William Y. Thompson, "Sanitary Fairs of the Civil War," *Civil War History* 4 (1958):511-57.

27. Stille, 11-13; Broadside in Box 5, MSS 1977.99, Brooklyn Historical Society.

28. Stille, 13, 14-15.

29. *Brooklyn Daily Times*, 30 Dec. 1862.

30. "General Circular of the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair, in Aid of the United States Sanitary Commission," *History of the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair*, 111.

31. *Brooklyn Daily Times*, 2, 4 Jan. 1864.

32. *Ibid.*, 11,12, 13 Jan. 1864.

33. *Hempstead Inquirer*, 6 Feb. 1864; U.S. Census, 1860, Kings County, 929, Ward 9, 2^d district, listing Julia Moore as the wife of W. H. Moore.

34. "General Circular of the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair," 110-11; *Brooklyn Daily Times*,

22 Jan. 1864.

35. Henry Ward Beecher to Minnie Burden, Brooklyn, 4 Jan. 1864, MSS collection 1977.99, Box 3, Brooklyn Historical Society; "Woman in History. An Entertainment given by the Senior Class of the Packer Collegiate Institute, in Aid of the Brooklyn and Long Island Sanitary Commission, in the Chapel of the Institute, January 22, 1864" (Brooklyn: Daily Eagle Print, 1864); programs for "Second Amateur Dramatic Entertainment in Aid of the United States Sanitary Commission at the Brooklyn Athenaeum on Thursday Evening, February 4th, 1864"; "Brooklyn Collegiate and Polytechnic Entertainment for the Benefit of the United States Sanitary Commission, Fri Evening Feb. 12th, 1864; "Brooklyn and Long Island Fair in Aid of the United States Sanitary Commission Concert by 500 Pupils of the Public Schools of Brooklyn at the Academy of Music Monday Evening, Feb. 15 at 7½ o'clock" (Nicholas Collection 1974.134, v.3, scrapbook at the Brooklyn Historical Society); *Queens County Sentinel*, 28 Jan. 1864.

36. *Brooklyn Daily Times*, 19 Feb. 1864. *U.S. Census, 1860, Kings County, 67, Ward 3, District 2*, listing Cecilia as the first name of Mrs. Sheldon; clipping from a contemporary newspaper account, 1977.99, Box 3, War Fund Collection, Brooklyn Historical Society; Harriet Stryker-Rodda, "The Brooklyn and Long Island Sanitary Fair," *Journal of Long Island History* 4 (1964): 3-4.

37. *Hempstead Inquirer*, 4 Apr. 1864; *Flushing Times*, 10 Mar, 1864; Stryker-Rodda, 6-7.

38. *Brooklyn Daily Times*, 5 Mar. 1864; *Second Annual Report*, 7.

39. Henry W. Bellows to the Committee of the Brooklyn and Long Island Fair, 22 Mar. 1864, *Second Annual Report*, 9.

40. For controversy involving the fair, see *Brooklyn Daily Times*, 13, 16, 17 Feb. and 11 Mar. 1864, *Queens County Sentinel*, 11 Feb. 1864, and miscellaneous newspaper clippings, n.d., Brooklyn Historical Society.

41. Bellows, quoted in Scott, *Natural Allies*, 68.

42. Fair Receipt Books of the Woman's Relief Association, 1977.99, box 4, MS collection, Brooklyn Historical Society.

43. Stiles 2:465; for J. S. T. Stranahan, who later helped bring about Brooklyn Bridge and Greater New York, see Donald Simon, "A Plan for All Seasons: The Design of Brooklyn's Prospect Park," *LIHJ* 3 (Fall 1990): 127-28, 130-32.

44. William L. O'Neill, *Everyone Was Brave: The Rise and Fall of Feminism in America* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969), 15.

45. Scott, *Natural Allies*, 58.

46. For Clara Barton, see McPherson, 483, 532.

IMMIGRANTS, INDIANS, AND IDLE MEN: LONG ISLAND'S "RABBLE IN ARMS" IN THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR

By John G. Staudt

In July 1759, the sixth year of the French and Indian War, British and American soldiers led by Sir William Johnson attacked the French garrison of Fort Niagara, at the western end of Lake Ontario. As Johnson's cannons pounded away at the fort, his scouts spotted a French relief column moving toward them from the south. Johnson sent 150 light infantrymen to stop the enemy from reaching his lines. The troops marched a mile down the Old Portage Road leading from the fort to a clearing called La Belle Famille, where they chopped down trees to construct a breastwork.

The next morning, 24 July, a messenger alerted Johnson that the enemy was about to attack. Three hundred reinforcements, including one hundred soldiers from the New York Provincial Regiment, took positions next to the British regulars behind the barricade. In a desperate attempt to break through to the fort, the French charged headlong into the breastwork. In a fierce battle that raged for more than an hour in the wilderness, French soldiers caught in the open were torn apart by the entrenched Anglo-American force. The attack turned into a rout as the enemy troops broke and fled into the forest. After confirming news of the defeat, the French commander inside Fort Niagara surrendered and the next day Johnson's army entered the fort. Seven hundred men, including one hundred New York provincials, remained behind to man the fort while the rest of the troops returned to the main camp at Oswego.¹

The New York provincials under Johnson belonged to a 2,680-man contingent raised in 1759. Among them was Private Joseph Buyer, an eighteen-year-old German immigrant who joined Captain Daniel Wright's Queens County company on 14 March 1759. Private Buyer epitomized the men from Long Island who served on active military duty during the French and Indian War. Like the majority of the troops, he was young, unskilled, and a recent arrival in the county in which his provincial company was raised.²

In his 1984 study of Massachusetts provincial troops in the French and Indian War, Fred Anderson concluded that the soldiers sent off to campaign in the wilderness not only reflected the composition of the colony at large, but that rarely had such a homogeneous force been assembled and sustained through an extended war. Because of differences in economic, social, and recruitment systems, however, there were few similarities between Massachusetts and New York troops: Bay Colony regiments consisted of militiamen serving temporarily, while New York troops were recruited from outside the typical social structure

and therefore from outside the militia system. While Anderson's findings constitute a major contribution to the history of Massachusetts, they are not appropriate for Long Island; to date, no major work surveys the provincial troops who enlisted in the forces of New York. Furthermore, misunderstandings of New York's colonial military institutions have been compounded by what some scholars call the "militia myth." According to Donald Higginbotham, confusion over the role of the militia distorts our image of the early American soldier. Militiamen were civilians who volunteered temporarily to defend their home communities. By the time of the French and Indian War, a new body of troops, the provincials, had been formed for military campaigning. Instead of citizen-soldiers, New York and other colonies paid semiprofessional soldiers for long-term expeditions.³

This study examines the social composition of Long Island's provincial units between 1758 and 1761. At a time when active military duties were not performed by the area's established citizenry, as popular legend would have it, but rather by foreigners, young unskilled laborers, migratory New Englanders, and indigenous peoples living in proximity to Long Island Sound.

In the mid-eighteenth century, contemporary cultural structures effected the social composition of Long Island's provincial forces. New York's dual Dutch-English heritage, religious pluralism, and entrepreneurial enthusiasm contributed to a subdued sense of community. During the French and Indian War, the established farmers of rural Long Island were beginning to think of increased involvement in the market economy and transatlantic trade. Leaving their farms to be foot soldiers facing a remote enemy on the distant northern frontier was not among their paramount interests. In addition, economic changes began to disrupt traditional political and social conditions. According to Robert E. Cray, "as farming regions" such as Long Island "were drawn into Manhattan's commercial orbit...the close-knit social fabric of village life began to give way to a more individually oriented society." With the stirring of commercialization, Long Island witnessed the development of a more "stratified social structure and the growth of a landless laboring class." "In the process" comments Cray, the poor, traditionally viewed as legitimate "objects of charity," were now considered "costly burdens." Men who could not contribute to economic development were called on to serve in an alternative capacity as full-time soldiers.⁴

Early in every year of the war, the New York Assembly enacted legislation organizing the colony's provincial regiment, including a bounty to volunteers. The amount increased annually, from five pounds in 1756 to fifteen in 1761, while each private's per diem allowance rose from fifteen pence in 1755 to one shilling, three pence in 1761. In addition, all soldiers received a coat, hat, cap, two shirts, jacket, buckskin breeches, trousers, two pairs of stockings, and a blanket.⁵

Beside regulating bounties and pay, the annual bills set quotas for each campaign season. For instance, the number in 1759, the year of the Niagara campaign, was set at 2,680 men, with Kings County required to raise sixty-eight, Queens 300, and Suffolk 289. Legislation between 1756 and 1760 provided that if there were not enough volunteers, men would be conscripted, or "detached,"



Reenactors posing as 1760 soldiers, Schuyler's Company, Old Fort Niagara Garrison Weekend, 12-14 Feb. 1999, Old Fort Niagara Assoc., Youngstown, N. Y. (<http://www.oldfortniagara.org/tour.htm>, CCNN Web Design, P. O. Box 4007, Niagara, N. Y. 14304.

from the militia into provincial service. Although those "detached" were expected to be regular members of the militia and established citizens of their communities, this study shows that the legislation did not reflect the way the system worked. Long Island's provincial soldiers were not established citizens, but newcomers to America, or men excluded from the militia in peacetime.

New provincial companies were raised in every spring season of the war. After a county filled its quota, a regimental muster was held to inspect and account for each soldier in the unit. After the inspection, the muster master certified a list of all considered fit for service in each company he reviewed. The rosters recorded each soldier's age, nativity, occupation, race, physical characteristics, and enlistment circumstances. By analysis of these muster rolls, the social composition of Long Island's provincial troops can be determined.⁷

Rosters for 1755 and 1756 were bare lists of names organized by rank, but those for 1758 to 1761 were more informative. The later rolls indicate that men recruited on western Long Island were, on average, older than eastern Long Island troops. Of 2,050 men recruited between 1758 and 1761, the average age of the 1,728 (84 percent) for whom such data was taken was between twenty-six and twenty-seven. The age that appears most often is nineteen. There were 605 troops under the age of twenty-two at the time of enlistment, more than one-third of the number of soldiers recruited on Long Island. However, the distribution of ages for provincials is skewed. In 1760, almost 80 percent of Kings County troops were twenty-two years of age or older, while almost half of the Suffolk soldiers were younger than twenty-one. In 1761, in Captain Dan Wright's Queens County company, one of every three soldiers was at least twenty-two. That same year, more than 60 percent of Captain Jesse Platt's Suffolk County recruits were under twenty-one. The ages of Long Island soldiers ranged from sixteen to fifty-six, with one exception. In 1758, in Captain Petrus Stuyvesant's Queens County company, Private George Lane, a Native American from Oyster Bay, enlisted during his seventy-second year.⁸

Besides being older than eastern recruits, provincial companies in western Long Island contained a higher percentage of soldiers born outside of the county. Most of the troops recruited for Kings and Queens were not born on Long Island, or even in North America, but on the far side of the Atlantic. The link between being an immigrant and serving in a Long Island battalion appears to be the port of New York, with counties closer to the docks of Manhattan having a much higher proportion of soldiers born in Europe.⁹

The rosters recorded places of birth for 1,734 soldiers (85 percent) recruited from 1758 to 1761. In 1760, 69 percent of men recruited in Queens were born in Europe, as were 93 percent of one company in Kings the following year. The further east from New York City, the lower the number of foreigners in the ranks. The same year in Suffolk County, fewer than one-third of enlistees were transatlantic migrants. Of the 867 troops enlisted in Queens in the peak war years, 445 were born in Europe, as were 67 percent of soldiers in Kings County; in both counties, the number of European-born recruits increased each year. In 1758, fifty-seven enlistees in Queens companies came from Europe, a number that

increased to 169 the following year, and to 215 in 1760. As the war dragged on, the proportion of foreign-born soldiers rose while the number of American-born provincials declined. At the same time, recruiters improved their ability to induce or coerce large numbers of foreigners to enlist.

It is not surprising that a large portion of western Long Island's provincial troops were immigrants. Newcomers without roots in local communities, and in need of employment, were most susceptible to incentives and pressures to enlist. In a letter to colonial governors in January 1755, Secretary of State Thomas Robinson, a member of the British ministry, recommended targeting foreigners in the recruiting of soldiers in America:

As there is probably, a considerable number of foreigners particularly from Germany, who will be capable and willing to bear arms upon this Occasion; the King does not doubt that you will be Able by care and diligence to Effect this intended argumentation. ¹⁰

Although this directive was aimed at recruiting for the British Regulars in America, the muster rolls suggest exploitation of foreigners for service in the provincials as well.

The largest proportion of foreign-born men enlisted in battalions formed on Long Island was Scots-Irish, with Germans the next largest group. In Queens County, in 1760, 102 of the 290 provincials were from Northern Ireland, while in 1759 and 1760, troops born in Germany constituted a quarter of the force.

Suffolk County did not recruit as many European-born men as Queens, but the rolls indicate that a good number of men from Connecticut crossed the Sound to enlist in New York provincial units. Of the 265 men recruited in Suffolk in 1759, 112 (42 percent) were born in Connecticut. The majority of these men (64 percent) were over the age of twenty-one, as were twenty-six of the ninety-five Long Islander's recruited. This pattern appeared throughout the war; men born in the county in which their company was raised were younger than those born outside it. Of the 177 European-born soldiers enlisted in Queens in 1759, almost 89 percent were over the age of twenty-one. In Kings County that same year, 84 percent of the foreign-born troops were twenty-two or older.¹¹

The most striking characteristic of Long Island's active-duty soldiers was the number of unskilled workers. Although some had a trade, most were untrained laborers. A variety of job designations appeared on the muster rosters, but for purposes of this investigation, the three major occupations were farmer, skilled laborer (including professional occupations), and unskilled workman and seaman. Of the three, unspecialized workmen were the most common, farmers the least. Occupational descriptions were reported for 1,640 troops, 80 percent of all names listed. More than half were described as manual laborers, followed by artisans, with only seventy-seven, fewer than 5 percent, recorded as farmers. More than half of the 581 men recruited from Queens in 1759 and 1760 were unskilled workers. The proportion of unskilled men enlisting in Suffolk provincial regiments during this same two-year period was even greater.

The occupational backgrounds of soldiers were affected by other variables,

such as age and place of birth. Many of the older, European-born recruits were tradesmen, while younger Long Island-born men tended to be unskilled. In 1761, more than half of the soldiers recruited in Kings were immigrants, averaging more than the age of twenty-seven, with training in a particular trade. For the same year, almost 84 percent of untrained workmen recruited in Suffolk were Long Island-born youngsters, twenty-one years of age or less.

Membership in the militia during the eighteenth century was based on "classical notions of citizenship," with active participation limited to the "community's propertied yeomen." By the time of the French and Indian War, Long Island's economy rested on agriculture and husbandry, and the majority of its citizens were homesteaders. Therefore, one might assume that the militia was comprised of property-owning farmers. On the contrary, landless laborers and artisans dominated Long Island's provincial ranks, while "propertied yeoman" rarely enlisted and served mostly as officers. The absence of farmers among its provincial soldiers indicates that Long Island depended on men from outside the community's basic economic and social sphere—and therefore from outside the militia—to assume full-time military obligations.¹²

The longer the war lasted, the more adept recruiters became at attracting or coercing the bottom portion of society. Under these circumstances, one might expect that the authorities would have made use of the region's sizable black population. Blacks, however, were ignored as a manpower resource for provincial regiments. The claim of several historians that New York recruited or impressed an "extensive" number of blacks into its provincial forces does not apply to Long Island, despite its large number of slaves.¹³

In 1756, New York had the largest black population of colonies north of Maryland. One-third of New York's 13, 542 black residents lived on Long Island, making up 17 percent of the population. Black males between the ages of sixteen and sixty accounted for almost one-fifth of the Island's male population of military age. However, as they were considered property, they were not fair game for recruiters.¹⁴

Of the 2,050 troops recruited on Long Island, between 1758 to 1761, only thirty-nine (under 2 percent) were described in the rosters as minorities other than Indian. Of these, twenty-eight were listed as "Mustee," seven as "Mulatto," and four as "Negro." From 1758 to 1761, Suffolk County enlisted twenty-five soldiers of mixed African lineage. Except for a few men born in New England and the West Indies, almost all were from Long Island. Although several were forty years of age or older, most were twenty-one or younger. The rolls identify the legal status of only one man, Scudder Sampson, who enlisted in Captain Alexander Smith's company in western Suffolk in 1758, and was described as a "Free Negroe." Only two—James Treadwell, a weaver from Queens, and Daniel Sampson, a shoemaker from Suffolk—were recorded as skilled workers. One man, Tone Sell, was listed as both mustee and farmer, while the rest of the black troops were laborers.¹⁵

Clearly, in the formation of its provincial battalions, Long Island did not draw upon its substantial black population, a restraint that ran counter to the tendency

to fill the ranks with men from the fringes of society. There are several possible reasons why only a small proportion of blacks served in the provincials. It could be that recruiters were sympathetic to the pleas of slave owners, whose economy would suffer if slaves were recruited in large numbers. Perhaps blacks did not want to risk their lives for a society that kept them in chains. These assumptions, however, do not correspond to the realities of the period. It seems doubtful that recruiters would forego enlistment bounties in order to placate slaveholders. As for the premise that slaves were unwilling to enlist, it is hard to imagine that any chance at escaping bondage would be disregarded. The thirty-nine blacks who managed to join the provincials testify to the historic willingness of African-Americans to participate in an enterprise from which they were virtually excluded.

In the absence of documentary evidence, it seems most likely that the paucity of blacks in the provincials resulted from fear of arming Negroes in a region where slavery was so widespread. Fears of servile insurrection prevailed from earlier incidents, including the murder of a Long Island family by slaves in 1708, and the so-called "slave conspiracies" of 1712 and 1741. Anxieties over slave rebellion in New York were especially prevalent during the French and Indian War. One newspaper reported the public whipping of eight slaves in New York City, simply for being seen together without their master's permission.¹⁶

Legislation passed after 1756 made "all Free Negroes, Mustees and Mulattos," eligible for provincial service, but clauses regulating the militia reveal apprehensions over slave uprisings in times of military emergencies. The Militia Act of 1755 required that masters of slaves report on their bondsmen to local militia captains so that rosters could be prepared listing the name, age, sex, and owner of all slaves in a district. Additional stipulations required that in times of invasion, all adult bonded males were to be surrendered to an appointed officer and impressed into service as manual laborers at artillery fortifications, or wherever the commander in chief might direct them. A detachment of militiamen would be assigned to watch over the slaves and guard against "an insurrection of the Negroes." During times of emergency, any bondsman above the age of fourteen found more than one mile from his owner's residence, without proper certification, was to be considered a felon and could be shot on sight. The law of 1755, which treated slaves as potential threats to public safety, did not include them in the militia system. Free blacks were mistrusted, as well, as demonstrated by an Oyster Bay militia captain who added free blacks to his list of slaves in his district. To explain naming "free Negroes, Mulattos and musts [*sic*]," the captain wrote that free blacks "may Probably in case of insurrection be as mischievous as ye slaves."¹⁷

While the authorities did not intend to arm and incorporate a group of potential black insurrectionists into the colonial military system, the same misgivings did not apply to arming another minority, Long Island's Algonquian Indians. Though discriminated against in every other aspect of society, Indians in the proximity of Long Island Sound were employed as full-time soldiers. Despite their exclusion from the militia under the same provisions prohibiting blacks, 154 Native Americans enlisted between 1758 and 1761. This number represented some 8 percent of troops in the region's units, a high proportion considering that Indians

represented less than 6 percent of the Island's population.¹⁸

Precedents for employing large numbers of the region's Indians for wartime service were well-established by the mid-eighteenth century. In 1663, under Dutch rule, Indians living near "Marsapeague" (Massapequa) took part in a military force dispatched to the (Kingston, N.Y.) frontier to fight the Esopus Indians. In 1711, during Queen Anne's War, more than 150 of six hundred troops raised in New York were Indians from Long Island, the majority from Suffolk County. According to John Witek, Native Americans made up more than one-fourth of the troops in a Suffolk County company participating in King George's War (1744-1748).¹⁹

As in previous conflicts, most Native Americans in the area's forces during the French and Indian War were from Suffolk. Of the 930 troops recruited in that county between 1758 and 1761, 126 were Indians, with Queens providing an additional twenty-eight. In 1759, forty-five (more than 17 percent) of the provincial troops recruited in Suffolk were Native Americans. All Indians recruited in Queens were born on Long Island, while in Suffolk all but twenty-seven had lived south of the Long Island Sound. Of the twenty-seven from New England, sixteen were from Connecticut.

Ages of Indians recruited into Long Island's units varied. Besides the seventy-two-year-old private, George Lane, several were thirty years of age or more; the average was slightly more than twenty-two, and about half of these men were born in 1739 or later. All but seven Indians from Long Island were laborers. According to the muster roll, one native Long Islander, Nemos Kellis of Suffolk, had trade as his former occupation. Three were farmers from Suffolk, and another three, who reenlisted in Captain Jesse Platt's 1761 Suffolk County company, described themselves as soldiers.

As with other groups examined, material gain may have been the chief motivator for Indians to enlist in the provincials. As John A. Strong observes in his study of Long Island's Algonquian peoples, "By the beginning of the eighteenth century...most native peoples were working as domestics, unskilled laborers, guides and seamen." Due to land encroachment and an "increasing demand for European goods," according to Strong, "many Indians were forced to seek employment with whites." The high bounties and steady pay offered for active military service gave the Island's Indian males an opportunity to earn a living in a period when they found themselves transformed from "hunters to servants."²⁰

Struggling to survive in an economy dominated by white people, the Island's original inhabitants became increasingly integrated into communities outside their reservations. As the muster rolls exhibit, Native Americans viewed provincial service as an opportunity for employment at a time when other demands for their labor were shrinking. The colonial establishment, for its part, was more than willing to send Indians to fight in the wilderness, while simultaneously denying them citizen status back home.

His May 1762 remarks to the Lords of Trade reflected Lieutenant-Governor Cadwallader Colden's eagerness to accept unemployed Indians and other jobless

men in the provincials:

I called the Assembly on the fourth of this Month and by a Message earnestly pressed them to give further encouragement to volunteers and to compel idle persons into the service, who have no visible means of living and are injurious to the community, of which great numbers are in this place at this time.

Colden's message left little doubt that the destitute were targeted as potential members of the provincials. Whether these men were coerced or induced into enlisting, however, remains more elusive.²²

In 1762, when conscription no longer was in effect, the number of volunteers fell short of the total set by legislation. The reason may have been that those most susceptible to the draft, the poor and downcast, no longer felt intimidated by the "detachment" system. The use of coercion to pressure unemployed men to enlist seems plausible, considering the problems arising from increasing numbers of "strolling poor." It is conceivable that, in those years when the draft was utilized, authorities threatened the indigent with conscription to help relieve burdens resulting from an increasing number of men who depended on poor relief.²³

Conversely, men looking for work may have viewed active military duty as the only way to earn a living in an economy that provided few other opportunities. It seems likely that some, if not most, of the men who enlisted in the provincials did so in an effort to improve their distressed financial circumstances.²⁴

It is likely that the combination of rewards and punishments led most soldiers to enlist. While enticed by the high wages and bounties for volunteering, the men realized that if they refused to sign up they would be drafted anyway.

Unfortunately, no extant primary sources record the thoughts of recruiters or soldiers, so the way the system actually operated remains open to speculation. When the British colonial government urgently looked for infantry for the French and Indian War, most of Long Island's established citizens chose to pursue endeavors other than military service. It seems that except for the type of young man who signs up for war for the sake of adventure, few citizens wanted to serve as common soldiers. Most prosperous farmers did not relish low-level military service, but some did serve as officers and non-coms in the French and Indian War, in which future Patriots fought side by side with future Loyalists. For instance, Nathaniel Woodhull, Long Island's militia general killed in service during the Revolution, served as a colonel of the Third Regiment of New York troops and marched to victory at Montreal in 1760.

Although accomplished men like Woodhull did serve as officers, reluctance on the part of yeomen to enlist as buck privates impelled the authorities to explore alternative man-power pools, especially indigent newcomers, Native Americans, and the increasing numbers of the "strolling poor." Accordingly, the rank and file of Long Island's provincial forces during the French and Indian War consisted chiefly of immigrants, Indians, and idle men. These lowly, underprivileged soldiers who assisted the British in driving the French from Canada were the harbingers of the "rabble in arms" that won American

independence.²⁵

NOTES

1. Brian Dunnigan, *Siege-1759: The Campaign Against Niagara* (Youngstown, N.Y.: Old Fort Niagara Assoc., 1986), 72-82; Augustus Buell, *Sir William Johnson* (New York: D. Appleton, 1903), 188-89; Frank H. Severance, *An Old Frontier of France* (New York: Dodd Mead, 1917), 2: 320-27, 353-54.

2. "An Act for the Raising of One hundred thousand Pounds for levying Paying and Clothing Two thousand six hundred and eighty Effective men officers Included for forming with Forces of the Neighboring Colonies, an army of Twenty thousand men to invade in Conjunction with a Body of his Majesty's Regular Troops the French possessions in Canada, 7 March 1759," *Colonial Laws of New York from the Year 1664 to the Revolution* (hereafter cited as *CLNY*), 4 vols. (Albany: J. B. Lyons, 1894), 4:317-37; Edmund de Lancey, ed., "Muster Rolls of the New York Provincial Troops, 1755-1764," *Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1891* (hereafter cited as *CNYHS, 1891*) (New York: Printed for the Society, 1892), 152-53.

3. Fred Anderson, *A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and New England Society in the Seven Year's War* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1984). Most provincials came from backgrounds similar to those from Long Island: see R. S. Stephenson, "Pennsylvania Provincial Soldiers in the Seven Years' War," *Pennsylvania History* 2 (1995):196-212; Harold E. Selesky, *War and Society in Colonial Connecticut* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1990); for New York troops in 1760, see Edward Knoblauch, "Mobilizing Provincials for War: The Social Composition of New York Forces in 1760," *New York History* 78 (April 1997): 165; Don Higginbotham, *War and Society in Revolutionary America: The Wider Dimensions of Conflict* (Columbia, S.C.: USC Press, 1988), 20-26. For historians' contributions to the "militia myth" see Howard H. Peckham, *The Colonial Wars, 1689-1762* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1964), 160, 180-84. and R. F. Wood, *Captain Jesse Platt and the New York Provincial Troops in the French and Indian War* (New York: New York Genealogical and Biographical Record, 1940).

4. Robert E. Cray, "Poverty and Poor Relief: New York City and Its Rural Environs, 1700-1790," in William Pencak and Conrad Wright, eds., *Authority and Resistance in Early New York* (New York: NYHS, 1988), 184-85.

5. *CLNY* 4: 60, 167, 215, 317, 398, 516; I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (New York: Arno Press, 1967), 4: 697.

6. Each campaigning season began in spring and ended with the approach of winter; *CLNY*, 4: 330.

7. Recruitment lasted from one to two months (for dates on rosters see *CNYHS 1891*); muster masters were local notables, sheriffs, or other authorities, frequently field officers in the county militia. The New-York Historical Society published transcriptions of the rosters in 1892 (see *CNYHS 1891*, 11); for copies of original documents, see *Second Annual Report of the State Historian* (hereafter cited as *SARSH*) (Albany: Wynkoop, Hallenbeck, Crawford, 1897), and *Third Annual Report of the State Historian* (hereafter *TARSH*) (1898); because a fire at the New York State Library in 1917 severely damaged most original rolls, it is best

to compare both these printed copies in reconstructing the originals.

8. The average age of New York troops in the Niagara campaign of 1759 is estimated at twenty-six by Michael Gabriel, "The New York Provincial Regiment during the Niagara Campaign of 1759," M.A. thesis, St. Bonaventure University, 1988), 55, and at the same age for all New York provincial troops in 1760 by Knoblauch ("Mobilizing Provincials," *NYH*); *CNYHS* 1891, 70-71.

9. Although New York City was not the primary destination of immigrants after 1714, it remained a busy entrepôt throughout the eighteenth century (Aaron Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717-1775* [Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1996], 6).

10. Thomas Robinson to Colonial Governors, 23 January 1755, in E. B. O'Callaghan and B. Fernow, eds., *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, (hereafter cited as *DRCHNY*), 15 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons, 1886), 6: 934.

11. The precedent for enlisting Connecticut men in the New York provincials was set in 1755, when three such companies were raised (*CNYHS* 1891, 501-2).

12. Lawrence Cress, "An Armed Community: The Origins and Meaning of the Right to Bear Arms," *Journal of American History* 2 (June 1984), 24-29, 40. In towns such as Jamaica, Queens, farmers comprised 78.5 percent of the male population around the mid-eighteenth century (Jean Pyer, "Jamaica, New York, 1656-1776: Class Structure and Social Mobility," *Journal of Long Island History* 14 [1977]:37; Bernice Schultz records similar statistics in *Colonial Hempstead* [New York: Review-Star Press, 1937]), 149-72.

13. Benjamin Quarles, "The Colonial Militia and Negro Manpower," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 45 (March 1959): 643-53; Jack D. Foner, *Blacks and the Military in American History: A New Perspective* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974), 5.

14. "A General List of Inhabitants in the Province of New York, February 16, 1756," E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *The Documentary History of the State of New York* (hereafter cited as *DHSNY*), 4 vols. (Albany: Weed, Parsons, 1850), 1:473; Winthrop D. Jordan, *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1968), 103.

15. For how these terms were applied in the muster rolls, see Knoblauch, 159-62; Benjamin Quarles argues that since only one man was described as free, "the others were presumably slaves" (Quarles, 652); the rolls, however, were never standardized, and not every officer or muster master may have considered it worthwhile to mention a free black's legal status).

16. Richard Moss, *Slavery on Long Island: A Study in Local Institutional and Early African-American Communal Life* (New York: Garland, 1993), xv; Pyer, 38; Jordan, 116-21; "New York Post Boy," Stokes, 4:678.

17. *CLNY*, 3:1050-51; "A List of Slaves Delivered unto me 25 April 1755," O'Callaghan, *DHSNY*, 4: 518. Long Island and southeastern New England native peoples included Shinnecocks, Montauks, Pequots, and Narragansetts (Handbook of North American Indians [Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978], 15:160-90).

18. John Wittek, "Bibles and Muskets: The Acculturation of East End Native Americans in the Eighteenth Century," *LIHJ* 6 (Spring 1994): 210-32; "Journal of the Second Esopus War," O'Callaghan, *DSHNY*, 4:50-52; John Shy, A New Look at the Colonial Militia, *Willam and Mary Quarterly* 20 (April 1963): 184.

19. Witek, 210.

20. John A. Strong, *The Algonquian Peoples of Long Island: from Earliest Times to 1700* (Interlaken, N.Y.: Empire State Books, 1997), 237, 282-87, and "From Hunter to Servant: Patterns of Accommodation to Colonial Authority in Eastern Long Island Communities," in Joann P. Krieg, ed., *To Know the Place: Teaching Local History* (Hempstead: Long Island Studies Institute, 1986), 18-23.

21. All Shinnecocks in tribal records used English names by the end of the eighteenth century, indicating the high level of integration among Long Island's Indians (John A. Strong, "From Hunter to Servant: Patterns of Accommodation to Colonial Authority in Eastern Long Island Indian Communities," in Joann Krieg, ed., *To Know the Place: Teaching Local History* [Hempstead: Long Island Studies Institute, 1986], 22; however, Native Americans kept a strong sense of group identity and refused to be fully assimilated into white society).

22. Cadwallader Colden to Lords of Trade, May 1762, O'Callaghan, *DRCHNY* 7:498-500.

23. Douglas Jones contends that as America emerged into a complex modern society in the eighteenth century, the New England/Long Island Sound region experienced increasing numbers of migratory workers looking for employment (Douglas Jones, "The Strolling Poor: Transiency in Eighteenth Century Massachusetts," *Journal of Social History* 8 (Spring 1975): 28-45 (Jones focused on the mainland and not the Long Island side of the Sound).

24. During the French and Indian War, advertisements throughout the colony offered pay and bounty for six-month's enlistment equal to one year's pay as a common laborer (Samuel McKee, *Labor in Colonial New York, 1664-1776* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1935), 25-26; see also Knoblauch, 156-57.

25. For Woodhull in the French and Indian War, see Michael Hayes, "General Nathaniel Woodhull and the Battle of Long Island," *LIHJ* 7 (Spring 1995): 166.

WILLIAM WALLACE TOOKER: A NEW LOOK AT LONG ISLAND'S PIONEER ETHNOGRAPHER

By Lois Beachy Underhill

William Wallace Tooker, 1848-1917, Long Island's pioneer ethnographer, was ineluctably drawn to the prehistoric Algonquian culture of Eastern Long Island at the close of the last century, a time when the few remaining traces of early Indian life were disappearing and unappreciated. Though not formally trained in ethnology or linguistics, Tooker nevertheless earned a reputation as the foremost student of Coastal Algonquian life, and he exerted an important influence on the development of the field. His outstanding collection of artifacts and his prolific writings on Indian place names established a standard against which later work was measured. After his death, his name disappeared into dusty history, all but forgotten. Today that is changing—So much so that his Sag Harbor birthplace recently celebrated his life and work. On Saturday, 1 August 1998, for the first time in one hundred years, objects from his Algonquian Archaeological Collection at the Brooklyn Museum of Art returned to 67 Hampton Street, the house where Tooker lived, studied, and wrote. Copies of the books he authored, selected papers, correspondence, and many volumes from his private library also returned to their original home for the day. The exhibition was followed by a reception at the Sag Harbor Whaling and Historical Museum which featured a talk by John A. Strong, a noted authority on the Algonquians of Long Island.¹

An interest in things past was bred in Tooker's bones. He was born in Sag Harbor, the first of five children of William Henry Tooker, a Sag Harbor merchant, whose family came from England to Massachusetts in the seventeenth century, and Virginia Victoria Ford, descended from the Reverend Robert Fordham, the seventeenth-century minister at Southampton. David Frothingham, editor of Long Island's first newspaper, *Frothingham's Long Island Herald*, was one of Tooker's great-grandfathers.²

Young Will Tooker found his first Algonquian flint near Conkling's Point in Sag Harbor when he was five and never stopped collecting. We know how Tooker looked because his grandfather, the well-known portrait painter Hubbard L. Fordham, did an oil portrait of his young grandson.³ Dark haired and bright eyed with a look of serious intensity, Will roamed the hillsides, meadows, and bays of Sag Harbor filling his pockets with pottery shards, arrowheads, celts, axes, and hammerstones—the working tools of daily life in an Algonquian village. During his adolescence, Tooker fell from the loft in his father's barn, and suffered an injury that dogged his health for the rest of his life. His convalescence gave him time to read about the Algonquians.

Tooker was educated at private schools to prepare him to attend Yale College, but his father's illness forced Tooker to leave school to work in his father's store. At eighteen, he became an apprentice pharmacist. He interrupted his apprenticeship briefly to work as an assistant to his grandfather Fordham. Although talent is apparent in the pencil sketches and oil works he did during that time, and his eye for composition eventually found expression in the fine photographs which he made later in life, he turned away from his grandfather's calling to return to the more financially secure life of a pharmacist. His training with his grandfather enabled him to do drawings of the artifacts he collected.⁴

The bright eyed boy became a handsome man with a fine head of hair and a generous mustache. His genial personality brought him a wide circle of friends and correspondents, specialists in the study of the Algonquians and general admirers.



WILLIAM WALLACE TOOKER,
Author of "Indian Place-Names on Long Island."

William Wallace Tooker. Photograph, n.d., courtesy
Sag Harbor History Room, John Jermain Memorial Library

Always first among his friends was Lilla Byram Cartwright, the daughter of Captain Thomas Cartwright of Shelter Island and Mary Winters of Sag Harbor. They grew up together, and married in 1872. The Tookers acquired a fine house, now 67 Hampton Street, originally built by a whale ship owner, Charles Thomas Dering. They were known for their amiable hospitality, evenings which Tooker described as "entertainment with ladies," occasions remembered and remarked on by the descendants of those who enjoyed them. Will and Lilla were childless, and they devoted themselves to each other for thirty-seven years. During the rainy summer of 1901, Tooker wrote to a friend that the mosquitoes were, "lively, but they don't trouble me much. I guess I am immune. If there is one in a room, it is sure to find Mrs. T. I tell her it is because she is so sweet."⁵ Tooker was married for twenty-nine years when he wrote these fond words. Three years after his marriage, in 1875, he acquired the pharmacy in which he had been apprenticed and his business supported him financially for twenty-two years, until his retirement in 1897.

The Algonquians became Tooker's avid avocation. His quest for artifacts expanded from Sag Harbor to all of eastern Long Island. His friends remembered that he cultivated the acquaintance of the last of the old Algonquian families, the Pharaohs and Fowlers of Montauk, and the Bunns, Cuffees, and Kellises of Shinnecock, learning everything they could teach him about Algonquian life. Tooker joined scholarly societies and read extensively in the field of Algonquian studies, acquiring a comprehensive library. He corresponded with specialists and made himself an expert on lithic tools, identifying each of his artifacts by name, type of stone, location of find and other pertinent information. He displayed many of his artifacts, carefully labeled, in his pharmacy. In 1881 he published his first article, "A Perforated Tablet of Stone from New York," which he illustrated himself. It appeared in the prestigious *Smithsonian Report*. With this publication, Tooker's collection began to be recognized beyond his local circle.⁶

In the same year, Charles C. Abbott, in his comprehensive *Primitive Industry*, included a drawing of a fishhook, made of bone, from Tooker's collection, along with Tooker's description of the shell-heap where he found it. Tooker's fishhook also appeared in Charles Rau's 1884 *Prehistoric Fishing in Europe and North America*, published by the Smithsonian Institution. In 1886 *The American Antiquarian* pictured a tablet which Tooker illustrated and described, saying it was cut on two sides with the figure X which he says he believed was a symbol for an enemy who had been decapitated.⁷

As Tooker's work began to be recognized, he prepared an inventory of his "Archaeological Collection," as he titled it, which now numbered some five hundred objects. Completed in 1882, the inventory ran to seventeen handwritten pages in his careful, rounded script. Tooker meticulously recorded axes, adzes, hoes, celts (chisels, fleshers, and skinning knives), gougers, hammers, sinkers, fishing weights, sharpening stones, grinding stones, mullers, oyster knives, choppers, perforated tablets, a stone puzzle, pipes, ornaments, spear points, hammer stones, rare brass items (arrow heads, a tube, a needle), perforators, mortars, bones of deer, knives, and scrapers—with the comment: "These scrapers

represent as perfect a series as Abbott illustrates in *Primitive Industry*." Two highlights of the inventory were a "very interesting" vessel of pottery from a grave near Otter Pond in Sag Harbor, that he found broken and which he restored along with the fishhook pictured by Abbott. Tooker identified most of the artifacts by weight, size, locality, "find" (shell heap, surface, woods etc.), and added remarks, "quite rare and perfect" or "very good" or "irregular and rude," and identified the stone, "dionite" or "porphyry" or "granite." Tooker's inventory also included about one thousand arrowheads that were "perfect," four hundred displayed on cards of one hundred each and identified by locality, the remaining six hundred mixed, as well as a "peck" of broken specimens. He inventoried three crania (skulls) removed from inadvertently disturbed grave sites. These objects formed an impressive array of the material culture of the Algonquians. Tooker became, as he described himself, "a student of prehistoric anthropology."⁸

Tooker's description of the fishhook shell-heap in *Primitive Industry* had the character of a site report. He later identified the site, about three miles west of Sag Harbor, as Weckatuck, based on his examination of colonial land transactions in the *East Hampton Town Records*.⁹

In Tooker's time the area was known as Northside, referring to its location on the north side of the moraine that forms the high backbone of Long Island's South Fork. Tooker wrote:

West of Otter Pond is a shell-heap of considerable extent, that covers nearly three acres. On its surface has been found hundreds of arrow points. Part of this deposit is still hidden under the leaves and soil of the woods and has never been disturbed. Along the cove beyond, for a distance of about one mile and a half, is one almost continuous shell-heap. It is thicker at some places than at others. Back on the southern slopes of the hills, near swamps and springs, are others, some being an acre in area. At Payne's Creek there is found one of the largest and most compact shell-mounds on this part of Long Island. At the time the shells were deposited, the creek evidently flowed in front of the deposit, but now it is filled up and a sand, country road extends along its front. This deposit covers about three acres, and is fully four feet in depth. In some spots on this shell-heap, are remains only of the oyster; in another, of the clam; and a third of the scallops, and then the various shells will be found to be about equally abundant, and mingled together. In this deposit have been found bones of the raccoon, bear, otter, fox, deer, and rabbit. Almost all the stone implements used by the natives have been found in this shell heap. Also awls of pointed instruments of bone, and one large bone fish-hook [pictured in Abbot's volume]. Fragments of their pottery, made of pounded shells, clay, and sand are seen strewn in every direction."¹⁰

Tooker's collection eventually included 166 objects from Weckatuck or

Northside, plus unnumbered quantities of arrowheads, spear points, pottery pieces, bones, and shells. He was particularly pleased with a perforated tablet of slate with two holes that was "small and very perfect," and the large bone fishhook illustrated in Abbott which was "fine indeed."

He scrutinized another Algonquian site near his home on Hampton Street, the area where he found his first artifacts, even more intently than Weckatuck. For a long time he was unable to identify it, he wrote later, but his examination of the *East Hampton Town Records* convinced him that an Algonquian site named Wegwagomock spread over a portion of present-day Sag Harbor located in the town of East Hampton. "The name *Wegwagomock* or *Wigwagomuck*, as designating the locality, was retained in the early records of East Hampton and probably in the speech of our first settlers until the year 1731, when it disappears from the written page and from the memory of our oldest inhabitant until it was brought again to light by the publishing of the records," Tooker later wrote:

From evidences, surface or otherwise, that have been discovered from time to time, this village extended, with wigwams in scattered order, along the edge of the meadow [today's Bay Street, Route 114, Burke Street and the lower part of the High Street hill]. At the present day a large portion of this area has been obliterated of its aboriginal marks by the march of improvements until but a small part of the site indicates what it must have been at the period of which I write, that portion in close proximity to the depression which has been known from my childhood as the "Frog Pond" [since filled and now the location of today's American Legion on Bay Street] is about the only part remaining that may be studied...with much interest and satisfaction.

The conditions which gave rise to this village in aboriginal times were these: First its nearness to the tidal waters in front made their food quest an easy one, for fish abounded here. Second, the sand flats, bare at low water, bordering the shore in every direction, undoubtedly teemed, as it does today, with shell fish of various kinds...There can be no doubt whatever but that the manufacture of wampum was carried on to a great extent in this Indian village, and that it was frequently visited by the Dutch for purposes of trading in this commodity. All the facts disclosed by excavating on this village site prove it; the numerous columella or stock of periwinkle scattered about this village site bear mute testimony of this manufacture. The writer, in digging here, discovered a cache of these shells which had evidently been stored for future use...It is very rare we find a whole valve of a round clam (*venus mercenaria*) but fragments exist in great quantity, showing breakage of the shell in order to obtain the "blue eye" so highly desired for the beads...The debris which marks the settlement is composed of shells, ashes, charcoal, burnt stones which were probably the hearths of the wigwams, pottery sherds, both ornamented and plain, arrow points, hammer stones, celts, stone axes and other objects that carry the age of the village, back to a past previous to the dawn of settlement by the English, and layers of which

prove that the occupation of the site by the Indians was not continuous, but was revisited time and time again. Again in the top layer has been found a few gun flints, glass beads and brass buttons, indicating occupation within historic times... Thus on every hand hereabouts may be met some token of the dweller in the village of *Wegwagonock*... The trail of paths from *Wegwagonock* led to... *Weckatuck* at the north side, with branches in various directions wherever the footsteps of the Indian might lead him.¹¹

Tooker eventually collected 159 objects from *Wegwagonock*, as well as an unidentified number of arrowheads, spear points, pottery pieces, bones, and shells. He found a "good series" of drilling stones or perforators, and thought his pestles were "much better" than those in the Museum of Natural History in New York.

About one-third of the objects in Tooker's collection came from *Weckatuck* and *Wegwagonock*. These objects, with their site descriptions, have yet to be subjected to new scientific analysis for the insights they might offer about native American land use, settlement patterns, and seasonal occupations.

Algonquian artifacts led Tooker to the Algonquian language. His interest was stimulated by the work of J. Hammond Trumbull, a Connecticut linguist who published a small but groundbreaking book on Indian place names in Connecticut in 1881. Trumbull combed Connecticut Indian deeds and colonial town records for Indian place names that he compared to the known word lists of the Algonquian dialects spoken in Connecticut. He had an opportunity to follow Trumbull's approach when the colonial records for the towns of Southampton and East Hampton were published in 1874 and 1887.¹²

Tooker, however, faced an obstacle. No Algonquian vocabulary lists had been made on Long Island during the time the language was actively in use. Modern linguists still struggle with the same obstacle. Tooker consulted with James Constantine Pilling at the Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, who wrote that Tooker needed "good vocabularies of the Algonkin dialects spoken on or about Long Island," as well as an extensive knowledge of Algonkin languages generally, in order to proceed.¹³

Despite Pilling's discouraging words, Tooker persevered. Herbert Foster Gunnison, editor of the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle Almanac*, learned of Tooker's work, and in 1887 asked him to prepare a list of Long Island Algonquian place names, with their meanings, for publication in the *Almanac*. The first article appeared in 1888, and Tooker's career as a published Algonkinist, as he called himself, began.¹⁴

In 1889, Tooker wrote to Pilling that he had already compiled more than four hundred Algonquian place names on Long Island, and that he hoped to emulate Trumbull's work in Connecticut and publish a comprehensive volume of Long Island place names:

With each name will be given extracts from the early records and deeds of the towns where they occur, showing their appearance, different forms of spelling as given by the early recorders... With the names [will] appear historical data relating to the early history of Long Island never before published.¹⁵

In a burst of activity over the next eight years, Tooker, still in his forties, published thirty journal articles and read many of them before the American Association for the Advancement of Science and other learned societies. He continued his popular annual *Almanac* pieces, but also published in scholarly journals, the *American Anthropologist* and the *Archaeologist* among them. During the same period he wrote nineteen newspaper articles and letters. In 1896, Tooker wrote "The Indian Village of Wegwagoneck," which analyzed the place name Wegwagoneck and described the Algonquian site near his Sag Harbor home. Even Pilling came to recognize Tooker. In his magisterial *Bibliography of the Algonquian Language*, published in 1891, Pilling acknowledged Tooker's achievements with more than a column of text, and inscribed Tooker's copy of the book "With the compliments of James C. Pilling."¹⁶

Tooker continued his "Archaeological Collection" during these years of writing. In 1889, he prepared a supplement to his catalogue in which he listed forty-one more items. This new inventory included two vessels of pottery, only slightly damaged, which came from a grave in Southold, and the prized inscribed tablet that he illustrated and described in the *American Antiquarian*. He noted in this supplement the many bones, shells, fragments of pottery, and pieces of worked stone he accumulated in addition to the forty-one artifacts that he itemized.

One of Tooker's newspaper pieces was an 1895 plea on behalf of the Montauk. Sixteen years earlier, a land developer from Brooklyn, Arthur Benson, bought East Hampton's pasture land, which the Montauks occupied, from the East Hampton trustees for \$151,000. He pensioned off the few remaining Montauk with token pieces of property or dollar amounts. After Benson's death, his heirs sold 5,500 acres to the president of the Long Island Railroad, Austin Corbin, and a group of land speculators. Corbin extended the railroad to Montauk in 1895. When Corbin died a year later, his development plans for Fort Pond Bay died with him, but the Montauk were not allowed to return to their land. The Montauk cause was not popular, but Tooker supported it:

Those now claiming...the home of their ancestors...were descendants in an unbroken line from George Pharaoh...if [their] rights belong to the tribe and not to any individual member of the tribe, any purchase by individual from Mr. Benson or Mr. Corbin amounts to nothing in point of law.

The case wound through the courts from 1893 until 1918, but the Montauk never regained their lands.¹⁷

Tooker's first book, *Cockenoe-De-Long Island*, appeared in 1896. Cockenoe, a Long Island Algonquian was in Connecticut at the time of the Pequot War (1637), and taken prisoner. Tooker makes a convincing case that Cockenoe was the young Indian, whose name was never recorded, who became a servant in an English household in Massachusetts after the war. There he met John Eliot, the first person to translate the Bible into an Algonquian language. Eliot was impressed with the young man's command of English: "This Indian is ingenious, can read, and I taught him to write, which he quickly learnt... He was the first that I made use of to teach me words, and to be my interpreter." Tooker translated Cockenoe's name as "interpreter," in a carefully delineated analysis of the language. In a conversational tone with an easy narrative flow, Tooker went on to describe Cockenoe's return to Long Island, his marriage into Wyandanch's family, and his later career. Through his "exceptional knowledge of the English language, his traits of character, and strong personality, [he] was recognized as a valuable coadjutor and interpreter by many of our first English settlers." Research into Cockenoe's life gave Tooker an opportunity to explore New England Algonquian records, such as Eliot's Bible, and to trace Cockenoe's name and life in much the same way he had been examining place names. In his meticulously documented book, Tooker appreciated the importance of the life of this Algonquian man at a time when biographical subjects were restricted to those of European descent and Native Americans were ignored. The book, published in a limited edition of 215 copies, is still highly regarded.¹⁸

Before Tooker was fifty years old, during this peak of productivity, ill health disrupted his work. Dr. Morley B. Lewis, his personal physician, diagnosed "paralysis agitans," now known as Parkinson's disease. Tooker retired from his pharmacy in 1897 and came to the difficult decision that it would be necessary for him to sell his Algonquian collection.

Once again he catalogued the additions to his collection—his failing handwriting is apparent on the undated manuscript. He added 820 items, but more than half of them were spear points and arrow heads without measurements, and with only vague generalities about the locations in which they were found. His inventory now totaled 1,361 items, plus numerous arrowheads and unnumbered quantities of pottery pieces, stone fragments, and bones.

In 1898, the Museum of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, now the Brooklyn Museum of Art, purchased Tooker's collection. The *Brooklyn Eagle* and the benefactors of the museum raised the money to preserve it. The price was \$3,000 for 1,242 artifacts (\$50,000 in today's dollars), rather than the \$5,000 Tooker was hoping for. It was a bittersweet accomplishment for him. "Tooker Collection Acquired," the *Brooklyn Eagle* reported in March 1898, "to preserve for all time...a permanent record of the history of the aboriginal tribes that inhabited Long Island." Several more years elapsed as arrangements were completed and the collection was formally accepted in Brooklyn on 27 January 1901. "The collection forms as complete a basis of knowledge of the prehistoric inhabitants of Long Island as has been secured for the prehistoric peoples of any

other portion of our country east of the Allegheny mountains," the institute wrote in its yearbook that year.¹⁹

In 1961, the bulk of Tooker's Algonquian collection passed from the Brooklyn Museum of Art, which redefined its mission to focus on the arts and exclude the sciences, to the National Museum of the American Indian, now part of the Smithsonian Institution. This undoubtedly will be the collection's final home, where it will be "preserved for all time," as Tooker hoped when it went to Brooklyn one hundred years ago.

Tooker continued a productive work schedule for some years after his retirement as a pharmacist, publishing fourteen journal articles and newspaper pieces between 1897 and 1900. In 1901, Harper published ten of Tooker's papers under the title *The Algonquian Series*, in a limited edition of 250 copies. The *Series* is still considered a landmark in Coastal Algonquian studies. The publication was dedicated to Tooker's old friend Herbert Foster Gunnison, of the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle*, "whose unwavering interest in my work led to its continuance."²⁰

But Tooker was struggling with Parkinson's. Then, as now, exercise was recommended to reduce the symptoms he suffered. He bought a bicycle, and, in 1901, when he was fifty-three years of age, he was still sufficiently mobile to write that he had "been on my wheel a good deal." He did his last public reading of a paper before a learned society the next year. After that his pace slowed considerably, but he managed to complete nine more articles and work on his place names manuscript. Eventually, his wife Lilla became his nurse and secretary.

When Lilla Tooker died unexpectedly in 1909, her husband memorialized his love for her by giving her white silk dancing slippers to the John Jermain Memorial Library, in Sag Harbor, with a note of tender sentiment stating that the slippers had been "worn by Mrs. Tooker at her first 'public' dance fifty years ago, Mr. Tooker being her first partner." He expressed his loneliness in a poem of sadness and longing:

To say goodbye to all sweet memories,
 Goodbye to tender questions, soft replies,
 Goodbye to hope-goodbye to dreaming too-
 Goodbye to all things dear, goodbye to you-
 Without a kiss, a tear, a prayer, a sigh,
 Our last goodbye!²¹

The philanthropic Margaret O. (Mrs. Russel) Sage became interested in Tooker's work and provided him with financial support. After the death of his wife, Sage underwrote the cost of secretaries and nurses so that he could complete his place names manuscript. The culmination of his twenty-two years of effort appeared in 1911, titled *Indian Place-Names on Long Island*. G. P. Putnam's Sons published the book in a handsome volume with a dark red cover and clear, easy-to-read type. Tooker dedicated the book to Margaret Olivia Sage, "whose benefactions are world-wide." In his preliminary remarks, he acknowledged the

major obstacle he faced all these years. Only "two brief vocabularies of the Algonquian language in the Long Island dialects, have been preserved," he wrote, one of 162 words in the Unquachog dialect collected in 1791 by Thomas Jefferson, in Brookhaven, and the second of 75 words in the Montauk dialect collected in 1798 by John Lyon Gardiner from George Pharaoh, aged sixty-six, the oldest man of the tribe. Tooker had little confidence in this second list, saying that it presented "such an array of English and Montauk, that I cannot believe, at the time, [1798] there was a native who could speak the language intelligently and correctly." Tooker described his debt to Trumbull's pioneering work and his forced reliance on a dictionary drawn from Eliot's *Indian Bible* which reflected New England rather than Long Island Algonquian. Tooker's research took him to Long Island's ancient manuscript records, unrecorded deeds, and papers relating to long forgotten lawsuits; he believed his collection of 486 Indian place names was exhaustive, or nearly so. Tooker's book, reprinted in 1962, is considered a classic today.²²

Tooker's interest in the Algonquians continued until his death in 1917, but his active work was drawing to a close. Over the years new friends, new protocols, and new linguistics obscured his early work. Even the Brooklyn Institute's new curator of ethnology, Stewart Culin, seemed to have gone on to new interests. When the historian James Truslow Adams expressed his desire to illustrate something from Tooker's collection in his 1918 *History of Southampton*, Culin replied that the Tooker collection consisted of "surface finds with little or nothing that is in any way distinctive." Adams persevered, and a drawing of a restored Indian earthenware jar from Sag Harbor appeared in his book, likely the "vessel of pottery" listed in Tooker's 1882 inventory as having been taken from Otter Pond and restored.²³

The businessman and collector, Morton Pennypacker, was not willing to let Tooker be forgotten. In 1921, he gathered copies of all of Tooker's published work, as well as various manuscripts and letters, now lodged in the Pennypacker Long Island History Collection of the East Hampton Library. The *Long Island Forum* did not forget Tooker either. A 1955 biographical article by John C. Huden provides a valuable account of Tooker's private life, based on the author's conversations with many people who knew him.²⁴

In the last twenty years, scholars have begun taking a new look at Tooker. The prestigious *Readings in Long Island Archaeology and Ethnohistory*, edited by Gaynell Stone, reprinted several of his out of print works, among them *Cockenoe-De-Long Island*. The series printed a partial listing of Tooker's Archaeological Collection inventory, his letter on behalf of the Montauks, and his drawings at the Queensborough Library. In 1991, the archaeologist, Robert Grumet, prepared an essay on Tooker for the Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, along with a guide to the forty-six items included in their Tooker papers. John A. Strong's comprehensive *The Algonquian Peoples of Long Island* (1997), and the Sag Harbor exhibition in 1998 offered the general public a new look at Tooker.²⁵

Ives Goddard, the Algonquian language expert at the Smithsonian Institution,

considers Tooker “an important pioneer. His work is still useful in many ways.” As he and I talked by phone, he reached up to pull his copy of *Indian Place-Names* off the shelf beside his desk. He told me that understanding of the Algonquian languages has progressed greatly since Tooker’s days, when the grammar was not understood. However, linguists still face the same obstacle Tooker faced: the language is “extinct, a blank spot we can’t fill.” The nuances of place names (the shapes of hills, the plants and ground covers, the mythological associations) have been lost. Tooker had no way of recovering these, and had to fall back on a kind of pidgin Indian, Goddard said. Some of his translations have held up over the years, while better information superseded others. Tooker’s greatest contribution was his culling of the early records, the Dutch as well as the English, and recording the Algonquian place names he found. In Goddard’s opinion, we have Tooker to thank for “that historical spade work.” As we look at Tooker’s collection and writings anew, the man himself seems to be taking on the character of a treasured historical relic.²⁶

NOTES

1. *Tooker Day*, a brochure issued 1 August 1998, and Tooker’s papers may be seen at the Sag Harbor History Room, John Jermain Memorial Library, Sag Harbor, Suzan Habib, curator; the exhibition at 67 Hampton Street was held by courtesy of the present owners of the house, Robert and Joy Lewis; Tooker’s Algonquian collection at the Brooklyn Museum of Art is not open to the public, but was made available to me by museum staff members Diana Fane, Susan Kennedy Zeller, Deborah Wyeth, Ellen Kuenzel, and Lisa Cain.

2. For Tooker’s private life see John C. Huden, “William Wallace Tooker, Algonkinist,” *Long Island Forum* 18 (August 1955): 143-58; Huden, who consulted with Russella J. Hazard of the John Jermain Memorial Library, Harlow Payne, Thomas Bisgood, Ency Carruthers Beyer, and other Sag Harbor residents, is, unless otherwise specified, the source for Tooker’s private life in this article.

3. The portrait of four-year-old William Wallace Tooker, painted by his grandfather Hubbard L. Fordham, hangs in the Sag Harbor Whaling and Historical Museum.

4. Tooker designed his own bookplate, a charming drawing of a Montauk scene; three Tooker pencil sketches, *West Banks-North Haven*, *View on the Otter Pond*, and *View from Brick Kilns* are in the Long Island Room, Queensborough Public Library; a fourth, *Round Pond*, is in the private collection of Arthur T. Brown and was a gift from the artist to his cousin Charles Nathan Brown; a fifth, another *View from the Brick Kilns* is in the private collection of Robert and Joy Lewis. A number of Tooker’s letters include charming drawings. His most successful known work in oil, *Waiting for a Bite, Scene on Round Pond, 1870*, is in the private collection of Robert and Joy Lewis. He also produced an oil study of *The Spirit of '76*, housed along with a collection of his photographs in the Sag Harbor History Room of the John Jermain Memorial Library (hereafter cited as SHHR).

5. Tooker to Orville B. Ackerly, n.d., Pennypacker Long Island Collection of the East Hampton Library; Helen Brown, of Sag Harbor, shared her family’s memories of Tooker with me; Tooker to Ackerly, 6 Sept. 1901.

6. Huden, 145; William Wallace Tooker, “A Perforated Tablet of Stone from New York;”

Smithsonian Report (1881):658-60.

7. Charles C. Abbott, *Primitive Industry: or Illustrations of the Handiwork in Stone, Bone and Clay, of the Native Races of the Northern Atlantic Seaboard of America* (Salem, Mass.: George A Bates, 1881), 439-40; Charles Rau, *Prehistoric Fishing in Europe and North America* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1884), 127; *American Antiquarian* (1886):111.

8. Tooker, "Archaeological Collection," 3 parts (1882, 1889 supplement, and n.d.), Pennypacker Long Island Collection, East Hampton Library (hereafter cited as EHL); acquired by Morton Pennypacker with his notation, "What use will ultimately be made of the collection [after it was sold to Brooklyn Institute] we do not know, but the discarded inventory that should have been preserved with it was purchased by me and it is now part of the Long Island Collection."

9. *Records of the Town of East Hampton*, 9 vols. (Sag Harbor: John H. Hunt, 1887) 1:145 (hereafter cited as *EHTR*. Weckatuck is in the town of Southampton, near the border of the two towns. This citation discusses town boundaries and for that reason appears in the *EHTR*.)

10. Tooker, quoted in Abbott, 439-40.

11. *EHTR* 3: 275, 382, 443, 465; Tooker, "The Indian Village of Wegwagonock," *Souvenir of the Fireman's Fair* (Sag Harbor, summer 1896): 27-31.

12. J. Hammond Trumbull, *Indian Names of Places etc., in and around the Borders of Connecticut: with Interpretations of Some of Them* (Hartford: Hartford Press of Case, Lockwood & Brainard, 1881).

13. James C. Pilling to Tooker, 30 Dec. 1887, SHHR.

14. Tooker, "Indian Geographical Names on Long Island," *Brooklyn Daily Eagle Almanac* 1889, 55-56.

15. James C. Pilling, *Bibliography of the Algonquian Language* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of American Ethnography, Smithsonian Institution, 1991) 489-90; Pilling printed Tooker's communication to him regarding his planned place names work.

16. Pilling, 490.

17. Tooker, "The Last of the Montauks," *Brooklyn Times*, 1 Nov. 1895.

18. Tooker, *John Eliot's First Indian Teacher and Interpreter, Cockenoe-De-Long Island, and the Story of His Career from the Early Records* (New York: Francis P. Harper, 1896)

19. Brooklyn Museum of Art archives; Scott Derks, *The Value of a Dollar 1860-1989* (Washington, D. C.: Gale Research Inc. 1994), 2.

20. William Wallace Tooker, *The Algonquian Series* (New York: Francis P. Harper, 1901)

21. Tooker to John Jermain Memorial Library, 12 Dec. 1910, SHHR; the full poem ran to five verses.

22. Tooker, *The Indian Place-Names on Long Island and Adjacent, with Their Probable*

Significations (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911), xv-xxvi; see appendix 2, 303-10, for a bibliography of Tooker's published work.

23. Stewart Culin to James Truslow Adams, 20 March 1917, Brooklyn Museum of Art Archives; James Truslow Adams, *History of the Town of Southampton* (Bridgehampton; Hampton Press, 1918), 23.

24. In addition to the EHL, other important repositories of Tooker papers are the John Jermain Memorial Library, New York Public Library, Library of Congress, Newberry Library, and of course, the Smithsonian Institution.

25. Gaynell Stone, ed., *Readings in Long Island Archaeology and Ethnohistory*, 7 vols. (Stony Brook: Suffolk County Archaeological Association, 1980-1993); see particularly vols. 3, 4; Robert S. Grumet, *William Wallace Tooker, Pioneer Algonkinist, 1848-1917* (Bronx, N. Y. Huntington Free Library, Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, 1991), 23-31; John A. Strong, *The Algonquian Peoples of Long Island from Earliest Times to 1700* (Interlaken, N. Y.: Empire State Books, 1997).

26. Ives Goddard to Lois Beachy Underhill by telephone, 21 Jan. 1999.

JAVITS V. ROOSEVELT: THE 1954 RACE FOR NEW YORK STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

By Michael Kelly

Editor's note: Many of the documents cited by Michael Kelly are from the public papers of Senator Jacob K. Javits, located at the Rare Books and Manuscript Division, Melville Library, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, New York.

By the 1940s, electoral slates in New York City customarily carried an Irish, a Jewish, and an Italian candidate. Statewide tickets had an added balance of urban and rural. This electoral equation was in response to contests pitting most of the fifty-seven upstate counties against the five comprising New York City. Upstate, Long Island, and Westchester County were considered GOP strongholds, while the city was Democratic with a strong Tammany influence, particularly in 1954 following the resurgence of the machine's fortunes under Carmine DeSapio's tutelage. Jacob Javits's path from being denied the Republican party's 1953 mayoral nomination to becoming its candidate for New York State attorney general the very next year is a lesson in the ethnic and regional politics that still are integral to New York's nominating process.¹

By 1954, Javits's reelection to the House was virtually guaranteed (after his 1948 victory Tammany Hall put its efforts elsewhere), and upon pursuing but failing to capture his party's mayoral nomination the previous year, he had little inclination openly to seek another political office. Still, he was often mentioned as one of a group of possible candidates for New York State attorney general, and as an ambitious and astute politician Javits always told reporters, when queried, that he "would gladly run if asked." Just being considered publicly for higher office often helped a politician break out of the pack.²

After twelve years in office, Governor Thomas E. Dewey was looking forward to retirement, and tapped U.S. Senator Irving Ives as his successor. Dewey had hand-picked Ives for the Senate in 1946, and although the senator was reluctant to leave the comfort of that deliberative body, he announced that he would accept the gubernatorial nomination if the rank and file of the party so desired. Since Dewey controlled the state GOP, the nominating convention would go along with whomever he chose.³

Ives was an early and vocal advocate for civil rights. In 1945 he helped write the New York State Fair Employment Act banning discrimination in state

employment, and introduced a series of bills in the Senate seeking to ban discrimination on the federal level. Ives was a member of the Senate Labor Committee that drafted Taft-Hartley, and though unhappy with the final bill, he voted with the majority of his party for its passage in 1947, thus earning the wrath of William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, who vowed to unseat him.

Apart from disagreeing on Taft-Hartley and a few other bills, Javits and Ives worked well together in Congress. Ives was an internationalist who supported the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan and was an early advocate of an independent Jewish state. Javits had "a profound regard-and deep affection" for the senator, who, he told reporters, had his "unequivocal and complete support." He moved closer to a possible nomination for attorney general when a *New York Times* front-page story quoted Ives that Javits would "add strength to the ticket."⁴

Javits's record in the House, where he sided with liberal Democrats more than with conservatives of his own party, combined with his liberal political philosophy, seemed to nullify his being offered a spot on a statewide Republican ticket. During his tenure in the House, he regularly criticized Dewey's legislative programs dealing with urban issues such as rent control, transit subsidies, and low-income housing, a twelve-year record he would have to defend if he secured a place on the ticket. In addition, he was virtually unknown to most voters and party regulars outside of New York City, and disliked by some GOP leaders in the House and the city. Queens County boss Frank Kenna (who, with Manhattan boss Tom Curran, was instrumental in denying Javits the mayoral nomination in 1953) announced that he opposed placing Javits on the ticket and named one of his own loyalists for the state's top legal post. If Javits gave up his House seat to run for attorney general, moreover, the Democrats would be sure to recapture his district in a city where the Republicans were perennially weak; many in the GOP feared the loss of House and Senate seats in the off-year election of 1954, without President Dwight D. Eisenhower's magic name heading the ticket.⁵

To the argument that he was needed in the House, Javits responded that the Republicans could easily sustain the seat, and boldly named Manhattan assemblyman Samuel Roman as his designated heir (Roman represented about 60 percent of the 21st District, in Albany). Queried by reporters about the possibility of the party's retaining Javits's House seat, Ives conceded, "That's the sixty-four dollar question." Reflecting the feeling of many rank and file Republicans, one New York City district leader opined that, "It may be heresy, but control of the state is worth more than one House seat." Although Ives favored placing Javits on his ticket, the decision depended largely on the Democrats' nominee for attorney general. Luckily, as it turned out for Javits's political career, the state Democratic convention met two days before the Republicans.⁶

Meeting in New York City, the Democratic convention was orchestrated by Carmine DeSapio, Tammany chieftain and Democratic national committeeman. DeSapio had proven his strength the previous year by helping to elect Robert F. Wagner Jr. mayor against the incumbent, Vincent Impellitteri, thus gaining some semblance of respectability for the machine and an uneasy alliance with the Citizens Union and other good government forces.⁷

W. Averell Harriman, Franklin D. Roosevelt's former adviser and ambassador to the Soviet Union, who in 1952 had attempted to capture his party's presidential nomination, was fervently pursuing the 1954 New York State Democratic gubernatorial nomination. His main opposition came from his former national campaign chairman, Rep. Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., who, after spending six years in the House, was ready to follow in his father's footsteps to Albany and, possibly, the White House. Though the son of the former president was not an influential political figure in New York or Washington, he assumed that his name recognition, coupled with Tammany Hall's support, was such that the voters of New York would send him to Albany as their governor.⁸

When Roosevelt first approached party leaders about running for Congress, they had dismissed the idea out of hand. Alex Rose and his Liberals gladly took the namesake of their founder into their tent, but most Democratic power-brokers in the state and city, including Carmine DeSapio, still considered Roosevelt a political nonentity. In addition to his New York City congressional district, FDR Jr. had a small but solid base upstate but no strong ties to the liberal programs of either the New or Fair Deals, and his voting record in Congress was uneven. Unlike his mother Eleanor, who carried the torch for the liberal wing of the party on the state and national levels, the junior Roosevelt had shown no inclination to exert the effort needed to become a leader in the House or a spokesman for the Fair Deal. He considered his congressional seat as only the first step toward becoming governor of New York, a position which, like Harriman, he planned to use as a springboard for a bid for the 1956 Democratic presidential nomination.⁹

By 1954, Alex Rose, state vice chairman of the Liberal Party, had come to view the junior Roosevelt as a rank opportunist; two years earlier he had temporarily denied Roosevelt a spot on the Liberal slate to indicate his displeasure. The Liberal Party chief, Adolf Berle, once declared Roosevelt an "ineffable ass." Commenting to reporters on the junior Roosevelt's ambition to succeed his father in Albany, Rose warned, "some people who think there is a short cut to the Governorship by walking out on principles and friends are in for a disappointment." Liberal leaders were upset with Roosevelt for backing a loan to Franco's Spain, which the party vigorously opposed. Yet, to many liberal Democrats, Roosevelt seemed to be the man who could return the state house to their control; he had the name, a highly publicized, if flawed, liberal voting record in the House, and a solid base of support in the upstate counties of Erie and Dutchess, which admired him for opposing Tammany Hall in 1949 (he did so only after being spurned by the machine).¹⁰

Roosevelt angered Wagner in 1953, when, as an emissary for Rose and the Liberals, he asked the mayor to step aside in favor of Rudolph Halley; this after privately assuring Wagner of his backing in the mayoral race if Wagner supported his gubernatorial quest. Roosevelt faced strong opposition from the Catholic community, as well, as the Rockland County boss and former Democratic national chairman Jim Farley, who privately assured intimates that he "was going to stop young Roosevelt."¹¹

While Roosevelt campaigned upstate for delegates to the state convention, a strategy worked out by DeSapio (who advised him to remain upstate to avoid any appearance of being viewed as the machine's candidate) sought alternative candidates for governor. After conferring with Rose, DeSapio met secretly with Mayor Wagner, who had already turned down the nomination, and Senator Herbert H. Lehman, the party's elder statesman; both agreed to support Harriman.¹²

By the time Roosevelt entered the Democratic convention at the 165th Infantry Armory in Manhattan, he knew that DeSapio and his Tammany stalwarts had outmaneuvered him. Refusing to concede without a floor fight, he ensconced himself in a cubicle behind the platform with his mother, and directed his floor managers by telephone. When DeSapio appeared on the rostrum to speak, Roosevelt's supporters drowned out his words with catcalls and boos. In another delaying tactic, Roosevelt's floor leaders demanded repeated roll calls from Harriman's delegation, and several supporters were taken into police custody after repeatedly attacking opposition delegates with their Roosevelt placards. However, Roosevelt could not prevent the inevitable; following Harriman's first-ballot nomination, he asked that "by-gones be by-gones" and proposed that the nomination be made unanimous. Eleanor Roosevelt would never forgive DeSapio "for what he did to my boy."¹⁴

For the sake of party unity, Lehman persuaded DeSapio to offer Roosevelt the attorney general's slot on the ticket, and Roosevelt, very reluctantly, accepted a place on the joint Liberal and Democratic slate. For lieutenant governor the delegates nominated the Bronx district attorney, George DeLucca, a Catholic; for comptroller Aaron Jacoby, a Jew; and for attorney general Roosevelt, a Protestant. The New York city-wide slate reflected both Tammany's strength and DeSapio's strategy for November; the party henceforth pursued a metropolitan area plurality large enough to offset the GOP's upstate strength.¹⁴

The news that the Democrats had selected Roosevelt for attorney general moved Javits closer to his own nomination. There were no other prominent Jewish liberals in the Republican party, especially with Javits's voter potential in New York City, and Dewey needed a Jewish candidate to balance the ticket and counter the lopsided city-based Democratic slate. If the GOP nominated Javits, Roosevelt would also lose any chance of running as the more liberal candidate. Javits had a liberal voting record and a strong following among Jewish liberals, a group the GOP desperately needed if it ever hoped to win New York City, a record in legal practice that showed him to be far more competent than his Democratic opponent, and a deserved reputation for being a successful campaigner. But, having heard nothing from the party concerning the nomination, Javits was focusing his energies on his own reelection campaign.

Arriving for the Republican convention in Syracuse, Javits was immediately approached by Dewey's intimate ally, J. Russell Sprague, the powerful leader of Nassau County, who, together with the Brooklyn boss John Crews, urged him to meet with the governor. The two county leaders, who during Dewey's twelve-year reign had grown powerful, and, in Sprague's case, wealthy, agreed that Javits was the only candidate with a chance of defeating the junior Roosevelt. At 4 A.M.,

Javits was summoned to the governor's suite. Wasting no time with pleasantries, not even bothering to shake Javits's hand or rise from the day bed on which reclined, Dewey asked bluntly "Jack, why should we nominate you for Attorney General?" Flustered briefly by the abrupt query, and recalling his last meeting with the governor when he was convinced that he had received Dewey's blessing for New York's mayoral nomination, Javits, as if presenting evidence before a jury, listed to the former prosecutor his qualifications and Roosevelt's weaknesses. After hearing him out, Dewey dismissed him without comment.¹⁵

Back in the room assigned by the party, Javits could only wait while others decided his future. Only hours before the day's proceedings were to commence, Dewey decided on Javits. When Frank Kenna continued his opposition, going so far as threatening to resign, Dewey made the comment that would catapult Javits out of the House and into state politics: "Who else have we got?" It was hardly a ringing endorsement from the leader of his party, but Javits had learned early in life from his brother Ben to take full advantage of every opportunity. He began organizing a "spontaneous" floor demonstration to coincide with his nomination.¹⁶

The delegates dutifully nominated Senator Ives for governor, State Comptroller J. Raymond McGovern as lieutenant governor, Javits as attorney general, and, for comptroller, Frank Del Vecchio, the Onondaga County district attorney. Javits viewed his nomination philosophically: "Since I was from New York City and was Jewish, I balanced the ticket...If I won, I would dispel forever the specter of another Roosevelt in New York politics; if I was defeated, that would be one less maverick to worry about." Revealing his understanding of the retiring governor's motives, Javits admitted that, "Dewey probably considered it a throwaway nomination that might give Ives some extra votes in New York City." In the end, Dewey had given in to Ives's choice. When asked by reporters how he captured the nomination, Javits replied, "If there was no Ives there would be no Javits." Accustomed to overcoming all obstacles thrown in his way, the man who had battled his way out of the Lower East Side vowed to himself to prove all the political experts wrong by devising a strategy leading to victory.¹⁷

Javits was used to the autonomy of his House campaigns, in which he linked himself tenuously to the head of the ticket under the auspices of his liberal Republicanism. He always portrayed himself as an autonomous citizen, running on the Republican and Liberal tickets to appeal to the widest possible spectrum of anti-Tammany voters. In this contest he was the third on a four-man slate, running on the record of the twelve-year administration of Thomas E. Dewey. Javits realized that if he followed the GOP's dual strategy of defending Dewey while attacking Tammany, Roosevelt would seize the opportunity to convince voters that he (Javits) was nothing more than a posturing liberal. Javits had attacked too many of Dewey's programs, along with most Republican domestic measures in the House, to portray himself now as a party regular. That left him with two options: to campaign for the entire ticket, trusting that his efforts in the city combined with the GOP's upstate strength would be enough, or to cut himself off from the Ives campaign and hope that even if the head of the ticket lost, he

would gain enough separate support to win the attorney generalship. Javits's character and political sense left him no alternative: he would go it alone, as he had throughout his career, not counting on anybody but himself. He told supporters: "If I was to make this, I had to go all out in a single unitary campaign against Roosevelt strictly on my own."¹⁸

It was a clever tactic. Because the state constitution stipulated only that the governor and lieutenant governor had to be of the same party, Javits, like Roosevelt, could appear on the ballot separately from his ticket. The result was a race that pitted Harriman and DeLucca against Ives and McGovern, and another setting Javits against Roosevelt. It was the creation of the new ballot that made a Javits victory possible. To prevail, he needed to convince Liberal Party voters that as long as they voted the straight ticket for governor and lieutenant governor, they were free to vote independently for Javits, the "people's attorney." He could not accomplish this if voters considered him an integral part of the Republican ticket. And, as the Liberal Party endorsed the entire Democratic slate, he could not ask its voters, as he did in previous elections, to cast their ballots for him on the Liberal party line. New York City accounted for 45 percent of the vote in state elections in 1954, the city usually delivering a Democratic plurality against that of the GOP upstate. The sole reason for Javits's place on the ticket, as he well knew, was to cut into the Democratic vote in New York City, especially among Jewish liberals. He hoped to accomplish this by divorcing himself from the ticket. He would run on his liberal record in the House and his laudable law experience, targeting Roosevelt, not Harriman, and, because of the new ballot, he could win even if the rest of the ticket went down to defeat.¹⁹

Javits had the nucleus of an organization in place because of having geared up for his House reelection campaign. While he did not have to create a staff from scratch, he did have to establish ties to the various organizations throughout the state. The Brooklyn Republican boss, John Crews, had vouched for Javits with Dewey and stood ready to help in the coming campaign, and the Nassau leader, J. Russell Sprague, also pledged his support. Attempting to assuage boss Tom Curran of Manhattan, Javits, after consulting with the outgoing attorney general Nathaniel Goldstein, appointed as his campaign manager John Trubin, a young attorney with ties to Curran's organization. Their relationship lasted throughout Javits's political career.²⁰

Javits's six-week campaign strategy concentrated almost exclusively on the metropolitan area, where his strength lay. He planned to attack Roosevelt's shaky record in the House (he could do this credibly as not only was his district adjacent to Roosevelt's, but he had observed his opponent on the floor of the House and in the Foreign Affairs Committee where they both served); to spotlight the weak legal career of his opponent, who had never tried a serious case before a jury, and had practiced law for only about three years; to create the belief in voters' minds that the office of attorney general was apolitical; and to publicize Roosevelt's extensive relationship with Tammany Hall's corruption of New York City's federally sponsored urban renewal projects.²¹

In his four races for the House, Javits used radio effectively, his five-minute appeals proving useful in getting his message to the voters. However, radio was

too limiting in a statewide campaign. In addition, any radio spots sponsored by the Republicans would emphasize the head of the ticket rather than the candidate for attorney general. Javits vetoed staged campaign commercials, which were not yet the polished products they would become. Always an innovator, he was the first to use a Roper poll and city-wide radio broadcasts for a congressional campaign. He now chose to concentrate his efforts on the emerging medium of television. Sales of television sets in New York City had soared during the Kefauver Hearings of 1951, and the metropolitan area boasted more of them than any other area of the country; Javits targeted this growing audience. The campaign purchased blocks of time on stations in the metropolitan area as well as the urban markets of Buffalo, Utica, and Albany. This required a vast amount of money, for which Javits turned, as always, to the best fundraiser he knew, his brother Ben.²²

During Jack's dozen years in Washington the brothers became distant, but after Jack lost his mayoral bid in 1953, Ben reached out to his younger brother: "We have grown apart too much...because of your choices and necessities and I am anxious for us to live as brothers should." Ben had many friends in Washington, including Charlie Wilson, Eisenhower's secretary of defense. The campaign ultimately cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, and, as his proud sibling later boasted, "Ben raised all the money."²³

Believing he would be the Democratic nominee for governor, Roosevelt established an extensive campaign organization, with offices throughout the state which he maintained even though most of the party apparatus worked for Harriman. Early in his quest, his chief of public relations, Dick Harrity, informed him that all the experts he consulted agreed that Roosevelt had to come up with an answer to what they believed would be the opposition's "main propaganda weapon," the question: "What is FDR Jr.'s public service record to justify giving him the second most important job in the land?" His advisors believed that the problem of Roosevelt's lack of executive experience "can and must be overcome." With his sights now set on one of the most important law enforcement jobs in the nation, and facing the prospect of Javits's stressing legal qualifications over party affiliation, Roosevelt's dilemma was as acute as ever.

To counter the charge that he was aligned with Tammany, Roosevelt assured his followers that the "New York City leaders of the Democratic party were opposed to me for the nomination for Governor, [but] my nomination was then demanded by the rank and file of the Democratic party." The cynical DeSapio, now aligned with the politician whose campaign for governor he had undermined, did not dispute this claim as long as it brought in the votes. But, not wanting to remind the city's voters of Roosevelt's previous threats against the machine, he made sure that his nominee did much of his campaigning outside the metropolitan area. Roosevelt's early strategy of working primarily in the upstate regions and celebrating the accomplishments of the New and Fair Deals, while relying on his popular name and Tammany to deliver the downstate vote, played right into the tactics of Javits, who emphasized the issue of qualifications while concentrating his efforts almost exclusively in the metropolitan area.²⁵

Roosevelt planned early on for a fractious and cutthroat campaign. While preparing for his place at the top of the ticket, he had made sure to examine the libel laws after one of his operatives informed him that some Republican state legislators were “really waiting for an opportunity to sue for libel, or slander.” One speech writer suggested that Roosevelt obtain “a completely definitive memo on the law of libel and slander so that we can skate close to the edge and not fall in.” Roosevelt’s attack-dog tactics did not change when he received the nod for attorney general instead of governor. In contrast to Javits, he planned to reach for his party’s supporters in general, with speeches at the ready to back the ticket. He set out to portray Dewey as “the evader of the Kefauver Committee [and] the pardoner of [the notorious gangster “Lucky”] Luciano,” and his administration as a “racket” run by political cronies. Harriman attempted to remain above the fray, while Roosevelt canvassed upstate counties attacking Dewey as ineffectual, constantly reminding voters of the scandals that engulfed the last years in office of the governor who had earned the reputation of incorruptible gangbuster. Roosevelt became, in effect, Harriman’s Nixon.²⁶

Roosevelt gave special attention to the harness racetrack scandal that rocked the GOP strongholds of Westchester and Nassau counties in 1953, involving some of the most powerful men in the state GOP. Roosevelt’s pledge to open new investigations, if elected, was one of the main reasons why the bosses of these two counties backed Javits. A major calamity of Dewey’s latter gubernatorial days was the forced resignation of his intimate ally, J. Russell Sprague, from the Republican National Committee when it was revealed that the Nassau boss, together with William Bleakley, Westchester County’s chief, owned large blocks of stock in racetracks they were supposed to be monitoring. The discovery that Dewey’s lieutenant governor, the former state senate majority leader, Arthur Wicks, used his position on the Legislative Committee on Horse Racing to steer business to certain insurance companies connected to the Republican party (a favorite GOP patronage device) brought another resignation. This was the administration that Roosevelt attempted to dissect piecemeal in front of upstate crowds, while, in the city, Javits did the same to Roosevelt’s legislative and legal record.²⁷

Although Javits’s decision to divorce his campaign from the rest of the ticket rested on his assumption that it was the only way to beat Roosevelt, his strategy also helped him to avoid statements condoning the actions of the Dewey administration and the state’s racetracks. When Javits steadfastly refused to discuss the matter, his silence persuaded many GOP bosses to work harder for his election: they had a bigger stake than usual in the outcome of the attorney general’s race.

Javits began his campaign in the heart of his congressional district, during the lunch hour when he could raise the largest crowd. After listing his legal qualifications, congressional accomplishments, and liberal Republican philosophy, he went quickly on the attack. Calling Roosevelt’s legal career “brief at best,” and noting that his opponent had “never built a serious record in Congress,” Javits charged Roosevelt with trading “upon brighter reputations, under the name he bears...instead of working for the high office he seeks but that is beyond his talents.” His opponent was “strangely silent about his qualifications

for a position he so eagerly covets." Javits also dragged out the GOP's favorite electoral device—the specter of Tammany Hall. Reminding his listeners that Tammany's chieftain, Carmine DeSapio, had "hand-picked" the entire Democratic slate, Javits warned that the sinister political machine would not be satisfied with controlling New York City and State, but sought political dominance eventually over the nation. Warming up to the coming battle, he declared, "this mad dream must be defeated." To win, Javits had to destroy the professional reputation of Roosevelt, and his initial speech was an indication of the brutality to come.²⁸

To bring Javits's message to almost every neighborhood in New York City, the campaign used a second-hand bus, covered with pictures of the candidate, on which volunteers spoke from prepared texts to propagate Javits's twin themes: Roosevelt's lackluster congressional career and his legal inexperience. Speakers' kits included outlines for several speeches, one contrasting Javits and Roosevelt's legal qualifications, another generally endorsing Ives and McGovern, and a general stump speech outlining the threat posed by a victory for Roosevelt and Tammany Hall.²⁸

Javits could not personally canvass the entire state; to cover the upstate districts that he relied on Ives to carry, the campaign established numerous phone banks, staffed with volunteers supplied with a manual instructing them to stick to the campaign guidelines and avoid debating with callers. The campaign arranged for Javits to make two live television addresses to upstate audiences shortly before the election.²⁹

From the moment the GOP nominated Javits, Roosevelt took a defensive position, hoping to ignore or sidestep his opponent's thrusts rather than attack his record and qualifications. Javits had an exemplary record in Congress, was known for twelve-hour workdays, and was an accomplished lawyer and active member of the bar since 1927, arguing cases before several state supreme courts. Fully aware of his own deficiencies, Roosevelt planned a strategy of double-talk and obfuscation when it came to describing his own qualifications for attorney general. Cognizant that many of his House colleagues viewed him as a rather lazy representative, the campaign early on stressed Roosevelt's "over 90% attendance record in the last session of Congress" (this tactic required voters to be oblivious to the four years before the election when Roosevelt's attendance record was less than 50 percent). Even press releases could not gloss over his legal inexperience. One early release, meant to put the issue to rest, observed that, "as a lawyer, Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., for the past four years has been the senior partner in a large and important New York law firm, employing over fifty people, including more than twenty lawyers." Javits, in turn, pointed out that even a genius "who did nothing but practice law for three years would not be prepared for the job." When Javits continued to hammer away at Roosevelt's "pitifully short" legal experience, Roosevelt's camp demanded "that Mr. Javits have the decency to apologize for his intemperate and unfactual [*sic*] personal attacks on Mr. Roosevelt's stature and prestige as an attorney."³⁰

Attempting to turn his attack on Tammany against Javits and return the battle to Roosevelt's theme of party identity, the Democratic candidate charged: "In this campaign Javits has become the New York window dressing for the Republican Party." Calling Javits "pretty shabby window dressing at that," Roosevelt asserted that his opponent "owes his political life to these bosses." All Roosevelt's efforts to disguise his limited legal experience and turn the issue to party labels were met with Javits's pronouncement that "the people's lawyer" must be experienced. Javits scored further points by stating that the junior Roosevelt, who hoped to represent the people in the courts, steadfastly refused to debate his Republican opponent. Roosevelt's effort to dodge Javits by making only short, orchestrated visits to New York City, followed quickly by retreats back upstate, proved impossible once Javits began his television barrage.³¹

In the first weeks of the campaign, Javits was stunned to read that DeSapio was charging upstate Republicans with playing down, on consideration of popular anti-Semitism, his place on the ticket. To avoid offending some anti-Jewish upstate voters, the Tammany leader claimed, GOP leaders omitted Javits's name and picture from a list of candidates submitted to the *Syracuse Herald Journal*, a Republican paper. The *Post* and the *Times* subsequently ran editorials questioning the validity of the GOP officials' claim that they had not received Javits's pictures in time to submit them with the rest of the slate. Javits confirmed this excuse, but it is unlikely that his meticulous campaign, which had a special media office at campaign headquarters, would commit such an oversight.³²

Javits took the opportunity of DeSapio's remarks to attack Tammany Hall, Roosevelt, the *Post*, and its liberal editor James A. Wechsler. In a two-page missive answering Wechsler's editorial, "What They Will Do with Him if He ever Reaches Albany?" Javits accused the *Post* of supporting Roosevelt "not because he is especially competent for the job, and not because he has made a distinguished record, but because he is a Democrat." Calling Roosevelt "mere window trimming" for Tammany, Javits observed, quite accurately, that his opponent was chosen by "the boss of Tammany Hall" who "spoon-fed him the nomination for Attorney General" after denying him the nomination for governor, in a desperate attempt to "bolster" the Democratic ticket. "DeSapio is the one who introduced bigotry into this campaign," Javits insisted, and "nothing could have been more calculated to keep this campaign from being fought on its merits." Javits told Wechsler that, "If Carmine DeSapio represents liberalism to you, I can understand why you can't support a Republican like me." The threat of Tammany was always a powerful Republican device among upstate voters, and DeSapio's charges, together with Javits's strong response, threatened to make the machine the overriding issue with liberal Democrats in New York City, an outcome DeSapio wanted to avoid at all costs. Following this episode, the Tammany chieftain lowered his profile.³³

Javits's strategy of concentrating on the metropolitan area hinged on a media campaign that allowed him to present his case before the entire state electorate. He always broadcast his television appearance live in the metropolitan area, and sent copies of the kinescopes to upstate stations for early morning broadcast on weekends, when he hoped most voters would be home. Willing as ever to use the

latest campaign innovations, Javits hired an advertising agency and a producer to help him achieve a glossy, fine-tuned television presentation. When pollsters reported that viewers were changing channels after watching for only a few minutes, Javits added projection screens, photographic blowups, and voice-overs by professional narrators. The new professional spots were reportedly more successful with viewers.³⁴

Roosevelt's television campaign was put on hold by party leaders after he lost the gubernatorial nomination. Harriman was not about to give a statewide platform to a rival placed on the ticket solely for party unity and name recognition. Roosevelt had not devised a television campaign for attorney general, and Javits's polished television attacks put him on the defensive early on. His campaign quickly purchased television time, used almost exclusively to counter Javits's accusations, but, caught off-balance from the outset, Roosevelt never went on the offensive. Refusing to confront Javits one-on-one, he continued to fight a rear-guard effort against his rival's charges and attacks, while Javits continually cut into his liberal base in New York City. DeSapio's instructions to Roosevelt to remain upstate courting the rural vote, making as few visits to the city as possible, further weakened the candidate's position in the metropolis.

Meanwhile, Ives ran a lackadaisical campaign, losing rather than gaining votes with each succeeding day. Never an aggressive campaigner, he was often still in his pajamas at 11 A.M. Dutifully criss-crossing the state, he warned the party faithful of the ever-present dangers of a Tammany victory, which would include a drastic cutback in state aid to upstate counties, a charge Harriman immediately labeled "a contemptible lie." The Democrats styled their campaign as a referendum on the "failed" and "corrupt" Dewey administration, and paid little attention to Senator Ives's qualifications or record. Insulted by constant attacks on his administration from Harriman and Roosevelt, and thus from Tammany, Dewey decided it was time to infuse some fire into the GOP's gubernatorial effort. The governor persuaded Ives to go on the offensive and attack Harriman personally. Canceling his upstate speaking engagements, Ives dramatically rushed back to the city, declaring that he would make a statewide television address the following day with "startling and shocking" revelations concerning Harriman.³⁵

Ever the prosecutor, Dewey resurrected charges made a quarter-century earlier against Harriman's shipping line, in which, after a thorough congressional investigation, Harriman was cleared of complicity in the scandal. Nevertheless, Ives, in a statewide television hook-up, accused his Democratic opponent of lifelong involvement in Tammany corruption. Displaying twenty-year old clippings, Ives predicted that if Harriman were elected, "Tammany Hall will make away with everything in the state except the steps of the state capital."³⁶

Although Javits declared that the accusations were baseless, and strongly advised his friend not to pursue them, Ives continued his personal attacks throughout the remaining weeks of the campaign. Harriman, he claimed, was an anti-labor union buster (a charge disputed by American Federation of Labor

President George Meany); did business with Hitler during World War II (Harriman subsequently proved he had pulled his money out of Poland in 1934); and, as a participant at the Yalta Conference, was "soft on communism."³⁷

Harriman, with a growing lead in the polls, confidently stumped the state. The attacks, he asserted, only demonstrated that his opponent was a "very desperate man." Adlai Stevenson, the former Illinois governor and Democratic standard bearer, remarked that New York's GOP leaders were "soaring through the gutter, right behind Governor Dewey." Javits's statements sincerely praising Harriman's integrity must have helped his electoral prospects, however unintentionally; claims that the Democratic gubernatorial candidate was a creature of Tammany kept alive the issue of machine politics and bolstered the case for an independent "people's lawyer" as attorney general.³⁸

Javits's most serious charge against his rival was Roosevelt's involvement in a Title I slum clearance and low-income project in his Manhattan district that was under investigation by House and Senate subcommittees. Manhattantown, a vast area of the Upper West Side of Manhattan targeted for urban renewal by the federal government, had become synonymous with political corruption and the uprooting of black residents. Community efforts to limit the size of the project and keep it for low-income blacks, rather than middle-income whites, were unsuccessful. While Roosevelt continually promised his constituents, most of them black and living in the condemned buildings, that the new project would not discriminate on a racial or economic basis, he ignored all calls to fulfill his pledge. Developers connected to Tammany were allowed, according to an investigative reporter, to "squeeze rent from black occupants of condemned buildings," and then build luxury high-rises rather than low-income housing on the sites. When reporters questioned Roosevelt, a member of the law firm that represented these so-called developers, about his involvement, he complained indignantly that the press "has tried to twist something I am proud of into something that they would make reprehensible."³⁹

In his most effective television broadcast, Javits staged a mock trial of Roosevelt's involvement with Manhattantown. Asking voters to "examine the evidence," Javits documented Roosevelt's connection, testimony before the Senate subcommittee investigating it, newspaper files, interviews, and a photographic montage comparing Roosevelt's scandal-ridden Manhattantown with the Title I showcase project in his district. Javits revealed for the first time that Roosevelt had filed the incorporation papers for the original investors, who subsequently, according to congressional testimony, "siphoned off more than six-hundred thousand dollars in profits." He queried, "was Mr. Roosevelt the fall guy for a group of ruthless, greedy speculators, or, still worse: did he know exactly what was going on?" In either case, Roosevelt appeared unqualified for the office he sought. After describing the money-making schemes uncovered in congressional testimony, and citing the observations of various good government organizations that had visited the site, Javits asked, "Who comes first in your book, Mr. Roosevelt—your constituents or the Manhattantown syndicate?" The next morning's papers carried Roosevelt's wan response citing unnamed "distortions" in Javits's presentation.⁴⁰

In the closing days of the campaign, Dorothy Schiff, the owner of the *New York Post*, acknowledged that many registered Democrats and Liberals were “seriously considering splitting their ballot” to vote for Javits. Schiff, a supposed friend, then accused Javits of attempting to bribe her for the paper’s endorsement by taking her to dinner and a Broadway show. Labelling FDR Jr. an “independent Democrat with Liberal party support” who opposed the Tammany machine, she made no attempt to explain his place on the Tammany ticket. Instead, she declared herself “disgusted that Jack [Javits] had so little self-respect” as to accept a place on Ives’s ticket, finding further fault with Javits’s divorce from the main ticket: “Sometimes he is not loyal to his own team. At other times he is.” “It is microscopically clear,” the editorial concluded, “that when you are untrue to yourself, it follows naturally that you cannot be true to others.”⁴¹

Javits could not let the attack go unanswered. The *Post* had a large circulation among the audience he targeted—Liberals, independent Democrats, and Jews of both persuasions. True to form, he sent Schiff a legal brief disguised as a letter to the editor, contending that,

No one will believe that any major candidate hoped to get the *Post*’s endorsement by buying the publisher dinner. The owners of the *Times*, *Herald-Tribune*, *World-Telegram*, and *Sun*, the *Brooklyn Eagle*, *Newsday*, and the *Amsterdam News*, which support me, will be amazed at Mrs. Schiff’s naive suggestion.

Arguing that a liberal wing within the Republican Party was essential, Javits queried: “When did a liberal philosophy come from Tammany Hall?” Roosevelt “took the nomination for Attorney General as a gift from the Tammany boss...is this a compromise that Mrs. Schiff wants *Post* readers to endorse?” He maintained (and hoped) that *Post* readers “will not be slaves to a name.”⁴²

On election eve, a dangerously over-confident Roosevelt pleaded with his followers not to cast “bullet votes” only for him, but for “for the entire Democratic ticket from top to bottom.” But Jesse Sharlette, the Democratic Committee Chairman of Essex County, reflected the views of many supporters in a telegram wishing Roosevelt luck while omitting the rest of the ticket.⁴³

On the Sunday before the election, Javits gave his last television address, continuing his relentless attack on Roosevelt’s meager qualifications, and appealing to New Yorkers by pledging to protect, among other liberties, the rent control laws. Both his staff reports and growing volume of mail gave him some indication that many Liberal party members would vote the straight ticket except for attorney general, for which office they would choose him, the “peoples attorney.”⁴⁴

Election night found Javits, his brother Ben, and his staff at their quarters in the Roosevelt Hotel in mid-town Manhattan. The morning and afternoon reports from New York City indicated a large Democratic turnout; by late evening, Republicans throughout the state prepared for the inevitable. Javits was watching

the return on television, when, he later related, a "grim-faced" Tom Dewey entered his suite. Pulling Javits into the bathroom and closing the door for privacy, the lame-duck governor told him it was over, time for the entire Republican ticket to concede. Taken aback by Dewey's abrupt request, Javits protested that it was far too early to count the ticket out. The governor then hurried to Ives's suite to repeat his instructions; minutes later, Ives, after brushing off Javits's plea to wait, went before the cameras to concede the election to Harriman at 10:16 P.M.

Disgusted by Dewey and Ives's concessions, Javits sat glumly watching the late returns, until, at a little past 2:00 A.M., he was summoned to Dewey's suite. The governor, surrounded by the rest of the ticket, told him he was impounding all voting machines and ballot boxes in the state, and ordering a recount. By this time, Ives had almost closed the gap with Harriman, and the governor feared that without immediate action Tammany would succeed in "stealing" the election. Within an hour, Javits watched in astonishment as Roosevelt stood before the cameras and conceded the election to him. The rest of the GOP ticket did not fare so well.⁴⁶

When the final tally was taken, Harriman defeated Ives by a mere 11,125 votes of the almost 3.5 million cast. The Democrats elected a governor, lieutenant governor, and comptroller, but Harriman's coattails were not strong enough to carry Roosevelt, who trailed the head of the ticket by 123,000 votes. Javits defeated the junior Roosevelt by 172,899 votes, and, although he did not carry New York City, proved his electoral strength to the paladins of the GOP by running 85,000 votes ahead of the Republican ticket in the Tammany stronghold.⁴⁷

On Long Island, Sprague's Nassau machine helped Javits garner 240,075 votes, almost doubling Roosevelt's 122,281. Javits swept Suffolk County even more convincingly, polling 90,578 votes against Roosevelt's 30,952.

The election was something of a social and cultural anomaly. In New York City, a blue-blooded Protestant was defeated by a Jewish candidate born to the city's streets. In the more ethnically traditional upstate area, where Roosevelt concentrated his campaign, Javits's organization and strategy, coupled with his ability to hold down the New York City majority gleaned by a powerful Democratic machine and a name revered by liberals, resulted in victory for a city-bred son of Jewish immigrants.

His stunning victory placed Javits at the head of the list of GOP contenders for the 1960 gubernatorial nomination. Even if Ives had been victorious, he would have been only a caretaker governor, not Dewey's political successor. Javits believed that he was the logical choice for that position. After all, he alone put an end to the political fortunes of another Roosevelt, and defeated a resurgent Tammany Hall. His four-year term would give him the opportunity to build a statewide organization, and the exposure of his new office would give him an excellent opportunity to place his ideas and his face before the public.

There is no doubt that when the campaign began it was Roosevelt's election to lose. He entered the race with the most recognizable name in modern American politics, a matinee-idol face and voice to go with it, and a war chest that far

outmatched his opponent's. Yet, he was the sole Democrat to go down to defeat. The reason lies in his place on the ticket (his legal qualifications would not have been deemed so important had he been nominated for governor); his tactic of avoiding New York City—he was rarely present to answer Javits's barrage of charges; the relentless campaign of his opponent, who from the beginning shaped the debate and made qualification rather than party affiliation the sole criterion for the position of attorney general; and, instead of focusing on the office he sought, campaigning as a liberal Democrat asking voters to elect the entire ticket. Understandably, he played down his qualifications, never explaining why he, as a specific individual, should fill a particular office. In retrospect, Roosevelt's entire campaign played directly into Javits's stratagem of stressing legal qualifications and divorcing the attorney general's race from the rest of the ticket.

The *Syracuse Herald Journal* best summed it up when its editor. "Casey" Jones, a former president of the National Association of Editors, wrote: "Jack Javits is as glamorous as a dead fish. All he has is a fine record and a lot of brains. He simply explained the requirements of the office of attorney general." Adding insult to injury, he concluded, "all the charm and glamour were on the other side." Eleanor Roosevelt weighed in with her epitaph on the election when she told a friend that her son was defeated "because they put a *very good* Jew against him. Ordinarily he has the Jewish vote but much of it had to vote for a good Jew."⁴⁸

NOTES

1. Frank J. Munger and Ralph A. Straetz, *New York Politics* (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1960), 39, 60-61; Tammany Hall would not dominate another statewide election after 1954.

2. *New York Times*, 22, 10, 21 Sept. 1954.

3. Arthur S. Moscowitz, "An Introduction to an Urban Politician: The Electoral Campaigns of Jacob K. Javits, 1946-1956," M.A. essay, Columbia University, 1974, 21.

4. For Javits-Ives collaboration, see Federal Fair Employment Practice Act, *Hearings before the House Committee on Education and Labor*, 81st Cong., 1st sess.; National Health Program, 1949, *Hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare*, 81st Cong., 2d sess.; Discrimination and Full Utilization of Manpower Resources, *Senate, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*, 82d Cong., 1st sess.; Anti-Discrimination in Employment," *Senate, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*, 83d Cong., 2d sess. Javits and Ives called on Secretary of State John Foster Dulles together on several occasions to help insure what they believed to be the proper security for Israel ("Dear Jake," 24 Sept. 1954, John Foster Dulles Papers, Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library, Princeton University, Box 82); *New York Times*, 14, 18 Oct. 1953; Jacob Javits and Rafael Steinberg, *The Autobiography of a Public Man* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981) 202-3; *New York Times*, 10, 16 Sept. 1954.

5. *New York Times*, 20, 21 Sept. 1954. Kenna nominated Sam Rabin, a liberal Jewish

assemblyman. It was a good tactic; if party leaders were interested only in an ethnic or religious type, rather than a particular candidate, Kenna might have nullified Javits's chances in the interest of party unity, as he had done so successfully in 1953.

6. *Ibid.*, 17, 21 Sept. 1954; Bamet David Skolnik, "Jacob K Javits in 1954. Portrait of an Election," B.A. thesis, Harvard University, March 1962, 13.

7. Chris McNickle, *To Be Mayor of New York: Ethnic Politics in the City* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1993), 108-9.

8. E. J. Kahn Jr., "Plenipotentiary I & II: Profile of Averell Harriman," *The New Yorker* (3, 10 May 1952), 131-33; Rudy Abramson, *Spanning the Century: The Life and Times of W. Averell Harriman, 1891-1986* (New York: William Morrow, 1992), 506-9; Roosevelt attempted to gain the gubernatorial nomination in 1950 but was thwarted by Tammany and the former New Dealer Jim Farley (*New York Times*, 26 Jan., 20 Feb., 14, 26 Mar. 1950).

9. In a special 1949 election to fill Sol Bloom's seat in the 20th Cong. Dis. (adjacent to Javits's in upper Manhattan), Roosevelt easily defeated his A.L.P., Republican, and Democratic opponents; his Fair Deal coalition was made up of Liberals and reform Democrats who broke with Tammany over the machine's opposition to a Roosevelt candidacy (Ben Davidson, Columbia Oral History Project, Butler Library, Columbia University, New York); McNickle, 70-71; Warren Moscow, *The Last of the Big-Time Bosses: The Life and Times of Carmine DeSapio and the Decline and Fall of Tammany Hall* (New York: Stein & Day, 1971, 74-75; Abramson, 505. Harriman had only a handful of pledged delegates outside of New York State, but was the second choice of many at the 1952 Democratic National Convention; the labor leader, Walter Reuther, secretly promised FDR Jr. second spot on a ticket with Stevenson if he could persuade Harriman to throw his support behind Stevenson before the first ballot (see Abramson, 485-504; E. J. Kahn Jr., "Plenipotentiary I & II: Profile of Averell Harriman," *The New Yorker*, 3, 10 May 1952, 131-33).

10. Moscowitz, 19; *New York Times*, 28 May. 1952.

11. When it became apparent that Wagner would win the 1953 Democratic primary, Roosevelt gave a televised endorsement (statement of Rep. Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. [D-Lib., NY] with respect to the Democratic primary for mayor of the city of New York, 2 Aug. 1953, Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. Papers, Box 110T); untitled list of upstate counties, *ibid.*, Series IV, Box 110P, 1954 campaign. When Roosevelt sent political operatives throughout the state to test the waters for his gubernatorial run, they found many instances of "certain problems with the Catholics"; many Catholics had not forgotten or forgiven Eleanor Roosevelt for her persistent effort to eliminate federal and state aid to parochial schools, and her feud with Francis Cardinal Spellman. Farley's comment was made to trusted aides on a transatlantic cruise to Ireland.

12. Abramson, 505; the day before the Democratic primary, State Democratic Chairman Richard H. Balch released the outcome, in percentages, of a statewide poll as Wagner 25.7, Roosevelt 23.2, and Harriman 23; before the poll was commissioned, the popular Wagner announced his decision not to seek the nomination (*New York Times*, 13 Sept. 1954).

13. Eleanor Roosevelt took revenge on Harriman at the 1956 National Democratic convention, when she threw her support behind Adlai Stevenson's candidacy, confiding to reporters that Harriman "was overrated on foreign policy"; she avenged DeSapio's treatment of her son by forming the Reform Democratic movement which helped unseat the Tammany boss (see Joseph P. Lash, *Eleanor, The Years Alone* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), 274-46; Abramson, 508, 541; *New York Times*, 22 Sept. 1954; Moscow, 121-23; Jordan A. Schwartz, *Liberal: Ado4f A. Berle and the Vision of an American Era* [New York: The Free Press,

1987], 312).

14. Aaron Jacoby, the original nominee for comptroller, withdrew when it was revealed that he had been involved in the Walker bus scandals of 1934—DeSapio did not want his ticket stained by past Tammany scandals. Jacoby was replaced by Arthur Levitt, the president of the New York City Board of Education, who shared his faith and so balanced the ticket by religion if not by region (FDR Jr. Papers, Series IV, Box 110P, 1954 campaign; McNickle, 110); the Republican state chairman released a poll indicating that in the off-year elections, with neither Dewey nor Eisenhower heading the ticket, the Republican vote would fall off by 13 percent (*New York Times*, 21, 22 Sept. 1954).

15. Sprague, with interests in several racetracks, was implicated in the scandals of 1953 and 1954; throughout the 1954 campaign, Roosevelt targeted the relationship between Sprague and Dewey (Richard Norton Smith, *Thomas E. Dewey and His Times* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982), 612-13; *Buffalo Times Union*, 3, 11, 19 Oct. 1954; *Newsday*, 11, 14, 17, 19 Sept. and 26, 25, 28 Oct. 1954); Moscowitz, 21, 24; *Time Magazine* (October 1956); Smith, 618.

16. Javits Papers, Series 14 \ ss 1 \ Oral History Tape 462; Javits, 202-4.

17. *New York Times*, 24 Sept. 1954; Javits Papers, Series 14 \ ss 1 \ Oral History Tape 462; Skolnick, 28-29; *Time Magazine*, (October 1956), 24; *New York Times*, 22 Sept. 1954.

18. Javits Papers, Series 14 \ sub-series (ss) 1 \ Oral History Tape 462.

19. The Liberal party nominated Harriman and DeLuca as well as Arthur Levitt, but several delegates refused to cast their lot with the junior Roosevelt and voted instead for Javits, who had represented their interests in Washington for eight years; though not a significant number, the vote indicated that Javits still had a following within the state's third party; queried about the Liberals seeming inconsistency (the party had praised Javits's liberal record for eight years), Alex Rose noted that his party was following a "pattern of coalition with the Democratic Party" (*New York Times*, 24 Sept. 1954). The Jewish vote had gone primarily to Democratic candidates since 1932 (see Lawrence H. Fuchs, *The Political Behavior of American Jews* [New York: The Free Press, 1956], 145-49).

20. Sprague and Westchester boss William Bleakley were anxious to have a Republican attorney general; both had been implicated in the racetrack scandals the previous year and did not want the investigation reopened as Roosevelt promised to do if elected.

21. The metropolitan area, with which Javits was most concerned, consisted of the five boroughs of New York City and the suburban bedroom communities of Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester counties, which had significant populations of former New Yorkers, Republicans, and Jews to whom Javits hoped to appeal.

22. *A Study of the Attitudes on the Current Political Issues of Voters in the 21st Congressional District*, Javits Papers, Series 5 \ ss 2 \ Box 17; William Manchester, *The Glory and the Dream: A Narrative History of America, 1932-1972* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973), 714-21; David Halberstram, *The Fifties* (New York: Villiard Books, 1993), 191-93.

23. Ben to Jack, 19 July 1953, Javits Papers, Series 8 / ss 1 / Box 3; Series 14 \ ss 1, Oral History Tape 462; Ben Javits to Morris Miller, 23 July 1954, Series \ ss 1 \ Box 4; The GOP state finance chairman, Jock Whitney, a multi-millionaire who admired Jack and supported him in his previous campaign, helped Ben raise the funds.

24.. Party bosses cited Roosevelt's lack of legislative experience as one reason why they chose Harriman (Dear Frank, 12 May 1954, FDR Jr. Papers, Series IV, Box 110P; see also *New York Times*, 23, 24 Sept. 1954).

25. Speeches, 11, 18 October 1954, FDR Jr. Papers, Series IV, Box 110P, 1954 campaign.

26. Dear Franklin, 20 January 1954, *ibid*; summoned to the Kefauver Committee hearings in New York City, Dewey claimed to be "indisposed" (Dewey had commuted the sentence of organized crime boss Lucky Luciano, who subsequently was deported to Italy), proposed radio address on hypocrisy of ethics code, undated, *ibid*. (see Mary M. Stolberg, *Fighting Organized Crime: Politics, Justice, and the Legacy of Thomas E. Dewey* [Boston: Northeastern Univ. Press, 1995], 260-62).

27. Speech before the Democratic Committee of Onondaga County, 14 Mar. 1954. FDR Jr. Papers, Series IV, Box 110P; *New York Times*, 15 Mar. 1954.

28. Speech, 11 October 1954, Javits Papers, Series 5 \ ss 2, Box 35.

29. Speech Kit, *ibid*.

30. To all Committee Chairmen, from Mrs. John Loeb, *ibid*., series 14 \ ss 1 \ Oral History Tape 462; Ben persuaded some Wall Street brokerage houses to volunteer their phone banks in the evenings for the Javits campaign; *ibid*., 457; The *Brooklyn Eagle* accurately noted that, "during the last six months of the 83rd Congress, when he was busy seeking the nomination for governor, Mr. Roosevelt's record of voting on bills was 44 percent," comparing that with Javits's 89 percent when seeking the 1953 nomination for mayor (*Brooklyn Eagle*, 8, 11, 19 Oct. 1954); speech, 18 Oct. 1954, Javits Papers, Series 5 \ ss 1 \ Box 35; "Multer and Stevens Named Co-chairmen of Committee for Election of Roosevelt for Attorney General," 14 October 1954, FDR Jr. Papers, Box 111.

31. Press Release, 14 Oct. 1954, FDR Jr. Papers, Box 111; *New York Post*, 9 Oct. 1954.

32. Although Javits denied any hint of anti-Semitism in the race, after reviewing results from several upstate counties following the election, he conceded privately that his poor showing there was a combination of "the faith thing" and ultra-conservatism in many rural farm areas of upstate" (Skolnik, 61); seeking the liberal Jewish swing vote, a tradition in New York elections, Javits and Roosevelt stressed their commitments to Israel and understanding of the special needs and concerns of Jewish voters (Javits to the New York Guild for the Jewish Blind, 10 Oct. 1954, Javits Papers, Series 5 \ ss 2 \ Box 35; interview with Dr. Hillel Seidman, September 1954, FDR Jr. Papers, Box 110, and "Roosevelt Attacks Shipping Arms to Arabs," October 1954, Box 111); 1954 Campaign Budget, 270 Park Avenue, Javits Papers Series 5 \ ss 2 \ Box 35.

33. Letter to editor, 8 Oct. 1954, *ibid*., Box 4; *New York Post*, 8, 9 Oct. 1954; *New York Times*, 8 Oct. 1954.

34. Javits Papers, Series 14 \ ss 1 \ Oral History Tape 462; Special Events, Peck Advertising Agency, Series 5 \ ss 2 \ Box 94; the producer, Shiela Kelly, joined Javits's staff after the election.

35. Harriman Campaign Speeches, Liberal Party Papers, New York Public Library, Box 23; *New York Times*, 22, 23 Oct. 1954; Roosevelt, who used the same theme while seeking the gubernatorial nomination, charged the Dewey administration with bringing "murder and corruption" to the state (television address, 16 Oct. 1954; speech, Democratic Party rally, Ithaca, 16 Oct. 1954, FDR Jr. Papers, Box 111 (following the 1954 campaign, Roosevelt was

condemned for campaign invective [*New York Times*, 31 Oct. 1954]; Skolnik, 34-35; *New York Times*, 16, 20 Oct. 1954; Dewey was not above personal attacks, and during the 1953 New York City mayoral contest described Rudolph Halley "as stupid and ignorant as he is shallow and venomous," and labeled Democratic nominee Robert Wagner as "stupid and crazy" (Smith, 612); *New York Times*, 19 Oct. 1954.

36. The case involved a \$250,000 payment to a Tammany operative for pier leases (Abramson, 510-14); *New York Times*, 20 Oct. 1954.

37. Javits Papers, Series 14 \ ss 1, Oral History Tape 462; *New York Times*, 24, 30 Oct. 1954; Abramson, 512-13.

38. Harriman Campaign Speeches, Liberal Party Papers, Box 23; *New York Times*, 31 and 19 Oct. 1954.

39. Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949 was an effort to replace slums with middle-income housing; Albert Cole, the Federal Housing administrator, had ordered an examination of all aspects of the project, including a complete audit of Manhattantown Incorporated (Schwartz, 300-301). While Roosevelt campaigned for the gubernatorial nomination, the *World - Telegram and Sun* ran a series detailing his involvement with firms friendly to Tammany which were reaping enormous profits from the project (press release, 20 July 1954, FDR Jr. Papers, Box 110S; *World Telegram and Sun*, 17 to 20 July 1954; Schwartz, xvi-xvii, 159, 169-70, 190-91; press release, 20 July 1954, FDR Jr. Papers, Box 110S).

40. *The Manhattantown Scandal*, WABC Television, 23 Oct. 1954, Javits Papers, Series 5 \ ss 2 \ Box 4; the Morningside Title 1 project in Javits's district became a showcase and was an obligatory stop for visiting housing officials (see *Hearings U.S. Congress, Senate Banking and Currency Committee*, vol. 49 [New York City, October 1954]; Schwartz, 194-97). Roosevelt had incorporated Manhattantown in 1950; its director, Samuel Caspert, was described by the *New York Times* as a "former city marshal and minor Democratic politician" (photostats of incorporation, Javits Papers, Series 5 \ ss 2 \ Box 4; *New York Times*, 2 Oct. 1954); the Women's City Club of New York described the Manhattantown relocation of tenants as "sub-human in concept and inadequate in execution" (see *Hearings U.S. Congress, Senate Banking and Currency Committee*, vol. 49 [New York City, October 1954] 82, 93).

41. Javits Papers, Series 8 \ ss 2 \ Box 19; *New York Post*, 29 Oct. 1954.

42. Javits was the only Republican candidate endorsed by the *Amsterdam News* and the *Brooklyn Eagle*. He reprinted the *Eagle's* endorsement as a campaign leaflet ("Eagle Supports Javits as Best Equipped for Attorney General," Javits Papers, Series 5 \ ss 1 \ Box 4; "Letter to editor," *New York Post*, 1 Nov. 1954 (Javits Papers, Series 8 \ ss 2, Box 19).

43. Press release, "Roosevelt Warns Democrats About Over Confidence: Emphasizes Party Unity," FDR Jr. Papers, box 111; telegram, 31 Oct. 1954 (ibid., box 110S).

44. Television address, 31 Oct. 1954, Javits Papers, Series 5 \ ss 1 \ Box 4; Phyllis Adams to Jack Javits, 28 Oct. 1954, ibid.; Liberal Party leaders distributed leaflets warning against ticket splitting (1954 Campaign Literature, Liberal Party Papers, Box 13).

45. Javits Papers, Series 14 \ ss 1 \ Tape 462; Javits, 207-10.

46. Ibid.

47. Javits ran ahead of Ives in all the downstate counties where he concentrated his efforts, which included Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, Rockland, Putnam, Orange, and the five boroughs of New York City.

48. Paul DeBemadis to Frank, FDR Jr. Papers Box 110S; *Syracuse Herald Journal*, 4 Nov. 1954; Lash, 274-75.

NAZIS ON LONG ISLAND

By Lucas Hanft

Paul D. Schreiber High School, Port Washington

Faculty advisor: David L. O'Connor

After the First World War devastated Europe, many defeated countries faced economic collapse. One of these was Germany, which had the additional burden of war debts imposed by the Treaty of Versailles. Given this state of crisis, the people looked for scapegoats. New groups and individuals rose to power, manipulating the public's search for the cause of strife. One of these groups was the Nazi party.

During the period of the creation and consolidation of Nazi power, a substantial number of Germans migrated to the United States. According to one historian, 354,182 Germans arrived between 1924 and 1933. The overwhelming majority came in search of opportunity, including many who left to avoid becoming victims of Nazi persecution. This article addresses the small but committed number, some eight to ten thousand strong, who came for the purpose of planting Nazi ideology in the minds of the American people. The most prominent of these pro-Hitler, anti-Semitic groups were the Friends of New Germany (FONG) and its successor, the German-American Bund.¹

The leaders of these organizations perceived that acceptance by Americans of a concept as undemocratic as Nazism required cloaking it in American terms. Thus, the German-American Bund manifested American beliefs and images, and incorporated American customs in its propaganda. The marketing of Nazism took place across the United States. A representative example was Camp Siegfried, the Bund's forty-five-acre Long Island base at Yaphank, in Suffolk County.

Before exploring the German-American Bund's activities on Long Island, it may be useful to examine the origin, goals, and leadership of American Nazism. The harbinger was the National Socialist Teutonia Association, organized in Detroit in 1924 by two pairs of brothers—Gritz and Peter Gissbl, and Alfred E. and Frank von Friedersdorff.²

Teutonia disintegrated when, in 1931, a foreign branch of the National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP), established in New York City, declared that members of Teutonia did not belong to the NSDAP and therefore were impostors. The NSDAP, in turn, gave way to Friends of New Germany as the leading Nazi party in the United States. FONG was headed by Heinz Spanknoebel, a former member both of Teutonia and the NSDAP. Spanknoebel left the NSDAP because of conflicts within the organization in April 1933. In July, he formed the new organization, headquartered in Yorkville, the principal German district of New York City. Spanknoebel's organization was marred by a crudely expressed totalitarian, anti-Semitic, and militaristic propaganda that led to its downfall. In October 1935, after FONG failed in its attempts at "Americanizing," the leadership in Germany denounced Spanknoebel and his

organization. It may have seemed inconsistent for the power base in Germany to repudiate a group engaged in spreading its doctrine in the United States. However, although most Americans were sympathetic to Britain, France, and the other "decadent democracies," the nation was officially neutral and the Nazis did not want to risk overplaying their hand. Some well-known and highly respected Americans, including Henry Ford and Charles A. Lindbergh, had good things to say about Hitler. Accordingly, the Germans were concerned that FONG's extremist policy would alienate Americans and galvanize public opinion against the Nazis.³

Now cut off from Nazi Germany, FONG's prominence in America diminished. It was time to make drastic changes in its basic ideology by striving for further "Americanization" in hopes of gaining a wider audience. In April 1936, the German-American Bund was formed by Nazi sympathizers, who wanted a stronger political and social platform than that of the disavowed FONG. Selected as *bundesfuehrer* of the new organization was Fritz Kuhn, a member of FONG. Ironically, Kuhn's previous occupation was as a chemist for Henry Ford, whose Dearborn *Independent*, in 1930-1921, "became notorious for its anti-Semitic articles on 'Jewish Activities in the United States.'" The new organization soft-pedalled the extent of its pro-Nazi position, and tried to adopt a veneer of American culture to appear less hostile and more benign. The Bundists professed allegiance to America by swearing "to honor and defend the Constitution, the flag and institutions of the United States of America." However, their oath went on to declare that the Bund opposed the "intermixture between Aryans and Asiatics, Africans and other non-Aryans," and aimed "To fight communism [and] to break up the dictatorship of the Jewish-international minority." The pledge exemplified the Bund's strategic veneer of American beliefs, which was only a cover for an unabashedly pro-Hitler group that sought to export the philosophy of National Socialism to America.

This conflict between actual loyalty to Nazi Germany and cosmetic loyalty to the United States would play itself out over the history of the Bund. It also became a key factor in the organization's demise at the hands of the House Un-American Activities Committee, commonly known as HUAC.⁴

Many telling examples demonstrate the extent to which the strategy of wrapping pro-Nazi beliefs in American vernacular characterized both FONG and the Bund. On a poster advertising a FONG rally at Camp Siegfried, the segments in bold type were antiwar, anti-German, and anti-Nazi. Headlines read "Revolution," "Nazi Storm Troops," "Hitlerism in America," "Down with Germany," and "Boycott German Goods," sentiments favored by a majority of Americans. A casual reader may have considered attending the rally. However, the copy in smaller type revealed the driving force behind the poster. FONG was merely masking its intention to appeal to its American neighbors and convince as many as possible to attend the rally, find the message attractive, and possibly convert to Nazism. Over the headlines a small paragraph stated that, "Here in the United States the Jews wail, cry, and lie, because their brothers in Germany are deprived of their dominating position. From here they shout: 'Down with Germany.'" The apparent combination of American and Nazi beliefs turned a

seemingly innocent poster into a piece of Nazi propaganda. As Fritz Kuhn put it, this made Camp Siegfried “part of Germany in America.” This type of American activity with an underlying fascist scheme was all too familiar to the streets of Yaphank.⁵

On a June day in 1938, a parade at Yaphank started at the Washington Hotel and the fair grounds and continued along the main street of the village. Music was playing, and, after dancing and enjoying themselves, people lined the streets to cheer the marchers and celebrate the joyous event. More than 3,000 spectators, 2,500 of whom were Yaphank residents, observed the parade. Lucky raffle-ticket holders won refrigerators and gift certificates. After the parade, there was a performance, with singing and dancing.

Now, let us complete the picture. The marchers were members of the Bund, including Fritz Kuhn, its president. Almost everyone in the parade wore a swastika, and many carried Nazi flags. The performance after the parade, according to the *Lindenhurst Star*, “depicted the rise of the German Empire as God’s appointed nation on earth, made sport of the Catholic and Jewish peoples and their religious beliefs,” and portrayed a nun sexually involved with a priest. All this came from a group that stated that its “object was true Americanism.”⁶

The turnout for this celebration was comparatively low. According to the *Mid-Island Mail*, upwards of five thousand people showed up for a parade in July 1936, and four thousand attended a Nazi picnic in 1937. Such wholesome American activities as parades, picnics, and festivals were turned into ugly displays of fascism. The German-American Bund used sophisticated propaganda, adapting American activities into celebrations of Hitler and Nazism.⁷

Yaphank Bundists attended town hall meetings, participated in politics, and had their local hangouts. Indeed, the Bund was a functioning part of the village culture, with road signs written in English and German; several beer halls near Camp Siegfried were draped with giant Nazi flags, with huge swastikas in the center surrounded by rays of light. One such establishment was *Saengerbund Halle*, upon entering which a patron was greeted by a large picture of Hitler and signs reading *Willkommen*.

The Bund’s influence in Yaphank extended to renaming streets for Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and other Nazi leaders, a situation not rectified until 1960, when a Patchogue newspaper reported: “Today, Adolf Hitler Street is Park Street. The names of the other Nazi heroes are gone.” However, many citizens of Yaphank not only did not participate, but staged an anti-Bund campaign. One such person was Gustave Neuss, a justice of the peace.⁸

The story of Gustave Neuss reflected, in many ways, the story of the Bund in America. Neuss extended a great deal of courtesy to the Bund, even granting a permit to march on Sunday, 18 August 1935, for which he allowed bilingual traffic signs to help German-speaking people from New York City find the fairgrounds. However, when Neuss gave the Bund some leeway, the Bundists became much more active and their speeches more inflammatory, with blatant anti-Semitic references. In mid-July 1935, a Bund member, “after placing a skull and crossbones overlay on a swastika flag ordained it the ‘flag of world Jewry’

and trampled it.” As a result, Neuss ended his sympathy for the Bund and became vehemently anti-Nazi and antifascist. He fought to remove Henry Hauck, a Bund member, from the Yaphank fire department. Hauck, it turned out, was funneling funds from the force to the Bund.⁹

In addition, having received complaints about Bundists’ robbing berry patches and orchards, Neuss registered a complaint against the Nazi crowds at Yaphank. Furthermore, he objected to the habit of some Bundists of walking through the streets wearing little clothing:

I saw a 250-pound woman walking around there in only shorts and a halter a week ago. She was bubbling out all over. Recently, I stopped a fellow who was walking, through Main Street, wearing only a pair of shorts rolled down as far as they would go and up and far as they would go.... The colony is far from an asset to Yaphank. When it was first mentioned several years ago, I visualized a group of Germans of my father’s type, but they’ve turned out to be just a bunch of Hitlerites.”¹⁰

The Bund retaliated, in 1937, by leading a campaign against Neuss, who was running for the position of at-large justice of the peace. Karl “Charlie” Mueller, the leader of the Siegfried sect, distorted Neuss’s opinions in a letter to the local paper, contending that Neuss approved of the Bund’s activities. In reality, he disapproved, but had no legal grounds to stop them. Mueller also implied that Neuss was slightly deranged: “‘Don’t mind him; at times his stunts are most incomprehensible!’”¹¹

As a result of the Bund’s effective campaign, Neuss lost the election but continued to speak out as a private citizen; he fought against *Phingfest*, a Nazi celebration in June 1938. However, the Nazi movement continued, as did the effort to merge it with American culture.

Another example of its co-opting American customs was the Bund’s summer camps. One of these was Camp Siegfried, a fully functioning summer camp at which swimming in the lake and in the currents of Nazism went on simultaneously. The idea of summer camp was not radical, but most Americans were not familiar with the camps’ rabid agenda. The strict regimen, in which every minute of the day was planned for the children, incorporated the Nazi obsession with discipline and order. The summer camps for American children resembled training camps for German troops. Perhaps not all parents of children at Siegfried were aware of its program, but the Bund made no effort to hide it. According to a Yaphank paper, “A flagpole stands at the entrance to the property with the American flag floating from the top and the German flag and Nazi flag, bearing the swastika emblem, float from the cross arms.” Obviously, the Bund made no attempt to fool the families of the approximately 120 boys and girls at Camp Siegfried, whose organization and program closely resembled those of the Hitler Youth.¹²

An average day started at six-thirty with reveille, and included swimming, singing practice, sports, group gatherings, and taps at 2130 hours (9:30 P.M.). The schedule included extensive periods of Nazi studies, in which the children read

Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. The camp was complete with swastikas on the doorways. The Bund once again took an experience familiar to Americans and Nazified it.¹³

How the Bund created and communicated its goals to the American public were revealed by Martin Wunderlich, a member of the Yaphank sect, during a federal investigation of the German-American Bund:

Q. How do you salute the American flag?

A. A greeting of the White Race.

Q. How do you hold your arm when you salute the American flag at Camp Siegfried?

A. You have seen so many picture—

Q. The jury would like to see. You are on the stand to tell us.

A. No, I am not.

The Court: Stand up and show us.

A. I refuse to.

Mr. Henry: Q. You refuse to do that?

The Court: Stand up and show us how you salute the flag over at Camp Siegfried.

Mr. Karl (Wunderlich's attorney) Which flag?

The Court: Any that he salutes.

A. I am saluting the American flag.

The Court: Stand up and show us.

A. I salute the American flag as a member and a proud member of the White Race (witness stands up and raises right arm).

Q. That is the American salute?

A. It will be.¹⁴

With those words, Martin Wunderlich concisely explained how the Bund tried to make its ideas and customs acceptable by linking American symbols to a pro-Nazi belief system. Testimony like his makes it no surprise that the Bund drew tremendous criticism from organizations on Long Island, in addition to that of the United States government. Eventually, it became obvious that the identity the Bund tried to create was spurious, which led to the realization that it had to be treated as the Nazi organization it was.

The government finally took action against the Bund. HUAC began its investigation in 1938, after the Bund held its overflow Washington's Birthday celebration at Madison Square Garden. HUAC, also called the Dies Committee for its chairman Martin Dies (D-Texas), conducted a campaign designed to "cleanse herself (America) of any and all foreign infiltration." In examining the possible link between the Bund and Nazi Germany, HUAC assigned an undercover operative, John C. Metcalfe, a German-born reporter, to collect information concerning the use of swastikas, the Heil-Hitler salute, and other evidence of the Bund's connection to Germany. As a result of HUAC's probe, many Bundists were deported, including Heinz Spanknoebel.¹⁵

In addition to governmental activity, many groups used their best efforts to expose and fight the Bund. The Jewish War Veterans (JWV) operated on Long

Island and in Brooklyn during the 1930s and 1940s. The group's main enemies were FONG and the Bund. On 9 April 1934, in one of its frequent protests against the Bund's rallies and marches, the JWV led a Long-Island-based demonstration against FONG's wearing storm trooper uniforms, desecrating the American flag, using clubs, and making such anti-Semitic threats as "When Jewish blood drips from the knife, then will the German people be free."¹⁶

The JWV's protest was followed with a demonstration by the Blue Shirts, a more radical offshoot of the JWV, two weeks after the April 1934 protest, in New York City. Marching behind its leader, Ben Lazare, the Blue Shirts burned Hitler in effigy. After the flaming dummy carcass was doused, the group continued marching towards Jaeger's Schwaben Hall, where it planned to invade a celebration of Hitler's birthday. Two hundred policemen intervened, stopping violence for the main part although some injuries occurred.¹⁷

The America First Committee, which existed from the late 1930s to the early 1940s, was organized with the primary aim of opposing America's taking the Allied side in the years leading up to World War II. This ostensibly American group gave aid and comfort to the Bund by campaigning to keep the United States from supporting the anti-fascist cause. According to Samuel Eliot Morison, it "preached an amalgam of isolationism and pacifism, with overtones of anti-Semitism, and it came out after the war that [it] had accepted financial support from Germany." Among its "top-billed" members was Charles A. Lindbergh, who, before the United States entered the war, was friendly to the Nazis and opposed to intervention. He took an ambivalent position concerning the German persecution of Jews, mixing lukewarm sympathy with patronizing stereotyping:

I can understand why the Jewish people wish to overthrow the Nazis. The persecution they have suffered in Germany would be sufficient to make bitter enemies of any race. No person with a sense of dignity of mankind condones the persecution of the Jewish race [*sic*] in Germany. Certainly, I and my friends do not. But though I sympathize with the Jews, let me add a word of warning. No persons of honesty and vision can look on their post-war policy, both for us—and for them. Instead of agitating for war, the Jewish groups in this country should be opposing it in every possible way, for they will be among the first to feel its consequences. Tolerance is a virtue that depends upon peace and strength. History shows that it cannot survive war and devastation. A few far-sighted Jewish people realize this, and stand opposed to intervention. But the majority still do not. Their greatest danger to this country lies in their large ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our Government... We cannot allow the national passions and prejudice of other peoples lead to our country's devastation.¹⁸

Although Lindbergh served his country during the war, his prewar bias for Germany, anti-Semitic rhetoric, and anti-interventionist stance played into the hands of the Bund. However, the Bund began an irreversible decline and fall in 1939, when, in the words of Bernie Bookbinder, "Kuhn, convicted of grand

larceny and forgery, was seeking converts in Sing-Sing. The Bund hung on through the courts until the United States declared war on Germany and seized its assets." As soon as the U.S. entered the war, the FBI arrested key members of the Bund, which by then it had thoroughly infiltrated; with its leaders in prison or deported, the German American Bund ceased to function.¹⁹

It is hard for present-day Long Islanders to imagine walking down streets adorned with swastikas, and hearing anti-Semitic statements shouted at pro-Nazi rallies. We teach school children about the atrocities of World War II and the Holocaust. We have museums where people can learn all they ever wanted to know about the Nazis, and perhaps ever more. However, we have fewer places to learn about the Bund. Not enough children know what happened at Camp Siegfried, just a few miles away on the Jericho Turnpike. It is our responsibility to teach the current generation about the darker side of history. In a society in which information flows at miraculous speed, it would be a tragedy if everyone did not know everything he or she could about a terrible time in history, the era of the Nazis.

NOTES

1. Sander A. Diamond, *The Nazi Movement in the United States: 1924-1941* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1974), Appendix I, n.p.
2. Susan Canedy, *America's Nazis: A Democratic Dilemma* (Menlo Park: Markgraf Publications Group, 1990), 38.
3. *Ibid.*, 51.
4. *Dictionary of American Social Reform*, s.v. Dearborn Independent; Canedy, 74-75.
5. Canedy, 75.
6. *Ibid.*, 52; "The Arrival of the Hate Groups," *Newsday*, 5 May 1965, 10.
7. Marvin D. Miller, *Wunderlich's Salute* (Smithtown: Malamud-Rose Publishers, 1983), 47-48, 54.
8. John Cummings unidentified newspaper clipping, 12 July 1960, Camp Siegfried file, Longwood Public Library, Middle Island, N.Y.
9. Miller, 13, 18, 77-78.
10. "Judge Neuss Registers Complain Against Nazi Crowds at Yaphank," *Mid-Island Mail.*, 23 June 1937, 2.
11. Miller, 36.
12. *Ibid.*, 100-101; Unidentified newspaper clipping, 1935, Camp Siegfried file, Longwood Public Library.
13. Miller, 97-99.

14. *Ibid.*, 69-70.

15. Canedy, 142, 188-189; after its early exposure of fascist activity, HUAC focused on anti-communist investigations, often conducted in an inquisitorial manner that attracted considerable controversy.

16. Miller, 11.

17. *Ibid.*, 15.

18. Samuel Eliot Morison, *Oxford History of the American People* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965), 997; Miller., 161-62.

19. Bernie Bookbinder, *Long Island People and Places: Past and Present, A Newsday Book* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1983), 210.

REVIEWS

Deborah Johnson, ed. *William Sidney Mount, Painter of American Life*. New York: The American Federation of Arts, 1998. Illustrations, notes, appendices, bibliography, index. Pp. 161. \$29.95.

This slender volume was published as the catalogue for a traveling exhibition of the works of William Sidney Mount, an exhibition of fifty paintings and drawings and eleven engravings and lithographs, the most comprehensive Mount show in many years, if not ever. The exhibition opened at the New-York Historical Society and will have moved to the Frick Art Museum in Pittsburgh and the Amon Carter Museum in Fort Worth when it closes in summer 1999. The heart of the exhibition is the collection of The Museums at Stony Brook, holder of the most comprehensive body of Mount's work, but most of the major museums of the country are represented.

The book is made up of four essays by established Mount scholars: Deborah Johnson, president of The Museums at Stony Brook; Elizabeth Johns, Silfen Term Professor of American Art History at the University of Pennsylvania; Franklin Kelly, Curator of British and American Painting at the National Gallery in Washington, D.C.; and Bernard F. Reilly Jr., director of research and access at the Chicago Historical Society. Together, the essays represent a major enlargement of the still-slender body of scholarship concerning Long Island's most important nineteenth-century painter.

The keystone article is Deborah Johnson's. Against a basic chronology of Mount's life, she provides a reasoned interpretation of the sources and themes of important works. Mount was at first captivated by the heroic subjects and treatments of European artists like Benjamin West and Jacques-Louis David, but his efforts to paint in that tradition, while admired at the National Academy of Design, did not find buyers, so he took up portraiture and genre painting. He was able, though, to bring lessons from the masters he admired to his more original work: David's *Oath of the Horatii*, for example, became the compositional prototype for his *School Boys Quarreling*. In moving from classical and biblical subjects to scenes of everyday rural life, Mount also had European models, primarily the Dutch genre painters. But he arrived at a unique satisfying synthesis: "More than any American artist up to this time, Mount successfully wed the artistic traditions of Europe with a vivid vocabulary specific to contemporary society in the New World" (41-42).

His genre paintings overwhelmingly depict rural and village life; they were painted for wealthy urban patrons, some of whom looked back nostalgically to their own rural origins but all of whom could reinforce their sense of accomplishment and status. In pictures like *The Sportsman's Last Visit* and *The Breakdown (Barroom Scene)* he "exploited the public's enthusiasm for works that struck a contrast between the polish of genteel society and the rusticity of country folk"(33), a contrast that paralleled trends in literature and theater.

Johnson believes that Mount approached his genre paintings in "starkly

symbolic terms" (29), and much of her attention is given to explicating the symbols. *Schoolboys Quarreling*, for example, is a representation of the rivalry between the established and conservative American Academy of Fine Arts and the new National Academy of Design (to which Mount was elected an associate while the picture was on exhibition). Many pictures are political: *Catching Rabbits* refers to Whig efforts to capture Democratic votes; *Cider Making*, painted for a Whig patron, celebrates the victory of William Henry Harrison in the 1840 election; *Ringling the Pig* rebukes the Democrats and condemns the political spoils system. But whether every genre picture needs to be seen in symbolic terms may be open to doubt. Pictures like *Dance of the Haymakers* and *Eel Spearing at Serauket* may be nothing more (or less) than lyrical evocations of rural pleasures.

Elizabeth Johns is the foremost interpreter of Mount's symbols; each of the other essayists refers to her work. Her own essay focuses on the vision of childhood in the genre paintings, specifically on how the paintings of boys represented larger issues. The decades of the 1830s and 1840s were times of rapid social change, bringing urban growth, fluctuations in fortune, and a high level of uncertainty about the future. Men, including art patrons, looked to images of boyhood for insights into their own situations. Mount's pictures, says John, "appealed to his viewers' nostalgia for the securities of their own childhood and youth. But more directly, he alluded to the current economic and social climate in which, as adults, they schemed and risked being caught" (11).

Franklin Kelly's article on Mount's patrons stresses a split—even a rivalry—between the kind of American who bought art in the early years of the nineteenth century and the emerging group that came to predominate by the 1840s. The first were conservative "aristocrats," the latter self-made men, mostly merchants. The aristocrats were sure of their own tastes, often quite ready to dictate to artists what they wanted, and sometimes disposed to demand changes in the finished pictures. The newer patrons had less confidence in their own judgment and gave the artists greater freedom. Mount was able to appeal to both groups: his "comic" characters appealed to the high-bred as "reassuring representations of a lower and inferior social class," and to the newly wealthy because "their supposed shortcomings...could be themselves admired as positive national traits" (114).

It was through prints, engravings, and lithographs that Mount reached his widest audience, according to Bernard F. Reilly Jr. in the final essay. Mount's Long Island farmer husking corn was his most widely disseminated engraved image, appearing on locally produced bank notes throughout the country, but especially in the South, from 1838 into the 1860s; it came to stand for agriculture as a force or an ideal. It was essentially a pirated image; there is no record that he either authorized the engraving or received compensation for it. Several other paintings were reproduced in the popular gift books, especially those of Edward L. Carey, of Philadelphia. Copper and steel engravings came to be largely displaced by lithographs, which were easier and less expensive to produce, in the 1840s. One of the major popularizers of lithography was the French firm of Goupil Vibert, whose American representative, Wilhelm Schaus, became a patron

and advisor of Mount. Under Shaus's tutelage, Mount became more adept at commercializing his work, selling paintings and copyrights separately. In the 1850s, Reilly says, Mount produced a distinct body of work with reproduction in mind, and intended for a wide audience. It was for Schaus that Mount produced a series of paintings of black Americans, paintings that catered to the "perennial fascination" of Northern middle-class Whig audiences with African American life and culture. This important body of work, including *Right and Left*, *The Banjo Player*, and *The Bone Player*, with their straight-forward and essentially sympathetic portrayals of African Americans, "contributed new matter to the national public dialogue over slavery" (145).

The volume is beautifully produced, with lavish illustrations, careful and full notes, and a very useful bibliography. In any book there are always questions and quibbles that can be raised. One would expect that the longest and most general essay, that of Deborah Johnson, would introduce the book, but it is Elizabeth John's that comes first, the placement perhaps a gesture of deference to a respected scholar. And one cannot help feeling that interpretation of symbols is not an exact science; Mount may have had more or less in mind than is read into the pictures. What a picture might have suggested to a Whig or a Democratic viewer in the 1840s is interesting, and the historical context of a painting is significant; exploration of symbolism is enriching, but modern audiences can happily accept the pictures at face value as well, as accurate and empathetic representations of Long Island life a century and a half ago.

ROBERT W. KENNY

Professor Emeritus, George Washington University

Newsday. *Long Island: Our Story*. Melville, N.Y.: Newsday, 1998. Illustrations, index. Pp. 428. \$49.95 (add \$9.95 to mail orders for sales tax, shipping, and handling; for the two-volume video, *Long Island: Our Story with Allen Oren*, send \$21, tax, s/h included)

From September 1997 through June 1998, *Newsday* treated its readers to a series of historical essays, vignettes, and reminiscences entitled "Long Island: Our Story." Beginning with the dinosaurs and running down to the 1990s, the series was a huge commitment of journalistic resources that must be almost unprecedented among modern American newspapers (try to imagine *The New York Times* bestowing such lavish attention on the history of New York City!). But even if you diligently clipped every item in the series, be sure you get this, the full-size book version. It will last longer than those files of crumbling newsprint, besides which the book's many handsomely produced photos, maps, and graphs look even better on high-quality paper than they did the first time around.

Pedants and other dullards will complain that *Long Island: Our Story* lacks anything even resembling a thesis and often seems whimsical in its selection and organization of subjects. Pay no attention: the book is not meant to be a seamless narrative, let alone a scholarly treatise, and half the fun is the rapid-fire succession

of tenuously connected topics. Thus, we leap from the story of Jupiter Hammon, the slave-poet of Lloyd Neck, to the winter of 1779-80 ("so cold the ducks froze") and thence to the Revolutionary-era prison ships in Wallabout Bay. Similarly, an account of the painter William Sidney Mount is followed by a report on the impact of the Hessian Fly, the tale of Julia Gardiner's marriage to President John Tyler, an investigation of why there are so many cemeteries in Queens, and an appraisal of Modern Times, the utopian village later renamed Brentwood. It is great entertainment, and the cast of characters extends well beyond the rich and famous to include such fascinating but little-known Long Islanders as Steven (Talkhouse) Pharoah, who toured with P. T. Barnum as "The Last King of the Montauks"; Elinor Smith, the aviation pioneer who won glory by flying under four East River bridges in one day; and Samuel Balton, a former slave who became the "Pickle King" of Greenlawn. Trivia, odd details, and burst-your-buttons firsts abound: did you remember that the career of Typhoid Mary began in Oyster Bay? that the Rosenbergs are buried in Farmingdale? that the nation's first black baseball team was formed in Babylon? that the first ATM machine in the country was installed in Rockville Centre? that the first measured racecourse in the American colonies was the New Market track on the Hempstead Plains? Do not think, however, that all this is simply an exercise in simple-minded triumphalist boosterism. Bigotry, crime, corruption, foolishness, scandal, and flat-out stupidity all get their due, and in the end it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Long Island is pretty much like the rest of America, only more so.

I have only two complaints to make about *Long Island: Our Story*. First, although the maps and charts and graphs routinely include notes on the sources consulted, the text itself does not offer even so much as selected bibliographies or recommended readings. For readers inspired to pursue a subject further, and many surely will be, this inexplicable omission will prove frustrating indeed—a major shortcoming in a book that is likely to be widely consulted and cited in area schools and libraries. Second, despite periodic forays into Queens, *Newsday's* "Long Island" consists principally of Nassau and Suffolk counties. While this obviously reflects the distribution of the paper's readership, it may well disconcert historically minded Brooklynites, at least some of whom labor under the impression that they live on Long Island as well.

EDWIN G. BURROWS
Brooklyn College

Joann P. Krieg. *A Whitman Chronology*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1998. Notes, bibliography, index. Pp. 207. \$29.95 cloth, \$14.95 paper. Available from University of Iowa Press, 100 Kuhl House, Iowa City, IA. 52242-1000.

This research tool about Walt Whitman, the Long Island poet who is generally considered to be America's greatest, is not only a reference staple for scholars, teachers, journalists, and students, but a dessert for tasters of the poet's metaphoric, cataloging, and biblically cadenced poetry. Expect to have fun leafing through the pages of this "Field Guide to America's Most Beloved Poet," as the

publisher advertises the book, and sighting details that catch the nineteenth-century poet in action—an effect of the present-tense style used by the author, Joann P. Krieg.

In 1863, for example: “11 February. Whitman sees New York’s Senator Preston King, who refuses to help him obtain work. Later he and Ellen O’Connor visit the Senate gallery and the Supreme Court, where Chief Justice Roger B. Taney and other justices appear to him as ‘a lot of old mummies’”(51).

10 August. Whitman writes to Mr. and Mrs. S. B. Haskell of Breseport, N. Y., to tell them of the final days of their son’s life in the Armory Square Hospital, one of many such letters by Whitman (54).

4 November. Walt hears Gaetano Donizetti’s opera *Lucrezia Borgia* at the New York Academy of Music; in his notebook he pronounces the singers, soprano Giuseppina Medora, tenor Francesco Mazzoleni, and bass Hannibal Biachi, “very fine”(57).

When lacking dates, Krieg prefaces entries with the name of the month, “Around this Time,” or “In the Same Month.” Sometimes there are introductions or summaries of years and groups of years. “In this Year,” for 1863, she summarizes, “A steady correspondence with his mother throughout 1863 reveals Whitman’s major concerns to be his family and the wretched suffering of the war wounded”(59).

The facts are chronologically presented, by years, in eight separate periods: the first section encompasses 1819-1854, followed by 1855-1859, 1860-1863, and, finally, 1888-1892. The entries are generally short, a paragraph or two, or even a single line. With the lines indented under the date, there is a great deal of white space enabling entries to stand out for easy scanning.

Nine inches vertically, five inches wide, the narrow, long book is a comfortable fit in the hand while the researcher thumbs through. With the help of a “Significant Dates” list, “Biographical Notes on Significant Persons,” index, title index, and the chronological arrangement of the data, a person can shortly acquire a basic overview about any of the many aspects that intrigue Whitman readers: when and how he saw Abraham Lincoln; the operas Whitman saw and liked; the newspapers that he edited; where he taught school on Long Island; his sexual orientation; and the publishing dates for the seven editions of *Leaves of Grass*. Krieg’s thoroughly compiled list positions a reader for further research.

Perhaps someone wants to explore Whitman’s relations with Ralph Waldo Emerson because of the common impression that the New England sage wrote Whitman praising *Leaves of Grass*, then lapsed into a second opinion. Truth is, Krieg reports, Whitman printed Emerson’s famous letter, “I Greet You at the beginning of a Great Career,” in the second edition of *Leaves* without the philosopher’s permission. She says Emerson “claims it to have been ‘very wrong indeed’ but does not retract his praise”(33).

Researchers seeking data about the poet’s meetings with Emerson can find four such contacts, the first apparently on 11 December 1855, when Whitman takes Emerson to a social function in Fireman’s Hall in New York City, “which,” as Krieg reports, “the staid Emerson little enjoys while Whitman is in his

element”(31). True, information about their meetings is contained in the many Whitman and Emerson biographies, but often spread throughout a book. Gay Wilson Allen discusses this, and at least two other meetings, but they are widely separated in his 594-page *The Solitary Singer* (New York: Grove Press, 1955).

Krieg is the right person to write this book. An associate professor of English at Hofstra University, she has written about Walt Whitman in *Long Island and Literature*, the paperback she edited for the Long Island Studies Institute in 1989, and the article, “Walt Whitman’s Long Island Friend: Elisa Seaman Legget,” in the Spring 1997 *LIHJ*. Twice she served as president of the Walt Whitman Birthplace Association, the support organization for the New York State Historic Site at Huntington Station (West Hills). On her second watch she oversaw the building and dedication, in 1997, of the Interpretive Center, a period-designed structure positioned so that the picture window directs the visitor’s attention toward the small brown-shingled farmhouse where the poet was born. Significantly, Krieg’s first chronological entry reads:

1819

31 May. Walter Whitman, Jr., is born to Louisa (Van Velsor) Whitman and Walter Whitman, Sr. He is their second child; the first, Jesse, is fourteen months old. The Whitman’s were among the earliest settlers of the West Hills, Huntington Township, area (2).

Patch Adams, in the recent movie of that name, tells the medical student he is courting that Walt Whitman was a nurse in the Civil War hospitals. If Robin Williams, playing the lead, had skipped around in *A Whitman Anthology*, he might have chanced on the 1863 entry for “January,” in which Krieg comments that Whitman “refers to himself not as a nurse but as a ‘hospital visitor.’”(51)

MAXWELL CORYDON WHEAT JR.

Poet and Whitman Birthplace Association Member

M (ildred) H(ess) Smith, with the assistance of Jeanmarie DiNoto. *Garden City, Long Island in Early Photographs, 1869-1919*. 1987; reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1998. Illustrations, bibliography, index. Pp., x, 83 \$11.95 (paper).

Garden City in Early Photographs is a 1994 reprint of the 1987 original, issued to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the village. The 96-page book, the compilation of the then-village historian, Mildred Hess Smith (1901-1991) represents a selection from the village archives, painstakingly amassed over a century and more from private and official sources. The 118 photographs are a pageant of Long Island’s only planned community, ranging from the purchase of the Hempstead Plains by Alexander T. Stewart in 1869 to the incorporation of the village in 1919.

Garden City stands out among the many villages that make up Nassau County in the many important and historic events that have transpired within its

boundaries. The legendary Vanderbilt Cup Races, the first international automotive races in America, were held here and on Vanderbilt's own pioneer parkway. Here too Long Island's premier architect, Stanford White, built fine residences and reshaped the Victorian Garden City Hotel into a striking Georgian masterpiece. Glenn Curtiss embarked on his aeronautical career here, and in 1900 Frank Doubleday launched his publishing empire. In a class by itself is the great thirteenth century Gothic cathedral whose spire towers over all else in the village, and enables Garden City to justly claim the distinction of being a cathedral town.

The Dover book is chronologically laid out. In picture after rare picture we move from portraits of the founder, Alexander Turney Stewart, famous in his own right as the inventor of the department store and of steel supported buildings, to the works of the man himself - laying out of the "City of the Plains" and its support structure (water, gas, stores.) We then move on through the real flowering of Garden City in the 1890s and the house building by the Garden City Company to the World War era. Aviation had its birth in Garden City with the Nassau Blvd. Aerodrome, and the International Aviation Meet of 1911, Glen Curtiss flying his Gold Bug and the construction of his engineering plant in 1917. World War I saw soldiers drilling in Garden City streets and pitching their tents over the raw plains land that overnight became Camp Mills.

More than one hundred black and white photos, reproduced on the best coated white stock, present this historical pageant of a unique village. Mrs. Smith has enriched each picture with a full and often lengthy caption, and the editors have varied placement of the individual pictures to avoid monotony of layout.

VINCENT F. SEYFRIED
Garden City Historian

Shirley G. Hibbard. *Rock Hall: A Narrative History*. Mineola: Dover Publications, 1997. Architectural glossary, index. Pp. 75. \$14.95 (paper).

This oddly titled book is anything-and everything-but a "narrative history." It is the work of a historical preservationist who carefully mixes healthy doses of architecture, genealogy, and biography with a pinch of history and even a little archaeology to produce what is above all else a love story. Shirley G. Hibbard's *Rock Hall: A Narrative History* is inspired by the love of a community for one of its grand old houses. The village of Lawrence, the town of Hempstead, the Friends of Rock Hall, and the author, Shirley G. Hibbard, has formed a unique and remarkable alliance to restore and maintain this architectural and historical treasure. This book represents the latest attempt to share this love of Rock Hall with a broader audience. As the story unfolds, we see how attachment to the family's ancestral home inspired several Hewletts to maintain the structure even well after anyone lived there. The heirs even celebrated the hundredth anniversary of Hewlett ownership in grand style-as if the house were some elder statesman, a living, breathing member of the family. And perhaps it was.

Rock Hall's greatest achievement is its ability to portray the house as a fluid, changing entity - even as it stood as a solid monument and symbol of both family

and region. The original Georgian mansion itself was significantly changed during the Federal period. These changes are painstakingly detailed and clearly explained. (Who imagined scientific paint studies were so advanced - or so interesting?) Chapters 3, 5, and 9 offer enough detail to satisfy any architectural historian. Hibbard even offers a "Glossary of Architectural Terms" nearly as long as the index to assist novices. Other architectural tidbits are liberally dispersed throughout the rest of the text. For example, chapter 7 cites the elimination of all physical reminders of Rock Hall's slavery heritage (34), while chapter 8 offers a photograph of the house's nineteenth century gristmill which was destroyed by fire in 1947 (38).

The genealogies which grace the inside covers (Martin in front; Hewlett in back) indicate immediately that Hibbard intends to recount the histories of two famous families, in addition to the one grand house. The Martins' and the Hewletts' are allotted more or less equivalent space, given the Martins' greater role in building Rock Hall and the Hewletts' larger-lasting influence on the Five Towns area. Characters are introduced, episodes are recounted, and relationships to the house are delineated. Most major players are drawn in shades of gray—no black and white heroes or villains grace this "Narrative History." On the other hand, the very detail of the family narrative sometimes takes the reader away from the house itself for pages at a time.

In sum, this is a book that offers something for everyone but fails to deliver everything for anyone. I suggest you study the sections that interest you but to be sure to peruse the rest. Architecture buffs will read every word and study every sketch and photo in the aforementioned chapters. Genealogists and biographers will love the detailed family histories of both Hewletts and Martins. Teachers will now have a wealth of information at their disposal with which to create more meaningful field trips to a true local treasure. Archaeologists and preservationists will be intrigued but ultimately frustrated by the failure to include results of the 1995-96 archeological excavations despite the 1997 publication date. Historians in search of a flowing, sequential narrative will find none. The stark transitions from family history chapters to architecture chapters and back again can be jarring. Although footnoting is not up to professional historical standards, the book is well researched and documented - making extensive and effective use of photographs, diaries, letters, census reports, and town records.

However, such quibbles pale when we consider the achievement of both Hibbard and the Friends of Rock Hall. A grand old house and a colorful tradition has finally been set in print, available for all to see and appreciate. (The photographs alone are worth the \$15 price.) If "love means never having to say you're sorry," then the Friends of Rock Hall (broadly conceived to include Hibbard, the town of Hempstead, the Martins, the Hewletts, et al) have no reason to apologize for anything.

STEPHEN J. SULLIVAN
Social Studies Dept., Lawrence High School

Linda B. Martin. *Nassau County at 100: The Past and Present in Photographs*. Hempstead: Hofstra University, 1999. Illustrations, bibliography, index. Pg. 48. \$8.00 (paper).

What is the universal appeal of old photographs? Linda B. Martin's answer to this question might well be this quotation from her introduction to this exhibit catalog:

Photography assures us of the reality of our vanished past. Without concrete evidence to prove their existence, wasp-waisted ladies strolling the boardwalk in floor-length dresses would seem as much the stuff of fantasy as a "Long Island landscape of meadows filled with sheep. Looking at old pictures confirms the long forgotten.

In addition, photography opens the viewers' eyes to see details and changes that were so familiar as not to have been seen at the time. This was so dramatically portrayed by Louisa May Alcott in *Little Women* when Jo and the failing Beth returned to the family after a time away which did not provide the hoped for recuperation for the patient. Most parents can also attest to this when looking over snapshots or school pictures of their children. The changes from infancy to childhood to adolescence to adulthood can be subtle or dramatic, but with the passing of time and the familiarity of the present, often the details of the past appearances are lost.

These might well be the aspects of the appeal of this book to the public. It is a permanent record of one moment in time—the public display, for two short months, of fifty photographs in the exhibition of the same name. It also is a permanent record of some of the changes to be seen from the birth of a county until its maturity in this year of its centennial.

Martin was the guest curator for the "Nassau County at 100" exhibit at the Hofstra Museum. This book reproduces the twenty-five vintage photographs she selected for the exhibition, and the twenty-five accompanying photographs she took in 1998 that completed the exhibit. In addition to reproducing the exhibit photos, Martin includes several other complementary historic views and a few photographs of the early Long Island photographers whose work is represented here.

Martin provides a well-written overview of the creation and development of the fourth county on Long Island. Nassau County dates from 1 January 1899, a year after the three western towns of Queens County joined in the creation of greater New York City. It is not easy to cover the history of a full hundred years in just a couple of dozen photographs and their contemporary counter-parts. Certainly the existence and availability of historic images exerted some control over the choices of topics covered; however Martin has done a fine job in presenting a diversity of subjects.

The photographs, taken between 1876 and 1927, are arranged chronologically rather than by topic. The natural history and beauty of the setting of Nassau County are demonstrated in views of the harbor and beach at Cold Spring Harbor and the cliffs at Garvies Point. Unfortunately, there are no images

of sheep in meadows, or of the Hempstead Plains blanketed with bird's foot violets. These are images that come easily to mind with the reading of Martin's artistic descriptions in the introduction, and yet for some, especially the younger reader, they might well remain as fantasy without the proof of photographic reality.

The role of government is shown in views of municipal buildings, a courthouse, and waterworks. Community life can be found in churches, fire departments, and, of course, scenes of main streets and businesses. The presence of the Long Island Railroad, which was a strong influence in the changing face of Long Island, is also noted. The birth and growth of aviation, as seen through a photo of Charles A. Lindbergh and the historic caption on Roosevelt Field, changed the face not only of Long Island but of the world.

No. Nassau County is not isolated from the rest of the world. The national connection is brought to mind with a view of Teddy Roosevelt's summer White House. Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis* reminds the reader of the global connection, as does the one photograph of the Hempstead Plains. Instead of violets or grassy meadows, the viewer sees a vista filled with tents. The plains were used as military training grounds for all the wars from colonial times through and into the twentieth century.

If there is anything missing from these photographs, it is today's people. Martin wrote of the difficulty in trying to photograph contemporary views of the historic scenes, and spoke of speeding traffic and stubborn delivery trucks, yet there is little of that in the end product, and there are few people. She persevered, returning to these locations as often as needed to obtain photographs that satisfied her. To this reviewer they lack the busyness of today's world and the rich diversity of Nassau's people.

A photograph initiates conversation with the viewer, and the juxtaposition of a "then" with a "now" photograph invites greater conversation. Martin wisely avoids directing any such conversation. Her captions simply identify the subject, location, and date. The explanatory text provides the historical context of the views without further comment.

Part of the pleasure in the experience of contemplating such exhibits is the opportunity to share one's discoveries with another. The similarities recognized between the photos, the differences discovered, the memories brought to mind, the irony revealed, all beg to be shared. If you are someone who likes to exclaim aloud as these discoveries are revealed to you, you will want to invite a friend to share the book with you.

DIANE PERRY

Suffolk County Historical Society

BOOK NOTES

Mathew Brady, et al. *Civil War Military Leaders in Photographs: 24 Cards*. Mineola: Dover Publications, 1998. Notes, captions.

24 black and white photographs on six plates. \$4.95 (paper). A collection of original photographs, reproduced in postcard form, of the important military figures of both the Union and the Confederacy. Includes Lincoln, Grant, Lee, and "Stonewall" Jackson. Biographical notes complement each photograph.

TO BE REVIEWED, FALL 1999

Edwin Burrows and Mike Wallace. *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Illustrations, references, bibliography, index. Pp. 1,383. \$49.95. This massive, Pulitzer Prize winning volume, the product of twenty years of research, covers every aspect of the city's pre-twentieth-century history.

Robert P. Crease. *Making Physics: A Biography of Brookhaven National Laboratory, 1946-1972*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. Pp. 446. \$38 (cloth). Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. This book, excerpts of which first appeared in the pages of the *LIHJ*, brings to life the people, the instruments, the science, and the politics of Brookhaven's first quarter century.

SCOPE (Suffolk County Organization for the Promotion of Education). *Where to Go and What to Do on Long Island*. Second rev. ed. Mineola: Dover Publications, 1998. Illustrations, Index. Pp. 240. \$4.95 (paper). Dover presents an updated version of this handy guide for teachers, nature lovers, history buffs, and visitors.

Mary Feeney Vahey. *A Hidden History: Slavery, Abolition, and the Underground Railroad in Cow Neck and on Long Island*. Port Washington: Cow Neck Peninsula Historical Society, 1998. Illustrations, bibliography. Pp.49. \$10 (paper).

Roberta Halporn. *New York Is a Rubber's Paradise: A Guide to New York's Cemeteries in the Five Boroughs*. Brooklyn: Center for Thanatology Research and Education, 1998. Illustrations. Pp. 76. \$12.95 (paper).

COMMUNICATIONS

Dear Editor,

I am indebted to Daria Merwin for her excellent review of the second edition of *We Are Still Here* in the Fall 1998 issue. A frequent complaint of authors is that the reviewers did not read the book carefully or did not have an adequate command of the subject matter. This was certainly not the case with Merwin, an experienced archaeologist, who has worked on several important sites on Long Island and is knowledgeable about the history and culture of the Long Island Native Americans.

There is one point, however, that needs to be clarified. The fault, I hasten to add, is not with the reviewer. In the book I stressed that the Shinnecock and the Unkechaug can easily meet all of the criteria set forth by the Branch of Acknowledgement and Research (BAR), and this was accurately noted by Merwin in her review. Both of these reservations are recognized by the state of New York and have the same tax-exempt status as the federally recognized reservations. I just wanted to make it clear that although they can satisfy all of the guidelines, they have not gone through the formality of filing an official petition with the BAR.

The Shinnecock are in the process of compiling the necessary data and intend to file in the near future, but the Unkechaug have, at present, indicated no interest in seeking federal recognition.

JOHN A. STRONG
*Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Miskolc,
Miskolc, Hungary*

Long Island Historical Journal

Department of History
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4348

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 65
Stony Brook, NY
11790