THE LONG ISLAND HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Fall 1996
Volume 9 • Number 1

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

Walt Whitman

Fall 1996
Volume 9 • Number 1

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

copyright 1996 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 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. Yearly subscriptions are $15.00, single copies $8.00. 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 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- or Apple-MacIntosh-compatible disk. Notes should be numbered consecutively, assembled at the end of the text, and modeled on examples in the *Chicago Manual of Style* or Turabian.

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 editors: Thomas D. Beal and Nancy Dawkins, USB

Editorial Board: Floris B. Cash, USB; Charles F. Howlett, Amityville Mem. High School; Eric E. Lampard, 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; William R. Taylor, USB; Carol A. Traynor, Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities; 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; 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; David M. Kahn, Brooklyn Historical Society; 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, Queens College; 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; Stan Rubenstein, Henry George School of Long Island; 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; John A. Strong, Long Island Univ., Southampton Campus; R. L. Swanson, Marine Sciences Research Center, USB; Francis J.Turano, USB: Evert Volkersz, USB Library.

Cover: *Harriet Quimby, Pioneer Pilot.* Fifty-cent airmail stamp, copyright 1991 by the U. S .Postal Service. Photograph, courtesy of the U. S. Postal Service, Washington, DC.

TABLE of CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENT

IN MEMORIAM:
WILLIAM M. P. DUNNE (1934-1995)
By Bill Dudley - 1

HISTORY OF BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY,
PART SIX: THE LAB AND THE
LONG ISLAND COMMUNITY, 1947-1972
By Robert P. Crease - 4

THE LONG ISLAND CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT
In the 1960s, PART TWO: THE STRUGGLE to
INTEGRATE PUBLIC SCHOOLS and HOUSING
By Charles F. Howlett-25

THE DOWNS and UPS of SAMUEL CARMAN
(1809-1881): A NINETEENTH-CENTURY
SMITHTOWN FARMER and SHIPBUILDER
By Elizabeth Shepherd-47

"SOMETHING THAT MAKES ME FEEL at HOME":
MARIANNE MOORE and BROOKLYN
By Jon Sterngass - 65

THE TOWN of HEMPSTEAD ARCHIVES, 1644-1996:
A WEALTH of MUNICIPAL HISTORY
By Michael J. Robinson - 79

Secondary School Essay Contest Winners
1) BANNED BOOKS: THE CHALLENGE TO THE FIRST
AMENDMENT of *PICO v. ISLAND TREES* (1982)
By Glenn Bernius - 90

2) THE FIELDS, WOOLWORTHS, and VANDERBILTS:
REMEMBERING the GOLD COAST
By Jeremy Gorelick - 96

3) HIS MAJESTY'S LOYAL SUBJECTS:
LONG ISLAND'S TORIES and the
DIVISION of HEMPSTEAD TOWN
By Adam Herbsman - 101

Review Essays

NEW INCARNATION of LYDIA MINTURN POST'S
"PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS" on the
AMERICAN REVOLUTION: A REVIEW ESSAY
By Natalie A. Naylor - 109

RESPONSE to an UNINSPIRED HOAX:
JUDITH E. GREENBERG and HELEN CAREY McKEEVER,
JOURNAL of a REVOLUTIONARY WAR WOMAN
By Sarah A. Buck - 120

Reviews

Judith E. Greenberg and Helen Carey McKeever.
Journal of a Revolutionary War Woman.
(See review essays by Natalie A. Naylor
and Sarah A. Buck)

John J. Gallagher. *The Battle of Brooklyn, 1776.*
By Roger Wunderlich - 122

Giacinta Bradley Koontz, Editor. *The Harriet Quimby Research Conference Journal, Volume One—1995.*
By Frank C. Erk - 125

Joshua Stoff. *History of Early Aviation, 1903–1913.*
By Frank C. Erk - 128

Roger D. Stone. *Fair Tide:*
Sailing toward Long Island's Future.
By Philip Palmedo - 130

Joan Druett and Mary Anne Wallace. *The Sailing Circle:*
19th Century Seafaring Women from New York
By Diane F. Perry - 132

Andrea Wyatt Sexton and Alice Leccese Powers, eds.
The Brooklyn Reader: 30 Writers Celebrate America's Favorite Borough.
By Peter Stephan - 135

Booknotes - 137

Communications - 138

Contributors

Sarah A. Buck is a graduate student working for her Ph.D. at Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, NJ.

Robert P. Crease, professor of philosophy at USB and the staff historian at Brookhaven National Laboratories, isthe coauthor (with Charles C. Mann) of *The Second Creation: Makers of the Revolution in 20th-Century Physics* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1995).

Bill Dudley is director of the Naval Historical Center, Washington, DC.

Charles F. Howlett, who teaches at Amityville Mem. High School and Adelphi Univ., is the author of *Troubled Philosopher: John Dewey and the Struggle for World Peace* (1977), *The American Peace Movement: References and Resources* (1991), *Brookwood Labor College* (1993), and *Amityville's 1894 School House* (1994).

Natalie A. Naylor, director of the Long Island Institute at Hofstra Univ., where she teaches American social history, is one of the most productive writers, editors, and conference organizers on Long Island history.

Michael J. Robinson, who helped to shape the Town of Hempstead Archives, is now the archivist of North Dakota State Univ., Fargo, ND.

Elizabeth Shepherd, a retired school teacher, has published eight nonfiction books for children, including *Arms of the Sea* and *The Discoveries of Esteban the Black.*

Jon Sterngass is visiting assistant professor of American history at Union College, Schenectady, NY.

Secondary School Essay Contest Winners:
At the time of submission,
Glenn Bernius was a junior at Amityville Memorial High School;
Jeremy Gorelick was a junior at Harborfelds High School;
Adam Herbsman was a senior at Lawrence High School.

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

LONG ISLAND STUDIES SYMPOSIUM

MONDAY, 18 NOVEMBER 1996, 8:30 a.m. — 4 p.m.
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY STUDENT CENTER

Sponsored by the Long Island Studies Institute,
Hofstra University

Speakers:
Martin Andrews, Constance Currie, Lynda Day, Michael Galgano, Joann P. Krieg, Arthur Sniffen, Geri Solomon, Judith and Raymond Spinzia, John A. Strong, Charles Webber, Roger Wunderlich, and others,
discussing topics ranging from
Native American Indians, the Battle of Long Island,
and the Gold Coast Estates
to Writing Family History and Preserving Family Photographs

For program schedule and registration fees,
call the Institute, (516) 463 6438

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 ILAND 11545

CEDAR SWAMP HISTORICAL SOCIETY · DON'T TREAD ON ME

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 ILAND 11545

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

Corrections

- In Sherrill Foster's review of Nancy Hyden Woodward, *East Hampton: A Town and Its People, 1648-1992* (*LIHJ* 8 [Spring 1996]: 253-54), we printed "Lake Georgica" instead of "Georgica Pond" (254). We apologize to Ms. Foster and our readers for this gaffe, all the more embarrassing because our policy is to check geographical designations with the way they appear in *Long Island Gazetteer* (LDA, 1984).

- In the same issue, we misspelled the surname of Frank J. Cavaioli, the author of "Corona's Little Italy: Past and Present" (199-212), both in the table of contents and on the contributors page, for which we profoundly beg his pardon.

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

We thank all who renewed and urge those who have not to do the right thing—we need you on our side, now. This issue begins volume nine of our study of Long Island as America, the premise that our story reflects as well as contributes to the history of the nation, from pre-colonial times to the present.

We present another assortment of articles and reviews of, for, and by the people of Nassau, Suffolk, Brooklyn, and Queens. Sorrowfully, we commence with Bill Dudley's tribute to the late W. M. P. "Bill" Dunne, a man we will long remember as friend and fellow historian. Robert P. Crease offers the sixth of his series on Brookhaven National Laboratory, this one on the lab and the Long Island community during the turbulent 1960s. Charles F. Howlett continues his perusal of the Island's civil rights movement, focused on the effort to integrate schools and housing. Elizabeth Shepherd recreates the downs and ups of Samuel Carman, a nineteenth-century Smithtown farmer and shipbuilder; Jon Sterngass examines the life and poems of Marianne Moore, an adopted daughter of Brooklyn; and Michael Robinson describes the historic contents of the archives of the town of Hempstead. Natalie A. Naylor critiques a recently published Revolutionary War diary of dubious authenticity, backed up by a response to the same "Uninspired Hoax" by Sarah A. Buck, whose article in the Spring 1995 *LIHJ* originated the controversy.

Do not miss the three winning essays in our contest for high school students, on such varied topics as a Supreme Court case involving book banning by a school board; three prominent gold coast estates; and the secession of the town of North Hempstead from Hempstead during the American Revolution. Finally, we offer a provocative book review section, plus a nostalgic letter on pre-restoration, pre-university Stony Brook.

We are up to our modem in articles, but, if our pipeline is open it never is full: you have a standing invitation to send articles, reviews, and letters. This journal belongs to its readers.

To finance the *LIHJ*'s future, your cooperation is vital. We ask only a rock-bottom fifteen dollars a year—a lot for a little. The holiday season is coming: is there a more historic gift than a subscription to *LIHJ*?

IN MEMORIAM: WILLIAM M. P. DUNNE (1934-1995)

By Bill Dudley

On Christmas Eve, 1995, having endured for several years a difficult bout with cancer, the historian Bill Dunne died, leaving behind a great number of mourning friends, colleagues, and students who had been touched by his allegiance to the maritime history profession. In comparison to some, Bill had been known to us but a short time. He came from other professional worlds where he had cut a swath. To those of us in the field of naval history, he had introduced himself in the early 1980s as an enthusiast who had been drawn to the field by an urge to write naval fiction. His dream in those days was to become an American C. S. Forester who would create a series of novels based on the exploits of the early U.S Navy. Bill Dunne, at that point, was about fifty years old and had already been and done many things, Citadel cadet, Korean War frogman, escaped prisoner of war, racing-car driver, salesman, yacht broker, and boat designer.

Judging from these earlier careers, one might reasonably ask how Bill Dunne could conceive of becoming a naval novelist, much less a naval historian. But, as these varying occupations may indicate, Bill was never one to accept type-casting. Rather, he saw objections and criticisms as challenges. He came to the Naval Historical Center seeking sources, and from Captain David Long, then executive director of the Naval Historical Foundation, Bill was referred to the Early History Branch. He paid several visits over a period of two or three years, bringing along draft chapters of his novel. Mike Palmer (now at East Carolina University) and I read these efforts and counseled Bill to look toward history for his inspiration. The fiction he produced paled in comparison with the understanding and knowledge of naval history that he displayed in creating his characters. He had a large personal collection of classic naval histories, biographies, and reference works. As he read to satisfy an enormous thirst for knowledge, he discovered gaps and fallacies in the writings of the great and near-great maritime historians and soon felt another challenge. Bill became inspired by U.S. naval history, and seeing there was so much to be done, aspired to become a historian. Yet there were obstacles to be overcome. With the educational world as it is, he could hardly have made a difference, much less a living, if he had no academic degrees. In the mid-1980s, he set about filling some of his own educational gaps. He had never completed college, having enlisted in the Navy during the Korean War. He proceeded to complete his B.A., in English, as it happened, at Southampton

College, Long Island University. In this he earned highest honors and then applied for graduate school to earn the Ph.D. in American history, the sine qua non if one wished to write and teach history at the university level.

It is to the lasting credit of the graduate history faculty of the State University of New York at Stony Brook that Dunne was accepted, despite his modestly advanced age, based on the promise and enthusiasm he showed. Every graduate student requires an investment of university funds and faculty time, and at Stony Brook the history faculty was sufficiently impressed with what they saw that they took the risk, in 1987, of accepting the application of this middle-aged student. Bill wanted to study naval history, and had already decided to write a revisionist biography of Commodore Stephen Decatur, but there was no naval history specialist at Stony Brook. After he completed his course requirements, the history department urged Bill to choose a dissertation subject close to its specialities. He decided on immigration history, with a maritime spin. He chose to research and write a biography of Thomas F. McManus, an Irish immigrant who, in the late-nineteenth century, became one of this nation's most respected naval architects. Bolstered by a great love and knowledge of Ireland and the Irish, Bill's quick-silver wit and outgoing personality brought him into contact with members of the McManus family who shared with him their family documents and memories of the paterfamilias, Thomas McManus. The result was handsomely published by Mystic Seaport Museum, in 1994, as *Thomas F. McManus and the American Fishing Schooners: An Irish-American Success Story*. As a reward for this great effort, the North American Society for Oceanic History presented Bill with its prestigious John Lyman Award in Maritime Biography in 1995.

While he was working to revise his dissertation for publication, Bill exercised his talents in writing numerous articles, book reviews, and television film commentaries, and assisted others with their projects. So much time did he spend with other aspiring writers that he sacrificed some of his own work in the process. Even with his Ph.D., Bill's search for remunerative employment at the college level remained a challenge. When he did teach, however, his classes in sea literature and maritime history were immensely popular, and he had several undergraduate teaching awards to his credit. Another trait of Dunne's was his combative nature. When he got his Irish up he was a formidable polemicist, and he fought for his version of the truth like a Crusader among the heathen. He used words well and dipped his quill in acid when writing reviews of works he disparaged, as can be seen in the *American Neptune* and other maritime history journals.

Unfortunately, we will probably never see Bill Dunne's completed book on Stephen Decatur. And, probably, if there are any Decatur progeny, they should heave a sigh of relief because the traditional image of Decatur, as portrayed by Captain Alexander Slidell MacKenzie, would have been relegated to the ash heap. On the other hand, naval historians will suffer the absence of Dunne's unfinished book, for in researching this study, Bill accumulated such a store of knowledge about Decatur and his peers that the field would have been greatly enriched and demythologized had his study been

published.

At the end, the disease Dunne had been fighting for several years won the war, although Bill had garnered several battles through sheer force of will. Despite all and until the end, Bill was always the scholar and during my last visit the glow of his computer screen was ever present during our conversation, while an unfinished page of text awaited its exhausted author. He will always be remembered as "the Naval Scribe," the description he chose for his calling card, by many who knew him and will miss him.

HISTORY of BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY, PART SIX: THE LAB and the LONG ISLAND COMMUNITY, 1947-1972

By Robert P. Crease

Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL), which was founded in 1947 as a federally supported, multidisciplinary laboratory oriented toward basic research in atomic energy, appeared to be well-positioned at the beginning of the 1960s. In the wake of Sputnik, the U.S. led all other nations in spending on scientific research and development (R&D) as a percentage of Gross National Product (GNP). A renewal took place of the science-government-industry partnership forged during World War II. Although more money was made available for scientific programs and facilities, and more enthusiasm expressed for basic research, the renewal was only temporary. By the end of the decade, enthusiasm for basic research had crumbled, funds for scientific R&D had fallen for the first time since World War II, and the ties that bound the partnership had begun to unravel. Strains and ruptures, not only in the relationship between science and government, but also between science and the public, created tensions felt strongly at BNL.

"A More Troubled Era"

The late 1960s, in fact, were the bleakest years yet for postwar U.S. science. A policy analyst, Bruce L. R. Smith, in *American Science Policy Since World War II,* calls 1966 the year in which the threshold was crossed into a new, "more troubled" era in the relationship between government and science:

> A darker vision replaced the innocence and optimism. Regulating dangerous side effects of technology became an urgent challenge. Such social priorities as preserving the environment and protecting consumers became important objectives. ...The assumptions of science policy became subject to intense scrutiny and doubt. Although cushioned somewhat from the shocks affecting the political system by virtue of the esoteric nature of their work, scientists were forced to confront an insistent and clamorous attack on premises that had once

appeared self-evident.[1]

The legitimate purpose of science was hotly debated on many fronts. Many liberals criticized scientists for their perceived indifference to human needs; their close ties to the military-industrial complex, and participation in Defense Department advisory groups such as Project Jason; their dealings with the segregationist government of South Africa; and their introduction into the environment of such new hazards as radioactive substances and toxic chemicals. Such critics no longer viewed science as the means by which society identifies and overcomes dangers to humanity, but rather as the powerful agent of the "establishment."

Conservatives, too, objected to science's alleged remoteness from human needs, expressed by its failure to deliver on promises of spinoffs. They also mistrusted the politics of its practitioners, many of whom they perceived as leftists. To this set of critics, many scientists were unpatriotic for their outspoken opposition to the Vietnam War, as well as to such military projects as the Antiballistic Missile System. The image of atomic scientists as "subversive" had arisen after World War II, when many of them had been instrumental in moving the U.S. atomic energy program from military to civilian control. One key figure was Lyle Borst, a BNL scientist who led the effort to build the Brookhaven Graphite Research Reactor (BGRR). Borst was a cofounder of the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists and of the Federation of Atomic Scientists, organizations which actively backed civilian rather than military control of atomic energy and, later, international control of atomic weapons. Borst earned thereby the enmity of many in Congress, including Senator Joseph McCarthy (R-Wis.), who in 1950 accused him of being a communist sympathizer; this unfounded allegation, like so many of McCarthy's, was made under immunity by virtue of being published in the Congressional Record.[2]

Under the force of these attacks from different directions, science was inadvertently reshaped in new directions. Many assumptions on which federal funding of research had been implicitly based since the end of World War II were questioned, new emphasis was placed on applied or "relevant" research, and increased concern was expressed for the social and environmental consequences of scientific projects.

The rationale for the postwar science-government-industry partnership had been articulated in Vannevar Bush's report, *Science—The Endless Frontier*, which described the relation between basic research and applications by analogy with a bank or common fund—a necessary investment which grows over time, from which withdrawals may be made to support specific projects, and without which the money for withdrawals eventually dries up. Money invested in science was thus sure to bring welcome returns.

> Basic research leads to new knowledge. It provides scientific capital. It creates the fund from which the practical applications of knowledge

> must be drawn. New products and new processes do not appear full-blown. They are founded on new principles and new conceptions, which in turn are painstakingly developed by research in the purest realms of science.[3]

By 1966, many found this analogy no longer convincing. Funds allocated for science now needed to be scrutinized and defended, with guarantees required that the money would be well-spent. In June 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson, speaking at the dedication of the National Institute of Medicine, declared that presidents ought to be more concerned with the specific results of medical research achievable during their administrations; "[T] he time has now come to zero in on the targets to get our knowledge fully applied." This view was echoed in Congress by Representative Emilio Q. Daddario (D-Conn.), a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee and chairman of the subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, an influential voice among those questioning traditional arguments for basic research:

> When scientists insist that their work is pure and devoid of application motives, they are naive to expect substantial portions of our tax revenues to be devoted to their projects. These same scientists sometimes represent science as a peculiarly noble human endeavor, ranking with the fine arts in challenging the intellect and talents of man. Within the framework of our political system it *is* difficult to justify expenditure of large amounts of public funds for the purely personal satisfaction of curiosity—merely for the sake of knowing.[4]

In March 1966, Daddario introduced the first version of a bill to alter the charter of the National Science Foundation to allow it to support applied as well as basic research. The corresponding Senate bill, introduced by Edward F. Kennedy (D-Mass.), easily passed. The Daddario-Kennedy bill was signed into law by Johnson in 1968. Early the next year, after Daddario's subcommittee's report, "Utilization of Federal Laboratories," Daddario was invited to speak at BNL. In his talk, "Shaping the Environment of the Federal Laboratories," he urged that laboratories "become strong outposts in our struggles with the changing problems of our day."[5]

By then, the national labs were responding to the change in the wind and emphasizing their applied research; BNL's Nuclear Engineering Department committed itself to applied programs, and, in 1969, was renamed the Department of Applied Science. In 1971, President Richard M. Nixon's science advisor, Edward David, asked BNL's deputy director, Ronald Rau, for a list of practical applications resulting from basic research at the lab. Rau contented himself with a thirty-page account of several dozen examples, ranging from development of tritiated thymidine for biology research, to technetium-99m (then, as now, the most widely used radioisotope for medical scans), to development of the first therapy for Parkinson's disease. Labora-

tories, especially those engaged in basic research, are often approached by skeptical outsiders seeking proof of the practical value of their product; what was new was that the person who needed to be informed was the president's science advisor.[6]

Finally, during the 1960s, a new sensitivity arose to the dangers of radiation and pollution that often accompanied large scientific projects like reactors, and also that unchecked use of technology might not anticipate side effects. In 1960, the AEC responded to protests by stopping sea disposal of radioactive wastes from its national laboratories, BNL included.[7] The agency also mandated its labs to issue regular public reports on the amount of radioactivity at their boundaries, after which BNL began releasing quarterly reports to Long Island newspapers on its contributions to environmental levels. The lab soon became one of the most closely monitored sites in the state, but concerns continued to mount, thus complicating relations between the lab and its surrounding community.

Community Relations, 1947-1972

Community relations rarely concerned prewar scientific laboratories, which were appendages to universities; nor were they a consideration for wartime labs. Things were different for BNL, a big, publicly funded, peacetime facility in the nuclear age. While it had been built in a sparsely inhabited part of Long Island, in 1947, population growth gave increasing importance to community relations.

Laboratories are a peculiar breed of cultural institution. Associated Universities, Inc. (AUI, the group that runs BNL and serves as a buffer between it and the government), is appropriately incorporated as an educational institution, given the large numbers of scientists trained there. However, BNL also resembles a factory, with its large construction projects and facilities, and also a service organization because of its valuable production of knowledge and techniques. While a cultural institution would be expected to be a source of pride for the local community, the peculiar character of a laboratory, especially one involved in atomic energy, understandably generates fear of environmental contamination. What was an appropriate level of wariness?[8]

The nuclear explosions over Hiroshima and Nagasaki had happened less than a year and one-half before the lab's founding. The public inextricably associated atomic energy, reactors, and radiation with atomic explosions, destruction, and warfare. On 6 January 1947, when the first person arrived at the site of the new lab to fire up the old coal-burning heating plant in preparation for the arrival of scientists and staff, the heating plant, which had sat idle for several months, belched, protested, and finally roared into life, sending a plume of black smoke high in the crisp Long Island sky. As BNL founder Norman Ramsey recalled, the plume provoked a neighbor to threaten a lawsuit, complaining that she had been exposed to radiation, though this was

long before any laboratory equipment or staff had moved in. The threatened lawsuit served notice, literally from day one, that the laboratory would face problems as it began to operate within a larger social community that harbored its own expectations and fears. But attempts to establish a dialogue between the scientists and individuals in the surrounding community, from which a mutual understanding might arise, encountered unexpected difficulties. It was no surprise that questions about safety in general and radioactive waste disposal in particular were among the first to be asked at the laboratory's initial press conference on 28 February 1947.[9]

How serious was the environmental danger? The answer involved two kinds of issues: those dealing with scientific fact, or those of a political/personal nature involving community values. The first assessed the effects of different levels of contaminants on humans and the environment, the second the acceptable level of such effects. Any technology, any machine, any significant human activity involves some degree of risk, and values are involved in assessing if the return is worth that risk. Moreover, it is rational that invisible risks such as radiation, or involuntary risks that expose large populations such as those living next to a nuclear research facility, be deemed less acceptable than others. It is tempting to believe that consensus between the public and the experts is simply a matter of mass education, but this, as George Steiner contends, is a fantasy of modernity shared alike by Jeffersonian liberalism and Marxism-Leninism.[10] Much more is involved in navigating consensus about what constitutes a safe environment.

The scientists who founded BNL knew little about achieving such a consensus; even engaging in the effort ran against the habits of most scientists who had just returned from war-related work. Many behaved as though safety were purely a technical, scientific question, and that informing the community about safety would involve no more than relaying a series of scientific facts.

Soon after the lab opened, BNL's first director, Philip Morse, established a speakers' bureau (which still exists) of senior scientists and administrators, including himself, willing to address local organizations and whomever else was interested. "One of the most important jobs," Morse said, "was to get the community around satisfied with the idea of a nuclear laboratory, with all this horrendous publicity on atomic bombs, to get them to feel that this was something to be proud of rather than afraid of." Morse and other speakers recall the early talks as well-intentioned, somewhat successful efforts to make light of the fears through reassurances and statistics. Trust us, the speakers said, we are the experts, and we have made the lab a safe place to live and work:

> Always the first question in the question period was, "Is this dangerous?" And my usual answer was, "Well, yes, there are dangers. There are dangers in any factory, but I'm willing to put my word on the line to say that the danger that we would show to anybody working in the lab or outside was very considerably less than your crossing the street outside on a Sunday afternoon."[11]

But Morse and his colleagues soon encountered a number of wild, even bizarre fears that seemed to come out of nowhere: pilots worried about becoming sterile by flying over the laboratory; a woman feared that the radiation would make her pregnant; farmers thought the lab had made their ducks radioactive; and a man viciously condemned the lab for tampering with God's creation. These concerns, voiced before the young lab had radioactive materials on hand, involved more than simple misunderstanding. One day the lab received a shipment of ordinary, light-green glass, called uranium glass because it contained minute amounts of that element. Upon learning its name, a worker who had handled it became psychosomatically ill enough to be sent home. "He was *really* sick," recalls Frank Long, a chemist who became a member of the board of trustees. "That psychological impact was not new. We would see it again."[12]

Public reaction to issues involving radiation has become the subject of study by historians and social scientists. One science historian, Spencer Weart, has documented how atomic energy almost immediately became a symbol: for some, a symbol reviving ancient hopes of social revolution and utopian dreams of transformation, but more often a fearsome icon of the danger of looking into forbidden subjects and tampering with nature, the inevitable punishment being catastrophe and apocalypse. Indeed, a number of people, including AEC chairman David Lilienthal, saw it both ways; atomic energy, for Lilienthal, had pushed humanity onto a threshold where either revolution or apocalypse was possible. The power of that symbol to attract displaced, anxious fears complicated discussion of the real hazards of radiation at BNL and elsewhere. Weart cites the windshield-pit episode, beginning in 1954 when, shortly after an atomic test in March, hundreds of Seattle citizens called the police to complain that a mysterious agent, probably related to fallout from the bomb, was causing tiny pits in the windshields of their cars. Soon, windshield pits were seen in other cities. "Few believed the real explanation: windshields ordinarily collect tiny pits over time but usually nobody notices. Anxiously scrutinizing their surroundings, the citizens were projecting into their perceptions a novel fear." To illustrate the polarization of nuclear safety issues in a way that technical and political/personal issues would separate entirely, Weart cites a meeting between a group of activists concerned with the safety of nuclear reactors and a representative of the French Atomic Energy Commission. The representative, one of France's most prominent scientists, rebutted point after point on technical issues until his countercultural opponents wearied of the discussion. "Particularly irritated was a leader of the local Friends of the Earth, a young man who had left his family and studies to commit himself to life in a commune and antinuclear campaigning. He raised his voice to insist that the real problem was not in technical safety games—'It's political."[13]

At BNL, some trustees thought that community relations were not germane to the lab's activity. Rabi and Zacharias, in particular, appear to have assumed that research into atomic energy needed no accompanying public justification or explanation. Science was inherently interesting, Rabi felt; as a youth, had

not he and many of his friends been fascinated by the test of Einstein's theory of relativity during the eclipse of 1919? He and Zacharias believed that public relations, if needed, was the government's duty to handle through educational programs (later, Zacharias became involved in restructuring U.S. science education, and Rabi eventually reversed his position). Other trustees felt that if the activity of atomic scientists had indeed brought the world to the brink of apocalypse, it was their responsibility to help guide humanity through the coming revolutionary transformations.[14]

In April 1948, a memo by AUI assistant treasurer John D. Jameson, entitled "Notes Concerning Possible Public Education Activities of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Contractors," was sent to the AEC's general manager. The memo, based on Jameson's extensive conversations with trustees, is a revealing expression of the feeling of "revolution or apocalypse" in the New World of atomic energy: "The atomic energy business is one still surrounded by fear and mystery...the task of assisting the average man to enter and live in [it] successfully must be undertaken and executed deliberately. It must not be considered a by-product of the other jobs or as something which will take care of itself in time," for if left unattended fear and mystery might lead people into "mass hysteria":

> Under the spell of such neurosis they might take political action which would set back the frontiers of scientific development for generations. To put it in a word, there might be another "burning of the books." The fear that the average man has of the Frankenstein monster of the machine or of science has never become articulate, but lies not very far below the surface. There are many evidences that Science is on trial and being allowed to continue its preoccupation with atomic and other mysteries because the people still believe and hope that great benefits will flow from scientific development. If they falter in their belief that a more or less steady flow of the good things of life, of surcease from worry, or relief from pain comes [from] the Laboratories, their fears of the "priesthood" will prevail and they might go so far as to take over the temple.
>
> A proper public education job will be founded upon recognition of such possibilities as this and upon the need to assist the citizenry to achieve peace of mind about the atom without having to go through the centuries of experience that accompanied the same achievement in the case of, for example, fire. Mr. Lilienthal has made frequent references to the analogy between fire and fission. It is a fruitful analogy. Over a period of a relatively few years it alone, properly used, might assist our generation to span an intellectual development which our forefathers took thousands of years to accomplish.[15]

The field of atomic energy is so young it has "not yet developed a generation of hobbyists and tinkerers," the memo continued, but "atomic

hams" may soon become as numerous as "radio hams." The AEC's contractors, who would be helping to develop so much of the country's scientific knowledge, might be able to assist in acculturating nonscientists to the new world of atomic energy, not by propaganda but by "a small but continuous stream of unemotionalized, pure fact about the atom and atomic energy [to counteract] rumors or erroneous deductions."

The AEC contractors, the memo suggested, therefore could fulfill three public education needs:

a. To establish and maintain good relations with a contractor's neighbors.

b. To inform the public, both technical and non-technical, of the plans, programs and achievements of the installation.

c. To assist the citizenry as a whole to enter and live in the atomic age successfully.

While the first two amounted to public relations, reassuring the neighbors that the work was safe and celebrating one's achievements, the third task was "really the main job."

The lab ran into difficulty handling even the first two, and never got around to the third. When the lab opened, in 1947, AUI engaged a public relations firm, Pendray & Liebert, but let it go early in 1949 on the advice of the AEC, because that agency was afraid of angering Congress by use of public money for promotional activities. In 1948, the laboratory opened a Public Relations Office, headed by Michael Amrine, a journalist and author. Amrine came with good credentials; he had cowritten pamphlets about the plight of humanity in the atomic age with Urey ("I Am a Frightened Man") and Einstein ("Then Shall We Find Courage"), served as publications editor of the Federation of Atomic Scientists, and even had the distinction of having "adverse allegations" reported about him to the AEC's security division.[16]

Amrine proved a disappointment. Though he enjoyed discussing the tragic dilemmas which the atomic age thrust upon mankind, he had little patience for talking with local people worried that radioactivity might leak into their yards. Worse, he saw no connection between the two issues. When a Chicago newspaper reported concerns of some Mineola residents about radioactivity at the lab (generated by an erroneous newspaper report), Shoup asked Amrine to investigate. Aware that the fears were unfounded, Amrine dismissed the problem and ridiculed the concerns, writing to Shoup that "It does not even appear that it is worth a trip to Mineola." Shoup, one of the few trustees genuinely concerned with community relations, was outraged. A few months later, Amrine was asked to resign.[17]

Amrine's failure added fuel to the fire of those who believed the lab was not the right institution to engage in public education. Within a few years all attempts to do so ended. Maybe there would be no "atomic hams" tinkering with basement-built cyclotrons, but it seemed reasonable to the founders that normal educational processes would filter down enough for the public to accept and appreciate atomic research.[18]

However, after the reactor and hot lab started, and the handling of radioac-

tive materials became routine, the lab found it increasingly difficult to address incidents involving local fears. At first, the reputation of science and scientists was high enough that issuing reassurances often sufficed. For the moment, stories of supposedly radioactive ducks, life-threatening uranium glass, radiation-induced pregnancy, and tampering with God's atoms were told and retold around the lab, accompanied by gales of laughter. The joke soon wore off.

One member of the speakers' bureau was R. C. Anderson, the first organic chemist at the laboratory and an easy-going, articulate young man whose ability to quote Hawthorne impressed Chemistry Department chairman Richard Dodson in his job interview. Anderson did not feel it beneath his calling to engage the local community in the activities of the lab. Curious enough to be interested in the difficulties he would encounter, Anderson was also imaginative enough to learn from his mistakes:

> The horror stories began very early. Farmers east of here complained that their cows were being killed by radioactive dust, and I would go out to talk to them and point out that we don't even have a radioactive source at the lab yet. One woman came up and threw her arms around my knees and pleaded with me not to put her baby in jeopardy. There'd be a flap over radiation in the tri-state area, and someone would call the lab and say, "Send a speaker!" Many times I'd have to stand up in front of groups of outraged citizens and try to deliver the message, "This is not a real problem."[19]

Frustrated by these difficulties, Anderson sometimes adopted the backpack and hiking boots image appealing to environmentalists. At other times, he tried a hard-hat persona and wore red, white, and blue: red tie, blue and white shirt. Though uneasy with these patronizingly brazen flourishes, he discovered that the message did not seem to be carrying itself. Sometimes he found it most effective to state the concerns and invite the audience to mull over their origins:

> Once, at the Patchogue Rotary Club, I discussed the science of radiation protection at great length; the inverse square law, shielding, and so forth. I said, "Doesn't it make sense that the scientists who know the most about radiation protection and who work with radioactive substances daily would take the maximum protection they could, to protect themselves and their families who live in the community?" I thought I'd made a convincing argument. But afterwards a guy came up and said, "Don't give me all that crap—what kind of pill do you take?" That remark taught me a lot about what an enormous gap existed between what we knew and the public's perception of it. The irony is that the remark came from science itself, but the reference was so embedded in our culture that it wasn't alien any longer. That really taught me a lesson...that you cannot take even the simplest illustration

> out of a scientific background and use it in a public forum safely. I took to simply repeating that story and it often worked to great effect. I had held up a mirror, and people in the audience recognized that that's how they think.

Anderson was good—too good—for the lab often succumbed to the temptation to dump complex public relations issues, like the shipping of reactor fuel rods, on his platter, which Anderson was too gracious to refuse. This contributed to the problem by helping to hide from lab officials the growing, long-range failure to establish consensus with the community over safety issues.[20]

Community fears were easy to arouse, hard to assuage. The assumption that something really hazardous was going on, masked by both its invisibility and a conspiracy of silence, was difficult to dispel. After a sonic boom over Suffolk County, the public relations office was often flooded with calls demanding information about the atomic explosion that just took place. Some callers refused to accept the explanation that nothing out of the ordinary happened, assuming they were the victims of a conspiracy of silence: "But I *heard* it with my own ears!" Many laboratory staffers were dismayed to discover that friends or neighbors thought of Brookhaven as "the bomb factory," an illusion that could not be eradicated, and was abetted by erroneous press reports. Once a consultant meteorologist picked up a hitch-hiker and idly asked what he his friends thought of the reactor about to go up in their midst. The hitch-hiker replied that he was afraid, and kept remarking, "They got stuff there that will burn right through you."

Concerned with how little real information about the lab had reached this person, the consultant wrote to a BNL meteorologist, Norman Beers, that, "A lot of local and not too busy legal boys with that kind of a countryside can make it difficult for the Laboratory in the courts." If a lawsuit developed, he advised planning "the defense for an appeal to a higher court rather than trust a jury picked from local residents...as far away from Upton as possible, preferably in Washington, D.C."[21]

Local newspapers tended to give prominence to the most incredible rumors. Consider the case of the death of Kenneth Koerber, who worked in Brookhaven's Medical Department between June 1947 and August 1948, when, after a serious accident, he returned to Philadelphia. When Koerber died in fall 1956, the Philadelphia Medical Examiner, Joseph W. Spelman, called the death radiation poisoning, announcing that Koerber's bones contained "1,000 times the maximum safe concentration of radiation."

The finding was implausible on its face. The reactor was unfinished at the time of Koerber's departure, and only a few radiotracers, to which Koerber did not have access, were in use; if he had swallowed them all, he could not have acquired the reported amount of radioactivity. Still, most newspapers swallowed the story whole, often couching it in lurid, inflammatory rhetoric. A *New York Post* headline read,"Martyr of Brookhaven Lab," implying that an evil institution had crucified an innocent man. When specimens of Koerber's

bones and liver were examined at Argonne, it turned out that he neither died of radiation poisoning nor did his body show "appreciably nothing above the activities to be found in contemporary man due to fallout and natural sources." A *Science* editorial observed that, "As atomic reactors go into action and the testing of weapons continues, we may...expect to read similar scare stories, couched in equally extravagant language. We recommend an attitude of skepticism until an assessment can be made on the basis of the best information available." Though copies of the editorial were sent to magazines and newspapers who ran the first scare stories, few if any corrections followed: apparently, it was not newsworthy that it had all been a case of hysteria. Small wonder confusion existed about what was really happening at BNL.[22]

Everyday window pits or health hazard? Sonic booms or nuclear explosions? Hysteria or radiation poisoning? Making headway toward consensus was hampered because perspectives involved were so different. From the perspective of the lab's scientists, many of whom were internationally recognized experts who made it their profession to study radiation and its effects, the laboratory was not at all dangerous and such incidents were transparent frauds. If science is a kind of authoritative knowledge, they were the authorities. The reactors, in their eyes, were small (the High Flux Beam Reactor and the Brookhaven Medical Research Reactor are about one hundred and one thousand times less powerful, respectively, than power reactors), expertly supervised, and carefully monitored. Moreover, the minimal amount of radioactivity they released was well within safe limits, and scarcely above the levels naturally present in the environment.[23]

From the perspective of the community, there were several good reasons to worry. Before the 1955 Atoms for Peace program, much of the information about atomic energy was classified, raising doubt as to whether the scientists were free to disclose possible dangers. Moreover, by the latter half of the 1950s, clear evidence emerged of the AEC's prior dissembling and mendacity with respect to nuclear hazards. As the former AEC chairman Lilienthal wrote in 1958, "I don't remember any instance in which a major public body has lost public confidence in its integrity to the extent that has happened to our old friend the AEC." In the next decade, assurances by experts were even less convincing now that the public understood that some technological dangers escape detection by scientists for years. In the 1960s a deeper worry dawned about whether technological society itself was out of control. The problem no longer was "their" control over "it," but "its" control over "us."[24]

Along with questioning the science-government-industry partnership, the new emphasis on applied or "relevant" research, and rising sensitivity to radiation as a potential environmental hazard, was the unprecedented visibility of such large scientific projects as accelerators, based in national laboratories, and vulnerable to political attack. An article in *Nation's Business*, by an advocate for keeping the scope of the National Laboratories as limited as possible, suggested that the federal role in supporting the national laboratories might harm science in the long run. The *Evening Star*, a Washington, D.C.

paper, remarked that with Uncle Sam's having run out of dam sites, the new accelerator was "federal pork in the grand old tradition." The regular increases of federal support for science slowed down by the middle of the decade, though the effects were not felt for a few years.[25]

Changing Atmosphere

By 1968, conflicts about the role and value of science began to divide even the scientific community. At the American Physical Society's winter meeting in Chicago, protesters from the scientific community disrupted talks by speakers from weapons laboratories, and argued that the Society should take a stand against weapons work and against the administration's policy in Vietnam. A new insecurity arose inside the national labs. Not only was federal support openly questioned and the relevance of the work challenged, but, most disturbingly, the work itself was regarded with suspicion. The question, "So do you make bombs?" and the overblown fears about radiation no longer were funny or likely to reflect innocence or ignorance, but, rather, indicative of deep suspicion of the role of science in society. It was more difficult than ever to maintain a dialogue between the scientific community and the public in which consensus on issues such as safety and relevance could be established.

Though BNL had trouble creating that dialogue since its inception, in the 1960s several factors were different. First, the day was gone when a scientist could calm the fears of a farmer by pulling out a Geiger counter to prove that ducks or cows were not radioactive. Particularly after the appearance of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1962), public awareness of environmental effects became more sophisticated, and answering questions about the impact of some contaminant was often complicated. A knowledge of demographics, statistics, geology, and background effects was often required for explanations that did not lend themselves readily to sound bites. Moreover, the health risk of radiation had become an ideological weapon in advancing an anti-nuclear political agenda, rather than a scientific issue which could help orient public policy.

A second factor was the antigovernment, anti-authority mood of the day. One participant in discussions of the dangers of radiation was Ernest Sternglass, a professor of radiation physics at the University of Pittsburgh. Sternglass made something of a career by finding supposed correlations between low levels of radioactivity and everything from high infant mortality rates to low Scholastic Achievement Test scores, though his scientific colleagues almost universally criticized his methods. While the careers of most scientists would have been annihilated by this, Sternglass flourished as an "expert" with an alarming message on TV and radio. A science writer, Philip Boffey, attributed this to the fact that "Sternglass makes good press copy. He has a startling theory that relates to important public issues," and was attuned to deeply felt public moods: "the revulsion against the military, the desire to end contamination of the environment, and the tendency to disbelieve the rosy

reports emanating from government agencies." That mood was strongly held on eastern Long Island, once farm country, where Brookhaven National Laboratory was not merely an interloper, but a government interloper. Posing to himself the question of what harm there was in a scientist's yelling "Fire!" when there may be none, Boffey replied that aside from stirring up unnecessary fears, it created the danger of society's losing its ability to determine what the real threats to it were, and in squandering limited resources fighting the least dangerous threats while continuing to expose itself to more pernicious ones. If it becomes impossible to distinguish real from unreal threats, reach solutions to the real threats, and choose real solutions over only seemingly safe ones, then problems which could be resolved are guaranteed to continue.[26]

The changing public attitude toward science was sharply felt inside BNL. In 1968 (when lab scientists were building huge projects such as the Tandem Van de Graaff accelerator, and a soon-cancelled fourteen-foot bubble chamber), the lab Theater Group staged an original musical revue entitled *Brookhaven/Facade*, to mark the twenty-first year of the lab and the fiftieth of Camp Upton. An introductory note by the director called the revue "expressive of the spirit of Brookhaven...primarily a humorous view of the prevailing attitudes here." The revue was a pastiche of silly songs, topical references, and puns (the lab's master plumber was the "drain brain"), that avoided political statements. For that very reason, it was a trustworthy gauge of the lab's self-esteem as well as its new feeling of beleaguerment, isolation, and being misunderstood.[27]

In the first skit, a group of druidic priests gathers in a remote place called Stonehank, a barren land of sand and swamps that supports only "scrubby little oak and pine trees," chosen because it is equally inaccessible from the priests' nine respective Temples of Wizardry (the nine AUI universities). The priests have come to construct a new Pile of Stones, represented onstage by a pyramid-cum-tower, a sendup of the reactor. The priests encounter hostility from the inhabitants of neighboring Patchenge, who do not believe assurances that, at Stonehank, the best brains in the country are working on peaceful research. The Patchengians fear not only that the priests are really chipping flint for weapons of mass destruction, but also that magic rays from the Pile of Stones will damage their crops, poison their water, and may even blow up the countryside. They also have heard rumors that the priests are actually subversives. To the tune of Cole Porter's "Friendship," the neighbors sing:

Radiation in our soil and in our crick
Makes us sick
We're selfish, selfish
Don't kill all our shellfish
And we don't want any scientists—
They're all communists!

an examination and historification of

BROOKHAVEN

as performed by the Inmates of the Site
at Upton under the Marquee of the Director's

FACADE

For Information Contact	Brookhaven National Laboratory Recreation Office Upton, New York 11973 Phone: 924-6262 Ext. 2808

Poster advertising *Brookhaven/Facade*.
Photograph, May 1968, courtesy of the BNL Historian's office.

Later, during Roman times, successors of the Druids are forced to play host to a set of governmental officials who descend on the site for an inspection. What practical applications, they ask loudly, do these devices have for the Roman Empire? When alone, however, the officials fawn over items of personal interest; Caesar is particularly enthusiastic about the Tandem Vanity Bath and the fourteen-foot Bubble Bath, which make "a really big splash." *Brookhaven/Facade*'s full title was *An Examination and Historification of BROOKHAVEN as Performed by the Inmates of the Site at Upton under the Marquee of the Director's FACADE*, a take-off on the full title of *Marat/Sade*, Peter Weiss's play of a few years earlier about a play put on by the inmates of Charenton, a mental institution outside of Paris. The revue's title wryly suggested that working at BNL was equivalent to being in an insane asylum.[28]

Echoing other academic institutions, a certain amount of mild political activism began to rise within the lab. This was one of the few issues on which the lab divided roughly along scientist/nonscientist lines, with the scientists acting as anti-Vietnam War "doves," and the support staff as "hawks." A conspicuous exception was the Medical Department, several of whose members hailed from the Navy, including the chairman, Eugene Cronkite (promoted to Rear Admiral in 1969). The Brookhaven Council, an advisory committee established by the lab's director, Maurice Goldhaber, was "too elitist" for some activists, who favored a more democratic "Academic Senate" to participate in lab administration. If this functioned like the speaker's corner in London's Hyde Park, where a person can voice any opinion, pro or con, Cronkite wrote Goldhaber, it "may have some therapeutic psychological value, although I question anything that will take time away from research, the primary mission of this Laboratory."[29]

On 15 October 1969, a national Moratorium protested the Vietnam War. The policy of most national laboratories, including Argonne and Oak Ridge, forbade demonstrations, with black armbands the limit of protest. Fermilab's Moratorium Day consisted of a lunch-hour meeting of about twenty people in the auditorium of the director's complex, mixed with a number of counter demonstrators demanding to know who paid for the memo advertising the event, and on whose time was it circulated. At Brookhaven, there was more activity than elsewhere, for Goldhaber adopted a lenient stance. Goldhaber was characteristically genial, open-minded, a little idealistic, and interested in running the lab in a more or less democratic way. The lab had its own Moratorium demonstration, with a large group of protesters in front of Berkner Hall, heckled by counter-demonstrators. The next few months witnessed a number of antiwar programs, and, in April, the appearance of a four-page radical newsletter, the *Brookhaven Free Press*. Though in many respects a minor episode in the story of BNL, the *Free Press* was meaningful for several reasons. It was a classic example of countercultural literature of the day, an almost instant forum for gripes about the lab. It revealed the continuing existence of a number of left-of-center lab scientists, who would be involved in opposing the Long Island Lighting Company's Shoreham nuclear power

plant (though these almost certainly were neither as numerous nor influential as the plant's supporters at the lab). The paper was yet another source of ill feeling between BNL and the surrounding community.

At the safe distance of a quarter century, the *Free Press* is a true artifact of the 1960s, filled with theatrics and a large dose of self-importance; the first issue prominently displayed a cartoon on page one, captioned Proud Parents, depicting two bald eagles—one labeled Bill of Rights, the other U.S. Constitution—gazing down at their tiny offspring, labeled *Brookhaven Free Press*. Articles took stands against racism, sexism, anti-free choice legislation, weapons research, and the draft. But the *Free Press* also was a forum in which apparently unrelated issues, problems, and gripes about the lab were thrown together and discussed in conjunction. The newsletter thus came to play what Michael D. Cohen and James G. Marsh, in their book about the American college presidency, call a useful "garbage can" role: if garbage cans do not exist, they create themselves.[30]

The *Free Press* became a much-needed "garbage can" for the lab. Articles attacked the absence of day-care facilities, onsite meetings of the Naval Officers Reserve Group, the retirement plan, and the cafeteria's architecture. The editors seemed motivated by a spirit of fun as much as of politics, with a self-consciously anti-elitist policy proclaiming the *Free Press* would accept "all written contributions." It had a rather anarchic voice, with sometimes downright silly stories that varied wildly in content and coherence. One editorial urged coping with gypsy moth infestation by shunning pesticides and enlisting "boy scouts, girl scouts, students, and senior citizens" to remove the insects from public property by hand. A masthead? God forbid! The staff squeezed their names together in as non-hierarchical a way as Western linear writing would allow:

> thestaffforthisissueiscompos
> edofthefollowing:audreybiitt
> nermaryhallmargarethindclair
> ehullwilliamkeatingtomkitche
> nssandylacksgeorgeslondonmar
> ksakitternieurvatertedwerntz[31]

The *Free Press* was designed in large measure to provoke. It succeeded. "Tune In!", the lab's anonymous suggestion box, was deluged by outraged letters demanding to know whether any lab resources had been sapped by the newsletter's production; some asked that it be banned from the site. Allowing it to continue, complained one individual, "is putting a fuse in a powder keg." Another, noting that *Newsday* had published an article about the *Free Press* ("Press Freedom Comes to Atom Lab"), feared that "all of us may lose our jobs, through diminished public support for BNL." Cronkite refused to allow its distribution in the Medical Department. At the first meeting of department chairmen following the appearance of the newsletter, Goldhaber again took a

relaxed stance: as long as the newsletter was not produced with any of the lab's resources, it could be left in bulk at standard mail drops. Still unhappy, Cronkite took the day off the day the next issue was due to appear. After about a dozen issues, the newsletter ceased publication the following year. "It stopped being fun," said Mark Sakitt, one of those involved.[32]

Though mild, the nonconformist political activity onsite ruffled some local feathers. The *Main Street Press,* a Patchogue newspaper, facetiously compared Brookhaven to Sweden in terms of favorite places for draft dodgers. This provoked one ultra-right-wing reader to write to President Richard Nixon that Brookhaven, "dominated by pinks, finks, and other democrat types [was] infecting Republican Long Island...Correct this situation please."[33]

Nixon already was on the case, in the form of sharply reducing the number of federally supported U.S. scientists. Federal R&D money declined in current dollars in 1969 and 1970, when, for the first time since World War II, steep cuts in the AEC budget forced staff reductions at the national laboratories. Goldhaber was forced to announce the layoffs of 250 of the lab's 2,800 employees, 100 from the Department of Applied Science and the rest from other divisions (termination notices went only to 150 as many of the others left voluntarily). At the beginning of 1971, he announced delays and withholdings of salary increases for staff in fiscal year 1972, with more layoffs in sight. That summer, the union representing plant engineering and other groups called a nine-week strike, which also took a toll on morale.

During this period, the lab lost property as well as personnel. From the beginning, the lab had consisted of two separate tracts of the former Camp Upton, three thousand feet apart: all development had taken place on the southern tract, none on the 2,300-acre north tract east of the William Floyd Parkway between Routes 25 and 25A. In 1970, to curry political favor with local communities, Nixon directed the General Services Administration (GSA) to discover surplus government property and return it to local governments. Brookhaven's north tract came to the attention of the GSA, which appointed a field study committee to study if its "current and extensive use" justified retention by the lab. "Some GSA New York people will be out on the 16th in this connection," wrote Assistant Director S. M. Tucker to George Vineyard, whom Goldhaber made Deputy Director in 1967. "We don't know whether they are seriously interested or just going for a ride in the country."[34]

It was more than a ride in the country. On 24 June 1970, the field study recommended that "the entire North Tract consisting of approximately 2,299 acres be reported excess to General Services Administration." The lab protested, but had little to offer in the way of current usage except for some ecology studies by a BNL biologist, George Woodwell (a cofounder, while at the lab, of the Environmental Defense Fund). More persuasively, it argued that the criterion of "current and extensive use" was inappropriate, considering the indefinite character of laboratory research. For example, it might decide to build an accelerator whose beam paths stretched onto the site. Impressed neither by ecology studies nor future accelerators, the GSA declared the property surplus.[35] In November 1971, in a ceremony at Berkner attended by

Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller and Julie Eisenhower, most of the land was turned over to the state, with five hundred acres going to Suffolk County. Protesters planted a prominent sign on the grounds of the former north tract, now Brookhaven State Park, advertising "Nixon's Legacy of Parks." In the 1972 election, the voters of Suffolk gave Nixon one of the largest majorities of any county in the country.

Another development in the early 1970s that drew the lab into the spotlight was the Long Island Lighting Company's plan to build a nuclear power reactor in nearby Shoreham, with hearings on the permit beginning late in 1970. Several conservation groups, including the Lloyd Harbor Study Group (an organization of private citizens which had stymied LILCO's efforts to build a nuclear plant in its community), petitioned to become involved in the hearings. Conversely, an organization called Suffolk Scientists for Cleaner Power and Safer Environment, led by BNL physicist Vance Sailor, also petitioned to be involved as private citizens The hearings were nationally precedent setting, and historically important for the U.S. nuclear power industry, with witnesses ranging from the country's most eminent scientists and including Ernest Sternglass. One effect of the hearings was to increase local attention to possible danger from BNL's reactors, encouraging activists to turn their attention to the lab. The month the hearings began, one lab scientist received a phone call announcing that the Lloyd Harbor Group's "next move" after Shoreham would be a request for an "investigation and survey of the records in the vicinity of BNL."[36]

Accusations continued to be lodged that radiation emanating from Brookhaven was destroying the local environment. Beekeepers blamed the destruction of a number of hives on radiation from the lab (a pesticide turned out to be the culprit). The declining osprey population on the East End was blamed on radiation the birds picked up while flying over the lab (DDT was evidently responsible). A fish kill in a nearby lake was also attributed to radiation (studies showed deoxygenation the probable cause). Windshield pits or genuine hazards? The temptation of many who worked at BNL was to blame public confusion on public relations. "I strongly feel that our Public Relations Department is exceptionally *incompetent*," wrote one frustrated lab employee, adding that "people on L.I. still believe we make bombs...We really do not have a P. R. Department."[37]

But the problem was not only public relations. These episodes manifested the enormous, culture-wide difficulty of establishing consensus on safety issues that would persist for decades at BNL, and elsewhere. In later years, BNL's most serious problem with environmental contamination involved seepage of certain chemical pollutants, a more genuine and less controllable hazard than the small amount of additional radiation the lab has contributed to the environment. But, as if to confirm Weart's thesis, the overriding focus of the public and the media stayed on radiation. In the ensuing years the problem of establishing consensus on environmental safety grew worse: political passions subsided after the end of the Vietnam War, but antigovernment and

anti-authority sentiment remained.

NOTES

The previous five LIHJ articles in this series, "The History of Brookhaven National Laboratory," were: "Part One: the Graphite Reactor and the Cosmotron," 3 (Spring 1991); "Part Two: The Haworth Years," 4 (Spring 1992); "Part Three, Little Science, Big Science," 6 (Fall, 1993); "Part Four, "Problems of Transition," 7 (Fall, 1994); and "Part Five, Particle Hunters," 8 (Fall 1995).

1. Bruce L. R. Smith, *American Science Policy Since World War II*, Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute, 1990, 71.

2. Ibid., 3, 71-2; for an excellent history of this struggle, see Alice Kimball Smith, *A Peril and a Hope* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1970).

3. *Newsday*, 25 Oct. 1950.

4. Smith, 43.

5. Ibid., 75; V. Bond to M. Goldhaber, 14 Apr. 1969.

6. Smith, 79; Daddario spoke on 20 Mar. 1969.

7. Ronald Rau to Edward E. David Jr., 4 Mar. 1971.

8. Spencer R. Weart, *Nuclear Fear: A Question of Images* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1988), 297-98.

9. Norman Ramsey, "Early History of Associated Universities and Brookhaven National Laboratory," BNL 992, Brookhaven National Laboratory, 30 Mar. 1966, 9; BNL Record of Press Conference, 28 Feb.1947.

10. George Steiner, *Real Presences* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1989), 67.

11. Philip Morse, BNL video interview, 26 Jan. 1983, reel 1.

12. Weart, 178. Frank Long, 24 June 1986, reel 3.

13. Weart, 187, 339.

14. I. Rabi, BNL video interview, 29 June 1983, reel 1.

15. John D. Jameson to R. O. Niehoff, 22 Apr. 1948; AEC chairman David Lilienthal was fond of drawing an analogy between humanity's acquisition of atomic energy and of fire: in his eyes, the effort to harness each brought new terrors as well as promises, but humanity had no choice but to try, and the inevitable success would be a giant step forward in the evolution of civilization.

16. John D. Jameson to G. Edward Pendray, 4 Mar 1949; Keirn C. Brown to John D. Jameson, 28 Feb. 1948.

17. Eldon C. Shoup to M. R. Amrine, 25 Jan. and 17 Aug. 1949; BNL director's office, 6: 24.

18. The sense of a meeting on the possible role of the corporation in public education, was that "the assumption of any major responsibility for production or direct program action should be avoided" (Minutes, executive committee, 23 Sept. 23, 1949). The following April, an outline of a possible program on public education was made to the trustees, who judged it only remotely related to BNL's goals; the AEC, they felt, should be induced to divorce this program from the laboratory's mission. Though an administrative aide, Karl Hartzell, pressed for an effort, the trustees' interest steadily declined. After Hartzell's departure in 1952, early attempts at a public education role for the lab all but ended.

19. R. Christian Anderson, interview with author, May 1995.

20. Ibid.

21. P. E. Kraght to Norman Beers, 24 Jan. 1948.

22. Graham DuShane, "Canard Corrected," *Science* 125 (12 Apr. 1957); Argonne report on Koerber's bone and liver samples, "Report to Dr. C. L. Dunham from Dr. John. E. Rose, Argonne National Laboratory, 16 Nov. 1957. Wildly inaccurate information about BNL is often disseminated. A 1984 article stated the lab was "part of a system" in which the push of a button could initiate nuclear war (Fred McMorrow, "About Long Island," *New York Times*, 17 June 1984, L.I. Sect. 13, 2); see also picture caption, "High Flux Beam Reactor [once] "Destroyed by a Fire," ibid., Sunday, 28 Jan. 1996, 1); the *Times* later corrected both errors.

23. Natural (unavoidable) background radiation varies widely with geography, depending on altitude and geology; a Long Islander's annual dose is about 300 millirems (including radiation from the soil, cosmic rays, radon, food, water, and air, and excluding radiation received from smoking, and medical or occupational sources), compared with, say, a resident of Denver's dose of about 325 millirems, or a resident of Wisconsin's 315 millirems. The maximum dose for a local persons exposed to every source of radiation due to BNL would be a single additional millirem.

24. Weart, 204.

25. V. Lawrence Parsegian, "Makework Projects Waste U.S. Brain Power: Unneeded Scientists Kept by Federal Facilities," *Nation's Business*, Sept. 1962, 106-7; *Evening Star*, 9 Mar. 1965.

26. For evidence on the hazards of low-level radiation in a report that discusses Sternglass's work, see "The Effects on Populations of Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation," Report of the Advisory Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiations, Division of Medical Sciences, National Academy of Sciences, November 1972; Philip M. Boffey, "Ernest J. Sternglass: Controversial Prophet of Doom," *Science*, 10 Oct. 1969: 196-200.

27. Ron Peierls, "About '*Brookhaven/Facade*,'" introductory note to "an examination and historification of BROOKHAVEN as performed by the inmates of the site at Upton under the marquee of the Director's FACADE" (BNL Historian's office).

28. Peter Weiss, *The Persecution and Assassination of Jean Paul Marat as Performed by the Inmates of the Asylum of Charenton under the Direction of the Marquis de Sade*, a title everyone shortened to *Marat/Sade*, as the BNL Theater Group's title was abbreviated to *Brookhaven/Facade*.

29. In 1969, the Theater Group produced *The Crucible*, Arthur Miller's 1953 play about

innocent people condemned on the basis of fabricated evidence for absurd reasons; those who attempt to introduce a rational level of discourse bring upon themselves ridicule, contempt, vituperation, and even persecution.

30. E. P. Cronkite to M. Goldhaber, "Scientific Staff Ferment," 12 June 1968; Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity*, Boston: Harvard Univ. Press, 1974, pp. 81-91, 211-212.

31. Alternative organizations and newsletters sprang up at several national labs; Argonne had the *Concerned Argonne Scientists*, Berkeley the *Real Lab News*, one of whose contributors, Charles Schwartz, was one of four cofounders of SESPA and one of the few important radical figures in the scientific community (see Karyn Gladstone, "The Unfolding of the Nuclear Age: A Psychohistorical Investigation into the Lives of Ten Men," Ph.D. diss., Univ. of California-Berkeley, 1987.

32.Cohen and March recommend institutional "garbage cans...on which apparently unrelated problems and issues can get thrown together, intertwined, and discussed in conjunction...If they do not exist, they create themselves" (Cohen and March, 81-91, 211-212); the *Free Press* became a much-needed "garbage can" for the lab; "Distribution *Brookhaven Free Press*," 13 May 1970.

33. *Main Street Press*, 31 July 1970; John S. Bucalo to Richard Nixon, public relations files, BNL.

34. "Providing for the Identification of Unneeded Federal Real Property," Executive order 11508, 10 Feb. 1970, *Federal Register*, 35 (No. 30), Thursday, 12 Feb. 1970, 2855-56; Memo, S. M. Tucker to G. H. Vineyard, 11 June 1970.

35. Report, GSA Field Survey of BNL, 24 June 1970.

36. Minutes of Dept. Chairmen, 19 Sept. 1970, records of department chairmen meetings, BNL director's office.

37. 1974 Environmental Monitoring Report, Apr. 1975, BNL 19977; Memo, Icarus Pyros to G. Vineyard, 26 Feb. 1971. The most extensive study of the environmental impact of BNL covering the years in question grew out of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA: 42 U.S.C. 4231), requiring federal agencies to prepare environmental impact statements on actions significantly affecting the human environment. Published as Energy Research & Development Administration, ERDA-1540), the study concluded:

The whole-body dose for 1973 for the population of 5,093,492 people living within 50 mi. of the BNL site was 3.4 man-rem/yr, only 0.001% of the dose received from natural background radiation...Similarly, the exposures of biota due to BNL are extremely low compared with those from natural radiation...[I]t may be concluded that health effects due to BNL operations are small if present at all (Sect. 4, page 1).

THE LONG ISLAND CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT in the 1960s, PART TWO: SCHOOLS and HOUSING

By Charles F. Howlett

Amityville, a Second Case Study of School Integration

Just inside the southwestern border of Suffolk County, the Amityville School District, one of the oldest on Long Island, encompasses three distinct areas: the incorporated and predominantly white village chartered in 1894; the African American community of North Amityville; and the racially mixed section of East Massapequa. It also resides in two towns—Oyster Bay and Babylon, and two counties—Nassau and Suffolk. Since its construction in 1894, the Park Avenue School had been fully integrated. All K-through-12 students attended the Park Avenue School complex, which included the 1894 building, a junior high school, and a high school.[1]

With post-World War II suburban expansion, the population of Amityville steadily rose. Reannex Park, a new development in North Amityville, attracted many homebuyers, especially African Americans. By the mid-1950s, school officials knew that new buildings would be needed to accommodate the baby boom explosion. In September 1953, when the school population reached 2,700, the district decided to purchase two thirteen-acre sites in its northern corners. One was on Albany Avenue, in the northeast quadrant, the other on County Line Road in the northwest quadrant. After the proposal was adopted on 26 April 1954, more than twelve hundred people took part in a budget vote on 5 June, with 784 in favor. "Initially, there was some confusion as to whether the resolution had been approved...[It] was originally announced that a 2/3rds majority would be needed for approval. If that was the case, then the referendum had been defeated by 16 votes." However, the

> situation was cleared up when Pierson H. Hildreth, the attorney for the Board of Education, contacted the State Education Department in Albany which said that a two-thirds majority was not needed in this case. Therefore, the acquisition of the two sites for $160,000 ($78,600 for the northeast site, and $81,400 for the northwest site) had been approved.[2]

The trustees then decided that the Albany Avenue location (Northeast School) would house kindergarten-through-third-grade children living north of Sunrise Highway and east of Broadway (Route 110). The County Line Road site (Northwest School) would house kindergarten-through-third-grade pupils north of Sunrise and west of Broadway. The neighborhood school concept was established; all four-through-six-grade students would attend the original Park Avenue School. African American residents immediately opposed the recommendation. At about the same time that the *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* (1954) decision was rendered, the NAACP charged that there was "a definite attempt to segregate the Negro children of the area during the primary education" in Amityville. The NAACP warily raised "the possibility of gerrymandering which might indicate political collusion between the Copiague and Amityville districts to swing Copiague school children into the Amityville district, and into the Northeast School." The board's president, William Koepchen, discounted the accusation of de facto segregation. He defended the neighborhood school concept in terms of safety and proximity; as many elementary school students living in these quadrants had been attending schools in Copiague and Farmingdale.[3]

The NAACP's Suffolk chapter established a committee of North Amityville residents to monitor the situation. The committee, which included Robert Bean, chairman, Vincent Best, Lucille Leonard, Irving Adams, and Lorraine Leftenant, circulated petitions calling for a public hearing and demanding selection of a central building location that children of both areas could attend. When the school board remained firm in its original decision, Wilfred Reape, president of the Central Long Island Branch of the NAACP, warned: "We are prepared to go further, to take the matter to court." The NAACP appealed to the state education department. While the schools were being constructed (1954-1956), the battle continued. At a hearing with Commissioner Allen on 16 January 1956, attended by Reape, Constance Motley of the NAACP, Hildreth, Isabelle Fajans, school superintendent Henry A. Kittle, and district superintendent (BOCES) John P. McGuire, the NAACP asked for a stoppage in construction until the matter was resolved. Attorney Hildreth insisted that the "trustees were acting under the rules of the State Department which, in effect, fails to recognize such considerations as race, color, or creed." Six months later, Allen rendered his decision in the matter of *Bell v. Board of Education, Amityville Union Free School District* (1956). After noting that the board "showed no discrimination in constructing an elementary school in a predominantly Negro neighborhood," he added that "elementary schools should be constructed in locations to provide the simplest access to young children as far as practicable." It was not safe for small children to cross Broadway, "one of the most dangerous highways of this section." The *Bell* decision emphasized that "safety of the children, both white and Negro, is certainly a greater consideration than the claim made by the appellants that because there is substantial predominance of Negroes in the Northeast School, that this will mitigate against their educational program."

The legal impact, at this time and in spite of *Brown*, was clear: "The mere fact that a school is predominantly black does not require a school district to gerrymander the attendance lines to accomplish the desired effect. This in fact would 'constitute as much discrimination as a gerrymandered line' to accomplish the opposite effect."[4]

In the coming years, the Northeast School became almost entirely African American, while the Northwest School became almost all white. The specter of de facto segregation, which the North Amityville residents raised at the start of the schools' construction, had now materialized. District officials sought to offset criticism of inferior education by placing the best elementary teachers at the Northeast School, but that was of little consolation to young African American students being raised on the dream of democratic equality. Evelyn Thomas, an African American English teacher at Amityville Memorial High School, remembers her early years at Northeast. The feeling of isolation, a world apart, embedded in her consciousness that de facto segregation was not fiction. Almost all the teachers were white, while all her classmates were black. Feelings of apprehension gripped her as she awaited the day when she and her classmates would have to attend the Park Avenue School, in the white part of town.[5]

The residents of North Amityville, like those in Malverne, were aroused by the civil rights movement's new-found aggressiveness. One of the sparks igniting Amityville African American consciousness was the appearance of Martin Luther King Sr., who came to the community in June 1963. On behalf of his son, who was attending the funeral of Medgar W. Evers, he accepted an achievement award at the annual dinner of the Laymen's League of the Hollywood Baptist Church. The audience applauded his statement that an African American's "income is still below that of the average white's. He's had a token situation a long time. Now he is dissatisfied. Now he realizes, I've been made a fool of. It's as simple as that." The time for complacency was over: "The Negro is impatient. You can get all the dogs you want, or shoot us down, but it won't do you any good."[6]

Events of summer 1963 caused passions to rise. The school board president, Carl Schlichtemeier, did little to placate civil rights activists when he expressed relief at the United States Supreme Court's refusal to review the Gary, Indiana, case, in which the lower courts "upheld the school board position that racial imbalance arising from housing patterns was not discriminatory and did not involve a denial of rights." He lauded President Lyndon B. Johnson for proposing and backing legislation ensuring that "the assignment of students to public schools, and within such schools be without regard to race, religion or color, but not assigned to overcome racial imbalance." In late August, after a four-to-one board of education vote "to make no changes in the Northeast attendance set up," the Central Long Island NAACP called for a boycott of school on opening day. An NAACP statement declared that:

> Amityville is supposed to mean Friendly Village. This is just what we want it to be, but for some reason or other the majority of the Amityville School Board has taken a stand to disregard the meaning of the word Amityville. The racial imbalance situation that still exists at the Northeast School located on Albany Avenue, in the Amityville School District, is now on the verge of making this a very unfriendly village.[7]

On Labor Day weekend, civil rights activists marched through the village with signs reading "Our Town Has Let Us Down," "Bigots Are Not Only in the South," and "School Board Shames Amityville." At a pre-school teachers' luncheon at the newly built junior high school, demonstrators handed out a Clergy and NAACP Committee statement accusing the board of being "ultra-conservative and reactionary," to which the board issued this rejoinder:

> The allegation of intentional segregation is not true, the school attendance being caused solely by residential patterns and the school district is vigorously defending its position to change the attendance pattern because of unwarranted pressure from Negro organizations from inside and outside the district...Amityville does not intend to change attendance areas for its various schools or to assign and transport to school solely on the basis of race or creed.[8]

Integrationists were active at the start of the 1963-1964 school year. On 5 September, "Integration forces quietly picketed the opening sessions of the Northeast Elementary School...calling for a desegregation plan for all Amityville Schools." Richard W. Hasgill, the president of the Central Long Island NAACP, charged that the Northeast School was 90 percent black while the Northwest School was 99 percent white. At the same time that pickets were stationed outside the Northeast School, "12 Negroes who would have been registered in kindergarten through third-grade classes at the Northeast School were taken by parents to the district's Northwest School for a sit-in demonstration." The sit-in continued next day, to the displeasure of district officials: on both days, the twelve students "were placed in a room with a teacher."[9]

The integrationists filed suit in federal court, Brooklyn, to restrain the board from continuing its enrollment policy at Northeast School, and urged a mass boycott of the schools. Throughout the first week of school, pickets continued the attack on de facto segregation of the Northeast School. Unfortunately for the protestors, Chief Judge Joseph C. Zavatt "refused to sign a restraining order barring the operation of an Amityville, L.I. school that is 95 per cent Negro."[10]

During the second week of school, "Integration pickets demonstrated at the Park [Avenue] Elementary School, then moved to the predominantly Negro Northeast School." At the head of the protest was the Reverend Andy L. Lewter, pastor of the Holy Trinity Baptist Church. The integrationists also held to their promise by conducting a one-day boycott of the schools on 13

September: "Mrs. Betty Brown, a member of the NAACP unit's Strategy Committee, said that 85 percent of the kindergarten-through-third-grade pupils at the predominantly Negro Northeast School had been kept home by parents." Racial tensions flared. The next week a cross was burned on the front lawn of Dr. Eugene Reed, a prominent North Amityville dentist and president of the State Conference of the NAACP.[11]

The cross burning served only to strengthen the integrationists' resolve and convince them that the only clear way to achieve their goal was winning seats on the school board. In spring 1964, a biracial organization backed the candidacy of Mae Walker, a black woman whose four-point platform consisted of "ending de facto segregation at the Northeast School; better communication between the board of education, the taxpayers, and teachers; formation of a permanent advisory committee; and a program to raise the level and broaden the scope of the district's educational service to its children." According to Walker, the board "must recognize its obligation to lead the community to better education by proposing a community-wide solution to the de facto segregation problem that exists, without waiting further decisions in the courts." Walker lost, yet the integrationists battled on. During a May 1964 Civil Rights Day Celebration on Long Island, Hasgill and Delores Quintyne, the president of Suffolk CORE, led a boycott of the Northeast School. The picketers conducted a peaceful protest, carrying signs reading: "Freedom Now," "We March for Democratic Education," and "Now Is the Time for Amityville to Integrate." Ten Suffolk patrolmen were on hand to maintain order. Only forty-five pupils showed up for classes, "about 12 per cent of the morning enrollment." [12]

Once more the protestors appealed to the state education department for relief. Their case appeared stronger in the wake of Allen's Malverne directive and the statistical breakdown showing overwhelming ethnic disparity between the Northeast and Northwest schools. The NAACP had indicated that it would withdraw its suit if the board of education was willing to reorganize the district. At a 7 October 1965 board meeting, Joan Franklin, NAACP counsel for the plaintiffs in *Bedford v. Board of Education, Amityville Union Free School District* (1965), requested that the trustees put aside the issue of money and busing. The board's attorney, LeRoy Van Nostrand (who still holds the position), noted that the increasing African American population had resulted in an "out-migration of white students to the point that a community problem is involved which will be harder to meet the more the ratio changes." He was relying on similar arguments the Malverne Board of Education had made in challenging Allen's order. Van Nostrand argued that "Amityville has been integrated for the past hundred years, and we believe it still is. We accept the argument that it is difficult for welfare agencies to place these children. They have come to where there are families that will take them and that is in Amityville." His chronology was somewhat incorrect. The school district did

Delores Quintyne

not become integrated until the completion of the Park Avenue School in 1894-1895, when the board invited Titus Jackson, the principal of a small school on Albany Avenue, to bring his African American students to the new school.[13]

At a fall 1965 hearing, Commissioner Allen listened to arguments on the matter of *Bedford*, during which the NAACP petitioned Allen to "eliminate what is termed imbalance in four of the five elementary schools." The appeal was in the name of Pamela Bedford, the daughter of Kenneth R. Bedford, president of the Central Long Island NAACP, and thirteen other youngsters. The petitioners, led by Joan Franklin, based their case on a New York State Court of Appeals ruling that the commissioner has the power to "provide for equal educational opportunity for all pupils." Van Nostrand, relying on the 1956 *Bell* decision, argued that this was a "blatant request to assign children to schools on the basis of color." He had moved to dismiss the appeal on

grounds that it was "not in the public interest for a party to be heard a second time on an issue which has been called upon and contested."[14]

Franklin referred to compelling statistics showing that 454 of the Northeast School's 469 pupils were black, while 568 of the Northwest School's 593 were white; of the previously integrated Park Avenue School's 1,159 students, 736 were white, 423 black. Van Nostrand countered that "there had been a change in attendance at the Northeast and Northwest schools as a result of moving the sixth-grade classes to the new junior high school." Trying to inject a sense of fiscal responsibility to his argument, he added:

> Grades four and five had been moved to the Park Avenue School, where there are more whites than there would be if the same classes were moved to the Northwest...The cost of the expanded service, involving the use of 10 additional buses, will come to $35,370 for the balance of the school year. The cost for a full year, according to administration, would be $58,950, which would account for a tax increase of 5 per cent.[15]

On 21 December 1965, Allen rendered his decision: the "Board of Education must take steps to counteract the educational problems caused by such imbalance." With respect to transportation, "the distances...were not great and this was a small matter that should not influence the racial balance of the schools." Although the board had set up many programs, "mere additional instruction and assistance aimed at help for the disadvantaged will not alone solve the educational problems caused by racial imbalance." Although some issues remained to be resolved, the acrimony characterizing the Malverne crisis was not duplicated in Amityville after Allen's decision. In January 1966, the board of education complied with the directive and revamped the system to end racial imbalance in the elementary schools:

> Northeast would house all kindergarten students. Grades 1 through 5 would be set up in the Northwest school for neighborhood youngsters and Northeast youngsters living south of Nathalie Avenue. The Park Avenue Schools would hold grades 1 through 5 for that area, plus Northeast youngsters now living on Nathalie Avenue and north of it.

The plan was approved by Allen on 23 June 1966. When the 1966-1967 school year began, the *Amityville Record* reported that, "For the first time all kindergarten children will attend school in the same building, complying with Commissioner Allen's plan."[16]

According to LeRoy Van Nostrand, the issue involved more than race: "About 1960, there was an appeal made by Mr. Bedford, who then was working for the NAACP center in Hempstead. The result was the formation of the Princeton Plan that students be sent to school according to class or grade rather than neighborhood, as it was before." Though the plan eliminated many

obstacles, it created three new problems. First, it changed Amityville's traditional policy of integration. Second, the cost of busing dramatically increased, which contributed to the third problem of private school competition, also known as "white flight." Some three of every ten families began sending their children to private schools "because the cost was the same as for public school, and the education was better.'"

Van Nostrand insists that the school district never was segregationist, and that much more than necessary was made of this.

> Those living in the north did not object to the Princeton Plan, while those in the south accepted it because there was no difference in where their children were going to school— their only objection was that the cost of transportation increased. This increase also led to more of those children going to private schools.[17]

If reluctant resignation marked one side, determination reflected the other. In the opinion of Eugene Reed, race was the real issue.

Eugene Reed and Irwin Quintyne

> The Amityville school system wanted to keep the schools segregated. North Amityville, where most African Americans lived, was divided into two areas by Route 110.The west side was white, the east side black. The school board decided to build two elementary schools, one on the east side and one on the west, less than one mile apart. I was very involved in a big war over that issue and registered my concerns with Albany. Connie Motley, a former federal judge, was top assistant to Thurgood Marshall and much involved in school desegregation. When we went to the Amityville School Board and Connie made a presentation, the board president told her, "You should be up in North Amityville teaching your people how to wash themselves." We won that battle. They still built the two schools, but they were [eventually] integrated.

"No doubt in our minds," Reed concluded, "the intent was segregation."[18]

The Campaign Against Discrimination in Housing

The struggles in Malverne and Amityville combined old and new direct action techniques to abolish de facto segregation. The same applied to the elimination of housing discrimination, one of the most blatant forms of prejudice which, as John Hope Franklin observed,

> was not only private practice but public policy... Despite the fact that by 1962 some seventeen states and fifty-six cities had passed laws or resolutions against housing discrimination, the bias persisted. Banks, insurance companies, real estate boards, and brokers greatly benefited from segregated housing for which they received a maximum profit from a minimum expenditure."[19]

The battle on Long Island was as intense as anywhere in the nation, especially regarding zoning, segregated housing patterns, and refusal to sell or rent to African Americans in white suburbs. In the late 1950s, evidence of discrimination and lack of concern for minority living conditions was glaringly apparent. In June 1957, the North Hempstead town board "voted down its own proposal to create an industrial park next to a predominantly Negro section of New Cassel." The vote came in response to a heated hearing at which "200 Negroes charged that downzoning of eighteen blocks from residential to light industry would devalue their property and produce 'messy' conditions." One speaker from New Cassel's Progressive Civic Association implored: "[It has] taken us years to build this very desirable neighborhood...It is hard for us in a minority group to obtain homes."[20]

Another 1957 incident involved a disabled veteran employed at a Mineola lithographic plant, who purchased a home in Copiague. No sooner did William

Delgado and his family move in, reported *Newsday*, they were

> hounded from their new Copiague home by a week of vile and threatening phone calls because somebody mistook them for Negroes. [The] dark-skinned Caucasian said nothing like that ever had happened to him in the many years he'd lived in the South. "And even if I were colored wouldn't I have the right to live?"

The Delgados moved back to his father's home in Amityville.[21]

As early as 1961, civil rights activists sought to promote the sale of homes on "an open occupancy basis." Mark Dodson, of CORE, began working with the recently established Long Island Council for Integrated Housing to provide "decent housing for all." Dodson claimed that, "The brokers have dictated our living conditions and have prevented the white and negro population from living together in healthy integrated patterns. They have fomented and spread the myths and misconceptions about real estate value, which are used to deny equality of housing."[22]

An early attempt to keep neighborhoods from becoming entirely African American took place in Lakeview. Ironically, rather than white people seeking to prevent the influx of blacks, here the fight was led by African American residents, urging "other Negroes not to buy homes there to prevent the area from eventually becoming predominantly Negro." Lincoln Lynch, a native of the British West Indies and a forty-year-old flight operations officer with British Overseas Airways, was one of the first nonwhites to move into Lakeview, in 1959. As a leader of CORE, he organized a campaign "designed to stop the panic selling which has developed in the neighborhood or in any other neighborhood where the percentage of Negroes has reached a high level he runs the risk of creating a segregated situation for himself." Many onlookers must have been puzzled by the reversal of standard attitudes as they watched African Americans carrying signs reading "Negroes: Your purchase of a home in this neighborhood is your contribution to segregation." This campaign was prompted by virtual panic among about forty of the white owners "of between 150 and 200 homes... for sale because of the increase in Negro residents." Lynch's campaign was designed to prevent "white flight," the common urban phenomenon which now seemed to grip suburbia. Lynch searched for the "point after which a neighborhood will become all-Negro. We're groping now, but we're trying to use the national percentage as a yardstick for our area. About 10 percent Negro."[23]

Newsday charged two Bellport real estate agencies with trying to "force quick turnovers of homes from white to Negro families by warning that a Negro influx was descending on the area anyway." The local taxpayers association held firm, advising residents to sell only at fair market value. The association's president, Al Bach, observed that:

> Real estate salesmen were active for a three-week period here last month [August 1962] with blockbusting and scare tactics, but left

quickly when association protests were aired. At the time for-sale signs went up like seagulls flocking to a garbage scow."[24]

Blockbusting and racial steering became serious problems. According to Kevin Curry, who monitored real estate agency tactics for the Diocese of Rockville Centre,

> There [were] concerns about organized attempts by real estate brokers to influence cost. You get a white couple and a black couple and together you develop a parallel profile. Each goes to [the] same broker looking for a home [in] the same price range; both present...profiles including income and education...as close...with the exception of color. The black couple was taken to black areas; we were taken to white areas. The broker had a map and he pointed to an area where we lived at the time. He used the term "jungle bunnies"; it was considered middle class but was interracial and had been since the Korean War. None of this came as a surprise to any of the black couples. It surprised me that it was so blatant."[25]

This was supported by John Edmead, an African American United Parcel Service executive, who moved to Roosevelt from Queens in 1963.

> In Queens...Malcolm X was the big deal. He made everyone think and see the inequality. It was a difficult time because black people did not have the things white people had. Many families were poor and the communities they lived in reflected it. Roosevelt was different. There were no groups, there really wasn't much going on. As I got older things began to change. I saw black neighborhoods developing. At that time they called it blockbusting. They told the white families, you better move out, the neighborhood is turning black. The real estates prospered and it segregated the communities. You can still see that today, it is very difficult for a black family to move into an all-white neighborhood. Prejudice was all around.[26]

From the point of view of real estate agents, such tactics deserved legal remedies. John Petracca, a retired broker, remembers that in the early 1960s, "real estate agents would steer black families away from predominantly white neighborhoods... [They] would put a scare into white neighborhoods that a black family was moving in, so the white people would sell. Realtors were creating their own market." When the market was slow they would try to convince an unhappy owner to sell for fear the value of the house would drop. In time, and in compliance with the federal government's Fair Housing Law, such tactics became illegal. Maria Hudack, a current broker, is mindful of Title VII of the 1968 Civil Rights Act, which makes "illegal any discrimination in the sale, lease or rental of property based on race, color,

religion, sex, or national origin."[27]

It was a struggle that civil rights activists worked long and hard to win. As early as 1961, the New York State NAACP staged a demonstration in Albany urging stronger sanctions for the Metcalf-Baker Fair Housing Bill. Led by Dr. Eugene Reed, State Conference president, busloads of Long Islanders joined New York City representatives in lobbying legislators and the governor's office. Two Amityville residents who took prominent parts in the lobbying—Charles Bellinger, the president, and Dottie Devine, a board member, of the NAACP's Central Long Island Branch—both met with Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller. Devine emphasized that "integrated housing would provide better educational facilities for minority groups so that Negro youths may qualify themselves for better jobs in the future."[28]

The Island, however, was not quite ready for the challenge. Another leading activist, W. Burghardt Turner, criticized local authorities for neglecting the living conditions in some African-American communities. Turner, a former social studies teacher in the Patchogue-Medford School District and the head of an NAACP branch, became the executive director of the Suffolk County Human Rights Division, from 1968 to 1986. Turner recently reflected that, "Black children were ridiculed by the white children when their parents expressed concerns about they way their were treated. There were differences in housing and jobs. Everyone was not equal." School administrators and local governments turned deaf ears to charges of discrimination. Even the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which many refer to as the "Second Emancipation Proclamation, "was not being utilized effectively...Many politicians were hoping that the Civil Rights Bill would go away. The legislation was not being utilized, it was not being enforced."[29]

One of Turner's main concerns was calling attention to the deplorable living conditions faced by many African Americans in eastern Suffolk County. After inspecting fifteen rented homes in the Center Moriches-East Moriches area, he was shocked:

> If someone didn't tell you, you would think some of the houses are tool sheds or chicken coops. I found a family of ten occupying two tiny rooms on Railroad Avenue. Kerosene heat was provided by the tenants in all the houses. We must assume that county and town officials do not know about the conditions. If they knew about them they would have to do something about these horrible conditions.

Turner called on Suffolk County and Brookhaven town officials to take immediate action to correct these "horrible, demoralizing and mentally debilitating conditions." The following day, Suffolk County Welfare Commissioner Richard Di Napoli began to seek ways to make landlords properly maintain the houses they lease; Herbert Davis, Brookhaven's fire inspector, found two homes violating the fire code; and Sydney Beckwith, the county health department's chief inspector, saw numerous violations including mounds of garbage, poor sanitation, and plumbing irregularities. Turner

praised this action, but warned that, "We understand it may be as bad in Gordon Heights, Patchogue, Mastic, and Centereach." In addition, officials served a notice of eviction on the family of Rosa Booker, who rented a house on Railroad Avenue, just north of the Moriches Bypass:

> Mrs Booker, whose family is on welfare, said she receives $175 a month from the county and pays $55 in rent. The one-story house in which her family lives has no inside bathroom. It has an inoperative water tap and a sagging kitchen floor. It was cited in the notice for improper electrical wiring and a faulty kerosene heater.

Turner sympathized with the tenants but not the landlords: "We want to see the landlords and not the victims punished." Although Di Napoli agreed that "many Negroes on the welfare roles are living in substandard homes," he felt powerless to offer an immediate solution: "[The] department had found it almost impossible to find proper housing for large Negro families."[30]

Moriches was only the tip of the iceberg. In affluent Southampton, a row of homes along Sunrise Highway off Sag Harbor Turnpike had no running water or electricity, and malfunctioning toilets. In one case, "an 83-year-old man slept in a bed beneath a sagging I-beam that was supported by a two-by-four to keep the shack from crushing its occupants." A middle-age woman in one of the shacks told a *Newsday* reporter, "There is nothing better. Sometimes I think Negroes would be better staying in the South than to come north to pick potatoes and escape prejudice. At least they can be warm in the winter...At least they can take a bath." Myron Nelson, president of the eastern branch of the NAACP, pointed out that, "Again you see people that in many cases can afford better but there is nothing better." A good many of these were products of the migrant farm workers' situation. Some remained permanently on the Island while others returned for seasonal employment. "You've seen larger slum areas in Riverhead and in western Suffolk Towns," Nelson commented, "but...it isn't the size of the area that determines whether a slum exists. There are only six houses here, but it is a slum, and it should be eliminated." Southampton Supervisor Stephen Meschutt found it hard to accept such criticism. Claiming he never heard any complaints, he rejoined: "There are a lot of white people in this and other towns that don't live in the kind of homes they want to live in."[31]

The NAACP's attack on slum housing spread to Bay Shore, where it changed from criticizing to embarrassing slum lords by such projects as assisting residents of "Third Avenue and East Third Avenue to clean up in and around their homes." Housing Committee chairman Ercell Williams proclaimed: "We want these people to feel...part of the community...[To] take more interest in their children and attend PTA meetings." In Babylon, the town building inspector, Herbert Zirck, inspected thirty welfare homes, many of which were converted garages or accessory buildings never "intended for use by human beings." Twenty-five landlords were issued summonses, with rents

withheld until violations were corrected, mostly for shacks behind the homes of individual landlords with average rents of $50 per month. In compelling compliance with housing codes and convincing violators of the gravity of the situation, names of guilty landlords were listed in the local press.[32]

Problems persisted, exemplified by the Hollis Warner Farm community in Riverhead, where more than six hundred migrant workers lived on the 447-acre farm, many in cottages housing six to a room. Both the Salvation Army and the Diocese of Rockville Centre called for an investigation, supporting CORE's demands that Hollis Warner Farm declare all housing in Riverhead town "open"; move the tenants to decent housing; examine state-financed programs for retraining farm tenants; and develop low-cost housing programs in Riverhead. Activists like Lincoln Lynch argued: "These people have forgotten that they are alive. We want to show them that if you pick up one foot and stretch it forward, you go some place."[33] The situation persisted for years, a persistent eyesore on Long Island, until the decline of farms and housing expansion eventually led to the collapse of migrant farming late in the 1980s.

The scope of the recently established State Commission on Human Rights was tested by Farrell Jones, its Long Island director, who charged the development corporation that built Centre City, in Merrick, with discrimination. An African American couple had placed a binder on one of the newly constructed homes, but filed a complaint with the Long Island Council for Integrated Housing when their money suddenly was returned without a reasonable explanation. The agency then set up a "tester"—using black and white couples to check alleged discrimination. A black couple went to Centre City and was told that no houses were available, but a white couple, the "testers," was offered the choice of four homes and within a week received three phone calls urging them to buy. The state commission, on behalf of the council, ordered the developers to

> send a letter of apology to the Bradleys; offer for sale an equivalent house; provide written instructions to all its sales people emphasizing a strict adherence to nondiscriminatory policies; and keep on file a record of all applicants who were refused purchases, including dates and reasons for such rejection.[34]

Rentals were another aspect of discrimination that civil rights activists set their sights on eradicating. In early 1964, pickets pitched a tent on Merrick Road, in Amityville, where for three days Suffolk CORE and the Huntington Township Committee on Human Relations marched in front of the Beachview Apartments, as well as Wagner's Plumbing and Heating, the owners' place of business in Huntington Station. A full-court press was applied on Abraham Wagner and his brother, who refused to rent to African Americans, with picketing of both places and a sit-in at the model apartment at Beachview. After the third day, the owners relented: *Newsday* reported "Suffolk's first sit-in and sleep-in for housing equality ended...with a victory for the civil

rights movement: a one-year lease in an all-white neighborhood for a young Negro couple." Mr. and Mrs. Colin Smith, of Amityville, signed a one-year lease for a $130-a-month, three-and-a-half-room apartment. Direct-action protest at last accomplished a quick response.[35]

Throughout 1964, civil rights groups responded to many acts of discrimination. For three days, fifteen people sat-in at the home of a Huntington woman who refused "to rent the upstairs apartment of a two-story house to a Negro woman" who filed a complaint under the Metcalf-Baker Fair Housing Law, which prohibited "denial on racial, religious, ethnic grounds of housing that is offered to the public." Three African American and seven white participants in this sit-in were arrested on trespassing charges, and the homeowner, William Sebastian, signed a complaint. The demonstrators were released without bail, but Sebastian, refusing to bow to pressure exerted by the state Human Rights Commission, vowed to "rent the apartment to someone else." Commissioner Frank Z. Giaconne stated that his office lacked the power to keep the owner from renting the apartment before the commission could rule on the charges later that year, in which case any finding would be moot because there was no enforcement procedure. In front of Babylon Town Supervisor William T. Lauder, protestors fought to block the town board's consideration of rezoning in North Amityville from residential to light industrial classification: The "meeting chamber was filled with the strains of 'We Shall Overcome,' the civil rights hymn...as about 50 Negroes walked out after voicing protests against the idea of downzoning some 43 North Amityville acres for the creation of an industrial park." The protest worked. Emulating the NAACP's efforts in Bay Shore, more than thirty CORE members assisted Hempstead tenants in "cleaning up the grounds of Wilklow Apartments..to inspire Negro tenants to improve conditions and to unite in a group that could negotiate with the landlord, the Graham Franklin Corporation of Brooklyn" to improve maintenance of the apartments. Joannie Johnson, of Levittown, CORE's housing cochair, stated, "The best thing we can do is to get the tenants organized to do for themselves." CORE pickets were also in Syosset, where the owners of a house backed off from selling to an African American electrical engineer and his wife, "after receiving several anonymous telephone threats, apparently from white neighbors." The owners did not count on an equally determined effort by protestors to hold them to their original commitment: "The 20 CORE pickets, who demonstrated silently, got some unexpected support from a 12-year-old girl who left her playmates, walked to the middle of the tree-lined street and, with a piece of chalk, printed in neat, three-foot-long letters, 'Freedom for All.'" It turned out to be more than the owners bargained for; the sale materialized.[36]

Perhaps the highlight of housing protests in 1964 occurred in Hicksville. In early August, CORE launched an eight-day protest against the real estate office of Vigilant Associates, accused of discrimination after refusing to show houses to an African American. By the fourth day tempers flared. A shoving match had to be broken up by twenty-to-fifty police backed by fifty

steel-helmeted Nassau special events police. Tension was exacerbated by the distribution of John Birch Society literature and the announcement of a formal "anti-CORE committee to oppose the civil rights picketing." The confrontation erupted when CORE and anti-CORE pickets "rushed for vacated sidewalk space" around 8:10 pm, shouting at and elbowing each other before the police separated them and they "then shared the walk in segregated groups" until picketing ceased three hours later. Distaste for civil rights demonstrators was expressed by John Bayer, a young anti-CORE member, who said his group was "just an organized bunch of human beings. The stocky, sandy-haired youth [claimed Negroes were] 100 years behind and they want to catch up in one night." The clash finally ended in the second week of August with an accord in which CORE would end picketing, drop its complaint against Vigilant with the State Human Rights Commission, and notify brokers three days before forming a picket line to allow time for discussion. Vigilant pledged to observe the state law barring discrimination, inform its salesmen in writing of its compliance, and discontinue its libel action in Supreme Court.[37]

The year 1965 brought more protests and demonstrations. In Hempstead, a partial rent strike took place at the twenty-unit Park Lake Apartments. Lee Hilton, head of the Tenants' Council and the caller of the strike, stated his impression "that [the manager] seems to realize that we mean business." The garden apartment development, almost all of whose tenants were black, stretched along both sides of Wilklow Avenue from South Franklin Street to Circle Drive. Tenants were urged not pay rent increases imposed despite the run-down condition of many apartments:

> The Wilklow Tenants Council and CORE called the strike...to protest the rent increases and the alleged failure of the development's owner, the Graham Franklin Corporation, to make necessary repairs. The rent increases...are $5 for five-room apartments that had rented for $125 a month and $6 for six-room apartments that had rented for $137 a month.[38]

This new tactic heralded things to come. After a two-month standoff, CORE and the Wilklow Tenants Council conducted a peaceful demonstration: "Carrying candles, American flags and placards, about 350 persons marched through downtown Hempstead...to the village hall where they presented to the village board a petition protesting living conditions a the Park Lake Apartments." The well-organized demonstrators were armed with loudspeakers and a patriotic appeal:

> Walking two and three abreast on the sidewalk, the line of marchers walked down South Franklin to Main Street then into Nichols Court. They sang "We Shall Overcome" and "Ain't Nobody Gonna Turn Around" and chanted "Freedom Now." A truck topped by loudspeakers and two American flags, idled along the route of march...There were

> Negro men and women, with a scattering of white adults, students and children.

A delegation of twelve Park Lake residents presented a petition demanding that the "village take over the apartment project and use the rent money for rehabilitation, that rent control be adopted, and that the village hire more Negroes, specifically on the police and fire departments." The newly elected mayor, Walter B. Ryan, argued that it would be illegal for the village to take over the Park Lake project: "We can't do it and we have no control over rent control. That is a state matter." Lynch retorted: "If they don't have the authority, they can get it. They can change the laws, if they are determined. We will come back. We are not going to be satisfied." At the rally he also told the cheering crowd: "The white power structure means you no good. You're not going to get anything unless you demand it."[38]

The year witnessed other efforts. In Hempstead, an accord was finally reached in the case of Gwendolyn Langley, a mother of two children who was separated from her husband: "A settlement was reached...in a three-week long dispute between the owners of a Hempstead apartment house [Hampshire House] and the Long Island Congress of Racial Equality, which had charged that a Negro mother was denied an apartment because of her race." In Setauket, a home purchased by an African-American couple, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Bayis, from Queens, was defaced with KKK lettering. Their new home, in the Heatherwood Housing Development, had been vandalized: "Ku Klux Klan had been painted in red, three-foot-high letters on the side of the $15,000 home at No. 21 [Bobcat Lane] and in eight-inch letters on a front shutter of the unoccupied house." In Islip and Rockville Centre, moreover, slum landlords and urban renewal projects became top priorities. In Islip, CORE led protests against rising rents and unsanitary living conditions. According to Lee Hilton, "We're not going to pay the increased rent unless something [is] done about our homes." In response, the Islip NAACP, in conjunction with the Housing and Relocation Bureau, "assisted tenants in moving into houses containing sufficient heat, lighting, ventilation, and sanitary facilities." In Rockville Centre, the NAACP, CORE, and the Rockville Centre Committee on Human Rights obtained an agreement from village leaders that urban renewal would insure improved living conditions for minority residents, "in the best interest of the entire community."[39]

Militant rhetoric did not diminish for the remainder of the decade. In April 1966, African American leaders threatened to make Long Beach a "'Montgomery of the North' by demonstrations, organizing the poor and an economic boycott of merchants they believe guilty of discrimination." Activists charged that the county welfare department neglected welfare recipients and supported slum conditions by paying rent to slum landlords. Lynch indicated that CORE would back the NAACP, and intimated that Long Beach "merchants and hotel operators are thinking of the summer season [but] there aren't going to be any visitors coming because Long Beach is going to

be a pretty hot place and I don't means the temperatures." In 1967, the Hempstead Committee for Action Now, consisting of representatives from churches, civic associations, and social groups as well as CORE and the NAACP, urged officials to construct "low-cost apartments in the village urban renewal project...[end] downzoning in residential areas and increase village efforts to improve care of dwellings by landlords." Furthermore, in 1967, Brookhaven became the first of Suffolk's ten towns to adopt anti-discrimination measures similar to those suggested by the Suffolk Human Relations Commission. Town leaders passed a resolution to:

> (1) provide an attorney to act as liaison man for board and human rights groups in matters concerning discrimination; (2) have state anti-discriminatory laws printed on building permit applications, building permits and certificates of occupancy issued by the town; and (3) direct any newspaper carrying legal notices for the town to print the state anti-discrimination laws in their classified real estate advertising sections.

Unfortunately, a year later five African American residents demanded that the town board pass an open-housing law, citing "discrimination in buying houses and land and renting apartments." W. Burghardt Turner, now Suffolk's NAACP coordinator, "told the board that his home in Patchogue was taken off the market the day after he expressed interest in buying it in 1954. The next day, he said, a white friend bought it and resold it to him. There were no other Negroes in the neighborhood then, and there are none now." Others bolstered Turner's view on housing discrimination: "One said that he was quoted one price for a plot of land on the phone and later a higher price when he spoke to the broker in person. Another said that he was told that no homes were for sale in a development while they were being sold to white persons."[40]

By the end of the decade, housing discrimination remained a top priority of the Island's civil rights activists. In Port Jefferson, protestors demanded open-housing legislation, claiming that, "All eight Brookhaven incorporated villages are exempt from town open housing ordinance which carries a maximum $250 fine and 1 or 5 days in jail for violations...No villages have such ordinances." The Port Jefferson trustees argued that this was unnecessary because of state plans to open a human relations office in Suffolk. In Oyster Bay, moreover, a major zoning battle took place. James Davis, an officer of the state NAACP charged that, "Town laws were aimed at discouraging two-family and multi-family dwellings and that lower-income families cannot afford a single-family home with the minimum amount of land required." Area residents refused to allow civil rights charges to go unchallenged. A civic group led by Dr. Gerard Bomse, of Woodbury, "made it clear that this is not a black-vs.-white issue. It's just a case of trying to knock local zoning...which should be strenuously maintained." The NAACP charged that "current zoning excludes up to 80 percent of the metropolitan area's population, including blacks and other poor people, because...they cannot afford to build new houses

on the large plots required by the town." In response to Bomse, Jerry H. Guess, the New York-New England regional director of the NAACP, took a more blunt approach: "Racism under any guise, regardless of how presented, is still racism. It's a dastardly shame...that they would want to exclude systematically through capricious zoning people who are less fortunate than they." In an effort to combat "restrictive suburban zoning," the NAACP asked the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to cut off federal funds to the town, and also threatened court action. Town Supervisor Michael N. Petito argued that, "It's a matter of economics; a lot a whites can't afford to move in, too." Changing the zoning ordinances, he added, would have a "phenomenal staggering effect on the town's fiscal situation as well as the school districts." The battle raged into the new decade.[41]

In 1968, despite some optimistic appraisals, a *Newsday* reporter, Tom Morris, pointed out that:

> Perhaps the core problem on Long Island...is housing discrimination, an area where civil rights leaders have found only token success. The Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board...noted that there were about 25,000 substandard housing units on Long Island housing 100,000 persons, most of them nonwhite.

A year later, Gregory Schirmer added to Morris's gloomy assessment: "[The] percentage of Negroes...combined with few anticipated changes in housing patterns, indicate that Long Island is headed toward bigger and bigger ghettos." In Suffolk, a state report said that "despite a 72 percent increase in Negro population in the county between 1960 and 1968, the county's Negroes remain concentrated in selective areas, including four 'census tracts' where Negroes constituted more than 50 percent of the population: Wyandanch, Amityville, Coram and Gordon Heights." A bi-county study also indicated that "Nassau and Suffolk needed 48,500 units of public housing, compared with 1,186 existing units." In the coming decade low and middle-income housing would remain the battlefield in the civil rights war against housing discrimination.[42]

NOTES

1. See William T. Lauder and Charles F. Howlett, *Amityville's 1894 School House* (Amityville: Amityville Historical Society, 1994).

2. Jennifer Gergen, "De Facto Segregation in the Amityville School System" (Honors paper, Amityville High School, 1986); Minutes, Amityville Board of Education, 20 May 1954; *Amityville Record,* 10 Sept. 1953, 22 and 29 Apr. 1954.

3. *Amityville Record,* 22 Apr. 1954.

4. *Amityville Record,* 16 June 1955 and 19 Jan. 1956; *Bell v. Board of Education, Amityville Union Free School District* (1956), State Education Department Transcript, Amityville School District Files; *Amityville Record,* 19 July 1956; Gergen passim.

5. Evelyn Thomas, interview by author, 26 May 1995; at a 14 Feb. 1962 meeting attended by fifty parents, the Central Long Island Branch of the NAACP urged "Mr. Kittle and the Amityville Board of Education to recognize that a school segregated, whatever the cause, exists, and to take whatever steps may be necessary to eliminate segregation" ("School Issue Revived by the NAACP," *Amityville Record*, 21 Feb. 1962).

6. "Negro on Long Island: Complacent, Leader Avers," *Amityville Record*, 20 June 1963.

7. "Board Still Looks to Court of Northeast School Issue," ibid., 9 July 1963; "School Board to Stand Pat on Northeast Attendance," ibid., 8 Aug. 1963; "School Impasse to Bring Demonstration In Village," ibid., 29 Aug. 1963.

8. "Demonstrations March Over Racial Issue," *Amityville Record*, 5 Sept. 1963; "Boycott of Stores Now Looms in School District," 12 Sept. 1963; in *Bell v. School, City of Gary*, 324 F. 2d 209 (7th Cir. 1963), the court noted:"There is no affirmative United States constitutional duty to change innocently arrived at school attendance districts by the mere fact that shifts in population either increase or decrease the percentage of either Negro or white pupils."

9. "Pickets in Amityville" and "Amityville Pickets," *New York Times*, 5 and 6 Sept. 1963; Tom Greece, Irwin Quintyne, June Shagaloff-Alexander, and Eugene Reed, interviewed by Gregg Postal and Mark Panek, Feb 1986, cited in Postal and Panek, "The Civil Rights Movement in Amityville," honors paper, Amityville High School, in "Journal of Historical Inquiry," Amityville Public Library.

10. "Amityville Parents Sue," *New York Times*, 10, 12 Sept. 1963.

11. "Amityville Protest Goes On"; "85% Out in Boycott"; "L.I. Cross-Burning Attacks N.A.A.C.P."; ibid., 11, 14, 23 Sept. 1963.

12. "Bi-Racial Unit Backs Bid by Mrs. Walker," *Amityville Record*, 16 April 1964; author's interviews, Nov.-Dec. 1992, with Delores Quintyne, who continues to serve as an Amityville public school substitute teacher; "Civil Rights 'Day' Celebrated on LI," *Newsday*, 18 May 1964.

13. "40% Negro Population Cited at Albany School Hearing," *Amityville Record*, 21 Oct. 1965.

14. Ibid.; *Bedford v. Board of Education, Amityville Union Free School District* (1965), State Education Department transcript, Amityville School District files; Gergen passim; "New NAACP Tack Taken on Schools," *Amityville Record*, 19 Aug. 1965.

15. "40% Negro Population," *Amityville Record*, 21 Oct. 1965; Gergen passim.

16. "30-Room School Now Looming in District's Expansion Planning," "School Board Adjusting to State Order Ending Racial Imbalance," and "Opposition to Busing for Kindergarten"; *Amityville Record*, 23, 30 Dec. 1965, 10 Feb. 1966; "Racial Order," ibid., 20 Jan. 1966; "4,600 Listed for Opening of Schools," ibid., 1 Sept. 1966.

17. LeRoy Van Nostrand, interview by Michael Freeman and Alexis Elman, 5 Apr. 1995, cited in Freeman and Elman, "A History of Northeast and Northwest Schools" (social studies honors paper, Amityville High School, 1995).

18. Eugene T. Reed, interview by Donna Barrett, 15 Feb. 1995, cited in Barrett, "Civil Rights and the Roman Catholic Church," paper, Adelphi Univ., 1995; Gergen passim;

Ken Moritsugu, "Rights Chief's Suit Recalls '60s," *Newsday*, 25 June 1995.

19. John Hope Franklin, *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans* (New York: Vintage Books, 3d ed., 1967), 640.

20. "Town Drops Protested Industry Zone," *Newsday*, 13 June 1957.

21. "Baited as Negro, Whites Flee LI Home," ibid., 14 June 1957.

22. Roy R. Silver, "C.O.R.E. Chapter Plans To Hit Homes Available on Integrated Basis," *New York Times*, 11 Oct. 1961.

23. Roy R. Silver, "L.I. Negroes Fight Panic Home Sale," ibid., 20 June 1961.

24. "Blockbusting Cries to Get State Airing," *Newsday*, 1 Sept. 1962.

25. Interview with Kevin Curry, 9 Mar. 1995, cited in Donna Barrett, "Civil Rights and the Roman Catholic Church" (unpublished paper, Adelphi Univ., 1995).

26. Interview with John Edmead, 14 Apr. 1995, cited in Jim Giancola, "Civil Disturbances on Long Island: Riots or Rebellions" (unpublished paper, Adelphi Univ., 1995).

27. Interviews with John Petracca, 24 Mar. 1995, and Maria Hudack, 7 Mar. 1995, cited in Aimee White, "Housing Discrimination on Long Island--1960s" (unpublished paper, Adelphi Univ., 1995).

28. Mary Ross, "Stronger Housing Bill Urged By NAACP Members," *Amityville Record*, 9 Mar. 1961.

29. Phone interview with W. Burghardt Turner, Apr. 1995, cited in Giancola, "Civil Disturbances on Long Island."

30. Bob Uris, "Negro Housing Unfit in Moriches: NAACP," *Newsday*, 9 Jan. 1963; "Officials Check Substandard Negro Housing, ibid., 10 Jan. 1963; "Negro Family Evicted in Shanty Crackdown," ibid., 11 Jan. 1963.

31. Ed Smith, "NAACP Labels Slum in Scenic Southampton," ibid., 14 Jan. 1963.

32. "Bay Shore NAACP To Aid in Cleanup," ibid., 15 Jan. 1963; "Babylon Will Condemn 5 Slum Shacks Today," ibid., 31 Jan. 1963..

33. "Riverhead Conditions Bring Call for Action," *Long Island Catholic*, 30 July 1964.

34. Thomas A. Johnson, "NY Rights Unit Sees Race Bias By Developer," *Newsday* 16 July 1963.

35. Abraham Rabinovich and Kenneth Crowe, "Sit-Ins Win: Negroes Get Apartment," ibid., 27 Jan. 1964; Postal and Panek.

36. "Sit-ins Push for Rental Apartment to Negro, " *Newsday*, 8 Feb. 1964; "Ten Arrested in House Sit-in," *Newsday*, 11 Feb. 1964; "Landlord Says He'll Defy NY Rights Unit," *Newsday*, 28 Feb. 1964; "Town House Hears Song of Civil Rights," *Amityville Record*, 9 March 1964; Donald Drake, "Cleanup of Project Pushed by CORE," *Newsday*, 1 June 1964.; Mel Ray & Stuart Dim," Picket Home After Pair Backs Off Sale to Negro,"

Newsday 3 June 1964; Linda Cahrlton, "Picketing End As Owners OK Sale to Negro," *Newsday*, 4 June 1964.

37. Bill Van Haintze & Jim Scovel, "Cops Break Up Clash of LI CORE and Whites," *Newsday*, 1 Aug. 1964; Dick Zander, "CORE, Firm in Accord; Picketing Ends,' ibid., 8 Aug. 1964.

38. "'Rent Strikers See Hope of Settlement," ibid., 17 Feb. 1965.

39. "Tenants Stage March on Village Hall," ibid., 7 Apr. 1965; Ronald Howorth, "Racism, Money Hot Hempstead Issues," ibid., 12 Mar. 1965.

40. "Negro Gets Apt.; Ending Protest," *Newsday*, 17 Feb. 1965; Abraham Rabinovich, "Negroes' New House Marked Twice by Klan's 'KKK,'" ibid., 3 May 1965,"Landlords Must Evict Their Tenants," ibid., 20 Jan. 1965; "They Also Guaranteed a Decent Relocations of Housing For the Tenants," ibid.,, 23 Mar. 1965; see also, "Court Backs State Unit In Freeport Apt. Bias," ibid., 30 Mar. 1965.

41."NAACP Vows Demonstrations and a Boycott in Long Beach," ibid.,, 1 Apr. 1966. "Hempstead Group Lists Bias Demands," ibid.,17 Feb. 1967; George DeWan, "Brookhaven Hears Open Housing Pleas," ibid.,1 Apr 1968; see also, "Rights Groups Seek Housing Talks With Gov.," ibid., 28 Jan. 1967; Patricia Burstein, "Port Jeff to Reject Open Housing Law," ibid., 3 Feb. 1969. 30. "NAACP Assails Zone Restriction," ibid., 8 May 1969; "NAACP Facing Fight on Zoning," ibid., 24 Oct. 1969; "NAACP Bids U.S. Curb O. Bay Aid," ibid., 17 Nov. 1969.

42. Tom Morris, "LI Confident on Racial Problems," *Newsday*, 1 Mar. 1968; Gregory Schimer, "Bigger Ghettos Seen on LI as Housing Patterns Hold," *Newsday*, 27 Feb. 1969; for background see Salvatore La Gumina, ed., *Ethnicity in Suburbia: The Long Island Experience* (Garden City: Nassau Community College, 1980).

THE DOWNS and UPS of SAMUEL CARMAN (1809-1881): A NINETEENTH-CENTURY SMITHTOWN FARMER and SHIPBUILDER

By Elizabeth Shepherd

In the early nineteenth century, the domain of Richard Smythe remained a land of Smiths and Smith in-laws as it had been since the founder received the patent for Smithtown in 1665. Onto this scene entered Samuel Carman, fully costumed for a leading role. His three-masted bark is emblazoned on the village of Head of the Harbor's seal, and his name on a subdivision sign. Yet Samuel Carman's name did not become a household word, not even on his own home ground. Far from that of a Horatio Alger rags-to-riches hero, his story was marked by as many downs as ups. In his history of Smithtown, Judge John Lawrence Smith, perhaps because he knew him well enough to lend him money, allotted little space to "the late Samuel Carman [whose] residence and farm [covered] an extensive territory and commanding views [and whose] barn, at the highest point, is a well known landmark to mariners passing through the sound." Although Smith ignored Carman as a builder of ships, the *Bi-Centennial History of Suffolk County* credited him with building four schooners at Stony Brook. One Smith descendant, Myrtle Beatrice (L'Hommedieu) Ketcham, remembered the Carman shipyard not far from Cordwood Beach. The stable for the horses that started ships down the ways stands nearby, its footings washed by spring tides. In Beatrice Ketcham's childhood, Carman's son ran the yard. He, too, was named Samuel, which made for some confusion. She had played with his daughters or maybe it was his granddaughters, she was not sure. [1]

Carmans have lived on Long Island since 1644, when John Carman, a shipmaster by trade, crossed the Sound from Stamford as one of the founding patentees of the future town of Hempstead. The Connecticut River was renamed Carman's River in honor of the mid-nineteenth-century owner of a mill in the hamlet of South Haven. George F. Carman, a prominent railroad official and politician, was one of Patchogue's Republican leaders during the formative years of that party. But almost nothing is known of Samuel Carman of Smithtown's background.[2]

In fragments like this and from wills, estate inventories, and store ledgers,

a living person emerged with the restless push for riches that marked the age. If shipowners in New England were amassing fortunes, why not shipbuilders on Long Island, including Carman? There was money in farming and logging as well, all of which and more Carman tried. Opportunities were everywhere. "It never occurred to these countrymen that they *couldn't* do a thing," as Ms. Ketcham's niece put it. And in Smithtown it helped if one were a Smith.

Scratch a little and you find a Smith connection, which for Samuel was made by his mother, Sarah (Wheeler) Carman. In 1815, some years after the death of her husband Isaac Carman, she married William Smith, a descendant of Richard Smythe, who was some forty years her senior and a prosperous sea captain with three grown children. When William and Sarah married she probably had two small sons, George L. and Samuel Carman: no baptismal records remain but wills and church records support this conclusion. Isaac and Sarah were names Samuel Carman gave two of his children, and among his grandsons were a Samuel *Wheeler* Carman, a William, and two Georges. Captain Smith and his young wife had three children, but he never adopted George and Samuel. In 1831, he sold Samuel his former house together with fifteen acres near the head of Stony Brook Harbor—Samuel had just married Eliza Ann Lovett.[3]

While fifteen acres of droughty hills and hollows was not much of a nest egg, they were something. Land, after all, was capital, basic to any kind of success. In the West, where credit was easier, a person could buy public land for $1.25 an acre, but in Smithtown no land was in the public domain and credit often hinged on family relationships. How was twenty-two-year-old Carman to establish that? He had a house and land, but the land was unsuited to marketable crops such as corn and wheat, and not much better as pasture for sheep or cattle. He rented a few acres of pasture from his next-door neighbor Gideon Smith (William Smith's second cousin); though they kept milk on the table, these extra acres hardly eased the way to riches. Even if he raised some crop on shares, as one neighbor did, it hardly filled his pocket. He had to rent (18¾¢ for three days) the very plow with which he turned the soil. He paid Gideon 37½¢ to borrow a horse to ride to Stony Brook.[4]

Carman was continually reminded of money to be made right outside his door. Wagons laden with lumber and firewood, potatoes and grain, creaked past his windows on their way to Stony Brook Harbor; cries of "load sloop" broke his slumbers. At least fifteen sloops, eight schooners, and one brig regularly "trucked" loads past the thatch beds across the shoals into the inner harbor. It was a busy place, Ms. Ketcham remembered, until the early 1900s, at least, with a ship always waiting for parts or repairs. There were cargoes to load and unload, by lantern light as often as not for timetables were set by the tides. At low tide a sloop, often called a "truck," settled alongshore, flat hull resting on the sand, deck within reach of farmers on a cart or wagon. They hustled to finish loading before the tide floated the vessel free. The voyage to the city took two or three days when the winds were fair, and another day or so to the brick kilns at Haverstraw, a regular market for firewood. On one memorable occasion, wind and tides being just right, the trip to the city took

only six hours. Five round trips in one month was the record, and the old histories never mention the long, windless, July days on the Sound or how the passengers amused themselves.[5]

Of that intense, contemporary activity, Judge Smith wrote nothing. Perhaps coastal vessels were so commonplace that he ceased to "see" them. Unlike the square-rigged vessels that crossed the ocean, coastal schooners were small converted sloops with shallow draft and no more than two masts. Sails, masts, everything was arranged so the captain and his one- or two-man crew could maneuver freely in the narrow channels and congested harbors where they docked or ran the ship aground.

Such sloops and schooners had been built in Setauket since Richard Smythe's time. The first yards in Smithtown began operations shortly after the Revolution, first on the far side of the Nissequogue River near the Crossing Over, and then on Stony Brook Harbor (so called officially in 1837). In time there were about twenty shipyards concentrated on West Meadow and Stony Brook creeks, with two at the mouth of the creek at the head of the harbor. These yards were not turning out spectacular clipper ships for long and lucrative transoceanic voyages, but good solid "trucks" designed chiefly to carry cargo to local ports.[6]

There was nothing spectacular about those cargoes, either. For the most part, the ships carried cordwood—fuel for city stoves—a market that continued long after anthracite coal was introduced. There was also demand for barrel staves and for three-foot lengths of wood to serve as chocks to keep hogsheads from shifting on ocean-bound freighters. A coastal schooner might carry up to fifty cords of firewood, for which a farmer usually received $2 a cord, or $100 a load. To earn that much, a skilled laborer needed to work two months, and an unskilled person much longer. If the farmer hired a woodcutter (usually an African American from the South Shore), he paid the man 50¢ a cord. If he paid someone else for the necessary but time-consuming tasks of sharpening saws or grinding axes, he paid 25¢ each time). How many schooner-loads could Carman harvest from his stepfather's hills? How long before those money trees would be gone?[7]

By 1838, enough people became concerned about the ill effects of clear-cutting land to support the passage of a law controlling such practices. "We all here cut our allowance," wrote Gideon Smith to his nephew, in 1849, about locusts he had recently cut in eight-, ten-, and twelve-foot lengths. It is not clear how this law was enforced—or how it affected Carman. Tree cutting went on all winter, shipping during the ice-free months, as Gideon recorded in his ledger during a week in January:

> Sunday Rain
> Monday work in shipyd
> Tuesday work at home Clear
> Whednesday Cut wood Clear
> Thursday cut wood Clear

> Friday kill pig-cut wood Clear
> Saterday Storm snow ground axes
> Sunday blustering Clear
> Monday Cold clear cut wood [original spelling and punctuation]

After mud season passed and spring plowing was done, cordwood was hauled to the shore and stacked along the roads awaiting the "trucks." Richmond T. Burr (born 1882), a local carpenter, recalled seeing stacks from the head of the harbor all the way to the grist mill and beyond, a distance of nearly two miles: People selling property along the landing roads often retained lifetime rights to stack cordwood. When a tree falls now, highway crews cut what is needed to clear the road and the logs may lie there for months before anyone carts the free wood away.[8]

Firewood was one thing, good lumber another. When a shipyard needed lumber, the boss walked out with a farmer to select the trees he wanted. The trees were then cut, carted to the saw mill at the head of the river, milled, and delivered in the desired lengths to the yard. A "stick" of chestnut was worth $2, a "slab" of white pine 31¼¢, or $25 per 1,000 [linear] feet. Sticks, slabs, "plancks" [*sic*], boards, and pieces became furniture and houses as well as boats, while branches, twisted crowns, and anything useless for building purposes became firewood for home use.[9]

Black locust was in demand for ship masts and the all-important trunnels (tree nails) that held a ship's framing and planking together. Shipbuilders sought other native woods, such as elm, black birch, ash, and hackmatack *(Larix laricina)*. While such trees grew here, they seem not to have been noteworthy. However, top prices were paid for chestnut and oak, with chestnut in greater demand for framing and planking. The wood was denser, with a straighter grain and a golden yellow cast. By 1950, however, chestnut was virtually extinct as a result of a fungal disease (as recently as twenty-five years ago, weathered chestnut rail fences cut a century earlier could be found in many abandoned fields).[10]

Carman could scarcely become rich on fifteen acres. Forty acres might yield enough lumber to build a three-masted schooner, but it took twenty years or more before those acres could be harvested again. It is doubtful that woodlots could maintain production of the desired hardwoods, or even firewood. However, one large landowner, Lyman Beecher Smith, was able to produce 300 cords of firewood a year from 450 acres. At that rate, Carman could not fill a small sloop, let alone harvest lumber to build one. For a sustainable and sustaining harvest he needed 100 or 150 acres, which he did not have. Inevitably, he had to cut into his capital.[11] Or, he could make himself handy around the ships, doing small repairs and stockpiling the lengths of lumber most needed for such repairs. That was what Carman's neighbor, Gideon Smith, did. He repaired boats and built up a substantial inventory of lumber and boat supplies: sloop "knees," oakum cotton, rudder stocks, flanges, tie rods, turnbuckles, and lead for the edges of centerboards. In a

natural progression, he converted part of his house to a small shop. Judging from his ledger, he came to stock much more than boat parts. Indeed, he offered nearly everything his neighbors could want, from yard goods and tools, to geese and piglets, to fruit (blue gages, peaches, and apples), black walnuts, and cider.

Smith owned more land than Samuel Carman did. He also had inherited a half share in his uncle Gershon's forty-five-ton sloop *Suffolk*, possibly built at the head of the harbor where the creek bears the name of Gershon's eldest son Obadiah. By 1825, Gideon was building small fishing boats there. In 1830, he completed the seventy-two-ton schooner *Equator*, designed and licensed for the coastal trade. If the judge did not see that work in progress, young Carman certainly did. How could he acquire a share in such a vessel or raise money to build one himself?[12]

It is easier to learn what he did not try than what he did. He did not sign on as mate or master of someone else's ship. The names of his stepbrother Nathan Smith and many other local men appear on the lists of merchant vessels trading out of New York City, never that of Samuel Carman. During the next two decades, Gideon's yard turned out, in addition to *Equator*, two more schooners and two sloops: the ninety-one-ton *Lady Helen* (1837) and eighty-seven-ton *Sylph* (1847), the twenty-one-ton *Isabella Smith* (1840) and seventy-seven-ton *Deception* (1852). All five vessels were built on the south side of Obadiah's Creek. Only the *Isabella*, named for his only child, was built on Gideon's own account; he received the owner's full share from her eleven voyages.[13]

Gideon regularly hired neighbors, keeping time sheets and signed receipts for wages paid. He paid carpenters 14 "shillings" a day, or about $1.75. Painters received 12 shillings, or $1.50, with Gideon providing paint (patent green for the hulls), brushes, varnish, "shellack" [*sic*], and linseed oil. He made tally marks for each man for full and half days (no Sundays), sometimes specifying the work the man did. Among all these names, Samuel Carman's did not appear. However, it showed up briefly in the record books of Daniel Y. Williamson's yard on Stony Brook Creek. Family connections may have ensured steady work for Carman on the far side of that creek, where William Smith's nephew operated the largest yard on the harbor. Captain Jonas Smith—"rich Jonas" or "Jonas the active" to his relatives—was to have some five sloops and twenty schooners to his credit. He owned many of these, maintaining an office in New York City as well as Stony Brook. No records remain of his operations or Carman's role in them, if any.[14]

The banking panic of 1837 saw Carman facing possible bankruptcy. Yet, and this seems a recurring theme, even when his fortunes sank they rebounded quickly. He turned to some sort of "manufacturing," along with his immediate neighbors to the north. One was James Roseman, who had married into Gideon Smith's family; Edward Barry, married to William Smith's niece, was another. The census taker did not note what they made, which might have been tools, rope, boat parts, or forms for the mills at the head of the river. Judge Smith

wrote nothing of Carman's enterprise, although he saw manufacturing as the way to prosperity and vigorously lamented the failure of his fellow townspeople to take advantage of the "natural resources" with which they were blessed. Presumably he meant water power, thinking of mills to rival those of New England.[15]

If local manufacturing remained "behind the age," in the judge's view, commerce thrived. The range of products sold proved the community's contact with other regions if not to local manufacturing. In addition to lumber and produce, Gideon Smith sold tobacco and razors, candles, writing paper, almanacs, gunpowder and shot, shellac, nails, and assorted tools. He also carried molasses and patent medicines like Moffat's Life Pills and Phoenix Bitters. And Gideon's was only one of six stores that catered to the small community around the head of the harbor. The newest, established by Ebenezer Livingston Smith, another of William Smith's nephews, survives to this day, thanks to the Friends for Long Island Heritage, as do many of its old account books. The names of Samuel Carman and three sons, Isaac, Samuel M., and Josephus, appear on these books over a period of almost fifty years. They made modest purchases and paid their bills more or less promptly.[16]

A later proprietor, Andrew Havrisko, reminisced in the 1960s with Richmond T. Burr, who recalled that:

> The [St. James general] store was the gathering place to read the weekly newspaper. Someone would read it, and that paper was read over and over as customers came until the next week's paper came in. Either Ebenezer or [his son] Everett would read or tell [the news] verbally, and it was a reason for people to come to the store.[17]

Such stores were places to drop by and visit, where ideas and local news were exchanged and debated, and goods bartered and sold. Gideon occasionally accepted labor in lieu of cash, while Ebenezer accepted tools and other goods in trade for store items. "One day," mused Havrisko,

> I saw this little old lady talking to herself in front of the candy counter. She looked up at me, and...said, "I was seeing myself coming up the hill on my third birthday. As we trooped up the hill, each had an egg mommy had given us. I was first because it was my birthday with my brothers and sister behind me. I asked Mr. Smith if I could trade for a peppermint stick of candy [which then cost one cent]. We made the trade, and that's the way we celebrated our birthdays."

The customer was Bertha Erma (Jayne) Bethel (born 1889), another Smith as Beatrice Ketcham laughingly explained: "That started with a brother of my grandmother. He married into the Blydenburgh family, and they had a daughter Iva and she married a Jayne—that's where the Jayne comes in. They had that big house there next to the second school house." Their father, Edward Jayne, was a carpenter and regularly bartered duck decoys for goods he needed,

including "a brand new pair of shoes." Havrisko shook his head. "The trade was made for a one-dollar pair of shoes!" The locals sat around "on the porch in the summertime," Bertha told him, "or in the store next to the fire, the potbellied stove [in the winter]...Father wouldn't just loaf, but would carve the decoys...Most were standard full-size [ducks]."[18]

The stores served as banks as well as trading posts. Gideon Smith, for example, not only gave Carman stamps but sometimes advanced teachers their pay. He regularly lent money to customers—25¢ was a usual amount, duly recorded—and small sums to his workers, the equivalent of a day's pay or less. Unlike a bank, Gideon did not cut off Carman or other debtors in bad times, not even during the severe depression of 1857. Sometimes he was repaid in cash, more rarely in labor; sometimes not at all. He once advanced two neighbors $3.00 to compensate them for "damage by hogs getting into corn and eating and destroying the amount hundred 8 bush[els] of ears—at 75 cts per bush." The offending hogs belonged to Samuel Carman, who neither acknowledged the kindness nor reimbursed his neighbor for it. When Gideon's own cow trampled his second cousin's grass, he promptly had "two good judges" assess the damages and offered the cousin its equivalent in hay already cut and stacked.[19]

Carman was seemingly proof against his neighbor's ideas of community responsibility. Besides, he had a considerable community at home. Eliza Ann gave birth with numbing regularity—ten children in fewer than twenty years. On the next census he reported his occupation as agriculture, meaning that he had acquired land he could farm. In 1838 his brother-in-law Alfred Lovett, together with Eliza's aunts Julia and Sarah Lovett, "sold" him four acres on Patchogue Creek for one dollar, but these were wetlands, not croplands. In 1844, Carman paid $1,050 for about one hundred acres (including a share in the thatch beds at Long Beach) more or less contiguous with his original lot, "subject to a mortgage to the Trustees of the Presbyterian Church and Congregation of Smithtown." The land had been part of the old Jonas Smith farm, divided after his death among his seven children. The eldest daughter, Wilhemina (Smith) Barry, sold Carman most of her share. In the language of the deed, it was

> all that certain tract of land with the building thereon on the harbor Beginning at a Marked Cherry tree from thence northerly along the shore to Cord Wood Road, thence westerly and southerly by and with said Road to the Moriches Road thence easterly by and with said Moriches Road to a cedar stake, thence north 30 East by and with the land allotted to [Wilhemina's brother] Ebenezer Smith to the place of beginning [copyist's spelling and punctuation].

There might have been some funny business about the sale of this property, for Wilhemina had to testify before Judge Huntting three years later that she sold the land freely, "without any fear or compulsion of her husband," Edward

Barry. Neither document was filed with the county clerk until 1869.[20]

At last Carman had the capital he needed: good cropland along Moriches Road, more potential woodlots on the hilly land above the harbor, harbor frontage on which to stack cordwood, and a share in the Smith family thatch beds. Hay, along with cordwood, was one the two most important cash crops for Long Island farmers, and Carman surely grew it, for he bought timothy seeds from Gideon Smith, and owned a hay cutter and three hay forks at the time he died. Indeed, Gideon made hay frames for him one year and spent half a day "taking up oats."[21]

Tradition has it that Carman grew corn and other grains on his uplands. Those grain fields might have looked "extensive," yet he still purchased food on credit from Gideon, and later from Ebenezer Smith, items he could have produced himself such as beans, onions, veal, mutton, spareribs, and fish (he did plant sprouting onions and turnips).[22]

Gideon Smith slaughtered beef, pork, and sheep, on a small scale, salting or smoking meat he did not immediately sell. If Carman ever sold him a pig or a steer or asked him to slaughter an animal, his neighbor failed to note it. One butchering day, Gideon made more than $5 profit on a calf, selling front and hind quarters to various individuals, and the skin to a customer who also bought the head, feet, "orful," and "pluck" (heart, liver, and lungs). In his early days, Carman rented a plow from Gideon to prepare a field and a wagon to bring flour home from the mill. By the time he died, though, he owned eight plows (five with cultivators), and a fleet of wagons—five four-wheelers, one spring wagon (with four wheels and seats that could be removed to accommodate freight), three farm wagons, and a horse-drawn farm wagon, oxen presumably pulling the others. He also had a two-wheeled buggy, surely pulled by one horse. Burr remembered the old farm wagons piled high with locust poles for the first telephone lines, often used so vigorously that they broke apart. More than once, Carman went to Gideon for help repairing a wagon. His half-brothers ran a carriage-making shop, but either did not bother with repairs or knew better than to extend him credit.[23]

The new acreage allowed Carman to harvest trees on a large scale. When he died he owned four lots of timber (the estate inventory does not show whether cut or uncut), which were not worth much by then. The value of the wood on his north lot (no acreage given) was $40, that of his south lot was $10, and the middle lot and the lot north of Cordwood Path, $5 each. However, he had stockpiled 1,340 locust posts and pieces, as well as oak and walnut planks, and chestnut boards and pieces. So much for agriculture.

Two of Jonas Smith's other heirs gave Carman his next boost. Elizabeth (Smith) Hodgkinson, recently widowed, and her brother Edmund asked Carman to become the agent for their 250-ton schooner. Completed in 1849, the *Urania* was to carry prospective gold miners to California. Norman "Bud" O'Berry (1907-1988) claimed that Carman had worked on the vessel himself. Now he gained sweeping responsibilities as the owners' agent "to receive and collect freight...sell and dispose of said Schooner ...or to charter... employ... equip and man her...as he may think proper." Two of Elizabeth's and

Edmund's brothers may have gone on her maiden voyage, Emmet to remain in California as so many Long Islanders did, Ebenezer to return and open the general store. *Urania*'s first officer was Carman's brother-in-law Alfred Lovett, who fell overboard and was lost at sea in a gale off Cape Horn. One of Gideon's brothers may have died on the same voyage. It is not known what Carman did with the ship.[24]

Everyone was talking gold rush, and Elizabeth and Edmund might have expected Carman to head for California when they made him their agent. Their brother Ebenezer Smith sold pieces of his inheritance to finance his journey, and many another neighbor spent his last dollar for passage on anything that would float. However, Carman seized an opportunity closer to home—if he could not buy a large ship, he could build one. This would take money, but mainly that of other people. Carman formed a partnership with Richard Smith, known as "Dick Nezer," that is, son of Ebenezer, of Rassapeaque, to distinguish him from other nearby Richard Smiths. The partners secured the backing of two of Dick's cousins, Nathaniel Smith, who inherited Sherewog, the first house built on Stony Brook Harbor, and his brother Joel, who had built the biggest farmhouse anywhere around (now known as Deepwells). All three belonged to the judge's branch of the family, owned acre upon acre of family land subdivided a century earlier, and raised crops shipped to distant markets. Joel owned several ships, including the *Sylph*, built by Gideon Smith. With financing in place, the partners received town permission in 1853 to build a dock north of Gideon's, at the foot of Cordwood Path opposite Carman's land. Gideon needed no permit, or perhaps never erected a dock. The remains of a stone pump house stand on the site labeled "S. C." on an 1858 map.[25]

Carman immediately began work on a three-masted bark of almost 300 tons. He had already approached a noted shipbuilder for help with her design. "Mr. Carman was not a practical builder," James E. Bayles told a reporter, years later. "I remember he came to my father to make the model of the 'Tanner' and afterwards father 'laid it down' and furnished the moulds or paterns [*sic*] for the frame etc." In O'Berry's opinion, the *Tanner* was not Carman's first ship. The *Alarech* (or *Alyric)*, of 220 tons, preceded her. While there is no record of a vessel with either spelling, an *Alaric*, of 177 tons, was built in 1842 in this area, in the construction of which Carman might have taken part. In any case, the *Tanner* dwarfed the *Alaric*. It is difficult to comprehend how Judge Smith failed to note a hull of this size. Although far from the largest ship built on the harbor, she was the largest on the Smithtown side, the largest at the head of the harbor. No wonder Judge Smith's grandson chose her for the village seal. Of 291.23 gross tonnage (276.67 net), she was 129 feet on the water, with a 29-foot, 7-inch beam. Rigged as a bark—square-rigged on foremast and main, with fore and-aft sails on the mizzen, not square sails as the seal has it—she drew 11.7 feet fully loaded. Carman and each of his backers held two of the eight shares issued for *Tanner*, with the remaining shares owned by two other investors (one of whom was from Brooklyn).[26]

The *Tanner* continued in service until 1907, trading out of California in her final decades, where many locally built vessels ended their days, abandoned as the Gold Rush waned. When the *Tanner* was hauled in 1901 for an Alaska run, "the keel and garboard were found to be in a petrified condition and the color blue." O'Berry, who unearthed this information from a contemporary newspaper story, felt the condition resulted from the way the native oak was "brined with rock salt. If the true formula of preserving the wood were known today it would be worth millions," he observed. Others suggested that the "acid of the salt water and the virtue of the sap of the wood [Long Island oak] combined to preserve the wood and to all appearances to make it last forever."[27]

Because Gideon worked at Carman's yard from time to time, some records of subsequent vessels survive. There was the *St. James,* a small (68.8 tons) schooner on which Gideon worked on and off from her "commencement" on 17 September 1863 until her launching in 1865. At $2.25 a day, he reckoned he was owed $544.25 for labor and some materials. He also built or installed the centerboard as a contract item, charging $16 for the job. The *St. James* was listed out of New York until 1876, but Carman never paid Gideon Smith a penny.[28]

The Civil War provided Carman's yard with more business. Ships supplying Union troops in the South needed constant maintenance to keep them afloat. Gideon's yard made such routine repairs, as his ledger makes clear. He replaced the planking and "corking" (caulking?) on the Barrys' sloop *Eagle,* and spent eleven days on Joel Smith's scow, whose rudder, likely of the barn door variety, gave him repeated trouble. (His charge each time was 75¢.) Does the fact that Carman's backer turned to Gideon for repairs tell something of Carman's yard?

By this time, Carman's son Sam worked in the yard. His elder brother Isaac, a mariner, was one of the 187 local men who enlisted in the Union Army (Smithtown's population was then about 2,000). However, a special tax of $8,000 had to be voted to kindle patriotic fervor approaching anything like what Judge Smith recalled: "a mass meeting on a summer afternoon under the shade of this [large black walnut] tree." Each volunteer was to be paid $110, with another $10 for each person he recruited, that recruit also receiving $100. In 1862, Carman's half-brother William Franklin Smith collected his fee, but other local people were sent home, among them Joel Smith, then town supervisor, because of his "imperfect vision," and the merchant Ebenezer Smith because of "caries." During the war years, Carman acquired the *William F. Bird* with the help of Sam and Isaac. Licensed for "the coasting trade and fisheries" by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the *Bird* was a two-masted, square-sterned schooner, 81.2 feet long, 14.2 feet broad, drawing 7.7 feet, and weighing 94.5 tons. Although Carman had never paid him for previous work, Gideon Smith spent sixteen days repairing the twenty-five-year-old vessel, and another Carman schooner, the *Omni.* Although by this time Gideon charged $2.75 a day, he received nothing for his time. Moreover, he was in constant

pain, tortured by his hernia to the extent that he had himself suspended by the heels at times in hopes his intestines would slide into place.[29]

Of the *Omni*'s fate there is no record. The *Bird* operated out of Stony Brook Harbor, and subsequently Setauket Harbor, for fifteen years. Isaac Carman was the master, and, for a short time, his brother Sam. Of eight shares issued, two were owned by Isaac and one by Sam. Although they probably carried cordwood, Isaac considered himself primarily a dealer in fruits and vegetables. On return trips the *Bird* transported general merchandise and building materials such as brick and tile, as well as passengers and mail. Isaac tied up frequently at rich Jonas's dock in Stony Brook, as did his neighbor Selah Smith with the schooner *Silas Wright*. They paid wharfage of 12¢ a day. Isaac eventually moved to the other side of the Sound, but without the *Bird*. Carman still had her chain and anchor when he died.[30]

The last schooner built in Carman's yard was the 207.75- ton *Martha M. Heath*, started in fall 1868. Gideon worked on her, too, undertaking such specialized jobs as making hatches and the rudder, putting in limber strakes (the inner planking next to the kelson), and squaring the hold. As always, he kept careful accounts of what Carman owed him, sums amounting to almost $800 in one four-year period. And there were always extras. For example, it was Gideon who fixed Carman's steam box, an essential piece of equipment for softening lumber. The moist heat produced by a steam boiler allowed the wood to be bent as desired. Gideon continued to build smaller fishing boats and scows for local boatmen, and rented his own small boats for 50¢ a trip. Franklin Smith was a customer, but met some misadventure and ended up owing Gideon 37½¢ for losing an oar and a thwart, and $2 for losing "timber poles and blocks."[31]

Not content with such bread-and-butter jobs, Carman continued to think bigger thoughts, as indicated by his real estate transactions. Even while he was building and operating ships, his belief in rapid land-transportation never wavered. Whenever he was able to borrow money, he would buy a small block of cropland, a potential woodlot, often some distance away on what might become a railroad right-of-way. His financing of these land deals was almost as inventive as the real estate transactions of the 1980s. Carman borrowed from individuals, including family members, sometimes using the same land as collateral for more than one loan. In 1870, he met with Judge Smith and other prominent residents to organize the Smithtown-Port Jefferson Railroad Company. Of the estimated $200,000 cost of constructing the nineteen miles of track from Northport to Port Jefferson, 60 percent would be raised by the Long Island Railroad, the rest by a thirty-year bond issue at what was considered a steep 7 percent. The bond, approved by a public referendum, was guaranteed by the well-heeled dignitaries, not including Carman. He, his son Sam M., or both, took part in constructing the track, at least the section that went through St. James (Carman had a "lot" of iron spikes and three signal lamps in his barn when he died). Drawing on stockpiles of locust and chestnut milled for his yard, he was able to turn a profit on the lumber. As usual,

Gideon Smith was involved, if only in "dressing" ties at 10¢ apiece. He hired various local men to help, paying them $2 per hundred ties.[32]

Carman and his fellow contractors, Joel Smith and William Powell, hired some fifteen teams with drivers and all the ablebodied men they could recruit, reportedly about six hundred! Many families benefitted during construction by boarding the workers. However, the sheer number of men to be fed and housed rapidly overwhelmed resources, spurring one Joseph Gould to build a hotel to accommodate them. Complete with saloon, the St. James Hotel (later renamed the Gold Coast Too) stood on North Country Road across from the old Isaac Smith house. By 1873, the railroad was in full operation to Port Jefferson, its present terminus, where passengers could take a steam ferry to Bridgeport, Connecticut. Local Smiths contributed land for the station erected that same year. This only surviving original station is the symbol of the St. James Chamber of Commerce. Nothing was quite the same again.[33]

Like the mainline, the branch played its part in decimating the trees along its tracks. One Smithtown resident recalled that

> The train from Port Jefferson to New York burned soft coal [They'd] rake off the cinders in the early spring from Setauket to St. James...The cinders would get in the dry leaves and burn the whole thing...All the men would leave whatever they were doing and go with brooms and shovels to put the fire out.[34]

More than any other phenomenon, the railroad changed the face of the land, not solely because of the fires. As it steadily diminished the need for coastal shipping, it drew business away from the harbor. Shops and houses gravitated toward the station. By soliciting passengers and freight, the railroad set off an era of intense land speculation. Farmers saw green when they contemplated residential use of their fields. Isaac and Sam M. Carman became involved, sometimes enlisting Isaac's wife, at least in name. However, their father once again watched from the sidelines. With his railroad money, Carman had built a handsome new house at the top of the Cordwood Path, or perhaps remodeled an older one built by the farmer William Moore. A typical, tall house of the period, it had views from the front porch across the farm fields along Moriches Road, and, from the back, across the hills to the harbor and Connecticut shore. When plans for further railway construction were delayed, Carman had to sell off property and borrow from family and neighbors. When he died two years later, he left debts but no will. His widow and family inherited $1,200, the new house, and the old William Smith house down by the bay. When his brother George, who was one of his many creditors, died in 1879, Carman's behavior suggests that his mind was deteriorating. When signing the legal documents, he certified that he was "the father of the deceased," a curious slip that confused his brother with his long dead son.[35]

He never paid Gideon Smith the $1,400 he owed for labor, goods, and services. Indeed, the hard-working Gideon, who claimed he never had more than one sit-down meal a day or spent so much as $5 for amusement in his life,

now faced bankruptcy. In response to a legal action brought against him by Judge Smith, he drafted a statement insisting that he had committed no crime:

> Mr Carman was owing me and always told me he would pay me—from a friend I heard he was short, making it over to others, I immediately went to him he gave me no satisfaction—I went to you and plead to you to save me something. You struck up a wistle [*sic*] you walked the floor and broke out in a hearty laugh.

Gideon fully expected to end in the poor house on Landing Road:

> I have worked in shipyard 59 years that is most of the time saved from labor over four thousand dollars loaned to others and have lost every cent and left me in debt imposible for me to pay any thing. have not got it...no money to redeem—only $20 in gold I have been keeping for the last sad rites [original punctuation and spelling].[36]

Meanwhile, Gideon's stepson George Smith Hodgkinson reaped the fortune Carman only dreamed of, buying land on which he built houses. He and George Jr. erected a number of houses on Moriches Road, Fifty Acre Road, and the newly created Highland Avenue, around the corner from the butcher's shop. These were large, shingled houses, set well back from the street, in styles ranging from Colonial Revival to Victorian, models for today's so-called "Victorian" subdivisions.

Hodgkinson came to Gideon's defense in a more public confrontation with the judge, whose son-in-law, Lawrence Bretter, had closed "an old road or passway" which came out on the harbor near Hodgkinson's house. Evidently, the judge had flexed his political muscle to persuade town officials to accept the closing. As Gideon noted indignantly to an attorney, "He wants me to fall down and worship him, I must and will tell the truth. Over 70 yrs ago I remember well passing over that road. I hold a map or skect [sketch?] made 150 years ago." [38]

Carman had his hands full without becoming embroiled in such civic affairs. The same was not true of either George Hodgkinson or Gideon Smith, who energetically defended a public right of way. Whether or not they owned property on the harbor, farmers had rights in the thatch beds, which they were entitled to reach by the shortest, most convenient paths established in the days of the patentee. For farmers going to Long Beach these rights of way crossed various farm fields at intervals along both the east and west sides of the harbor. If these access roads were closed, farmers faced longer, more roundabout trips. The closing of the pass-way would not seriously affect Gideon, the Carmans, or their neighbors at the head of the harbor, whose shortest route was the road along the shore. Nonetheless, Gideon Smith and his stepson staunchly defended the principle, and most rights of way were preserved.[39]

Despite such public-spirited efforts, Gideon Smith, who built ships, was not honored on the village seal. George Hodgkinson, who built houses and sailed ships, left no name swinging on a signpost. It remained for Carman, the financial artist who bankrupted his neighbor and benefactor, to receive such recognition—from the judge's grandson and great-grandson. The grandson—Stanford White's son Lawrence—designed the seal when the village of Head of the Harbor incorporated in 1928. Fifty years later his son, Peter White, sold off chunks to developers, with only the road sign, Carman Lane, to hint of the former owner.[39]

A monument to Samuel Carman—*Father*—stands in the cemetery behind the St. James Episcopal Church on North Country Road, inscribed "You shall sleep but not forever/There will be a glorious dream/In His own good time He'll call us/From our rest to Home sweet Home." Although Carman had been a founder of the Thompson Methodist Episcopal Church and a member of the congregation when he died, the family had previously erected memorials both to Eliza's brother and his brother George in the St. James cemetery, and presumably owned the plot.

The church has no record of those arrangements, but a past rector, Donald Webster, observed it was not unusual to erect monuments in one place while interment occurred elsewhere. He also stated that a past rector, Ingraham W. Irvine, had mutilated some records during his tenure from 1876 to 1900; others were lost in the 1947 parish-house fire. Church records show that Samuel's eldest surviving daughter Sarah provided a small fund for their perpetual care. Efforts to trace her heirs, Eleazar Carman and Emma (Carman) Conlin, or their descendants, have been fruitless. Gideon Smith, his wife, and their children are buried in the St. James cemetery, for reasons that are even more puzzling. Gideon had moved the remains of his first family and those of his second wife's from the St. James family graveyard to the Methodist cemetery, of which he and his third wife were founders as well as donors of the land at the top of Three Sisters Road, the site of the church built in 1872. There is no apparent explanation of why he changed his mind again in favor of St. James Church.[40]

As if to be sure of the last word, Samuel Carman's monument stands higher than Gideon's and other markers of that period. The monument to his wife—*Mother*—is taller and, and, on her other side, the one to his brother—*George*— is taller still. All are of limestone, the names and epitaphs much eroded by time.

NOTES

1. J. Lawrence Smith, "The Town of Smithtown," in *History of Suffolk County, N.Y.* (1882; reprint, Smithtown: Smithtown Historical Society, 1961), 19; *Bi-Centennial. A History of Suffolk County* (1885: reprint, Smithtown: Suffolk County Tercentenary Commission, 1983), 122; Carman's original residence was torn down in the early 1900s; M. Beatrice Ketcham (b.1892), interviews with the author, 20 Feb. and 15 Sept. 1989.

2. For John Carman, see "Hempstead," *History of Queens County, New York* (New York: W. W. Munsell, 1882), 144, and Benjamin F. Thompson, *History of Long Island from Its Discovery and Settlement to the Present Time*, 3d. ed., 3 vols. (1918; reprint, Port Washington: Ira J. Friedman, 1962), 2:470; Frederick W. Beers, *Atlas of Long Island* (New York: Beers, Comstock & Cline, 1873), 16, shows Carman's River in place of the same stream's 1858 designation as the Connecticut River (J. Chace, *Map of Suffolk County, L.I., New York* [Philadelphia: John Douglass, 1858]); Charles J. Werner, *Genealogies of Long Island Families* (New York: the author, 1919), 49-54; for George F. Carman, see Richard M. Bayles, "Brookhaven," *History of Suffolk County, New York* (New York: W. W. Munsell, 1882), 56-60.

3. Frederick K. Smith, *The Family of Richard Smith of Smithtown, Long Island* (Smithtown: Smithtown Historical Society, 1967), 210-11; see also U.S. Census enumerations for town of Smithtown, Suffolk County, 1830-1880, St. James Episcopal Church records and gravestone inscriptions, and Carman family wills and estate inventories, Suffolk County Surrogate's Court, Riverhead; Office of Suffolk County Clerk, Riverhead, *Liber* 0, 86: William and Sarah Smith to Samuel Carman, 23 Mar. 1831.

4. Gideon Smith, "General Farm Accounts Ledger, 1838-1868," in Edgar Law Land Collection, Museum of Early Trades and Crafts, Madison, NJ, n.p. (hereafter cited as Smith ledger).

5. Thomas R. Bayles, *Port Jefferson Advance*, 29 Dec. 1955 and *Port Jefferson News-Review*, 7 Nov. 1957, n.p., in the Richard H. Handley Collection, Smithtown Library, Smithtown.

6. William Brewster Minuse, *Shipbuilding in Suffolk County* (West Sayville: Suffolk County Tercentenary 1683-1983, Suffolk County Department of Parks, 1983), n.p., and conversation with the author, Sept. 1991; see also Harry D. Sleight, *Town Records of the Town of Smithtown, Long Island, N.Y.* (Smithtown: Town of Smithtown, 1929), 11:295-303; for the possible origin of the word *schooner*, see William Smith Pelletreau, *A History of Long Island from Its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (New York: Lewis Publishing, 1903) 2:42: "'See how she scoons or skims,' one spectator said as the first schooner was launched, and the owner replied, 'A schooner let her be!'"

7. See Bayles for woodcutters and cargoes; Smith ledger shows prices charged for cordwood and filing saws.

8. Daniel M. Tredwell, *Personal Reminiscences of Men and Things on Long Island* (Brooklyn: Charles Andrew Ditmas, 1912). Gideon's nephew Captain Lewis Davis "became a member of the shipping firm, Jonas Smith and Company," and his father was "owner and master of the first passenger packet running between Stony Brook and New York" (Frederick K. Smith, 301-3); *A Look at Life in St. James* (St. James: St. James Methodist Church, 1961).n.p.

9. Gideon Smith charged lumber at these prices to Carman's account; in his spare time he made "benches." Gideon Smith, among others, provided stage coach service from St. James to the train stations in Hicksville and Farmingdale. Frequently, the stages were delayed by accidents caused by the bad roads, or failed to run because of the weather; Gideon routinely noted "very bad traveling [or] 'dreatful [*sic*] traveling." One January "night it blowed almost a huricane [*sic*] the snow is very much drifted and the snow bancks [*sic*] in places from 10 to 12 feet high." In winter, however, the roads were, if anything, improved, with packed snow and ice offering a smooth sleigh ride.

10. See Minuse for properties and uses of various woods in shipbuilding.

11. J. Lawrence Smith, 38; my estimates are based partly on those of Robert Cushman Murphy, *Fish-Shape Paumanok: Nature and Man on Long Island* (1964; reprint, Great Falls, Va.: Waterline Books, 1991), 43.

12. F. K. Smith, 305; see also *Special Lists #22: List of American Flag Merchant Vessels that Received Certificates of Enrollment or Registry at the Port of New York 1789-1867* (Washington, DC: National Archives & Records Service, 1968) vols. 1 and 2; information from notes taken by a researcher in the National Archives, which William Minuse generously shared.

13. See *Special Lists* for vessels out of local harbors trading with New York City.

14. Daniel Y. Williamson ledger, Carriage Museum, Museums at Stony Brook; Williamson had crewed with Carman's stepbrother on the *Aeronaut*, under Selah Smith (see *Special Lists)*; Williamson built a foot bridge across Stony Book Creek in 1867 (a convenience since he was located on the west side of the creek while his suppliers—sailmakers, riggers, blacksmiths—were on the east side) to allow "sail-boats to come up the creek to the grist mill this was a drawbridge, manned by Williamson himself" (Sleight, 38); Edward A. Lapham, *Stony Brook Secrets.* (New York: Gotham Bookmart Press, 1942), 141-46.

15. *1840 U.S. Census for Smithtown*; J. L. Smith, 30.

16. Barbara Ferris Van Liew, *Fifty Years 1928-1978, Head of the Harbor* (St. James: Inc. Village of Head of the Harbor, 1978), and conversations with the author, 1988-1996; some ledgers of the St. James General Store are on display in that store (now under the auspices of Friends for Long Island's Heritage), others in the collection of the Smithtown Historical Society .

17. Andrew Havrisko, proprietor of the store from 1959 to 1974, interview with the author, 8 Aug. 1988.

18. Ibid.

19. Smith ledger.

20. Suffolk County Clerk's Office, *Liber* 121:197; F. K. Smith, 245; Jonas Smith the farmer, not the shipping magnate, was the brother of William Smith's first wife. The Carman children were: Elizabeth, born 1832; George, 1834; Sarah, 1836; Isaac, 1839, Samuel M., 1841; Ann E., 1843; Mary 1845; Julia, 1846; Josephus, 1847; and Isabella, 1850 (*1850 U.S. Census of Population, Smithtown*); Suffolk County Clerk's Office, *Libers* 28: 296 and 161:297, F. K. Smith.

21. Suffolk County Surrogate's Court: Samuel Carman Inventory, microfiche #9092;

Carman died intestate on 4 July 1881; see also Smith ledger.

22. See S. Carman inventory; Havrisko; 1850 census.

23..Smith ledger; St. James General Store ledgers; Carman's livestock inventory listed "1 cow and 2 sows reserved for the widow," 3 hogs, 1 sow, 3 [?] pigs, 2 horses, 1 black bull, I brindle bull 3 years old, I heifer 3 years old, I pied cow 5 years old, I calf about 3 months old"; see also Havrisko; 1850 census.

24. F. K. Smith, 348-55; for copies of documents giving Samuel Carman power of attorney, see Norman H. O'Berry, "History of St. James and Smithtown," unpublished notebooks, Richard H. Handley Collection, Smithtown Library.

25. F. K. Smith, 258-61; Sleight, 296; Beers, *Atlas of Long Island.*

26. Sleight, 296; see also Lapham. The Bayles family was responsible for more than one hundred ships in a fifty-year period. James's father, David T. Bayles (1827-1895), was famed for building the largest ships launched in the area; among the dozen he built on Stony Brook Harbor were the three-masted schooners *Anna* at 800 tons and *Royal Arch* at 600, both used in the fruit trade where their speed ensured a minimum of spoilage (the *Royal Arch* was lost in a hurricane off Central America). After 1869, Bayles ran a lumberyard south of the grist mill, on the site of the present Museums at Stony Brook.

27. See *Special Lists*; see also O'Berry; Sleight, 301.

28. See *Special Lists*; Smith ledger.

29. "Record of Suffolk County's Volunteers in the Civil War," *History of Suffolk County, New York* (New York: W. W. Munsell, 1882), 70-79; enrollment papers for the *William F. Bird* (6 May 1864), Charles E. Lawrence Collection, Smithtown Library.

30. See *Special Lists*; Lapham, 144-46.

31. See *Special Lists*; Smith ledger.

32. Numerous deeds with Carman family members as grantees or grantors, 1838, 1857, 1869, 1871-1878 (Suffolk County Clerk's Office, see n. 20 above); Vincent F. Seyfried, *The Long Island Railroad: A Comprehensive History* (Garden City: Vincent F. Seyfried, 1966) 3:50-62; see also J. L. Smith, 30, 38; Sleight, 37-41; Van Liew, 20; S. Carman Inventory, Smith ledger.

33. See Seyfried 6:275; see also St. James Methodist Church; Historic District Inventory, Historic and Natural Districts (Albany: Division for Historic Preservation, New York State Parks and Recreation).: *Life in St. James,* folders 32,35.

34. Frank Jicinsky (1889-1992), interviews with the author, 14 Apr. 1988 and 19 Sept. 1989.

35. Carman family deeds; also S. Carman Inventory; George L. Carman death certificate, Suffolk County Surrogate's Court, *Liber* A: 38, 1879.

36. Smith ledger.

37. *Historic District Inventory,* 305; *Head of the Harbor,* folder 38; Gideon Smith's first wife was said to have died of a broken heart when her only child died after giving birth

to a son who lived only two months; he subsequently married the widow Elizabeth (Smith) Hodgkinson, who died of tuberculosis four months later, and Sarah Rudyard (Smith), by whom he had three sons who remained in the area, and a daughter who died in infancy (F. K. Smith, 351-52; Van Liew, 20).

38. Smith ledger; unfortunately, Gideon did not insert the map.

39. George Kerr (1912-1993), interviews with the author, 2 Dec. 1987 and 5 Jan. 1988, and many conversations, 1977-1992.

40. St. James Episcopal Church cemetery and records; *A Look at Life*;Thompson Methodist Church cemetery; Rector Donald Webster, interview with the author, 11 Jan. 1988.

"SOMETHING THAT MAKES ME FEEL at HOME": MARIANNE MOORE and BROOKLYN

By Jon Sterngass

Although Marianne Moore was white, a woman, and a member of the American middle class, the fact that she lived in Brooklyn for thirty-seven years was equally influential on her style of poetry and, especially, choice of topics. Whether or not Moore's art reflects her membership in a distinctly female culture or subculture, her poetry reveals a love of location and a concern with the physicality of place far more prevalent than gender, racial, or class concerns.[1] Moore expressed a warm appreciation for Brooklyn's special ambience through her sense of joy in describing local trees, churches, streets, and ballparks. This spirit of connection with a geographic entity permeates her poetry.

Marianne Moore's relationship to New York City, and especially to Brooklyn, has rarely been examined as a factor in her poetic development. This is a curious oversight, as she lived in New York for fifty-five years, and in the same apartment in Brooklyn for thirty-seven, and often wrote about the metropolitan scene. Moore herself claimed that her biography would be "a very tame affair," and this stability has tended to focus attention away from her local influences. She constantly revised even her best poems throughout her life, and the resulting output for sixty years of poetry is small; *The Complete Poems* (1981, though not truly complete) contains only 260 pages, barely four pages of poetry a year. Moore left an enormous archive of correspondence, notebooks, and manuscripts to the Rosenbach Museum in Philadelphia before her death in 1972, which helped stimulate interest in her poetry as well as her creative processes. Her writings about New York made her a popular poet, and that alone compels closer scrutiny. Marianne Moore drew both poetic inspiration and peace of mind from her life in Clinton Hill in Brooklyn. In addition, in poems such as "The Steeple-Jack," "A Carriage from Sweden," "The Camperdown Elm," and "Granite and Steel," she used microscopic images of Brooklyn locales to suggest references to more universal topics.[2]

With the exception of Walt Whitman, Brooklyn claims Marianne Moore as its greatest poet. Closely associated with T. S. Eliot, William Carlos Williams, Wallace Stevens, and Ezra Pound, Moore stretched the bounds of modern poetry, using unusual rhyme and rhythm schemes to merge the commonplace and the unusual. It is a rare anthology of American poetry that includes neither "What Are Years" or "In Distrust of Merits." Her poems on baseball, horses,

and New York City life drew media attention as well, and she cultivated a public persona which made her an unlikely celebrity. However, she retains the reputation of an unusually "difficult" poet. As early as 1923, Louis Untermeyer declared, "she is not, in spite of the pattern of her lines, a poet." More recently, Emily Watts, in *The Poetry of American Women* (1977), noted that Moore's reputation was fading and that her poetry "will ultimately be unacceptable." Moore herself admitted, although with typical irony, "I see no reason for calling my work poetry except that there is no other category in which to put it."[3] Even devoted partisans acknowledge the need to abandon a fixation with consistency, symmetry, and direct narrative when reading her poems, which often resemble Cubist collage. Nonetheless, a veritable cottage industry of Moore criticism has developed over the last twenty years, and the advent of the woman's movement enhanced her reputation and stimulated scholarship.

Marianne Moore constructed her poetry like a precise mosaic. Her concern with both idealistic ethics and material things often made her a poet of analogy, but the pieces of many of her best poems often lack connecting phrases, demanding the reader's complete concentration. On the occasions when she used rhyme, it was usually unstressed and subdued. Similarly, she counted syllables but rarely used conventional metrical pattern. She carefully composed her poems with an eye for exact detail. Whether focusing on animals (jerboas, frigate pelicans, buffaloes, monkeys, fish, snakes, mongooses, snails, a cliff ("The Fish"), or a glacier ("The Octopus"), Moore confronted the physical reality of the object before drawing further observations. Within this precision, however, was an enthusiastic response to ordinary things, a kind of "tame excitement." This oxymoronic phrase from her essay, "Brooklyn from Clinton Hill," referred not only to her poetry but also to her life in Brooklyn.[4]

Marianne Moore was born in Kirkwood, Missouri, a suburb of St. Louis, on 15 November 1887. When her father, an engineer, suffered a nervous breakdown, Marianne's mother returned to the home of her father, a Scots-Irish Presbyterian minister. Mrs. Moore remained in Kirkwood until 1894, and then took her two children to Carlisle, Pennsylvania. The three Moores remained extremely close; Mrs. Moore lived with Marianne until the mother's death in 1947, and supposedly remained her daughter's toughest editor and critic. Marianne's brother John made a career as a navy chaplain.[5]

Moore entered Bryn Mawr College in 1905, and, although she published several poems in college literary magazines, majored in "history, economics and politics," with a minor in biology. She received her B.A. in 1909, and returned to Carlisle to teach stenography, typing, and bookkeeping at the United States Indian School (Jim Thorpe, the famous athlete, took courses from her). In 1917, after a brief stay in New Jersey, Marianne and her mother moved to a basement apartment at 14 St. Luke's Place, in Greenwich Village, where they lived for the next eleven years. Moore worked as a tutor in New York, as well as a part-time assistant at the Hudson River branch of the New York Public Library. She published her early poems in a variety of "little magazines" of the late 1910s and early 1920s. Although these did not generate

much income, she acquired a considerable reputation among the modernists centered in Greenwich Village. As early as 1915, her poetry attracted Ezra Pound's attention and they corresponded for many years. William Carlos Williams, another early admirer, was smitten by Moore's red hair, imaginative conversation, and innocent aura. "Marianne was our saint," Williams wrote, "Everybody loved her." Moore was famous for knowing everything about everything; Alfred Kreymborg took her to a baseball game at the Polo Grounds and was stupefied to find she not only knew all about Christy Mathewson, but had read his book on the art of pitching.[6]

The reestablishment of *The Dial* in 1920 as an avant-garde literary journal greatly furthered Moore's career and she appeared frequently in its pages. Although hardly a mass-circulation magazine, *The Dial*, which boasted thirty thousand readers by the mid-1920s, effectively popularized her poetry. *Observations*, Moore's first book published in the United States, proved to be the breakthrough of her career. *The Dial*'s founders had announced a $2,000 award for achievement in poetry, the first winner of which was T. S. Eliot in 1922. Moore received the 1924 prize, and welcomed the recognition as much as the money. For five consecutive issues *The Dial* featured her poetry, and in 1925 she was appointed editor.[7]

With her mother ill, and her brother John stationed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, the two women moved from Greenwich Village to the Clinton Hill section of Brooklyn. After the *Dial* ceased publication in 1929, Moore worked as a freelance poet, book reviewer, and writer of articles. She resided at 260 Cumberland Street, only a ten-minute walk from the Brooklyn Navy Yard, until 1965. To this day, the apartment building boasts bay windows and inlaid tile mosaics, although what Moore described as "mothballs on iron stands flanking the entrance" are gone. Clinton Hill, developed as a suburban retreat from Manhattan in the 1880s, was partially transformed into an area of great wealth in the early twentieth century, when it was home to a Standard Oil partner, Charles Pratt, a lace manufacturer, A. G. Jennings, as well as coffee merchants and baking soda magnates. Clinton Hill was losing its unique social cachet by 1930, but still contained beautiful tree-lined streets in a partially integrated neighborhood, amid old row houses and small red-brick homes, many of them two-family dwellings. Moore lived on the fifth floor, where she could observe the diversity of her Brooklyn neighborhood with detachment. The Brooklyn Institute and the Pratt Free Library served as her main sources of information and cultural stimulation for the next thirty years. Charles Molesworth noted in his detailed biography of Marianne Moore, "What she could hardly have guessed at the time is how much her public identity would eventually be tied up with the borough to which she was moving, and where she would live for the next thirty-seven years."[8]

It seemed incongruous that Moore should move to out-of-the-way Brooklyn after fifteen years courting fame in the center of the Greenwich Village scene. By the thirties, however, the great days of the Village were over and several noteworthy writers had relocated in Kings County. Hart Crane moved to the

quiet of Brooklyn Heights as early as 1924, into the same house that Washington Roebling occupied while supervising the construction of the Brooklyn Bridge. Crane boasted of his neighborhood to his mother, "It's really a magnificent place to live. This section of Brooklyn is very old, but all the houses are in splendid condition." Thomas Wolfe moved to the solitude of a Brooklyn apartment in 1930, mainly to achieve a sort of anonymity while working on *Of Time and the River* (1935). Although he eventually tired of the place, Wolfe initially wrote, "Brooklyn is a fine town—a nice, big country town, a long way from New York. You couldn't find a better place to work." Like Wolfe and Crane, Marianne Moore also felt that a less-pressured life would benefit her poetry. Moore's adoption of a desired seclusion in Brooklyn, away from the intensity of Manhattan, echoed her poetic admiration for animals such as the rat and the pelican, able to engage in activity and then rest. Moore later noted,

> Decorum marked life on Clinton Hill in the autumn of 1929 when my mother and I came to Brooklyn to live. An atmosphere of privacy with a touch of diffidence prevailed, as when a neighbor in a furred jacket, veil, and gloves would emerge from a four-story house to shop at a grocer's or meat-market. Anonymity, without social or professional duties after a life of pressure in New York, we found congenial.[9]

In 1935 Moore broke a decade-long "silence" with the publication of *Selected Poems*, which considerably enhanced her critical reputation. The widely distributed work contained an introduction by T. S. Eliot that claimed her "poems form part of the small body of durable poetry written in our time." During the next two decades, Moore published several volumes, won poetry prizes, and dabbled in academia. Her poem "In Distrust of Merits" (1944), perhaps the most famous poem of World War II, attempted to legitimize the war through the necessity of furthering ethical concerns.

> We vow, we make this promise
> to the fighting— it's a promise— "We'll
> never hate black, white, red, yellow, Jew,
> Gentile, Untouchable." We are
> not competent to
> make our vows. With set jaw they are fighting,
> fighting, fighting,— some we love whom we know,
> some we love but know not— that
> hearts may feel and not be numb.
> It cures me; or am I what
> I can't believe in?[10]

In 1951 Moore's *Collected Poems* won a triple crown of sorts: she received the Pulitzer Prize, the National Book Award, and the Bollingen Prize the same year. The resulting publicity made the sixty-four-year-old Moore a

New York City celebrity. In fact, Marianne Moore the personality tended to eclipse Marianne Moore the poet in her final years. She consciously tried to broaden her appeal, gave interviews to several mass-circulation magazines, including *Life*, and wrote occasional pieces for various celebrations. Her work appeared in magazines such as *Harper's Bazaar* and *Vogue*, perhaps to confound those who claimed she was overly cerebral. Moore's black velvet tricorn became her trademark the last twenty-five years of her life, and she even appeared in sidewalk-fashion shows. She liked tools, baseball, the tango, and claimed never to have made a pie. "Cook and sew enough of the time and you feel degraded," she said. Moore read the *New York Times* every day, the Bible almost as frequently, and every sort of scientific, poetry, or natural history journal. She liked horses, dogs, and small animals, but kept no pets. She continued to play tennis into her seventies with the neighborhood children in Fort Greene Park, and rode the subway to all her appointments.[11]

Marianne Moore died in her eighty-fifth year, on 5 February 1972. Her funeral was held at the Lafayette Presbyterian Church, which she faithfully attended for the thirty-seven years she lived in Brooklyn, and which served as the model for the church in "The Steeple-Jack." In Venice, Ezra Pound, who died nine months later, led a memorial service in which he read Moore's poem of philosophical consolation, "What Are Years?", which concludes:

> So he who strongly feels,
> behaves. The very bird,
> grown taller as he sings, steels
> his form straight up. Though he is captive,
> his mighty singing
> says, satisfaction is a lowly
> thing, how pure a thing is joy.
> This is mortality,
> this is eternity.[12]

Marianne Moore wrote about New York City and especially Brooklyn throughout her career. From start to finish, she viewed New York as a dynamic environment where, in the words of the poet, John Ashbery, "life is slowly exploding around us, within easy reach." Here the arts reigned supreme, baseball encompassed the enthusiasm of the masses, and old buildings ("Carnegie Hall Rescued") and trees ("The Camperdown Elm") must be preserved in order to retain the dignity of city life. In all these concerns, Moore projected the idea that the physical environment was intrinsically connected to the moral environment; one cannot harm one without weakening the other. After World War II, she sensed the break-down of this creed, but remained wearily optimistic: "Stand for truth...It is enough."[13]

"The Steeple-Jack" (1932), one of her most popular poems, examined the undercurrents of a seemingly ordinary town, yet one that did not exist on any map. This was a classic example of Moore's famous definition of poetry as "imaginary gardens with real toads in them."[14] She took some of the poem's

elements from visits to various New England seacoast towns, but her Clinton Hill life inspired the church, the steeple-jack, and perhaps the whole work.

"The Steeple-Jack" began with a description of an apparently typical seaside town, a superficially benign locale. As early as the second line, however, "eight stranded whales" disconcertingly beached on the shore, made the reader aware that all was not perfection. Moore's love of natural history minutiae followed, in this case a listing of tropical and semi-tropical flora. Finally, a steeplejack in red leaves a danger sign on the sidewalk in order to safely gild the star on the church spire. Moore often used scenes like this, fraught with symbolism, to delineate her vision of "the nature of things" even when she could not deliver a logical explanation to make the analogy work. In "The Steeple-Jack," Moore painted a word picture of a typical human community, "a fit haven for waifs, children, animals, prisoners, and presidents."

> The place has a school-house, a post-office in a
> store, fish-houses, hen-houses, a three-masted
> schooner on
> the stocks. The hero, the student,
> the steeple-jack, each in his way,
> is at home.
>
> It could not be dangerous to be living
> in a town like this, of simple people,
> who have a steeple-jack placing danger-signs by the church
> while he is gilding the solid-
> pointed star, which on a steeple
> stands for hope.

Beneath the ordinariness lurked a wealth of confusion, as evidenced by Moore's last ironical stanza, "It could not be dangerous to be living in a town like this." Simple people go about their business, accepting danger and hope as equal partners in experiencing the possibilities of life. This conclusion moved Moore to neither sadness nor exultation; life must be lived to the best of one's ability, and beyond a calm optimism, the poet refused to play the pedant.[15]

More modeled the church star, "which on the steeple stands for hope," after the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, with which she was acquainted even before she moved to Brooklyn. This Romanesque Revival church was built in 1862, and noted for its numerous Tiffany windows; the major window in the Underwood Chapel was the last work of the Tiffany firm. Moore's poetic hero, C. J. Poole, actually helped remove the steeple in 1932, after construction of the IND subway line from Manhattan to Brooklyn undermined the foundation and made the Lafayette Avenue Church unsafe. Despite its size (more than 2.5 million residents by 1930), Moore still viewed Brooklyn as an American microcosm, where "villagers" agonized over moral choices. Even in Brooklyn, however, Manhattan's craziness intruded. The building of a

subway, supposedly an act of progress, could undermine a venerable church, a symbol of safety and stability for Moore. Yet Brooklyn remained here the idyllic and quintessential American community, albeit in disguise.[16]

Moore's ambivalence about New York City, reflected in "The Steeple-Jack," also permeated "New York" (1921). Moore justified her admiration for New York in the conclusion:

> It is not the dime-novel exterior,
> Niagara Falls, the calico horses and the war-canoe;
> it is not that "if the fur is not finer than such one sees
>   others wear,
> one would rather be without it"—
> that estimated in raw meat and berries, we could feed the
>   universe;
> it is not the atmosphere of ingenuity,
> the otter, the beaver, the puma skins
> without shooting-irons or dogs;
> it is not the plunder,
> but accessibility to experience.

By contrasting the fur trade with New York's reputation as a cultural capital, Moore humorously reminded readers that commerce existed for the growth of individuals, not vice-versa. New York brought to mind the Statue of Liberty, freedom, and "accessibility to experience" (the phrase is Henry James's), but it also represented pressure, incessant demands, and Babylon, "a vast indestructible necropolis." Perhaps this explained Moore's choice of "accessibility" in Brooklyn over "participation" in the maelstrom of the Manhattan literary scene.[17]

In "A Carriage From Sweden" (1944), Moore overtly compared Brooklyn and Sweden in the first three verses through the presence of a Swedish cart stored in the Brooklyn Museum where no one could see it:

> They say there is a sweeter air
>   where it was made, then we have here;
>   a Hamlet's castle atmosphere.
> At all events, there is in Brooklyn
> something that makes me feel at home.
>
> No one may see this put-away
>   museum-piece, this country cart
>   that inner happiness made art;
> and yet, in this city of freckled
> integrity it is a vein
>
> of resined straightness from north-wind

hardened Sweden's once-opposed-to-
compromise archipelago
of rocks. Washington and Gustavus
Adolphus, forgive our decay.[18]

The poet initially linked Sweden's "inner happiness" with her own feeling at home in Brooklyn where she lived and wrote. As the poem progressed, Moore allied Brooklyn's "freckled integrity" to Sweden's decay and transformed the concrete idea of the carriage into ideas about more abstract concepts such as "compromise." Apparently, both Gustavus Adolphus and George Washington (the losing general in the Battle of Brooklyn) would be shamed if they could look upon their decayed "homelands" again. The poem's conclusion dwelt on Sweden as a land of beauty, skill, fine civilization, and moral integrity as evidenced in the Swedes' ability to save Jews from the Nazis in World War II. Moore made no further reference to Brooklyn in "A Carriage From Sweden," thereby leaving the poem in typically asymmetrical form. The poet's feeling lingered, however, that "At all events, there is in Brooklyn, something that makes me feel at home."[19]

In the 1950s, Moore completed the journey from "Greenwich Village avant-garde to character." She now claimed she liked to write "not in Greek...but in plain American which cats and dogs can understand." For example, she entertained readers of the *New Yorker* with her attempts at naming a new automobile for Ford—the poet suggested "Silver Sword" but the company came up with "Edsel"! She read a poem, "Blessed is the Man," at class-day ceremonies for Phi Beta Kappa at Columbia University (1957), and wrote, on request, on such topics as "If I Were Sixteen Today" (1958). M. M. Graff described a trip with the eighty-one-year-old Moore when she accompanied her on a note-taking expedition to Central Park to write an introduction to a Sierra Club book:

> Miss Moore, though a tiny woman, was as conspicuous in her tricorn and cape as Abe Lincoln in his stovepipe hat. I was uncomfortably aware that every diner's eye was on us as she made her way down the steps, pausing to examine the carvings and to make notes, seemingly absorbed in her study but thoroughly enjoying the sensation she was causing...Men, as they approached us, bowed and murmured, "Good afternoon, ma'am" with the utmost deference and affection. Miss Moore, still an inveterate flirt at eighty-one, would flash a quick smile and duck her chin to one side in a pretense of shyness, while loving every moment.[20]

Moore often contrasted American themes, characters, and places with European ones. "The Steeple-Jack," "The Hero," "England," and "Virginia Britannia" all displayed her belief that sincerity and gusto were American national characteristics, par excellence. As her career progressed, she wrote less on European scenes and preferred to concentrate on American and

especially local vistas in which Brooklyn sometimes became a virtual metaphor for America. Nothing revealed this transformation to the topical and the lightly popular better than "Hometown Piece for Messers. Alston and Reese," manager and captain of the Brooklyn Dodgers. The poem, which appeared on page one of the *New York Herald Tribune* on the opening day of the 1956 World Series, urged the Dodgers to "come on" and beat their arch-rivals, the New York Yankees, as they did the year before. Complete with arcane references to particular players, fans, superstitions, and incidents, later reprints of the poem included extensive notes for the uninitiated. Moore's poem captured the excitement of a long-time baseball fan, part of whose love for the game involved memorization of esoterica. The poem, written in rhyming couplets, was to be sung to the tune of "Hush Little Baby, Don't Say a Word," further marking it as light verse for a popular audience. Yet the power of "Hometown Piece" lay precisely in its grounding in the genuine feelings of Brooklynites for their much-loved hometown team. If Moore's optimism and enthusiasm were of no avail (the Dodgers lost the seventh game of the World Series that year), the work presented a "new" Moore as a popular poet throughout New York City. As Bernard Engel pointed out in his study of Marianne Moore, "Whether they understood it, or even read it, many New Yorkers who had ignored poets all their lives were pleased (as was the Dodgers' front office) with the fact that an artist had paid tribute to the supposed national pastime as carried on in Brooklyn." Nonetheless, some academic critics tend to resent Moore's turn to popular forums and local topics, and are almost unanimous in disparaging her later poetry as inferior, feeble work. Bonnie Costello essentially refused to consider them in a major study of Moore's poetry; Jeanne Heuving judged virtually all of Moore's "late" poetry after 1929 as disappointing, and ignored anything composed after 1950![21]

The fickle business side of professional sports took the Brooklyn Dodgers to Los Angeles only two years after "Hometown Piece." Though Moore wrote celebratory pieces for both horses and dancers, her chief love remained baseball, and the absence of the Dodgers and Giants forced her to support the previously despised Yankees as the only hometown replacement. In "Baseball and Writing," Moore dealt with the nature of beauty and the analogy between baseball and writing in a less topical way than in "Hometown Piece":

> Fanaticism? No. Writing is exciting
> and baseball is like writing.
>   You can never tell with either
>   how it will go
>   or what you will do;
> generating excitement—
> a fever in the victim
> pitcher, catcher, fielder, batter.
>   Victim in what category?

Written with the zest of a New York fan, Moore's two baseball pieces sentimentalized her public image as an esoteric poet who nonetheless wrote on everyday concerns. While working on "Baseball and Writing" in October 1961, Moore wrote "(Am reprehended for writing about the Dodgers) but urged on by T. S. Eliot and even if he discouraged me, I couldn't forsake my catchers and fielders." In 1968, she threw out the first ball at the season's opener for the Yankees.[22]

Toward the end of her life, Moore's fame made her a logical choice as Brooklyn's chief occasional poet, writing works on request for particular events. Her efforts to save the Camperdown Elm in Prospect Park reflected her reputation as a meditative nature poet. This odd tree, planted in 1872, lacks the gene for geotropism (growth away from the pull of gravity) and must be grafted onto a regular scotch elm. Clay Lancaster, the curator of Prospect Park, noticed in 1967 that the tree had decayed to the point of collapse. The organization Friends of Prospect Park appealed to Moore, who not only wrote a poem, "The Camperdown Elm," but also asked her friends to donate money to the Camperdown Elm Fund rather than send flowers to her funeral. She noted, "'A city of churches', Brooklyn might also be called a city of trees." Her subsequent poem received unusual recognition; the New York City Department of Parks published it as a leaflet in 1968.[23]

Moore praised this Brooklyn elm, which compelled the poet to think not only of the Hudson River School, America's first great artistic flowering, but also of the trees of Paris. Setting the Camperdown Elm into the larger context of America's artistic heritage revealed the tree's importance to be more than provincial:

> I think, in connection with this weeping elm,
> of "Kindred Spirits" at the edge of a rockledge
> overlooking a stream:
> Thanatopsis-invoking tree-loving Bryant
> conversing with Thomas Cole
> in Asher Durand's painting of them
> under the filigree of an elm overhead.

Moore's poem also commemorated the hundredth anniversary of the founding of Prospect Park, and she linked the historical celebration to the theme of rejuvenation. The poet's final demand, "We must save it," implied the salvation not only of the great Camperdown Elm, but also of the landscape of the United States as well as our kindred spirits, poets, and painters of the past. Thus, once again Moore created an imaginary garden for the reader out of a venerable old elm in Prospect Park.[24]

Moore also played an instrumental role in saving the Prospect Park boathouse by serving as president of the Friends of Prospect Park. The boathouse, built in 1905, was modeled after the Library of St. Mark, in Venice. The handsome terra cotta Palladian building, although somewhat incongruous in the park, had over the years won the admiration of romantic

Brooklynites. Unfortunately, the boathouse lacked money for maintenance, as well as a well-articulated purpose after the decline of boating in Prospect Park. The public did not discover the decision to raze the boathouse until the contracts were already signed. Moore led the storm of public protest: "I implore Mr. Newbold Morris to allow our Boat House in Prospect Park to remain. We in Brooklyn admire it. No substitute for it would appease us." Moore also served as the first president of Greensward Foundation, an environmental group she termed "my only mortal entanglement." Her advocacy succeeded in preserving the boathouse, which now serves as a Prospect Park visitor center. Moore's intervention ensured that both the Camperdown Elm and the Prospect Park boathouse would continue to exist to delight future generations of Brooklynites.[25]

Moore's increased concentration on Brooklyn themes can also be found in "Granite and Steel" (1966), a brief reply to Hart Crane's masterpiece on the subject of Brooklyn Bridge (*The Bridge*, 1930). In his ambitious poem, Crane used the bridge as a mystical, unifying symbol of civilization's evolution. Moore also loved the bridge, "a stern triumph, this feat— memorialized by cables, towers, and centrally fixed arcs of filament united by stress, refined till diaphanous when seen from the Manhattan Bridge, silhouetted by the sun or the moon." Her poem echoed Crane's by extolling the superb practicality of Brooklyn Bridge, and celebrating its power as a symbol:

> "O path amid the stars
> crossed by the seagull's wing!"
> "O radiance that doth inherit me!"
> — affirming inter-acting harmony!
>
> Untried expedient, untried; then tried;
> way out; way in; romantic passageway
> first seen by the eye of the mind,
> then by the eye. O steel! O stone!
> Climactic ornament, a double rainbow,
> as if inverted by French perspicacity,
> John Roebling's monument,
> German tenacity's also;
> composite span— an actuality.

Moore believed that encroaching greed threatened American ideals. To her, the Brooklyn Bridge, in all its artistry, as well as the Statue of Liberty, standing on "shattered chains," combatted materialism by their very existence. One might expect her to begin with specific observations regarding the physicality of the bridge as she had in "Dock Rats," a celebration of the sensory delights of the New York City waterfront. Instead, in "Granite and Steel," Moore rejected everyday reality and unexpectedly used traditional symbolism to write a paean to a bridge that barely existed in her text except

as a symbol.[26]

By the mid-1960s, Brooklyn's Clinton Hill had changed from the time Moore moved there in 1929. The streets and subways had become more dangerous, and several apartments in her building had been burglarized. By the winter of 1965, she admitted she had grown scared in the neighborhood. Reluctantly, Moore moved to 35 West 9th Street and became a Manhattanite for the last six years of her life. So astonishing was this severance of the tie between Marianne Moore and Brooklyn, that the *New York Times* treated her relocation as front-page news in the metropolitan section. Shortly afterward, she paradoxically informed a writer for the *New Yorker*, "I receive fifty letters a day, and answer almost all of them...I think that you respect people the more you let them alone. I'm a metropolitan recluse." Her move, in addition to the flight of the Dodgers, the bankruptcy of the Brooklyn Eagle, the closure of the breweries, and the termination of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, served as yet another symbol for Brooklyn's loss of unique identity in the 1960s.[27]

Marianne Moore concluded her account of "Brooklyn from Clinton Hill" by hoping "someone" would do for Brooklyn of 1960 what she had just done for the Brooklyn of 1929: "Someone should delineate the Hill, the Heights, the center— doing justice to landmarks and losses. I like living here. Brooklyn has given me pleasure, has helped educate me, has afforded me, in fact, the kind of tame excitement on which I thrive." The peace of mind Moore achieved in Clinton Hill inspired some of her best poetry. As she noted in "A Carriage from Sweden," "there is in Brooklyn something that makes me feel at home."[28]

NOTES

1. For example, Harold Bloom suggested Moore was an "extraordinary poet-as-poet," whose gender should be of issue "only after the aesthetic achievement is judged as such" (*Modern Critical Views: Marianne Moore* (New York: Chelsea House, 1987), 2; Jeanne Heuving vehemently disagreed on the grounds that "a woman cannot write as a man because of her position in her culture and in language" (*Omissions Are Not Accidents: Gender in the Art of Marianne Moore* [Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1992]), 11-12.

2. George Nitchie, *Marianne Moore: An Introduction to the Poetry* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1969), 1-15; Pamela Hadas, *Marianne Moore: Poet of Affection* (Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1977), 6.; Marianne Moore, *The Complete Poems of Marianne Moore* (New York: Macmillan, 1987); Craig Abbot, *Marianne Moore: A Descriptive Bibliography* (Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1977); Bonnie Costello, *Marianne Moore: Imaginary Possessions* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981), 4-7; Charles Molesworth, *Marianne Moore: A Literary Life* (New York: Atheneum, 1990), 449.

3. Bernard Engel, *Marianne Moore* (Boston: Twayne, 1989), 146-47; *Brooklyn Eagle*, 31 Jan. 1951.

4. Marianne Moore, *A Marianne Moore Reader* (New York: Viking, 1961), 192; for Moore's reputation as a nature poet, see Guy Rotella, *Reading and Writing Nature: The Poetry of Robert Frost, Wallace Stevens, Marianne Moore, and Elizabeth Bishop* (Boston: Northeastern Univ. Press, 1991), 141-86; Jeredith Merrin, *An Enabling*

Humility: Marianne Moore, Elizabeth Bishop, and the Uses of Tradition (New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1990), 10.

5. Jay Parini and Brett Millier, eds., *The Columbia History of American Poetry* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1993), 348.

6. Donald Hall, *Marianne Moore: The Cage and the Animal* (New York: Pegasus, 1970), 20-26; Engel, 13, see also Hadas, 4; Molesworth, 90-91, Parini and Millier, 359, and Susan Edmiston and Linda Cirino, *Literary New York: A History and Guide* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976), 70-71; for admiring essays by Pound, Williams, and Eliot on Moore's early work, see Charles Tomlinson, ed., *Marianne Moore: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969), 46-65.

7. Taffy Martin, *Marianne Moore: Subversive Modernist* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1986), 7-14; Nitchie, 1-15.

8. Molesworth, 247-49; Engel, 12-19; Edmiston and Cirino, 335, 361; Landmarks Preservation Commission, *Clinton Hill Historic District: Designation Report* (New York, 1981), 2-7.

9. *Moore Reader*, 182; Moore, *Poems*, 25; Martin, 4; Heuving, 153; for Hart Crane in Brooklyn, see John Unterecker, *Voyager: A Life of Hart Crane* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1969), 343, 355-57; Edmiston and Cirino, 89, 343-48; for Thomas Wolfe in Brooklyn, see David Donald, *Look Homeward: A Life of Thomas Wolfe* (Boston, Little, Brown, 1987), 252-58, 306-07; Elizabeth Nowell, *Thomas Wolfe: A Biography* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1960), 194-98, 208-19, 339-41; Wolfe's five-page masterpiece, "Only the Dead Know Brooklyn," immortalized Brooklyn and the Brooklyn accent (in *The Complete Short Stories of Thomas Wolfe* [1935; reprint, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1987], 260-64).

10. Tomlinson, 65; Moore, *Poems*, 136-38; *Moore Reader*, 261 ("In Distrust of Merits" initially received mixed reviews).

11. Molesworth, 434-52; Elizabeth Phillips, *Marianne Moore* (New York, 1982), 2; for Moore's participation in a sidewalk fashion show, see *New York Times*, 13 July 1965; Phillips, 1-5, gave a nice portrait of Moore's post-1950 public image; Robert Wilson, *Marianne Serves Lunch* (New York: the author, 1976), 1-7.

12. Moore, *Poems*, 95; *New York Times*, 9 Feb. 1972.

13. John Ashbery, back cover of Moore, *Poems*; John Slatin, *The Savage's Romance: The Poetry of Marianne Moore* (University Park: Penn State Univ. Press, 1986), 15.

14..Moore, *Poetry*, 36, 266-67; the famous phrase came from the longer version of "Poetry," which began:

'I, too, dislike it: there are things that are important beyond
all this fiddle.
Reading it, however, with a perfect contempt for it, one
discovers in
it after all, a place for the genuine.

15. Moore, *Poems*, 5-7; Engel, 23-25; Hall, 78-81; Slatin, 176-204, provides an excellent description and analysis of this poem.

16..Grace Schulman, *Marianne Moore: The Poetry of Engagement* (Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1986), 57-62; Slatin, 176, 202; Molesworth, 173, 224-26; Eliot Wilensky and Norval White, *AIA Guide to New York City* 3d ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988), 625; for Moore's discussion of this church, see *Moore Reader*, 183-84.

17. Moore, *Poems*, 54.

18. Moore, *Poems*, 131-33; for Moore's ambivalence toward technology and modern America in general, see Lisa Steinman, *Made in America: Science, Technology, and American Modernist Poets* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1987), 113-32.

19. Laurence Perrine and James Reid, *100 American Poems of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harcourt Brace, and World, 1966), 95-98; Bloom, 56-61.

20. *Christian Science Monitor*, 24 June 1957; *Brooklyn Eagle*, 31 Jan. 1951; Phillips, 209; *Moore Reader*, 195-97, 215-24; M. M. Graff, *Central Park, Prospect Park* (New York: Greensward Foundation, 1981), 41.

21. Moore, *Poems*, 182-84, 290-92; Engel, 124; Heuving, 140; Costello's index had no citation for "Camperdown Elm," "Hometown Piece," "Baseball and Writing," or "Granite and Steel"; for similar critical judgments, see Nitchie, 150; Steinman, 132; Merrin, 7; Parini and Millier, 348; Tomlinson, ed., 12.

22. Moore, *Poems*, 221-23; for Moore and baseball, see Molesworth, 164-65, 392-93, 428-33; Margaret Holley, *The Poetry of Marianne Moore: A Study in Voice and Value* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987), 167-69; see also Moore's interview with Donald Hall: "Hall: 'Have you missed the Dodgers here, since they went West?' Moore: 'Very much, and I am told that they miss us'" (*Moore Reader*, 257).

23. *Moore Reader*, 182.

24. Moore, *Poems*, 242; Holley, 182-84; Graff, 159-67.

25. Clay Lancaster, *Prospect Park* (New York, 1972), 8; Wilensky and White, 653; Graff, 158-67; Lancaster, 7-9.

26. Moore, *Poems*, 205; Edmiston and Cirino, 345; Costello, 74-77, 219-20; Holley, 17-18; Engel, 64.

27. Nitchie, 14; *New York Times*, 20 Jan. 1966; Molesworth, 425-26; Holley, 179; Donald Hall interviewed Moore in 1960 and briefly described her apartment (Tomlinson, 20-21).

28. *Moore Reader*, 192.

THE TOWN of HEMPSTEAD ARCHIVES: 1644-1996, A WEALTH of MUNICIPAL HISTORY

By Michael J. Robinson

The Town of Hempstead Archives contain a wealth of material that chronicles the evolution and development of the oldest municipality in the United States. For the past two years, as project archivist on two grants from the New York State Archives and Records Administration, Local Government Records Management Improvement Fund, I have had the good fortune to help shape the archival collection of the town of Hempstead, which was founded in 1644. In addition to the New York State funding, the support of Town Clerk Daniel M. Fisher Jr., whose office oversees the archives, has been extraordinary. Without the commitment and dedication of my coworkers, Town Historian Thomas A. Saltzman and his assistant Karen Rosselli, this project would not have accomplished as much as it did.

The archives contain more than 260 cubic feet (c.f.) of processed records series. Twenty-four of twenty-eight record series have been processed, dating from the late 1830s to the present. Within this grouping more than one thousand maps (many hand-drawn and one-of-a-kind), dating from 1830 to the late 1980s, have been separated and removed to archival sleeves, folders, and boxes. In the course of our work we found approximately 30 c.f. of the records in no semblance of order. Therefore, we created a number of artificial record series which correspond to documentation in the town's record books. In addition to the processed series are 265 bound volumes, dating from 1644 to the mid-1960s. Each year the town clerk has earmarked money for restoration of these volumes, and to date, fifty-eight have been professionally restored.[1] The records in the early volumes are transcriptions from the early 1800s, but their contents were taken verbatim from the originals. We know that the original documents existed as of the beginning of the twentieth century, but their whereabouts presently are unknown.

The grants from New York State called for the arrangement and description of the historically enduring permanent records of the town of Hempstead, and publication of a guide to make these records available to the public. As the surveying of these records began, we had to adhere to two parameters. The first was the MU-1, which sounds ominous but simply stands for the records retention and disposition schedule that municipalities (cities, towns, villages and fire districts) must follow. This indicates the minimum time of retention of municipal records before they may be legally disposed of. The other

parameter dealt with folders with case number listing, an in-house numbering system for matters brought before the Hempstead Town Board since 1952. Because, for in-house usage, retrieval was often requested by case number all folders were to be retained. These restrictions were minor, since the MU-1 had no impact on most of our folders and the case numbering system did not begin until 1952.

During the surveying and appraising of the records, supplies were ordered, an additional, oversized map case (70' x 36") was purchased, WordPerfect 5.1+ was also purchased and loaded into the computer, forms (accessioning, user, internal use, separations) were created, and the mission statement and collection policies were given their final shape. Upon completion of the survey, record series were identified and processing began.[2]

As with any archival project, basic archival tenets were observed: provenance (not intermingling material from one office or creator with others) and *respect-des-fonds* (maintaining the order of materials as put together by the creating office or individual). Metal fasteners and rubber bands were removed from the documents, appropriate plastiklips were used, delicate or fragile materials were placed in polyethylene or mylar sleeves or bags, and maps were unfolded and flattened before placement in map folders. Only acid- and lignin-free boxes and folders were used, with separation sheets (archival bond) placed in record series folders whenever necessary.

Brief History

The town of Hempstead is the largest township in the United States, encompassing more than 142 square miles, with a population of approximately 725,000. The town contains thirty-four unincorporated areas and twenty-two incorporated villages, more than sixty-five parks and marinas, and 2,500 miles of city, county, state, and federal roads.

The history of the town began before its official inception in 1644. In 1636, settlers from Massachusetts Bay established the first three towns of Connecticut colony—Hartford, Windsor, and Wethersfield (called Watertown). From Wethersfield, a handful of people including the Reverend Richard Denton and his four sons journeyed along the Long Island Sound and established a settlement at Stamford. In 1643, two emissaries (Robert Fordham and John Carman, his son-in-law) were sent across the Sound to the Dutch-held western part of Long Island to obtain town rights from Director General William Kieft, and purchase title from the Indians. On 13 December 1643, Carman and Fordham negotiated a land deed with representatives of the Reuckowacky, Merockes, Matinecock, and Massapequas. However, the deed failed to specify boundaries of the vast tract that became Hempstead, nor did it mention any form of compensation for the tribes. The deed that Fordham and Carman concluded with the Indians was not confirmed until 4 July 1657.

Although colonists began coming to what is present day Hempstead (the name Hempstead seems derived from Hemel-Hempstead, in England, and

means town spot), Kieft did not issue the patent granting the settlers rights and title (Kieft Patent) until November 1644.

During the early years, the decisions of annual and special town meetings formed the basis for government and community living. These decisions, often termed "orders," dealt primarily with community land and enforcement of local laws. The following and subsequent excerpts, presented exactly as written, provide the flavor of early town meetings:

> May 2, 1654—It is ordered by all the inhabitants that hath any right in the work shall sufficiently make up either his or their proportion of fence at or before the 15th day of May next ensuing the date hereof stilo nova and every person or persons...found negligent in so doing shall pay for every rod defective two shillings and sixpence.
> May 2, 1658—At a town meeting this present day, it is ordered that every inhabitant within this town of Hempstead shall within five days, after the date hereof, give in to be enlisted by the Town Clerk, all lands that was ploughed, and reaped and gathered viz. hollows, uplands, homelots, excepting one hollands acre by patent allowed, for each inhabitant, allowance whereby our tithe may be paid unto the Governor according to our agreement, being one hundred shocks of wheat.
> July 10, 1658—It is ordered and agreede by general vote ye Mr. Richard Gildersleve, according to appointment is to go to Mannatens to agree with ye Governor concerning the tytles and therein is ordered not to exceede one hundred scheepels [sic] of wheate (and if required) it is to be delivered at the towne habour and the charge of his journey is to be defrayed by the towne.[3]

During its twenty years under Dutch rule, the town of Hempstead enjoyed a good measure of self-rule. Elections were allowed for magistrates, a clerk, five townsmen, a pounder, cattle keepers, and hay warden, and other local officials. Following the British taking of New Netherland from the Dutch in 1664, a convention was held in Hempstead in February 1665 to approve the so-called Duke's Laws, a code drafted by Governor Richard Nicolls that granted limited power to local government but no elected provincial assembly. The following towns sent delegates: Southampton, Seatalcott (Brookhaven) Huntington, Oyster Bay, Hempstead, Jamaica, Gravesend, Newtown, Flushing, Brooklyn, Bushwick, Flatbush, New Utrecht, and, from the mainland, Westchester. Hempstead's delegates were John Hicks and Robert Jackson.

In 1683, the first New York legislative assembly, elected under a new charter, divided the colony into twelve counties, with Hempstead as one of the five towns of Queens together with Newtown, Jamaica, Flushing, and Oyster Bay. Hempstead's 1 April 1684 town meeting agreed

> by majority vote that all and every person that have had grants of home lots are obliged, either to fence, build upon or improve them within

> three years and one day's time, or if they do not improve the same Lotts according to ye above written agreement in the time specified, then the said home lotts belonging to the persons they were given to, are to return to the towne again.[4]

With New York restored to British rule after the Dutch briefly retook it in 1674-75, Hempstead town's patent again was revised (Dongan Patent) in 1686.

As the town continued to grow, record keeping and accounting became increasingly important, as illustrated by the following excerpt:

> At a general Town Meeting held at Hempstead the 22n day of May 1711 it was voted by a major vote that every freeholder on the township of Hempstead shall give an account of what lands he hold in the township of Hempstead, and by what right he holds it by.[5]

By the mid-to-late-eighteenth century, town governance was becoming more complex and detailed:

> Town Meeting—the 30th day of March 1752. It was voted and agreed by the major vote of the tenants in common of Hempstead plains that the plains should be divided to every person that hath any right to the same according to every persons right in the patent with respect of quality the one part with the other after the deduction of former divisions, grants, hollows & highways.
> Town Meeting—the 14th day of April 1755, it was by the majority of the freeholders and tenants in common of the town voted and agreed upon to fence the plains belonging to this town off from the adjacent towns.
> Town Meeting—19th day of April 1771 pursuant to a warrant granted for that purpose was then voted by a majority of the freeholders and inhabitants then assembled that the committee lately appointed to erect buildings to accommodate the poor belonging to this town be empowered and they are by the said town of Hempstead empowered to purchase land to erect the said buildings.
> Town Meeting—April 6, 1773—At the same town meeting it was voted that the same persons that was appointed to build a poor [house] should erect a building nigh the same as a place of confinement and that the trustees pay them the expense of the same out of the public money in their hands.[6]

During the American Revolution, most settlers on the south shore of Hempstead were Loyalists while most of those on the north shore supported the patriot cause. Although it is widely assumed that North Hempstead seceded from Hempstead in April 1775, in the aftermath of Lexington-Concord, the separation remained unnoted officially until 1784, when the state

legislature confirmed the two towns of North and South Hempstead (Hempstead dropped the word "South" in 1791). The town records fail to indicate any reason for the division, the only notation of which is the following excerpt:

> At a Town meeting held Hempstead according to adjournment the 15th day of April 1784 and the Town being then divided into two towns and after the town officers for South Hempstead were chosen the Town meeting chose by major vote John Hendrickson Senior and Nathaniel Seaman as a committee to associate with a committee to be chosen by the Town of North Hempstead for the purposes of dividing the poor and poor house of the two townships.[7]

During the nineteenth century, Hempstead's growth continued steadily. The population rose from 4,141 in 1800, to 5,094 in 1810, and to more than 6,200 in 1830. By 1855 it was the most populous town in Queens County, with some 10,500 people. Within thirty-five years the population more than doubled, reaching just under 24,000 in 1900. Long Island was also growing during this period. The *Long Island Telegraph*, first published in the village of Hempstead in 1830, became the *Hempstead Inquirer* the following year. The Long Island Railroad, chartered in 1834, decided to build its first branch, connecting the main-line station of Mineola with Hempstead in 1836.

During the Civil War, referred to as the War of Rebellion in town records, the federal government set up Camp Winfield Scott on the Hempstead Plains in 1861. At a special town meeting on 27 August 1862, the following resolutions were adopted:

> *Resolved* that to make ample provisions for the comfort of any who shall volunteer, and for their families in their absence this meeting of the citizens of the Town of Hempstead recommend that seventy-five dollars bounty be given to each volunteer for the war, and, we also pledge ourselves to aid and protect the families of such during their absence.
> *Resolved*, that to make provision for the payment of this bounty and having full confidence in the liberal policy and honor of the citizens of town, to sanction the same in special town meeting. This meeting respectfully and earnestly request Robert Cornwell Esq our supervisor, to borrow on the credit of the Town such sums as may be necessary, the aggregate of which shall not exceed twenty five thousand dollars, and that he pay to each volunteer enlisting the sum of seventy five dollars, on the presentation of proper vouchers of his enlistment from the Town of Hempstead and acceptance by the appointed officers of the Government.
> *Therefore Resolved* by the legal voters of the Town of Hempstead in Special Town Meeting assembled, August 27th 1862 that the foregoing

resolutions, be, and the same are hereby endorsed and adopted as the action of this Special Town Meeting
Resolved, by the legal voters of the Town of Hempstead in Special Town Meeting assembled, that there be assessed and collected on the taxable real and personal property of said Town the sum not exceeding twenty five thousand dollars to be apportioned by the Supervisor of said Town in the payment of bounties to such persons who since the 13th day of August 1862, have enlisted or who may hereafter enlist in the volunteer service of the United States, pursuant to the proclamations of the President thereof.[8]

At the annual town meeting of 1866, there was no mention of the past war. The meeting dealt with the election of officials and the passage of resolutions, among them to replenish the more-than-$700-relief fund and raise $80,000 more to support the poor of the town for the ensuing year; appoint a sexton; set times for cutting grass on the common marshes and beaches, together with fines for cutting sooner; convey a deed for forty acres to the Queens County Agricultural Society for promotion of agriculture; and, inevitably, to set up the next annual meeting.[9]

Until the mid-1870s, annual and special town meetings were held at different locations, but the meeting of 7 April 1874 "resolved that the sum of five thousand two hundred and fifty dollars ($5250) be appropriated by the board of Auditors from the surplus funds of the Town arising from the sale of the Hempstead Plains for the purpose of purchasing Washington Hall for the use of the Town."[10]

The late-nineteenth century was a relatively undisturbed time for Hempstead, with a population growth of less than ten thousand from 1880 to 1900. Along with the rest of Long Island, the town's farmers supplied the New York metropolitan area with a multitude of products (dairy, produce, and livestock) and provided abundant recreational opportunities. Summer resorts (cottages, hotels, beach and boat clubs) abounded on the South Shore. Fox hunting was available in Westbury, East Williston, and Cedarhurst, and polo was played in Westbury. Horse racing, which dates back more than three hundred years in Hempstead, continued to flourish.

A new metropolis was created on 1 January 1898, when "Chapter 378, of the Laws of 1897, went into effect, creating the (Greater) City of New York which included that part of Queens County known as the Towns of Jamaica, Newtown, Flushing and the Westerly Part of Hempstead. (The Rockaway [Far Rockaway])." The three eastern towns took action to remedy their omission from the revised county of Queens: "By Chapter 588, Laws of 1898, passed April 27, 1898, the County of Nassau was created, which included the Towns of Oyster Bay, North Hempstead, and that part of Hempstead not already incorporated into New York City." At the 28 December 1898 town board meeting it was "Resolved, That the Town Clerk be and is hereby authorized to procure a Seal of the Town changing the word Queens to Nassau County

and have the same for use by January 1st 1899."[11]

By the turn of the century, Hempstead's population rose to more than 27,000. The early 1900s saw the introduction of the trolley, which soon linked Mineola, Freeport, Hempstead, and Valley Stream. In the same period, and of more lasting importance, Hempstead became the "cradle of aviation." In 1909, Glenn Curtiss flew his *Gold Bug* at Mineola, followed in 1911 by the first air mail delivery to Washington, D.C., the flight of the dirigible (blimp) R-34 in 1919, and the famous Charles A. Lindbergh flight in 1927.[12]

In 1917, the following proposition was voted on: "Shall the sum of Seventy-five thousand Dollars ($75,000) be raised by tax upon the taxable property of the Town of Hempstead, for the purpose of building a Town House in the Village and Town of Hempstead?" Of the 3,849 votes cast, 1,899 were in favor and 1,772 against, with 178 blank or defective. The building still stands at the corner of Fulton and Washington Streets, connected by tunnel to the current and larger hall built in 1968. [13]

By 1930, the population exceeded 186,000. After World War II, returning GI's and their families expanded the population from some 265,000 in 1940 to 448,000 in 1950. Levittown serves as but one example of suburban growth in the town. Further population growth and development after the Korean War boosted the population to more than 765,000 by 1960. The population peaked at slightly more than 800,000 in 1970, and levelled at approximately 725,000 by the 1990s.

The Collection

The records in the archives portray events and transactions with specific impact on the management, physical development, and governance of the town. Although these records provide a great deal of evidential value (documenting the founding or substantive activities of the creating department), I believe that their informational value—shedding light on persons, places, things, and events—is as fascinating, if not more so, than that for which they originally were intended.

The finding aids for each of the twenty-four processed record series describe the contents at the folder level. In addition, many of the series have "see also" notations referring to related bound volumes. Illustrative of this grouping are the following seven record series.

The fire district series (1832-1974) consists of fire districts and fire protection districts (unincorporated areas that have contracted services from a fire district), separated into existing (and dissolved) incorporated and unincorporated villages within the town of Hempstead. Materials contained within the series include: establishment (creation, organization, and/or incorporation of fire districts or fire protection districts); elections (district elections of fire commissioner and fire treasurer); special elections (includes appropriations for equipment, building construction, authorization of serial bonds, facility improvement and extension, supplies, maintenance, and

insurance); financial information (audit and treasurer reports, bank statements), claims and injuries (partial information on claims of injury of firemen for reimbursement); extensions (proposed and actual extensions of fire districts and fire protection districts); annexations (applications, resolutions, orders, and determinations of extensions of fire districts/fire protection districts), contracts (contractual agreements of fire districts with fire protection districts for fire coverage), specific fire companies (incorporation/establishment papers, member roosters, and related information) and posters and flyers (notices of special meetings, elections, and special elections). The fire district series is arranged alphabetically by village, with the exception of the town of Hempstead which is first. The folders are arranged by topic and reverse chronological order, except individual fire companies which are arranged chronologically.

The school district series (1833-1967) consists of five sub-series: I: Individual districts; 2: Boundaries—establishment & alteration of school districts; 3: Attendance and truant officers; 4: district officers; and 5: School signs (stop, crossing, school zone, children at play, and 15 MPH school zone). The materials within the series include salary information, resolutions, acts, collector's bonds, district boundaries, officers, establishment and determination of districts, elections of officers, creation of districts, special meetings, trustee appointments, alterations of districts, health concerns, and propositions. In addition to the town record books, which note the establishment of common schools in 1812, the bound volumes collection contains two school district disbursement books from the mid-1800s; eighty-three individual school district assessment books from 1889-1916; three volumes of school records from 1894-1926; and a two-page restored "Description of the School Districts in the Town of Oyster Bay in Queens County," from February 1814.

The highway series (1828-1968) documents development of the road and highway system in the town. The series is divided into six sub-series: road dedications (1830-1919); road acceptances (1828-1959); road closings (discontinuance or abandonment) (1845-1963); topical road divisions—general highway, railroad, snow removal, and bridge and trestle repairs and maintenance; overseers of highways, improvements, funding, and sidewalks; New York State (1863-1947); highway bonds (1893-1945); and highway commissioners (1864-1909) More than 260 original maps have been separated out of the series and are also available for research use.

The board of health series (1884-1922) contains seven sub-series: Hempstead Board of Health; birth, parentage, and school certification; town resolutions relating to health; licenses and permits; health complaints; official communications; and the *Monthly Bulletin of the New York State Board of Health*. The "see also" notations refer researchers to the following bound volumes: town records, with check indexes beginning in volume 9; record of naturalization, 1899-1906; register of licensed embalmers, 1899-1923; board of health minute books, 1901-1912; and records, 1912-1913; and the register of contagious diseases, 1906-1912.

The overseers of the poor series (1858-1952) consists of nine sub-series: overseers' bonds and related (1862-1919); reports of overseers (1890-1906); physicians reports (1894-1896); committees (1894-1913; appropriations (1858-1905); financial related (1878-1907); extended relief (1893-1908); legal matters (1885-1912); almshouse and poor house (1894-1952); and directives and proceedings (1875-1938). The first mention of an official overseer of the poor is in *Indentures and Town Meetings: 1788-1797, 1784-1856,* vol. 3: "At a Town Meeting held in the Town Spot of South Hempstead on the 13th day of April 1784...the undernamed Persons were elected and chosen Town Officers for the ensuing year. Richard Jackson, Overseer of the Poor...."

The town land series (1837-1955) is an artificial series that incorporates loose and miscellaneous subject titled folders, consisting of the following sub-series: 1) boundaries (1852-1934); 2) land surveys (1869-1934); 3) lease applications (1838-1938); 4) Leases, sales of common lands [including marshes and meadows] (1837-1963); 5) communications & resolutions relating to town land (1890-1953); 6) petitions and disputes relating to town land (1884-1923); 7) lease transfers & sublets (1893-1911); 8) quit claim deeds & deeds (1880-1959); 9) maps of leased or proposed leased land [no written documentation available] (1886-1926); and 10) legal disputes (1874-1928). All the sub-series are in chronological order.

The underwater lease series (1891-1901) correlates with the land series, because underwater leases dealt with town land under the town waters. Individuals and companies applied for grants of underwater land for a number of purposes. All applications stated that the grant was to promote public interest in navigation and commerce. The most common objectives were to maintain existing docks, wharves, and bulkheads, build new ones where needed, and deepen and improve access waterways. This series is created artificially from loose materials, documents in generally marked or miscellaneous subject folders. Primarily, the series consists of correspondence, legal opinions regarding grants, grant applications and petitions, and resolutions awarding grants. The series, arranged chronologically, contains a plethora of original hand-drawn maps.

Bound Volumes

In preparing this repository guide, it was important not only to verify the contents of the bound volumes, but also to provide a synopsis. Within the collection of bound volumes are fifty-seven volumes of town records. The records within these volumes are listed chronologically and indexed (except volumes 1-3) alphabetically by topic. Topics include: appointments; attorneys; bills of sale; bonds; claims; commissioners; committees; constables; communications and correspondence; election districts—bills, boundaries, and polling places; electric lights; fire insurance, departments, companies, and districts; franchises; Grand Army Relief (GAR); grants; grass cutting on

common meadows; Greenfield Cemetery meetings; health—board, officers, rules and regulations; highways—locations, alterations, releases, laying out, road districts, specific streets; jury lists; justices of the peace; lighting districts; nuisances; overseer of the poor; overseers of the highway; oyster and clam licenses; petitions; quit-claim deeds; school—appointments, accounts, districts, elections; town board meetings; town clerk; town meetings (regular and special); town reports, resolutions, land, leases; town treasurer reports; utilities; and matters pertaining to villages. Topics of interest from the early records include: Kieft patent, cattle listings, grazing laws, land transactions, articles of agreement between Tackapausha and the provincial governor, land grants, town meetings, and ear marks. In addition to the town records and related volumes, included within the bound works are ten volumes from overseers of the poor (1789-1930 with gaps) covering expenditures for support of the poor, appropriations, audits, outside relief, children's board, hospital accounts, farm accounts, almshouse accounts, meetings, reports, and appointments. Seven volumes of military records (1862-1865, 1916-1919) provide enlistment information during the Civil War and World War I (for which only seven names are listed). The eleven volumes of assessment books and rolls (1880-1905) afford the researcher considerable information about real estate value and acreage. Other volumes include vital statistics, marriages, account books, oyster and clam licenses, chattel mortgages, annual reports, advertisements, monographs, and reference volumes.

Conclusion

The Town of Hempstead Archives furnish a rich and unique collection of data concerning the social, economic, and political evolution of Long Island. The expanded and revised *Town of Hempstead Repository Guide* provides a brief history of the town, descriptive listings of all bound volumes and record series, and an authority file that enables researchers quickly to determine, for each record series containing village sub-categories, the records germane to the town's incorporated and unincorporated villages. All information has been put into WordPerfect on the Archives's computer, with key-word searches available. *LIHJ* readers interested in obtaining a copy of the *Repository Guide*, and/or visiting the archives, are urged to contact Thomas A. Saltzman, Historian, Town Clerk's Office, 1 Washington Street, Hempstead, NY 11550, phone (516) 489-5000, extension 3493. Visiting hours are 9:00 A.M. to 3:45 p.m., Monday through Friday.

NOTES

1. The record series have been appraised, arranged, and described according to archival principles and are now available to researchers.

2. Another oversized map case was purchased in winter 1996.

3. Town of Hempstead, *Town Records (1644-1713)* 1:21, 24-25, 36.

4. Ibid., 189.

5. Hempstead, *Town Records (1658-1725)* 2:98:

6. Hempstead, *Town Records (1747-1768)* 3:175, 238; ibid. *(1761-1784)* 4:15, 186.

7. Hempstead, *Town Records* 4:386-387.

8. Hempstead, *Town Records (1859-1883)* 7:32.

9. Ibid., 122-125.

10. Ibid., 407.

11. *Atlas of Nassau County* (Brooklyn: E. Belcher Hyde, 1914), 1; Hempstead, *Town Records (1879-1898):* 12:550.

12. See Joshua Stoff, *History of Early Aviation, 1903–1913* (New York: Dover Publications, 1996), reviewed in this issue of *LIHJ*.

13. Town of Hempstead, *Outside Records* (28 Mar. 1916-3 July 1917) 23:403.

SECONDARY SCHOOL ESSAY CONTEST

We take pride in the following three winning papers in the "Long Island as America" contest for secondary school students, which we sponsor in conjunction with the USB Center for Excellence and Innovation in Education, Dr. Eli Seifman, director. Rather than rank these fine essays as first, second, and third, we present them in the alphabetical order of their authors' names.

BANNED BOOKS: THE CHALLENGE to the FIRST AMENDMENT of *PICO V. ISLAND TREES* (1982)

By Glenn Bernius

Amityville Memorial High School: faculty advisor, Dr. Charles F. Howlett

When our nation was in its infancy, the Constitution was created as the guideline for republican government, quickly followed by the Bill of Rights to define the essential liberties of the citizens. What happens when one of these rights is contested? What is done to protect people's human rights?

The United States has witnessed many challenges to the Bill of Rights, a large number of which have been argued in the Supreme Court, setting precedents followed for years to come. This article examines one such case with particular interest to residents of Long Island—*Board of Education, Island Trees Union Free School District No. 26 et al. v. Steven A. Pico et al., 457 U.S. 853* (1982)—a trial that disputed a school board's power to ban books in its libraries.

This was not the first trial pertaining to the First Amendment or school boards. Many preceding cases involved educational institutions, but this case was distinguished by its focus on the issue of censorship. It was the first Supreme Court case concerned with removal of books from school libraries. Because it was heard at a time when books were being banned from school and public library shelves at a rapid pace throughout the country, many people awaited the outcome of this landmark trial that came out of a school in the Long Island suburbs of New York City. "It is a frontier First Amendment issue, unique ground-breaking legislation," commented Arthur Eisenberg, a lawyer for the defense.[1]

From its origin to its bizarre resolution, the case assumed a significant

place in the nation's legal history. The events that led to the trial began in September 1975, when the Island Trees Union Free School District's school board president, Richard Ahrens and a board member, Patrick Hughes, attended a conference organized by the Parents of New York United (PONYU). This organization was run by a group of conservative parents concerned with their children's upbringing, and, specifically, with legislation regarding schools in New York State. At this conference, Ahrens and Hughes obtained lists of books that, according to the PONYU, were detrimental to education: Ahrens described them as "objectional."[2] The two board members returned to the school and discussed the list with their colleagues, vice president Frank Martin and board members Christina Fasulo, Richard Melchers, Richard Michaels, and Louis Nessim. Martin objected strenuously to the books on the list, calling them "improper fare for school students." The board discovered that their high school library had nine of these books, the junior high had one, and that one of the books, *The Fixer*, by Bernard Malamud, was in the curriculum of one twelfth-grade class. The nine in the high school library were: *Slaughter House Five*, by Kurt Vonnegut Jr.; *The Naked Ape*, by Desmond Morris; *Black Boy*, by Richard Wright; *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*, by Alice Childress; *Soul on Ice*, by Eldridge Cleaver; *Down Those Mean Streets*, by Piri Thomas; *Best Short Stories of Negro Writers*, edited by Langston Hughes; *Go Ask Alice*, by an anonymous author; and *Laughing Boy* (the one book the board returned to the library), by Oliver LaFarge. The book in the junior high library was *A Reader for Writers*, edited by Jerome Archer. In February 1976, the board requested that the books be removed so they could evaluate them. When this decision was questioned, the board issued a statement deeming the books "anti-American, anti-Christian, anti-Semitic and just plain filthy." They also said that it was their "duty, our moral obligation, to protect the children in our schools from this moral danger as surely as from physical and medical danger."[3]

The board appointed a committee of four parents and four school staff members to read the books and recommend what the board should do, taking into account educational suitability, good taste, relevance, and appropriateness to age and grade level. In July the committee released a report which suggested removal of two books, retention of five, no decision on two, and taking the tenth book from the library only with a parent's permission. However, the board all but ignored the committee's report. Instead, it called for returning one book to the library, placing another on condition of parental consent, and not to replace the other eight.[4]

The board's drastic act inspired immediate opposition, especially on the part of five students, four from the high school—Steven Pico, Jacqueline Gold, Glenn Yarris, and Russell Rieger—and one from the junior high—Paul Sochinski. A group of parents also dissented, aggressively backed by the New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU). The NYCLU first acted in an advisory capacity to the parents, and later provided the students with two lawyers, Alan Levine and Arthur Eisenberg. As the case proceeded, other groups joined to

oppose the ban, including a coalition of Nassau and Suffolk librarians and a group of authors. Eventually, the number in opposition rose to twenty-one organizations.

George W. Lipp Jr. represented the Island Trees School District. Although the district faced vigorous opposition from various groups, it also received some support, including that of an organization of school principals, a quasi-fundamentalist group based in Texas, and such prominent conservatives as Pyllis Schlafly and the Rev. Jerry Falwell. Lipp based his argument on a ruling from a 1978 case, *Federal Communications Commission v. Pacifica Foundation 438 U.S. 726*, a decision with a strong impact on the broadcasting industry. It stated that the Federal Communications Commission could prohibit WBAI, a New York City FM radio station, from airing a monologue by George Carlin containing "seven dirty words."[5]

The initial trial took place in 1979 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Claiming that they were denied their rights under the First Amendment, the students sought a decision finding the board's actions unconstitutional, and ordering return of the books to the library shelves. However, Judge George Pratt supported the school board and justified its actions:

> The board acted not on religious principle but on its conservative educational philosophy, and on its belief that the nine books removed from the school library and curriculum were irrelevant, vulgar, immoral, and in bad taste making them educationally unsuitable for the district's junior and senior high school students...The board has restricted access only to certain books which the board believed to be, in essence, vulgar. While removal of such books from a school library may...reflect a misguided educational philosophy, it does not constitute a sharp and direct infringement of any First Amendment rights.

Pratt contended that it was not the court's job to supervise school boards unless rights were clearly obstructed, which he felt they were not in this case. This stance was taken primarily because he felt the "removal of the books clearly was content based." Even at this level, controversy arose. Pratt had to draft his opinion himself when his clerk refused to do the work because he disagreed with the ruling.[6]

The next step on the path to the Supreme Court was a three-judge panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which reversed Judge Pratt's decision by a vote of two-to-one and sent the case to another court. One of the judges, Judge Sifton, justified his actions by criticizing the board's procedures as "erratic, arbitrary, and free-wheeling." Sifton also observed that "precision of regulation and sensitivity to First Amendment concerns [were] hardly established by such procedures." On the rehearing that followed, the ten-member panel of the Board of Appeals split five-to-five. Once again another trial was required, this time in the highest court in the nation.[7]

In 1982, six years after the case began, the Supreme Court chose to hear it as one of eighty for that year. As *Pico v. Island Trees* had moved through the legal system, similar disputes arose throughout the country. According to the American Library Association, in 1982, the average annual number of books removed from library shelves and classrooms had risen to one thousand, and included such works as *A Farewell to Arms*, *The Godfather*, and *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest.*[14] In a *Newsday* poll of Long Island residents, 51 percent of those questioned did not agree that the Island Trees board had the right to remove school library books, as opposed to only 36 percent who agreed (the rest were undecided).[8]

Both sides continued to polish their arguments. The lawyers representing Steven Pico and the other students cited the First Amendment and questioned the school board's criteria for removing the books. They argued vigorously against banning a book merely because its viewpoint did not coincide with the personal views of board members..Sensing the validity of this premise, Lipp knew he would have to stay away from the topic of censorship. Instead, he referred to such a basic principles of democracy as "whether a school district can transmit the values of its communities to minors."In his brief, he also said that the board's "actions are subject to disapproval in the normal course of school board politics. To accede to the wishes of a militant few in their community would be to disregard their electoral mandate." Lipp reminded the Supreme Court that the question was not what they would do if they were on the school board, but rather the constitutionality of the case.[9]

On 2 March 1982, the long wait was over, the case was heard. Both sides faced an array of questions ranging from "How many books were in the school library?" to "Can a school board remove a book offensive to a particular religion?" Levine emphasized that although it was the board's job to determine a book's suitability, sometimes a court must review that decision. Both sides faced probing interrogation while trying to persuade each justice to accept their side. At the end, each side predicted victory. Looking back at their optimistic attitudes, one wonders if either side realized how close it was to victory.[10].

On 25 June 1982, the Supreme Court handed down a five-to-four decision in favor of Steven Pico et al. Justices William Brennan, Thurgood Marshall, and John Paul Stevens issued a joint statement favoring the students, and Justice Harry Blackmun concurred. Brennan's plurality opinion stated the thoughts of these four:

> The First Amendment imposes limitations upon a school board's exercise of its discretion to remove books from high school and junior high libraries...Local school boards have broad discretion in the management of school affairs, but such discretion must be exercised in such a manner that conforms with the transcendent imperatives of the First Amendment...Students do not shed rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate...Whether petitioners' removal of

> books from the libraries denied respondents their First Amendment rights depends upon the motivation behind petitioners' actions.[11]

These four later suggested that if students or parents dissented with a school board's actions, they should have a right to take the case to federal court.

The Island Trees School Board was supported by Chief Justice Warren Burger and Justices Lewis Powell, William Rehnquist, and Sandra Day O'Connor. Burger wrote in his dissenting opinion that, "I categorically reject this notion that the Constitution dictates that judges rather than parents, teachers and local school boards, must determine how the standards of morality and vulgarity are to be treated in the classroom." Rehnquist stated that if students really wanted the books, they could have been obtained by different means, including public libraries and book stores. In yet another dissenting, but varying opinion, O'Connor wrote, "I do not personally agree with the board's actions...but it is not the function of the courts to make decisions that have been properly regulated to the elected members of the school board."[12]

What makes the case even closer than the one-vote margin is that Justice Byron White, the ninth vote, agreed only on sending the case back to federal court, after which he would come to a decision on the constitutionality of book removal. Thus, he did not address the main point of the case.

In the end, the ruling did not ban book removal at all (though Pico et al are considered the victors because citizens now can challenge school boards in court), but, instead, stated that students and parents have the right to go into federal court to challenge book removals. In that sort of situation, the criteria of the board should be looked at, especially if the books were banned because of unpopular views. In fact, the criteria of the removal were among the minutely examined areas of the case. The justices questioned whether the removal was to protect the students or because the books represented unpopular views in the eyes of the school board.

Steven Pico, the only student who stayed with the case all the way to the Supreme Court, commented that the decision was "a message to the censors around the country that students have a responsibility to encourage students to think freely. The Supreme Court is saying that it is the job of a board to teach young people how to think, not what to think."[13]

Though Pico, his attorneys, and his supporters were happy with the victory, no definitive resolution was reached. Instead, the case simply was referred to another court. This disillusioned many, including Lipp, who called the decision "mixed-up and crazy."He also wished he had moved to reargue the case in an effort to bring Justice White to his side, a step the opposing attorney, Arthur Levine, told him he was surprised that he did not take.[14]

Essentially, the decision not only failed to confront the real subject, but continued to brush it aside. George Lipp pointed out that if parents and students continually challenged decisions of school boards, the federal courts might be overcrowded with book ban cases. [15] It was a sad commentary on our judicial system when, after six years, the only decision that could be reached

simply sent the case back to a lower court.

The case officially ended later that year when the school board voted four-to-three to return the books to the shelves, rather than engage in another trial that might have hinged on their personal views. The board settled with the NYCLU by paying its attorney fee of $70,000, a settlement covered by the school district's insurance policy

The most amazing phase of this case was the way it split the judiciary. After the case passed through many courts, eleven judges favored Pico, eleven supported the Island Trees School District. And then, there was Supreme Court Justice Byron White, who was undecided and chose only to remand to a lower court. A case that seemingly would end the debate over censorship in school libraries merely showed how divided the country was on the issue.

Regardless of the outcome, the trial was extremely meaningful because it showed that such issues as book banning and censorship were, and still are, important. Reaching the Supreme Court indicates a case's importance and relevance.

Censorship in school libraries remains an extremely controversial issue, as illustrated by the decision in *Pico v. Island Trees*. It shows the reluctance of the Supreme Court to interfere with the acts of a school board, and represents the divisions this case created throughout the country.

NOTES

1. Rita Ciolli, "Preparing for the High Court," *Newsday* 10 Jan. 1982.

2. *Supreme Court Reporter* (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Virginia Publishing, 1985), 2802.

3. Ibid., 2802, 2803.

4. Ibid., 2803..

5. George W. Lipp Jr., interview with the author, 29 June 1996; Ciolli.

6. *Supreme Court Reporter*, 2804.

7. Ibid.; Lipp, Jr.

8. Ciolli, "Tomorrow in High Court," *Newsday*, 1 Mar. 1982; "Where LIers Stand on Banning Books," *Newsday* 8 Mar. 1982.

9. Ciolli, "Preparing for High Court."

10. Ibid.

11. Ciolli, "Top Court Hears Book Ban Case," *Newsday* 3 Mar. 1982.

12. Ibid., *Supreme Court Reporter*, 2801.

13. Ciolli, "Top Court Restricts Ban of Books by School Board," *Newsday* 26 June 1982.

14. Lipp Jr.

15. Ibid.

THE FIELDS, WOOLWORTHS, and VANDERBILTS: REMEMBERING the GOLD COAST

By Jeremy Gorelick

Harborfields High School: faculty advisor, Dr. Joyce Lemonedes

F. Scott Fitzgerald was not the first to fall in love with the beauty of Long Island, "that slender riotous island which extends itself due east of New York," although he was one of the first to express it in a novel of amazing literary charm, *The Great Gatsby*. His unmistakable descriptions of life in the 1920s on Long Island hold remarkably accurate to the mindset and culture of the "Long Island Set."[1]

Fitzgerald divided the rich into two basic categories: old money and new money. Old money represented the established wealth of the village of East Egg (Manhasset/Port Washington/Sands Point) in the form of Tom and Daisy Buchanan's "cheerful red-and-white Georgian Colonial mansion, overlooking the bay. The lawn started at the beach and ran toward the front door for a quarter of a mile, jumping over sun-dials and brick walls and burning gardens." New-money residents of West Egg (Great Neck/Kings Point), exemplified by Jay Gatsby, garishly copied and modified old-money ways. Gatsby's house "was a factual imitation of some Hôtel de Ville in Normandy, with a tower on one side, spanking new under a beard of raw ivy." East Egg tended to disdain West Egg, "the less fashionable of the two, though this is a most superficial tag to express the bizarre and not a little sinister contrast between them."[2]

New money and old often tried to outdo one another, sometimes by unscrupulous means. However, great marvels unspoiled by corruption emerged from this moral wilderness—the palatial gold coast estates of the Vanderbilts and the Woolworths, the Fields, Morgans, and Roosevelts, the Guggenheims and the Tiffanys. Of the nine hundred mansions whose building began in the late nineteenth century, fewer than half remain. This article deals with three: those of Marshall Field III, F. W. Woolworth, and William K. Vanderbilt.

The Caumsett estate of Marshall Field III, in Lloyd Harbor, is a compilation of previously owned family lands along with additional land grants. Caumsett was originally occupied by Indians, the Algonquians of the Matinecock group (to whom Caumsett meant "place by sharp rock"; not surprisingly, the Fields used their rock as a place for meditation as well as for watching boat races in

the Sound). Scattered along the north shore, these Native Americans survived through fishing and agriculture, harvesting the fruits of the land and sea. In the middle of the seventeenth century, there were several droughts and years of bad fishing. For this reason, the Algonquians chose to accept an offer by three Englishmen for land. In return for three coats, three shirts, ten knives, three hatchets, three hoes, two fathoms of wampum, two pairs of stockings, and two pairs of shoes, an area of 3000 acres was obtained for the personal use of the Englishmen and their families.[3]

Over time, the ownership of this neck of land jutting into the Long Island Sound changed until, finally, Marshall Field bought between 1,600 and 1,700 acres for $1,750,000. Immediately upon purchase, Field and his wife set out to find an appropriate architect. After much investigation, they settled upon the avant-garde John Russell Pope, a designer of the Beaux-Arts school. According to many reports and professional opinions, it appears that the Caumsett manor house and surrounding buildings were his most famous and admired work. Because of the estate's proximity to the Sound, the Fields encouraged their children to participate in marine activities. Along the same lines, Marshall Field III encouraged the development of large marine facilities along the shores of his property to moor his large motor yacht, the *Corisande II*. In keeping with the tradition of other fine estates, he brought in developers to place exquisite stables and barns on the grounds of his estate. As his interest in racing grew, the number of ponies in his stables increased. However, his interest in other women also grew, and in 1930 Field divorced his first wife Evelyn. Several years later, he married a quick-witted, fashionable woman who aided in changing the Caumsett estate from only a home to a party hall, as well.

Like other gold coast mansion owners, Marshall Field III gave his share of extravagant parties. One party in particular was well-attended by nearby socialites, the guest list stretching to more than one thousand. The host dressed as the butler, and many leading women of the era wore costumes, pretending to be serving girls and waitresses to the arriving guests. Among the guests at this party were George Gershwin, Fred Astaire, Mrs. Payne Whitney, Mr. and Mrs. Vincent Astor, Mr. and Mrs. Ogden Phipps, Mrs. Junius S. Morgan, Mrs. Mrs. William K. Vanderbilt, Mrs. William Randolph Hearst, and Mrs. Walter Jennings.[4]

The cost of throwing such large parties placed a large economic strain on the Fields. After the end of World War II, the nearby village of Huntington began to develop into a booming town. Because of this, the cost of hired help began to rise. To lower their property taxes, the couple began to lay off workers and reduce the number of rooms in their mansion. Within months of Marshall Field's death in 1956, his widow decided to sell the property. In 1961, she sold the Caumsett estate for $4,275,000 to the Long Island State Park Commission, under whose ownership it remains. Tours of the house and the stables are given regularly, while another building was donated to the Nassau County BOCES Outdoor Education Center. Scientific experiments are

currently conducted to learn about the erosion of beaches due to winter storms.

Winfield Hall, Frank Winfield Woolworth's tribute to the gold coast's Long Island set, is perhaps the most magnificent mansion left to visit on the Island. After being born to a rural family in upstate New York, F. W. Woolworth attended business college in Watertown. In 1879, he opened his first five-and-ten-cent store in Utica, New York. His premise caught on, and he opened another store. After a short while, he was the owner of a chain of over one thousand stores in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada.

Located in the village of Glen Cove, the impressive home of the Woolworth family was the result of several million dollars and many years of hard work. According to one gold coast mansion historian, Monica Randall, "it is a house that would have dazzled Gatsby himself. From top to bottom it was built to impress." In 1916, Woolworth decided to use his money to build a mansion to top all others. He had Charles P. H. Gilbert, a top architect, design the $9,000,000 house; it was worth every dollar. From the two-million dollar marble staircase to the carved walls of limestone wood, the brass light fixture dressed with 14 karat gold leaf to the twenty-foot kitchen cooking stove, not a single dollar went to waste. In decorating the house, no expense was spared, either. To finish the master bedroom suite, Napoleon Bonaparte's bed was obtained, and Marie Antoinette's vanity was acquired for the personal use of Mrs. Woolworth. Unfortunately for him, Frank did not have much time to enjoy the fruit of his efforts; within two years of moving in, he died of tooth decay. Because of this, the house was not the site of the lavish parties to which the other mansions of the day were accustomed. After Woolworth's funeral, his wife locked the door and threw away the proverbial key.[5] For eleven years, the house lay dormant, until Mrs. Richard S. Reynolds acquired the magnificent estate. Although she effected very few changes within the walls of the house, Mrs. Reynolds developed the grounds, adding an Olympic-size pool and modifying the gardens to her liking. After she decided to sell the house, it was immediately purchased by the Downs School, a girls' school, in 1962. Thirteen years later, it was put on the market once again. In 1976, Winfield was bought by two wealthy men, restored to its previous glory, and used as the site of the 1977 Decorator Showcase. Recently, the hall was purchased by the Pall Corporation, which still holds its meetings there. For this reason, the building is not always open to the general public.[6]

William Kissam Vanderbilt II's mansion is truly stupendous to behold. Differing from the two mansions mentioned above, it serves as a museum and monument to the public. In contrast to the styles of other mansions owned by members of the Long Island set, the Vanderbilt estate was completed in the Spanish Moorish style. The house was nicknamed Eagle's Nest for two reasons, one figurative and the other literal. While the house appeared secluded from nearby Northport Harbor (not unlike an eagle's nest), the stone eagles placed just inside the front entrance were taken from Grand Central Terminal, in New York City, just before its destruction.

Following the occupation of the house in the middle of the 1910s, William

began to accumulate animals and artifacts from his trips around the world. In 1922, he opened his museum, filled with marine life which he collected on his trips to South America and Africa. By 1935, Vanderbilt discovered he had to build a second story to his museum, filling it with artifacts obtained from his trips to Egypt. One of this museum's exhibits is the mummy recovered from one of the Egyptian archaeological digs which he helped to fund. Close to the Long Island Sound, Vanderbilt built an airport with a hangar to accommodate his hydroplane[7]

Like his contemporaries, William Vanderbilt hosted a number of parties on the grounds of his estate. He was responsible for providing jobs to more than one hundred employees, and for maintaining the forty-three acres of grounds as well as the comparatively small main house. Following his death in 1944, Vanderbilt's will provided funds to maintain the estate. However, he also left the house to the county of Suffolk.[8]

Eagle's Nest, together with the planetarium built on its grounds, is currently operated as the Vanderbilt Museum. The courtyard of the main house is the site of concerts throughout July and August. Each June, the Vanderbilt Museum and Planetarium hosts the pre-prom party for Harborfields High School seniors, and has recently begun to open its grounds to that school's annual "pops" concert. Unlike other mansions, the Vanderbilt Museum is used constantly throughout the year.

Visitors to these mansions will benefit from rewarding architectural knowledge as well as insight concerning the way of life of the business tycoons who built them. Some viewers may even experience illusions of grandeur, imagining themselves in the role of master of the house being seen. The causes of the decline of the gold coast vary. Second- or third-generation owners often felt the strain of rising property and inheritance taxes and problems of wages and availability of servants After all, a twenty-or-more- bedroom house can be difficult to maintain, especially if only for the enjoyment of a small family. Many families secured generous tax write-offs for signing over their houses to schools, colleges, museums, and other public agencies. Others, in the jet-set age, sold their houses to private individuals, now that they had the ability to spread around the world. And the heirs of the original builders do not feel the urge to flaunt their wealth as strongly as did their progenitors at the beginning of the century.

In the course of time, many of these majestic houses have been torn down to make way for tract developments, or fallen into decay. Others, however, have been immortalized through the triumphant efforts of historical societies of Long Island. Following the example set by the Newport Historical Foundation, responsible for the preservation of magnificent Rhode Island homes, as well as by the British National Trust Foundation, many of these impressive domiciles remain. Turned over to the public domain, these estates continue to illustrate the opulence of the "robber baron" era. Although these members of the Long Island set may have been wrapped up in their own social world, it is important to keep their houses in existence, as an important part

of the history of Long Island and the United States.

NOTES

1. F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925) 4, 6.

2. Ibid., 5.

3. Matthew Bessell, *Caumsett: The Home of Marshall Field III in Lloyd Harbor, New York* (Huntington.: Huntington Town Board, 1991), 1.

4. Ibid, 21.

5 Monica Randall, *The Mansions of Long Island's Gold Coast* (New York: Hastings House, 1979), 56.

6. Randall, 58; Arlene Travis and Carole Aronson, *Mansions and Millionaires* (Greenvale, N.Y.: Mansions & Millionaires, 1983), 33; Raymond E. Spinzia with Judith A. Spinzia and Kathryn E. Spinzia, *Long Island* (New York: Hippocrene, 1988), 372.

7. Harvey A. Weber, *Centerport* (New York: H. B. Davis, 1990), 117; Robert B. King with Charles O. McLean, *The Vanderbilt Homes* (New York: Rizzoli, 1989),148-50.

8. King, 153.

HIS MAJESTY'S LOYAL SUBJECTS: LONG ISLAND'S TORIES and the DIVISION OF HEMPSTEAD TOWN

By Adam Herbsman

Lawrence High School: faculty advisor Dr. Steven J. Sullivan

> At a meeting of us, the freemen, freeholders and other inhabitants of Great Neck [and] Cow Neck [Manhasset Neck]...taking into [account] our distressed and calamitous situation, and being convinced of our total inability to pursue proper measures for our common safety...and being conscious that self preservation, the immutable law of nature, is indispensable, do therefore,
> 1. *Resolve*, That during the present controversy, or so long as their general conduct is inimical to freedom, we be no further considered as a part of the township of Hempstead than is consistent with peace, liberty, and safety; therefore in all matters relative to the Congressional plan, we shall consider ourselves as an entire, separate and independent beat or district. True copy-attested.
>
> John Farmer, Clerk of the Meeting
> Saturday, September 23, 1775

The quotation is from a "declaration of independence" by the town of North Hempstead, proclaimed when the Whigs of the northern section decided to break away from the town of Hempstead. The purpose of the separation was to enable North Hempstead to circumvent the town of Hempstead's Tory-controlled government, and support the policies of the Second Continental Congress.[1]

At the time, Long Island was home to one of the colonies' most active collections of Loyalists (Tories), who are often viewed as the villains of the Revolution—pro-monarchy schemers who tried to prevent the formation of the United States of America. I myself once sympathized with this view until I became aware that it was largely invalid: Loyalists simply could not accept the new direction in which the former colonies were headed.

Although the separation was not confirmed until the New York State

Legislature's Act for Dividing the Town of Hempstead into Two Towns took effect in April 1784, the actual split occurred nine years before, at an early point in the Revolution. The people of North and South Hempstead were divided by a variety of personal factors, as well as by their principles regarding taxation and the rights of Englishmen. Religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, political ties, and occupation all influenced the decision. This article examines the role these factors played in individual and community decisions to side with the Tories or the patriots.

Before the Revolution, the majority of colonists on Long Island and elsewhere hoped to maintain their loyalty to the Crown while protesting what they perceived as unconstitutional transgressions against their liberties. This position became increasingly untenable as hostility between militant colonists and the mother country rose from protest to open rebellion to full-scale revolution.[2]

When the town of Hempstead was invited to partake in correspondence movements, its Tory government not only refused but also denounced the Whigs and their movement. The Tories felt that any British improprieties (unfair laws and restrictions) should be protested legally, maintaining a belief that British law would compensate them fully. According to the Tories, revolution was neither legal nor necessary: it was better to suffer under the rule of a bad king than cast their lot with ungrateful traitors. After all, English liberties had survived bad monarchs before, and George III would not be king forever.[3]

In early April 1775, a letter was received by the town of Hempstead soliciting its participation in the extra-legal New York Provincial Congress, which evolved into the Convention of the Representatives of New York State on 10 July 1776, after adopting the Declaration of Independence the day before. When asked to choose deputies to the 1775 convention called to select representatives to the Second Continental Congress, the leaders of the town refused, producing instead this response:

> We, the freeholders and inhabitants of Hempstead, being legally assembled on the first Tuesday in April, 1775, have voluntarily entered into the following resolutions:
> 1st. That as we have already borne true and faithful to allegiance to his Majesty King George the Third, our gracious and lawful sovereign, so we are firmly resolved to continue in the same line of duty to him and his lawful successors.
> 2d. That we esteem our civil and religious liberties above any other blessings, and those only can be secured to us by our present constitution; we shall inviolably adhere to it, since deviating from it and introducing innovations, would have a direct tendency to subvert it, from which the most ruinous consequences might justly be apprehended.
> 3d. That it is our ardent desire to have the present unnatural contest between the parent State and her colonies amicably and speedily

accommodated on principles of constitutional liberty, and that of the union of the colonies with the parent State may subsist till time shall be no more.
4th. That as worthy members of our General assembly, who are our only legal and constitutional representatives... have petitioned his most gracious Majesty, sent a memorial to the House of Lords and a remonstrance to the House of commons: we are determined to wait patiently the issue of those measures, and avoid every thing that might frustrate those laudable endeavors.
5th. That, as choosing deputies to form a Provincial Congress or convention, must have this tendency, be highly disrespectful to our legal representatives, and also be attended, in all probability, with the most pernicious effects in other instances, as is now actually the case in some provinces—such as shutting up courts of justice, levying money on the subjects to enlist men for the purpose of fighting against our sovereign, diffusing a spirit of sedition among the people, destroying the authority of constitutional assemblies, and otherwise introducing many heavy and oppressive grievances—we therefore are determined not to choose any deputies, nor consent to it, but do solemnly bear our testimony against it.
6th. That we are utterly averse to all mobs, riots and illegal proceedings, by which the lives, peace and property of our fellow subjects are endangered: and that we will, to the utmost of our power, support our legal magistrates in suppressing all riots, and preserving the peace liege sovereign.

Hulet Peters, Town Clerk[4]

Meanwhile, a patriot faction was gathering in the northern part of the town, where, for the first time, Whigs began to organize. Soon after the Loyalists declared their intentions, the Whigs announced their plan to separate from the Tories and take part in the New York Provincial Congress. They elected their own town committee, with Benjamin Sands as chairman, Adrian Onderdonk as deputy chairman, and John Farmer as clerk.[5]

Once the Provincial Congress learned of these actions it responded with this note of commendation :

SIR: The Congress have received the state of the proceedings of the inhabitants of Great Neck, Cow Neck, &c., relative to the choice of a committee and of officers for that district, and highly approve of their conduct therein. The commissions are enclosed to the officers agreeable to the choice made; and the Congress doubt not that your committee and the other associators, will, in their conduct, manifest a due attention to the important interests of their country in its present and alarming critical situation.

We are your humble servants.

P.S. You are requested to return a list of the Associators as soon as may be convenient.

Nathaniel Woodhull, President[6]

After the Whigs received their response from the Provincial Congress, the Tories were declared "enemies of the people." The Whigs solicited signatures supporting the Continental Association, a document pledging cessation of trade with Britain and support of the Continental Congress. Anyone who did not sign became known as a "non-associator," targeted for seizure by the Whigs. Loyalists were denied such basic rights as bearing arms, conducting business, and receiving legal advice. A resolution passed by the Whigs stated, "That no lawyer ought to prosecute or defend any action at law for any who voted against sending Deputies, and that their names continue to be published for a month in the newspapers."[7]

It now was obvious to Hempstead's Tories that the North Hempstead Whigs would aid the military effort of the revolutionaries, and that Loyalists must be prepared to defend themselves. More than two thousand Long Island Loyalists participated in the British war effort. Among their military leaders, Richard Hewlett was most heavily involved in obtaining weapons and ammunition from the British warship *Asia* for use by British and Loyalist forces. During the seven-year-long British occupation of Long island, Tories serving in the British forces tried to protect the coast from patriot whaleboat raids from bases across the Sound, just as patriots guarded the shores to prevent smuggling by Tories.

The rebels on Long Island had close ties with their counterparts in New England, who often crossed the Sound in commando raids against Tories and their British colleagues. The Tories, in turn, engaged in similar acts of violence aimed at Whigs. During the long years of occupation, Long Island, including North Hempstead, was ravaged by the British army in need of housing, livestock, crops, and timber, while Redcoat soldiers stole from known Whigs and set fire to their property. This behavior was encouraged by the Tories, who often profited from it by receiving stolen grain and cattle.[9]

Although it is generally assumed that the first battle of the American Revolution on Long Island was the Battle of Brooklyn (27 August 1776), the first armed encounter on Long Island was the Battle (skirmish is a more accurate word) of Hempstead Swamp, in June 1776. Before this encounter, charges of treachery had been levied against the Tories, including plotting to assassinate George Washington, and arming themselves to regain control of Long Island and New York City with the help of British forces. At the same time these accusations were cast at the Loyalists, a Whig from North Hempstead, John Hendrickson, reported the names of many prominent Tories, including Richard Hewlett, Isaac Denton, Isaac Smith, and James Smith, to the Provincial Congress. Subsequently, the Provincial Congress issued warrants for the arrest of these Tory leaders. There are varying accounts of the Battle of Hempstead Swamp, which ensued as the Whigs attempted to enforce the warrants. While the primary targets escaped, the patriots apprehended a

number of less prominent Tories.[10]

By far the major clash on Long Island was the disastrous Battle of Brooklyn, after which victorious British forces proceeded to occupy Long Island for seven years until their evacuation late in 1783. Long Islanders were forced to take an oath of loyalty to the Crown or face the loss of their property. Those patriots who refused often fled to the mainland to fight for American independence. Adding insult to injury, Whigs who stayed on the Island after the battle were frequently humiliated or even assaulted by Tories, who wore red patches on their hats to distinguish themselves from patriots, for whom retaliation was out of the question.[11]

Ironically, although the Tory movement in Hempstead seemed successful, its members were largely responsible for its demise. Intercolonial leadership, evident in the patriot movement, was absent from Tory ranks. There were plenty of effective and energetic local leaders, but their failure to communicate, coupled with frequent changes in status and identity, fostered disorganization and weakened the force of the Loyalists' actions.[12]

The role of religion in the separation of the town was evident. The north, inhabited principally by Whigs, was also dominated by Presbyterians and members of other Calvinist denominations. On the other hand, the south, inhabited mainly by Tories, was largely Anglican. This geo-religious rift exacerbated political differences between the two areas. Many Whigs were forced to attend Anglican services because of the lack of a permanent Presbyterian minister. Many resented the power of the Anglican Church, but some, influenced by the preaching of its ministers, may have been swayed to defend the mother country.[13]

St. George's, in Hempstead, the only church in the colonies to receive a charter from the Crown, was a Loyalist stronghold, just as the Presbyterian Church was supported by patriots of the area. There was also a sizable contingent of Quakers on Long Island during the Revolution, pacifists who preferred to stay neutral in hopes the dispute could be settled with as little bloodshed as possible. As a result of the difference in religious beliefs between patriots and Loyalists, the Presbyterian Church was treated far more harshly by British forces than was St. George's. The Presbyterian Church was converted into a barracks for British troops, whose behavior must be considered improper, at best.[14]

Also important in the separation of the town of Hempstead were factors of status and occupation. Even though both Loyalists and patriots represented all socioeconomic strata, the northern and southern sections were defined by the principal occupations of each. North Hempstead was predominantly agricultural. The most common occupations were farming, clamming, fishing, and oystering, which yielded modest incomes to those who pursued them. South Hempstead contained a considerable number of farmers, but also a large contingent of office-holders, professionals, and merchants closely tied to British patronage and markets, and therefore supportive of British policy. This difference in occupations caused a difference in the social class levels of the

two sections.[15]

However, census and tax records show that the northern section was more affluent than the southern section. The average real property holdings of a resident of the north was £380, while the average for residents of the south was £200. The average personal property holdings of a resident of the north was £152 compared with £78 for residents of the south. The disparity may be attributed to an act in effect in 1784, when these tax lists were recorded, which allowed many Whigs to repossess property which Tories had seized during the war. Inspection of a smaller number of prominent Tories and Whigs confirms this economic relationship. It also reveals that the north had a greater number of slaves (an average of 3.8 per resident) than did the south, probably because of its greater involvement in farming and agricultural occupations[16]

Once the war ended, many patriot refugees in New England came back to Long Island, while many Tories went into exile. Tories were often viewed as treacherous persons who posed a possible threat to the policies of the victorious patriots. A great number of Loyalists removed to Nova Scotia and other parts of eastern Canada because they were afraid the patriots might seek revenge. As years went by and they started returning to Hempstead, they encountered the "trespass act," enabling farmers to recover damages from "British agents who had impressed horses, cattle, wagons, forage, or persons, or carried off wood, during the war. Only two farms in North Hempstead were confiscated to the State. One...owned by Daniel Kissam ...the other [by] the Ludlows." The trespass act caused dissatisfaction among the Loyalists.[17]

At the first town meeting of North Hempstead, on 14 December 1784, Adrian Onderdonk was elected supervisor and John Schenck town clerk, thus confirming the separation from Hempstead. The southern section, where Tories were still the majority, resented the metamorphosis of North Hempstead from Loyalist to Whig control, and the resulting division into the two towns of North and South Hempstead (the latter reclaimed the one-word name Hempstead in 1796). The act of separation stipulated that all of the area "south of the country road that leads from Jamaica, nearly through the middle of Hempstead, to the east part thereof should be included in one [new] township," called South Hempstead. The act also stated that the remainder of old Hempstead town would henceforth be known as North Hempstead.[18]

The separation of the town of Hempstead was the mutual decision of two factions who took opposite political sides in the War of Independence. An alternative view, expressed by the Hempstead historian Bernice Marshall, was that "the town was hopelessly divided, the split seeming to be determined more by geography than by creed, occupation, or social position."[19]

After the separation, tensions continued over the rights of the people of each town to fish and cut grass in the other, and over certain disputed lands.[20] Despite these disputes, both halves of the original town developed peacefully, side-by-side, even though one had endorsed and the other opposed the creation of the republic under which they both flourished.

NOTES

1. *Documents and Letters Intended to Illustrate the Revolutionary Incidents of Queens County, with Connecting Narratives, Explanatory Notes and Additions* (1846; reprint, Port Washington: Ira J. Friedman, 1970), 38-39; Myron H. Luke and Robert W. Venables, *Long Island in the American Revolution* (Albany: N.Y. State American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, 1976), 12-13.

2. Luke and Venables, 4-5.

3. Bernice Marshall, *Colonial Hempstead* (Port Washington: Ira J. Friedman, 1962), 258-61.

4. Harriette B. Norris, "The Division of the Towns of Hempstead and North Hempstead," *Nassau County Historical Society Journal* 22 {Fall 1961): 1-13); Onderdonk, 24-25.

5. *A History of the Town of Hempstead* (Hempstead.: Town of Hempstead, 1969), 33-34; *History of Queens County, New York, with Illustrations, Portraits, and Individuals* (New York: W. W. Munsell, 1882), 413.

6. Onderdonk, 39; for Woodhull's capture and death, see Michael Hayes, "General Nathaniel Woodhull and the Battle of Long Island," *LIHJ* 7 (Spring 1995): 166-77.

7. Myron H. Luke, "The American Revolution on Long Island," *Nassau County Historical Society Journal* 32:19-32; *History of Hempstead*, 33-34; Harriette B. Norris, "The Division of the Towns of Hempstead and North Hempstead," *Nassau County Historical Society Journal* 22 (Fall 1961): 1-13.

8. Luke, "American Revolution on Long Island," 19-32.

9. *History of Queens County*, 32; Peter Ross, *A History of Long Island from its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (New York: Lewis Pub. Co., 1902), 1::222-25.

10. Myron H. Luke, "The First Revolutionary Battle on Long Island: Battle of Hempstead Swamp," *Nassau County Historical Society Journal* 29 (Fall 1969): 38-43.

11. *History of Queens County*, 11, 36; Luke, "American Revolution on Long Island": 27-28.

12. William H. Nelson, *The American Tory* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1961), 40.

13. Henry Wilcox Loweree,"Town of North Hempstead," in Paul Bailey, ed., *Long Island: A History of Two Great Counties, Nassau and Suffolk*, 3 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing, 1949), 1: 416; Marshall, 265.

14. "St. George's-1735," *Daily News Sunday Magazine*, 29 June 1975, 14; Loweree, in Bailey, 416;.William D. Meisser, *The Story of a Little Home* (n.p., n.d), 18.

15. Nelson, 86-87.

16. See "Tax Lists of North Hempstead and Hempstead, 15 Dec. 1784," collection of Brooklyn Historical Society; for slave holdings, see *United States Census, 1790, New York* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1900).

17. Luke, "American Revolution On Long Island": 31; *History of Queens County,* 415.

18. *History of Queens County,* 415; Benjamin F. Thompson, *History of Long Island from its Discovery and Settlement to the Present Time,* 3rd. ed., revised and greatly enlarged with additions and a biography of the author by Charles Werner, 3 vols.(1918; reprint, Port Washington: Ira J. Friedman, 1962), 2:540.

19. Marshall, 265.

20. Loweree, in Bailey, 433.

A NEW INCARNATION of LYDIA MINTURN POST'S *"PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS" of the AMERICAN REVOLUTION*: A REVIEW ESSAY

By Natalie A. Naylor

Given the paucity of books on Long Island history written for younger readers—whether nonfiction or historical fiction—teachers and librarians are likely to enthusiastically welcome this young adult title. Not only is it largely set on Long Island, but it is also part of an "In Their Own Words" series. Drawn from Lydia Minturn Post's *Personal Recollections of the American Revolution* (first published in 1859), it promises first-hand primary sources, which are always desirable in historical writing. Readers of the *LIHJ*, however, should be more cautious if they recall reading about *Personal Recollections* in Sarah Buck's article, "An Inspired Hoax: The Antebellum Reconstruction of an Eighteenth-Century Long Island Diary."[1]

Sarah Buck did excellent detective work and quite conclusively demonstrated that the diary was not genuine, but "an embellished, if not a completely fictionalized, diary of life in the Revolution reconstructed from an antebellum perspective." She located a Post family genealogy that indicated the character of Henry Pattison in *Personal Recollections* was based on Lydia Minturn Post's Quaker paternal grandfather, Henry Post (1733-1816), who lived in Westbury.[2] Judith E. Greenberg and Helen Carey McKeever, authors (more accurately, editors) of *Journal of a Revolutionary War Woman* (hereafter referred to as *Journal)*, claim that it is the story of Mary Titus Post (1740-1823), Lydia Post's paternal grandmother. The diarist "Mary" is portrayed as living with her father, an Anglican clergyman, while her husband, Edward, is an officer serving with the patriots (no last names are given for these people throughout *Personal Recollections*).

The only Anglican church in the Hempsteads during the Revolution was St. George's. The distance from the town spot in Hempstead, where St. George's Church and rectory were located, to Westbury is five to six miles, making it impossible for the Pattisons to be "the nearest neighbor," as Buck points out. She presents other evidence that the journal was not contemporary with the Revolution. The words attributed to Nathan Hale at his execution ("I only

regret that I have but one life to lose for my country") were first published in that form in an 1848 biography. This is also one of a number of examples Buck cites of how the rhetoric in *Personal Recollections* reflects nineteenth-century antebellum romantic and nationalistic sentiments. Buck carefully analyzes the way *Personal Recollections* "reflects elements of Lydia Minturn Post's life in antebellum America" and is "a fictitious version of life in the town of North Hempstead during the Revolution."[3]

An editor at Franklin Watts contacted the Long Island Studies Institute in spring 1995, seeking illustrations for *Journal of a Revolutionary War Woman,* which they planned to publish for middle-school students. After we sent them a copy of Sarah Buck's article in *LIHJ,* the Franklin Watts editor said that their book was only for children, and besides, that *Personal Recollections* was still an old book. I replied that while it could be useful "as an exercise in historical detective work to determine authenticity of a purported document," the journal's value as a first-hand historical account was "fatally impaired." The Franklin Watts editor indicated that Greenberg and McKeever "had investigated the diary thoroughly" and were aware of "questions surrounding this material." She further indicated that "the question of whether this is an authentic Revolutionary War document; the work of the writer's granddaughter who edited the original journal for publication in 1859; or something else entirely will be fully looked at."[4]

The first chapter in Greenberg and McKeever's 1996 book is entitled "The Mystery in History." It devotes two pages to the mystery of Napoleon's death and conflicting evidence for arsenic poisoning. This is a prelude to considering the mystery of *Personal Recollections* in the next two pages of the introduction. The full title of the source is given: "*Personal Recollections of the American Revolution. A Private Journal. Prepared from Authentic Domestic Records. By Lydia Minturn Post. Edited by Sidney Barclay.*" Greenberg and McKeever raise the question of "Who wrote the recollections and who lived them?" Lydia Minturn Post is correctly identified as the daughter of Henry Post and Mary Minturn and granddaughter of Henry Post and Mary Titus of Westbury, Long Island.

> Who is the woman who is recalling the American Revolution and the siege [sic] of Long Island? For the last one hundred or so years, readers, historians, and the Library of Congress have accepted the book as the nonfiction journal of a woman named Lydia Minturn Post. However, the genealogical and time-frame references point toward Mary Titus Post. It is not known why Lydia did not state that *Personal Recollections* was based on her grandmother's story; however, she never denied it, either.[5]

Of course, the journal ostensibly is presented as a first-hand, first-person account, and to acknowledge that it was written by someone two generations removed would impair the effect. Moreover, Lydia also used a pseudonym (Sidney Barclay) as editor; the second edition, issued in 1866, is identical

except for adding *Grace Barclay's Diary* to the title and a more expensive gilt-edge binding. The diarist, however, is still named Mary.[6] The pseudonym Sidney Barclay was early identified. However, not all historians have accepted the book as genuine; in fact, those who have examined it closely have had reservations.

From its initial publication in 1859, questions were raised about the authenticity of *Personal Recollections*, and reviewers expressed skepticism, although praising the writing and recommending the book. The *New York Times* stated that it "resembles a young girl in the dress of her grandmother," and described the volume as "a very successful imitation of the manner of the last century," based on what "profess to be private records." *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper* noted, "it purports to be a private journal." The editor of *Historical Magazine* asked in 1859, "Is it purely imaginary, or have real family papers been used, with other material, to form the present journal?" Three months later, in the same publication, "E" identified Lydia Minturn Post of New York as the author who "compiled" the work from family records in the "*form* of a contemporaneous journal" (emphasis in original). However, the anonymous "E" also vouched that the family records were authentic.[7]

The most explicit contemporary indictment of the book was by Henry Onderdonk Jr., whom one modern scholar has called "the county's most reliable chronicler of the Revolution."[8] Onderdonk had compiled accounts from newspapers and other sources about various events that occurred on Long Island in his *Revolutionary Incidents of Queens County*, published more than a decade before Lydia Post's book. Onderdonk quoted from Post's book in 1865, with the following prefatory remarks:

> The following extracts are taken from an *imitation antique*, entitled: "Personal Recollections of the American Revolution," edited under the pseudonym of Sidney Barclay, the real writer being L.M.P. The scene and chief characters are mythical, but the book being a neat patch-work of "Revolutionary Incidents," is readable if not reliable.[9]

Onderdonk recognized that Post drew on his own *Revolutionary Incidents* book and proclaimed *Personal Recollections* to be "mythical" and "not reliable"— and thus not genuine.

In a paragraph beginning, "There are people who think a mystery still exists," Greenberg and McKeever briefly mention Sarah Buck's *LIHJ* article, but essentially dismiss it as an example of "the problems of fact-finding and interpretation." They do acknowledge that Lydia Post "sometimes combines names and personalities of two or more people into one person and moves locations of houses and buildings," but accept her claim that "she was working from authentic domestic records—diaries, letters, family recollections, Quaker church records, and other primary source materials." They also admit that there may be "some faulty statements, or errors" and "misinformation," due to

the time elapsed before publication.[10] However, Greenberg and McKeever provide no evidence for their assertion that Lydia Post used "authentic domestic records" to tell the story of her grandmother Mary Titus Post.

I originally encountered *Personal Recollections* a decade or so ago, in the facsimile edition reprinted by Kennikat Press in 1970. I felt that it did not "ring true," but gave it no more thought until I read Buck's article in *LIHJ*. For this review essay, I have sought to learn more about Lydia Minturn Post and her book, *Personal Recollections*, which is the source for Greenberg and McKeever's *Journal*. In the Nassau County Museum collections in the Long Island Studies Institute at Hofstra University, I located a copy of an unpublished 1969 paper by Ellen M. MacRorie, "*Personal Recollections of the American Revolution*, by Lydia Minturn Post: An Authentic Long Island Revolutionary Relic?"[11]

MacRorie located additional unpublished historical assessments which questioned the authenticity of *Personal Recollections*. An 1896 letter from a Quaker editor is pasted in the copy of *Personal Recollections* in the Friends Haviland Records Room in New York City: "It purports to be, and probably is, the diary of the wife of a patriot officer, kept on Long Island during the Revolution. It has, however, I think been edited a good deal, and perhaps rewritten altogether...It contains....family details, which I suppose may be true."[12]

Morton Pennypacker, an eminent twentieth-century local historian, wrote in a 1951 letter:

> I am going to tell you frankly that that book is a positive fraud. It is written in a style that would make one believe that it is a perfect diary by mentioning names of people that actually existed in that period. Perhaps ninety out of one hundred people who bought and read that book thought they were reading real history, but that is not the case....Comparatively few until recently knew how they had been fooled by that book because it is written in such a way that she mentioned in many parts of it things that really happened to the people whose names she quotes. But recently it has been discovered that her book as a whole is ranked fiction, and should not be ranked with anything but.[13]

With the interest in women's history in recent decades, Post's book has found a new audience. As Buck points out, however, though Mary Beth Norton quotes extensively from *Personal Recollections*, in her essay on sources she cautioned that it "appears to have been altered by its nineteenth-century editor and so should be used with great care."[14]

Sarah Buck and Ellen MacRorie independently analyzed *Personal Recollections* most carefully. Their assessments and conclusions are similar, though their evidence and details differ. I will not further reiterate all of Buck's arguments; they are basically sound, and interested readers can consult her 1995 *LIHJ* article as well as her response to Greenberg and McKeever's

book in this issue. Since Ellen MacRorie's analysis has not been published, I will draw upon her work in more detail, as well as my own research. MacRorie concludes:

> Much of the Journal portion of the book is fictional. The very Journal or diary of the Revolution itself is apparently inauthentic, although the Long Island history in it is accurate. Miss Post's sources most likely contained personal family material of revolutionary vintage, but much of her narrative in the Journal can be traced to secondary sources.

Buck and MacRorie both conclude that *Personal Recollections* reflects Lydia Minturn Post's nineteenth-century era. MacRorie summarizes it as follows, "Nineteenth-century Romanticism pervades every part of this book, including the Revolutionary material." She also gives examples linking the book to the historian, George Bancroft, whose "guiding hand is anachronistically evident in shaping the philosophy of the hypothetical diarist who preceded him."[15]

Lydia Minturn Post drew primarily on Onderdonk's *Revolutionary Incidents* and other secondary sources on the Revolution for her "Personal Recollections," and MacRorie gives various examples. Lydia Post did change names and probably embellished it with some family stories. A Post family genealogy, for example, indicates that there was an English officer, Major Crief (in *Personal Recollections* he is called Major Musgrave), who died in the house, and Onderdonk mentions a Lieut. Forbes who died in Westbury and "was interred near the [Quaker] meeting house" (as was Musgrave in the *Journal*). MacRorie observes that though there was a British officer named Musgrave, there is no evidence he was on Long Island. She characterizes this aspect as "romantic fiction at its most sentimental and melodramatic," and his traitorous words as "fantastic." The appendixes to *Personal Recollections* were not discussed by Buck or included in the 1996 *Journal,* but MacRorie conjectures that portions of the "Recollections" of Generals La Fayette and Washington may have drawn on Lydia's and her father's memories in New York City, heavily infused with the flowery romantic rhetoric of the time.[16]

The unsigned preface to Post's 1859 *Personal Recollections* states: "The old manuscript has been faithfully adhered to, the writer of this preface being confident that its authenticity will not be doubted by those who, taking truth and nature for their guide, can relish a plain tale plainly told." This is Lydia Post's effort to convince her readers that the journal is genuine. Standards for historical writing were much looser in the mid-nineteenth century. As MacRorie points out, it was not uncommon for editors to "tidy up" diaries and memoirs, and *Personal Recollections* was "popular history" designed "to entertain contemporary readers." Indeed, the contemporary notice of *Personal Recollections* in *The New York Times* compared it (favorably)

> with the *Diary* of Lady Willoughby, and *Leaves from Margaret Smith's*

Journal in the Province of Massachusetts Bay, 1678-9. John Greenleaf Whittier published the latter in 1849 from secondary sources, but in the form of a contemporary seventeenth-century journal.[17]

No one has found any evidence of the existence of an actual diary or journal. Greenberg and McKeever, however, assure their readers that Lydia was using "authentic domestic records" and that it is the diary of her grandmother Mary Titus Post. Although the time frame would be appropriate, they do not address the issue of why the diarist Mary is living with her Anglican father, whereas Lydia's grandparents Mary Titus and Henry Post were members of the Westbury Quaker Meeting, and her great-grandparents—Sarah and Edmund Titus and Mary and Richard Post—were also members of the Society of Friends, who had died before the Revolution began. Henry Post did not serve in the army during the Revolutionary War; Quakers were pacifists and tried to remain neutral—a situation portrayed in the diary in the family of the "Pattison neighbors."[18]

Most entries in the original 1859 book give the day of the week and the year. Only five give the day of the week and the full date. In checking these days with a perpetual calendar, I determined that each one had the wrong day of the week.[19] This is further proof that the journal was *not* written during the Revolutionary War. Moreover, Quakers would use numbers for days and months, rather than the conventional "pagan" names (e.g., first day or second month, rather than Sunday or February).

MacRorie could not locate any Sidney or Grace Barclay in Long Island or New York records—she reports that the only Barclays in New York City were Anglicans and Loyalists. However, she does provide an interesting explanation for the Barclay pseudonyms. Robert Barclay was a well-known seventeenth-century Quaker theologian in Britain, and the name had become "synonymous with Quaker." MacRorie argues that *Personal Recollections* is virtually a Quaker apology on the Revolution, and relates specific examples of the Quaker elements.[20]

There are other problems with *Personal Recollections*—and with the newly published edited version. Mary knows *everything* that is happening during the Revolutionary War, sometimes by letters she records or from neighbors. Contrast this with *The Diary of Mary Cooper: Life on a Long Island Farm, 1768-1773* or any other domestic diaries of the period, which typically are filled with reports of the weather and daily chores.[21] Moreover, though ostensibly Mary is the daughter of an Anglican clergyman, there is very little in *Personal Recollections* about religion, either in terms of personal feelings or even references to religious services—again, such references were quite usual in journals of that time. (References to Quaker beliefs in the preceding paragraph focus on pacifist views and moral character.) Furthermore, diarist Mary (and Greenberg and McKeever) refers to living at the parsonage, whereas Anglican usage (then and now) for the home of the clergyman is rectory.

In this book for young adult readers, Greenberg and McKeever have reorganized the journal into thematic chapters and provided historical background to help interpret and put the information in context. Their additions are clearly set off in a different type style. Their editorial comments are helpful, though one can quibble with some of their points. For example, their statement "the British forces were able to make New York City their headquarters and capture Long Island on August 27, 1776," reverses the order of the August Battle of Long Island (also called the Battle of Brooklyn) and the September British invasion of New York City. Washington did not retreat from Long Island to New York City until 29-30 August, and he did not withdraw his forces from lower Manhattan until 15 September 1776 (see Roger Wunderlich, review of *The Battle of Brooklyn, 1776*, in this issue of *LIHJ*). Also, in recounting what they acknowledge is the confusing story in Major Musgrave's journal, they have confused his cousin with his brother.[22]

More significantly, Greenberg and McKeever refer to the marauding troops and thugs as "Cowboys, Runners, Skinners, and Robbers" and claim these "gangs roamed the neutral ground, the area between the American and British armies on Long Island." There was no neutral ground on Long Island, all of which was occupied by the British from after the Battle of Brooklyn until their evacuation in fall 1783. However, there were many incidents of thievery, as noted by many historians. Greenberg and McKeever portray the Hessians much more negatively than *Personal Recollections* does, even in the excerpts they include. In discussing religion after the war, the authors mention Anglicans, Quakers, Methodists, and Baptists, but ignore Presbyterians and Congregationalists who then were the largest denominations on Long Island and in many other parts of the north.[23]

There are still mysteries to *Personal Recollections*. Who *did* Lydia use as the model for the journal writer, Mary? Perhaps she modeled Mary on her maternal (Minturn) grandmother rather than Mary Titus Post as Greenberg and McKeever conclude. If Lydia's paternal grandfather, Henry Post, is the inspiration for the Quaker neighbor Pattison, as Sarah Buck and Ellen MacRorie each discovered, it is certainly not logical that his Quaker wife would be the Anglican Mary keeping the journal for her soldier husband, as Greenberg and McKeever posit by identifying the *Journal* as written by Mary Titus Post. The answer to this question, however, is not really important, since the diarist Mary was Lydia's "fictitious alter ego," as Sarah Buck indicates, or what MacRorie calls a "literary device."[24] Mary is probably a composite and a figment of Lydia's imagination. The mystery that still remains is who *was* Lydia Minturn Post?

Post genealogical records indicate that Lydia was the daughter of Henry Post (1774-1847) and Mary Minturn, who married in 1806. (The parents of this Henry Post [Jr.], as noted earlier, were Henry Post and Mary Titus, who had married in 1761.) Though his roots were in Westbury, Lydia's father moved to New York City to become a clerk or apprentice in 1790, when he

transferred his membership from the Westbury to the New York Monthly Meeting. Lydia, the third of six children, was born ca. 1812. Some of Henry Post's business partnerships can be traced in *The Old Merchants of New York* and he is listed in New York City directories, but information on Lydia Minturn Post herself is sparse.[25]

In addition to *Personal Recollections*, Lydia Minturn Post edited *Soldier's Letters from Camp, Battle-Field and Prison* in 1865, "published in aid of the United States Sanitary Commission." According to the preface, these were from manuscripts sent in response to an appeal for "soldiers' letters."[26]

The New York State Library in Albany has more than three hundred letters of Lydia's father, Henry Post, including many with Dewitt Clinton concerning politics and the Erie Canal. The collection contains three letters to Lydia Minturn Post, in 1874 and 1875, which are not very informative but may imply that she was collecting her father's correspondence, perhaps for another book. MacRorie located a terse, two-line death notice in the *Glen Cove Gazette* in 1875: "Died. Great Neck. Lydia Minturn, daughter of the late Henry Post of New York City." Unfortunately, the exact date of death and her age were not given, nor was there any information about her life.[27]

Conclusion

What is the educational and historical value of the *Journal of a Revolutionary War Woman?* Better sources are available for this era, though the full story of the British occupation of Long Island and women's roles during the Revolution remain to be written.[28] The editors of the *Journal* did not adequately explore the question of the authorship and authenticity of *Personal Recollections*. The overwhelming weight of evidence, as indicated here as well as in more detail in Sarah Buck and Ellen MacRorie's work, is that it is a pastiche of fact and fiction written by Lydia Minturn Post in the mid-nineteenth century, not a first-person account of the revolutionary era. Yet Greenberg and McKeever present it as a genuine journal of Mary Titus Post, as part of an "in their own words" series. Their solution to the mystery of this history is not plausible. Portions may be based on private family papers, but it is impossible to expect most readers to disentangle authentic revolutionary era aspects from Lydia Minturn Post's mid-nineteenth century romantic rhetoric and fiction.

The *Journal* is neither genuine nor authentic—like *Personal Recollections*, it is an anachronistic history—a literary creation and, at best, historical fiction, at least in terms of its unique aspect, i.e., a woman's experiences during the Revolution. *Personal Recollections* could be the basis for an excellent case study of historical detective work in determining authorship and authenticity, but Greenberg and McKeever do not provide sufficient information for this purpose. If it had been presented as historical fiction or had they not been aware of Sarah Buck's work before publication, I would not be so critical. The *Journal of a Revolutionary War Woman* is worthless as a Revolutionary War

history purporting to be "in their own words." Pennypacker and Onderdonk said it best. It is a "rank fraud" and an "imitation antique."[29] The fabrication should not have been reincarnated.

NOTES

1. Sarah Buck, "An Inspired Hoax: The Antebellum Reconstruction of an Eighteenth-Century Long Island Diary," *LIHJ* 7 (Spring 1995): 191-204; Lydia Minturn Post, *Personal Recollections of the American Revolution*, edited by Sidney Barclay (New York: Rudd & Carleton, 1859).

2. Buck, 193; Marie Caroline de Trobriand Post, *Post Family* (New York: Sterling Potter, 1905), 88 (Sarah Buck kindly provided me with photocopies of pages from this book).

3. Buck, 195-98, 202, 193. The diarist's description of the home in the *Journal* (19-20) and *Personal Recollections* (19-20), is not consistent with the description of the Hempstead minister's house in church histories (see Myron H. Luke, "St. George's Rectories and Their Long Island," *Nassau County Historical Society Journal* 50 (1995): 3; the current St. George's rectory on Peninsula Boulevard, Hempstead, was not constructed until 1793, after the Revolution).

4. Natalie A. Naylor to Lorna Greenberg, editor, Franklin Watts, 25 May 1995, and Lorna Greenberg to Natalie Naylor, 12 June 1995.

5. Judith E. Greenberg and Helen Carey McKeever, *Journal of a Revolutionary War Woman* (New York: Franklin Watts, 1996), 9.

6. The East Hampton Library has a copy of each edition; it was reprinted in a facsimile of the first edition by Kennikat Press in 1970. It was not uncommon for women to write under male pseudonyms—in this case, Sidney is a name given to both sexes.

7. "New Books," *New York Times*, 28 July 1859, 2; *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, 20 August 1859; *Historical Magazine and Notes and Queries Concerning the Antiquities, History and Biography of America* 3 (Sept. 1859): 290, and 3 (Dec. 1859): 374-75.

8. Joseph Tiedemann, "Response to Revolution: Queens County, N.Y. During the Era of the American Revolution" (Ph.D. diss., CUNY, 1976), 211.

9. The full title is *Documents and Letters Intended to Illustrate The Revolutionary Incidents of Queens County, with Connecting Narratives, Explanatory Notes and Additions*, (1846; reprint, Port Washington: Ira J. Friedman, 1970), hereafter cited as *Revolutionary Incidents*; Henry Onderdonk Jr., *Queens County in Olden Times* (Jamaica, NY: Charles Welling, 1865), 60.

10. Greenberg and McKeever, 9-11.

11. B.A. diss., St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn, 1969. Sarah Buck subsequently told me that she had been aware of this study, but had been unable to locate a copy (e-mail, 29 July 1996). MacRorie had located the contemporary reviews of *Personal Recollections* (see n. 7, above); I independently found the Onderdonk reference

cited in n. 9, which she also includes.

12. Howard M. Jenkins, editor of the Quaker periodical *Friends' Intelligencer and Journal,* addressed to an unnamed "Friend," 7 May 1896, quoted in MacRorie, 50.

13. Morton Pennypacker to Mrs. Hallock, 9 November 1951, in Pennypacker Collection, East Hampton Library. Pennypacker was Historian of Suffolk County and East Hampton and the author of *George Washington's Spies on Long Island and New York* (Brooklyn: Long Island Historical Society, 1939); his books and manuscripts are the core of the East Hampton Library's Long Island collection named for him). I was unable to locate anything in Pennypacker's published works which discussed *Personal Recollections.*

14. Buck, 191-92.

15. MacRorie, 81, 82.

16. For examples of Lydia Post's sources of information in secondary accounts, see MacRorie, 52-54, 61-62; Marie Post, *Post Family,* 86; Onderdonk, *Revolutionary Incidents,* 175 no. 317; MacRorie, 67, 65; *Personal Recollections,* 219-40.

17. *Personal Recollections,* 14; MacRorie, 37, 83; *New York Times,* "New Books," 28 July 1859, 2; for similarities between *Personal Recollections* and Whittier's book, see MacRorie, 39-40.

18. William Wade Hinshaw, *Encyclopedia of American Quaker Genealogy,* vol. 3, *New York and Long Island,* compiled by John Cox Jr. (Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers, 1940), 434.

19. For full dates and days of the week in *Personal Recollections,* see 39, 48, 52, 83, 118. I used the perpetual calendar in Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff, *The Modern Researcher,* 3d ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), 89.

20. MacRorie, 43-46, 67-68; for examples from *Personal Recollections* cited, see 114, 146, 56, 59, 93, 99, 136, 163, 165, 166, 41, 43, 44.

21. *The Diary of Mary Cooper: Life on a Long Island Farm 1768-1773,* edited by Field Horne (Oyster Bay: Oyster Bay Historical Society, 1981).

22. Greenberg and McKeever, 14, 89-90; *Personal Recollections,* 169.

23. Greenberg and McKeever, 24.

24. Greenberg and McKeever, 41-45, 122. Buck, 202; MacRorie, 64.

25. Marie Post, *Post Family,* Chart C—Appendix G, 292; Hinshaw, 256; Walter Barrett [Joseph A. Scoville], *The Old Merchants of New York City,* 4th series (New York: Carleton, 1866), passim. The New York State Library secured Henry Post's papers in 1972 from Mrs. Henry Post Mitchell, whose husband was a descendant of Lydia Post's married sister, Cornelia Post Mitchell (information from James Corsaro, associate librarian, e-mail, 2 Aug. 1996); Henry Post disappears from the Quaker records after 1790; his marriage and children are not recorded. Mary Minturn apparently was not a Quaker, but there is not even a notation that Henry "married out of meeting (which usually was grounds for expulsion). Genealogies traditionally pay little attention to women, particularly to those like Lydia Minturn Post who did not marry and have children. Her mother's background is also unknown.

26. Lydia Minturn Post, ed., *Soldier's Letters from Camp, Battle-Field and Prison* (New York: Bunce and Huntington, 1865).

27. G. W. Clinton to L. M. Post, 23 March, 1874; John Bigelow to Miss Post, 12 June 1874; G. W. Clinton to Lydia Minturn Post, 16 March 1875; *Glen Cove Gazette* 19 (7 Aug. 1875).

28. For a few of the many works on the Revolutionary War on Long Island, see Myron H. Luke and Robert W. Venables, *Long Island in the American Revolution* (Albany: New York State American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, 1976); Henry Onderdonk Jr., *Revolutionary Incidents of Queens*, and *Revolutionary Incidents of Suffolk and Kings Counties*...(1849; reprint, Port Washington: Ira J. Friedman, 1970); Martha Bockée Flint, *Early Long Island: A Colonial Study* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896).

29. There is an interesting parallel in the authorship of *Personal Recollections* and the classic case of verifying the author of "The Diary of a Public Man," which covered important incidents in 1861. Samuel Ward combined fiction and truth in this diary, published in 1879. Barzun and Graff relate this case in The Modern Researcher and and indicate that the Diary's hybrid of fact and fiction left the "documentary value" as "nil" except for Ward, the biographer of the author (Barzun and Graff, 101-9, quotation 108-9); Pennypacker to Hallock, and Onderdonk, *Queens County in Olden Times*, 60.

RESPONSE to an UNINSPIRED HOAX: JUDITH E. GREENBERG and HELEN CAREY McKEEVER, *JOURNAL of a REVOLUTIONARY WAR WOMAN*

By Sarah A. Buck

Lydia Minturn Post's *Personal Recollections of the American Revolution*, the letter-journal on which *Journal of a Revolutionary War Woman* is based, is an intriguing document, as I indicated in my article in a previous issue of *LIHJ*, "An Inspired Hoax: The Antebellum Reconstruction of an Eighteenth-Century Long Island Diary" (Spring 1995: 191-204), and as Natalie A. Naylor points out in her review essay in the current issue. As the editor of *Personal Recollections*, Post appears to have spliced together elements of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century America in an effort to use a powerful historical narrative to make statements about her own antebellum world. Her document expresses the manifest destiny ideology prevalent in the North just before the Civil War, not the ideas prevailing in 1776. Because of this, *Personal Recollections* provides fascinating material for study, forcing the historian to ask important questions about authenticity of authorship, and to face difficult issues of objective and subjective historical interpretation.

Unfortunately, it seems that Judith Greenberg and Helen Carey McKeever have failed to understand either the details or implications of the historical problems raised by the document. In their deceptively promising introductory essay on the "Mystery in History," they observe that "historians are like detectives who piece together clues in their search for the truth" Yet, they caution, "as human beings, historians have their own experiences and opinions and these affect how they interpret certain events. Therefore, two historians may come to different conclusions about where, how, and why things happened"(7). This is precisely the lesson that *Personal Recollections* teaches, for it blatantly demonstrates Post's subjectivity and consequent inaccuracy in revealing the objective details of life on Long Island during the American Revolution. Sadly, Greenberg and McKeever's own interpretation fails to develop this lesson, just as their book does not deliver what one expects to be an interesting examination.

After briefly citing my article as an example of disagreement in historical

interpretation, Greenberg and McKeever go on to disregard my conclusion that *Personal Recollections* is an embellished, if not completely fictionalized, work. Instead of exploring the ambiguities and complexities of the diary that make it a rich historical source, they present excerpts from *Personal Recollections* to provide children with presumably authentic representations of life on Long Island during the Revolution. The result is an inaccurate portrait. The authors erroneously claim that, in *Personal Recollections*, "Lydia tells of her grandmother's [Mary Titus Post's] historical experience, but she sometimes combines names and personalities of two or more people into one person and moves locations of houses and buildings." Despite such clues to fictionalization, they feel it "is clear...that she was working from authentic domestic records" (11). While I agree that the journal is *probably* based on authentic records, I believe it is crucial to recognize that it is not an authentic eighteenth-century diary. My research suggests that Mary Titus Post could not have been the author because she was a Quaker living in Westbury, not an Anglican living in the only Anglican parsonage in the vicinity, St. George's Rectory in Hempstead village. Nowhere is this mentioned by Greenberg and McKeever.

By ignoring this and other equally compelling evidence of the journal's fictionalization, Greenberg and McKeever promote Post's mythologized nineteenth-century portrait of the Revolution. They uncritically accept her derogatory images of Redcoats and (local) "Cowboys, Runners, Skinners and Robbers" as vicious marauders, and her biased, Anglo-Saxonist rhetoric stereotyping Hessians as drunken, carousing thugs. To challenge such prejudicial statements is a major goal of the historian.

It is unfortunate that Greenberg and McKeever fail to take advantage of the possibilities offered by *Personal Recollections* to teach such important lessons as how one's subject position influences one's work, and why critical inquiry is necessary for examining people's opinions and the products of those opinions. By ignoring such possibilities and continuing to promote an unfounded and sometimes disturbing representation of American history, Greenberg and McKeever appear to have misunderstood the basic purpose of doing historical research.

REVIEWS

John J. Gallagher. *The Battle of Brooklyn, 1776*. New York: Sarpedon Publishers, 1995. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Pp. xvi, 206. $24.95.

In his shot-by-shot account of the largest and bloodiest battle of the American Revolution, John J. Gallagher recreates the Battle of Brooklyn (also known as the Battle of Long Island), the fierce encounter of 27 August 1776 in which twenty thousand British, Hessian, and Loyalist troops defeated ten thousand patriot soldiers. For reasons discussed below, the British did not cash in their victory by mounting a final assault on the Continentals pinned against the Gowanus Creek, on the brink of capture or death. Accordingly, during the night of 29 August and morning of the 30th, the Americans beat a brilliant retreat to Manhattan, of comparable significance to the Allied withdrawal from Dunkirk in World War II. However, the British did not hesitate to seize defenseless Long Island, which they occupied until the war ended seven long years later. The author, a forensic historian who lives in Brooklyn, not only details the rival armies' strategy, leadership, manpower, weaponry, and equipment, but also performs the reader-friendly task of linking each event to its present address.

Battle lines were drawn in June 1776, when the British decided to make New York City their base for smashing the Revolution. Although Manhattan was controlled by the patriots, Major General Sir William Howe and his brother, Admiral Lord Richard Howe, were able to sweep onto heavily Loyalist Staten Island with the largest expeditionary force yet assembled by the Empire—some twenty-four thousand well-armed, disciplined regulars, augmented by eight thousand Hessians, and backed by an armada of thirty warships and four hundred transports manned by ten thousand sailors and two thousand Royal Marines (66-67).

For a short time, the New York City area played host both to British and Continental forces. Each side understood the strategic importance of Brooklyn, particularly of the Gowanus coast from which artillery could control access to the East River. With an intelligence-gathering apparatus far inferior to that provided the British by Tory informants, the Americans could only guess whether the enemy would direct its main thrust at Manhattan or Long Island. Some patriot tacticians held that General Washington's nineteen thousand availables could defend neither city nor island against the Howes' massive land and sea power. John Jay, for one, proposed that "New York City be burned, Long Island laid waste, and the army and city inhabitants fall back to the Hudson Highlands...a formidable defensive position" (75). The commander in chief and most of his generals rejected this scorched earth

program in favor of splitting their forces until they knew where the British would attack, sending nine-to-ten thousand men to fortify Brooklyn Heights and keeping the rest in Manhattan.

Unfortunately for the American cause, Nathaniel Greene, the capable major general in command of Brooklyn, took sick before the battle. His replacement on 20 August, Major General John Sullivan, was, in turn, replaced four days later by Major General Israel Putnam. Neither Sullivan nor Putnam, in contrast to Greene, was familiar with the terrain. Conversely, Howe's second-in-command, Major General Sir Henry Clinton (born in New York City when his father was governor of the province), had, "In the several months preceding August 27...made a critical reconnaissance of the area" (98).

Starting on 22 August, British transports protected by warships ferried twenty thousand fighting men across the Narrows to Gravesend Bay, where they came ashore against sparse opposition at Denyse's Landing (Fort Hamilton), and swarmed over the plains of Gravesend, New Utrecht, Flatbush, and Flatlands. The American forts and earthworks loomed to the north of the invaders, behind the wooded ridge created by the moraine of the Wisconsin glacier "running down the spine of Long Island, from Oyster Bay on the Sound to a point on the coast of Brooklyn" (30).

In Gallagher's words, "The British had five possible routes through the hills to the fortifications around Brooklyn Neck": Gowanus Road, along the shore; Martense Pass, "through what is now the southern end of Green-Wood Cemetery"; Flatbush Pass, "near today's Zoo in Prospect Park"; Bedford Pass, "today at the intersection of Bedford and Rodgers Avenues"; and Jamaica Pass, between "the small settlement...known as the New Lots and today's Evergreen Cemetery" (97). The first four were heavily guarded, but, as Howe's reliable Loyalist informants reported, Sullivan had assigned only a five-man horse patrol to watch the Jamaica Pass. Consequently, Howe launched substantial feints along the Shore Road, Bedford, and Flatbush approaches, "to keep the Americans occupied while [he] maneuvered behind them" (102) During the night of 26 August, fourteen thousand redcoats, led by Howe in person, marched east on Kings Highway, then north through the woods, pulling twenty-eight cannon with them "nine miles in the dark...along a rutted and muddy path seldom more than twelve feet wide"(168). Early on the 27th, they poured through Jamaica Pass in a textbook-perfect flankng movement, swung west on today's Atlantic Avenue, and successively hit "the American positions at the Bedford and Battle [Flatbush] Passes and on the Gowanus [Road] with overwhelming force" (104).

Most of the fighting took place below the heights, where sizeable British units, sent to distract the Americans from detecting Howe's end-run, inflicted far more casualties than they suffered. The author provides a vivid account of furious hand-to-hand encounters, in one of which, "on the western slope of Mount Prospect, where the Central Branch of the Brooklyn Public Library now stands"(119), both Hessians and Black Watch Highlanders gave no quarter to some American units that opened fire after feigning surrender (121).

Fighting stopped soon after noon. Although some fifteen hundred Continentals were killed, wounded, or taken prisoner (compared with fewer than four hundred British and Hessian troops), the main American force made its way to the banks of the Gowanus, the creek facing Manhattan. Two nights later, helped by rain, fog, and winds that inhibited British warships from entering the East River, fishermen soldiers from Massachusetts rowed 9,500 men to safety. General Washington was among the last to leave.

The author briefly recounts Howe's September invasion of Manhattan and pursuit of Washington's army, which staged delaying actions from Kips Bay to Harlem (120th Street between 7th and 8th Avenues); Fort Washington (184th Street and Broadway); White Plains; and New Jersey. At Trenton, late in December, the patriots defeated some of the same British and Hessian units to whom they had lost the Battle of Brooklyn.

Had Howe ordered all-out attack in Brooklyn he might have destroyed the American army and reversed the course of the Revolution. However, "he saw it as his duty to regroup, feed his troops, attend to prisoners and organize for a siege. [With] Washington bottled up...cut off from the mainland...Howe had accomplished all he had planned to do that day" (139). Characteristically cautious, especially only several months after his costly attack on Bunker Hill, he was unsure if American reserves from Manhattan might not counter-attack and turn the tide. Gallagher's explanation of British reluctance to crush the defeated army at their mercy fails to allude to the Howe brothers' latent sympathy for the patriot cause.

This is not the only flaw in this generally excellent work. Minor errors include adding *s* to New Netherland and omitting the last *s* in Hempstead Plains. More importantly, Gallagher pays minimal attention to such topics as the presence of Long Island troops in the battle; the death, from a wound inflicted after his capture, of militia General Nathaniel Woodhull, the patriot president of the New York Provincial Congress; and the hardships and plunder Long Island endured in its seven-year occupation. His discussion of the Battle of Brooklyn as the opening battle of "democratic warfare"—wars of national liberation and social upheaval—omits the seventeenth-century English Revolution, the first rejection of the "divine right of kings" by an army of citizen soldiers. Although aborted by the Stuart Restoration of 1660, the seed of republican democracy took root in the New World and flowered in the American Revolution. Gallagher's thesis of democratic warfare, the intellectual hook on which he hangs his narrative, tends to lump all such conflicts together without distinction.

Notwithstanding these objections, the book offers many perceptive observations that add spice to its account of the battle. British infantry wore red coats "for visibility...The color also masked blood, either from the wounded soldier, or, more importantly, blood splashed from a comrade" (39). In contrast, with Congress hard-pressed to issue uniforms, an American farmer-soldier "wore whatever he brought from home." Washington encouraged "his men to wear a frontiersman's hunting shirt," believing that British regulars feared that men who wore them were expert marksmen (57).

However, the Kentucky or Pennsylvania long rifle did not become the patriots' weapon of choice; it proved slow and difficult to load in battles that "depended on the rapid volley fire only the musket could supply" (55).

The author succinctly summarizes the lessons derived from the battle. The Continental Congress now knew that to have any chance of defeating highly trained professionals, America needed a standing army committed for the duration. No longer could victory be trusted to short-term local militia, the expiration of whose enlistments permitted them to go home at times when they were urgently needed. Also, though wind and weather prevented the British armada from stopping Washington's retreat, the superiority of heavily gunned ships of the line over much less powerful coastal batteries convinced the American high command henceforth to fight inland whenever possible.

The day was "won by the British," but in spite of "his having more than 30,000 effective troops...Howe had neither shaken the rebels' political resolve nor destroyed their military effectiveness." However, muses Gallagher, "such a cool review more than two hundred years after the battle, might...have come as a great surprise to any of the desperately tired and demoralized troops huddled inside the American entrenchments at the time" (134). This book is recommended reading for all who cherish the heritage of the gallant "rabble in arms" that risked all for American independence.

ROGER WUNDERLICH
SUNY at Stony Brook

Giacinta Bradley Koontz. Editor. *The Harriet Quimby Research Conference Journal, Volume One—1995*. Woodland Hills, CA: Harriet Quimby Research Conference, 1995. Illustrations. $10 (paper).

The short but brilliant aviation career of Harriet Quimby, the high-society New York theater critic who became the first U.S. woman to become a licensed pilot, has served as the motivation for the first Harriet Quimby Research Conference. It was held at Arroyo Grande, California, on 14 October 1995, more than eighty-three years after Quimby's 1912 death in a plane crash, and the conference proceedings compose this soft-bound volume.

Harriet Quimby was a beautiful, talented, ambitious woman who pursued her own career goals with unlimited energy and commitment. These twelve somewhat informal and largely unedited short papers deal with various aspects of Quimby's life and times. Their authors range from present-day high school and college students to writers, historians, and aviation enthusiasts. Not surprisingly, the papers are quite uneven in focus and quality.

The papers are reproduced from typescripts, apparently much as the authors submitted them. The editor of the collection, Giacinta Bradley Koontz, is clearly the leading spirit of the Research Conference. As founder and

director, she called upon her background in anthropology, aviation history, and screenwriting to organize this conference and plan future ones: on 19 October 1996 a two-session meeting was held on Long Island at the Cradle of Aviation Museum and Hofstra University, with a 1997 conference scheduled in Michigan.

On 27 April 1991 the United States Postal Service issued a stamp honoring Harriet Quimby, as illustrated on the cover of this issue of the *LIHJ*. In the Scott Specialized Catalogue of United States Stamps, it is No. C128. The fifty-cent air post stamp shows Quimby in her purple satin flying suit (she was known as the "Mauve Maiden"), and in the background is a Blériot plane of the type she flew. The catalogue heading for this stamp issue reads, "Harriet Quimby, 1st American woman pilot," and beside the illustration are her dates: 1884-1912. The legend on the stamp itself is "Harriet Quimby—Pioneer Pilot—US Airmail."

The Postal Service has also honored other aviation pioneers whose lives, planes, and exploits were contemporaneous with Quimby's. These include Igor Sikorsky (#C119), Samuel P Langley (#C), Glenn Curtiss (#C100), Octave Chanute (#C93,94), Orville and Wilbur Wright(#C45,91,92), and, of course, the famous Curtiss "Jenny," featured on#C1,2,3, and 74. A 1953 stamp commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of "powered flight." There was also a stamp honoring Blanche Stuart Scott (1886-1970), also described in the catalogue as the "first woman pilot"; Scott was the first woman to solo, but she never earned a license.

In spite of Quimby's notoriety at the time, her aviation career lasted only from 1910, when she first enrolled in the Moisant flying school in Mineola, to 1 July 1912, when she died in a crash of the Bérliot XI plane she was flying.

Even at the time of her death there was uncertainty, which has now grown into mystery, about the time and place of Harriet Quimby's birth. Ed Y. Hall's paper details his efforts to answer this question by visiting Coldwater, Michigan, where a 1988 marker at the Branch County Airport states that Harriet was born 11 May 1875 at Coldwater. The way this marker came to be erected is described in a paper by Loranetta Diebel, president of the Branch County (wherein Coldwater is located) Historical Society.

Nevertheless, Hall's research (with the help of Bonnie Hughes) disputes her birth at Coldwater, and presents a completely different story. Although two of Harriet's sibs were indeed born in Branch County, her father William Quimby, as a Civil War veteran, received in 1868 a land grant of 160 acres in Arcadia Township, Michigan, and soon thereafter he settled on that land, some 190 miles northwest of Coldwater. The 1870 census shows that William and Ursula Quimby and one child (Jennie) were living in Arcadia. Harriet N Quimby was probably born there on 11 May 1875, but there is no birth record (because of a courthouse fire in Manistee, no births were recorded between 1873 and 1880). It appears that the Quimby family left Michigan for Arroyo Grande, California in 1883/84, and later went to San Francisco, where they were listed in the 1900 census. This may account for the opinion that Harriet

was actually born in California(and ten years later!), but that claim has no basis in fact. Since the Harriet Quimby stamp gives her dates as 1884-1912, that is still another birth date to consider; but, of course, the Postal Service is not known for historical accuracy.

Clearly the genealogy and family history of the Quimbys is incomplete, with conflicting dates and places. The papers by Hall, by Monica Quimby Batac, and by Roberta Smith all contribute data that will help in putting the pieces together, but there is still much work to be done—and hence the need for future conferences.

If the 1875 birthdate is correct, then Harriet was thirty-five years old when she first attended an air meet at Belmont Park in 1910. Soon thereafter she enrolled in the Moisant flying school, and became licensed on 11 August 1911. She became a member of the famed Moisant exhibition team, and in that same year won a cross-country race at the Nassau Boulevard air meet. On 16 April 1912, she became the first woman to fly the English Channel, piloting her new Blériot XI aircraft through clouds most of the way from England to France. Unfortunately, her fame was short-lived, for she crashed in Boston Harbor on 1 July 1912 and was killed. Her aviation career lasted less than a year.

The account of that fatal crash is the focus of papers by Peggy Teague and Sally Knight. There were conflicting reports at the time, even from observers of the crash, about exactly what happened. Both Quimby and her passenger were hurled from their seats, plunging into only five feet of water, and died instantly. The pilotless plane righted itself and coasted to a landing with little structural damage. Reports persisted that the passenger, William Willard, actually wanted to commit suicide; if that be true, in so doing he took the life of Quimby as well. It appears that these questions will never be answered.

The plane in which Quimby and Willard were flying was a Blériot XI, the same type Harriet flew across the Channel. A careful paper by Pat Fry summarizes much information about the famous Blériots, and lists all the restored and reproduction Blériot XIs that are known to exist, both in the U.S. and abroad

Editor Koontz contributed one double paper ("The King of Aviation" and "The Human Bomb"—a fascinating speculative exercise about the men who were, or might have been, a part of Harriet's life), and coauthored another (with Katie Sherwin) on William Quimby's possible employment in Arroyo Grande; no evidence was found.

Other papers include a well-crafted description by Lygia M.Ionnitiu of the Mineola Air Field (which includes personal details about Harriet Quimby, including her personality and her training at the field), and one by Jean Hubbard on the practice of folk medicine in the West at that time—Harriet's parents were thought to have been herbalists. The Mineola Air Field was later called the"Cradle of American Aviation" because of the number of important early aviation events that occurred there and nearby.

Without doubt, the remarkable life and achievements of Harriet Quimby

deserve a full and accurate account, and there is still much research to be done before that can be accomplished. This volume represents a giant step toward that goal.

FRANK C. ERK
SUNY at Stony Brook

Joshua Stoff. *History of Early Aviation, 1903–1913*. New York: Dover Publications, 1996. Illustrations, index. Pp. viii, 136. $12.95 (paper)

Less than a decade separated the first manned heavier-than-air flight from the development of those fragile early flying machines into the armed fighting aircraft of World War I. The future development of the airplane could not have been foreseen by Wilbur and Orville Wright when they made their successful 852-foot, 57-minute flight against a strong headwind at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, on 17 December 1903. The embryonic development of aviation during that first exciting decade is strikingly presented in Joshua Stoff's new pictorial history. The large-format book is a companion volume to others in Dover's series of picture history books on aviation. One of particular interest to readers of the LIHJ is a picture history of Aviation on Long Island from 1908-1938 by George C. Dade and Frank Strnad (reviewed in *LIHJ* 2 [Spring 1990]: 285-86).

The book consists of 307 photographs, each accompanied by a paragraph that not only describes that picture but weaves the person, plane, or event into a continuous narrative that stretches from the earliest gliders in the 1890s to the machine gun-equipped military planes of 1913. The volume is composed of six major sections: aviation pioneers; European aviators and their machines, American aviators and their machines; air meets; the price; and "loss of innocence." As the story unfolds, it becomes clear that the birth and early growth of aviation occurred primarily because of the intense work of a small number of pioneers, who had little to validate their efforts except the large failures and small successes of each trial-and-error modification in the design of wings, rudders, ailerons, and airframe.

The errors made in this relentless struggle to put humans into the sky were costly, and often resulted in death. The first person to be killed in a plane crash was Lt Thomas Selfridge, a passenger riding with Orville Wright in 1908, while Wright was demonstrating his plane to the Signal Corps at Fort Myer, Virginia; Wright himself was badly injured in the crash, but survived. Few of those early pilots survived into old age.

It is not well known, perhaps, that Alexander Graham Bell played an important role in these early experiments. Both in New York and near his Nova Scotia home in Baddeck, Bell and Glenn Curtiss endeavored to improve the early designs. Bell worked on perfecting propellers, and his results proved effective in transmitting the power of the small engines used to provide forward thrust.

Much of this early aviation history took place in Nassau County and in the New York City area. Alfred Moisant opened an early flying school near Garden City, where more than 1,200 treeless acres were available. He accepted women students, and his school set the pattern for later ones; his curriculum included the mechanics of flight, construction and repair of aircraft (including engines), training in a flight simulator, and finally flying an actual plane. Moisant used only Blériot Type XI monoplanes, which could be purchased in Hempstead from the American Aeroplane Supply House, "built with either American or Foreign Motors." This was the largest US maker of monoplanes before World War I.

The key importance of air meets in generating public interest in aviation is stressed in a separate chapter. Here Stoff describes in considerable detail the various tournaments that were held in Chicago and New England, and on Long Island. Race tracks were favorite venues for such meets, and in 1910 a nine-day International Aviation Tournament was held at Belmont Park Race Track, with prize money of $72,300. Some twenty-seven aviators participated, including representatives of the Wright and Curtiss teams. For many spectators, it was the first time they had seen an airplane in flight, especially the unusual French designs. One day there were ten planes in the air at one time! Clifford Harmon, the wealthy owner of a new Farman biplane, had, earlier, been the first to fly across Long Island Sound, but his plane crashed at Belmont. Roland Garros flew his tiny *Demoiselle*, and later became the first "ace" of World War I. The exciting events of the Statue of Liberty race of 30 October 1910 are detailed in words and pictures.

The following year, the International Aviation Meet, held at the Nassau Boulevard Aerodrome, featured thirty-six aviators and sixty planes. One participant was Lt H. H. Arnold, flying his Wright machine; he later became General "Hap" Arnold, commander of the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II. An important event during this meet was the first flight to carry U.S. mail by air; on 23 September 1911, Earle Ovington carried the mail in a sack on his lap as he flew the three miles to a spot near the Mineola Post Office, thus demonstrating the practical possibilities of carrying mail by air.

In the absence of much systematic knowledge of aerodynamics, many amazing designs were conceived, but most of these creations, which seem bizarre indeed today, never left the ground. A number of photos of these aircraft anomalies provide a humorous touch to an otherwise very serious look at early aviation. The heavy price these pioneer aviators paid to advance the design and effectiveness of flying machines can easily be seen in the photos of some of the fatal crashes during that first decade, especially during its second half.

The Wrights were not only outstanding engineers and pilots, but good businessmen as well. They demonstrated their planes to the U.S. military, and, after several trials, sold their "Flyer" to the government; it became Army Aeroplane No. 1.They took their designs to Europe in 1908, and seeded a fervor that attracted aircraft designers and pilots from England, Holland,

Russia, and France. They began building their planes in France in 1909.

Among many French pioneer designers and pilots, Louis Blériot was perhaps the best known, for his designs were widely used in air meets and other contests both in Europe and America. In July 1909, Blériot was the first person to fly across the English Channel.

America's first licensed woman pilot was Harriet Quimby, who flew a Blériot across the English Channel in 1912, the first woman to do so. Later, she had the plane shipped to the US, where she flew it until she died in a crash in Boston Harbor in July, 1912, less than a year after she became a licensed pilot (For more information on Harriet Quimby, see the companion review above).

From the very early days of aviation, there were prizes and trophies for those who won endurance tests, reached new altitudes, flew greater distances, and won air races. During the first decade after the Wright's pioneer flight, plane bodies gradually lost their open-frame construction. Some planes boasted two or four engines, and carried up to eight passengers.

The military potential of aircraft was soon recognized, and planes were developed that could drop bombs or be armed with machineguns. Some of the first steps in air-to-air gunnery were taken in 1910 at the Hempstead Plains airfield near Mineola; a local trapshooter shot at cans thrown into the air, and managed to hit about half of them. The recoil of the rifle did not noticeably affect the balance of the plane. The notion of an aircraft carrier was born in 1910/11, when Eugene Ely was able to take off and land successfully on temporary wooden decks built on anchored navy ships. The first experimental drop of live bombs was done in 1911, paving the way for raids in World War I.

Working closely with pioneer Glenn Curtiss, the Navy encouraged the development of hydro aeroplanes, and purchased models from both Curtiss and Wright. By 1913, military fighter aircraft design was well underway, and Curtiss's "Scout" directly preceded the famous "Jenny" that played such an important role in the war. Sopwith developed the antecedent to his famous "Camel" fighter. Soon most military aircraft were equipped with machine guns, and the airplane took its place in the military forces of the world. Joshua Stoff's attractive, fascinating and authoritative book is an essential tool for understanding the early days of aviation. It is a work both of history and art.

FRANK C.ERK
SUNY at Stony Brook

Roger D. Stone. *Fair Tide: Sailing toward Long Island's Future*. Great Falls, VA: Waterline Books, 1996. Illustrations. Pp.208. $22.95.

"In search of a sailboat to borrow, I am in Greenport with the thick air of a muggy afternoon lying heavy over the saltmarsh, waiting for Kiremidjian" (1). So begins Roger Stone's ingratiating and important new book on Long

Island's environment, *Fair Tide: Sailing Toward Long Island's Future.*

Stone invites us to join him aboard the *Piper*, a twenty-five-foot wooden cruising sloop (borrowed from Mr. Kiremidjian) for a leisurely, contemplative circumnavigation of Long Island. *Fair Tide* describes a trip taken by Stone and a small, changing group of companions during the summer of 1995. Setting off from Greenport they explore the waters of Peconic Bay, sail around Orient Point, down the Sound to the East River and New York Harbor, back along the South Shore and around Montauk Point to return home. Along the way, in sections of the book set out with different type-face, the author explores the history and state of the Island's environment. At times the distinction between nautical narrative and environmental analysis gets blurred, but no matter. After all, what better vantage point from which to contemplate Long Island's environment than its coastal waters, in view of that ecologically complex, productive, fragile, desirable and contentious coastline?

Along the way, Stone writes lucidly and engagingly about the Island's environmental situation, exploring issues of land use, the power of developers, the Pine Barrens, transportation, golf courses, water quality, shopping centers, beaches, DDT, energy, and a myriad of other related matters. By now, these subjects, important as they are, can be dull and muddy waters. With Stone, they are fresh and sparkling, in part by virtue of his descriptions of relevant situations in other parts of the country, and in part because of his use of specific examples, and discussions with key individuals. The narrative of the voyage also adds immediacy and freshness.

Readers of the *Long Island Historical Journal* will appreciate Stone's description of the historical context of the region's environmental condition. It is a judiciously selective history, concentrating on the evolution of our predecessors' use of the land and waters of the region, and the account is enlivened by quantitative details such as the number of ships in Stony Brook's commercial fleet in 1843 (one brig, eight schooners and fifteen sloops); the amount of wood exported annually from Stony Brook at that time (four thousand cords); and the Island's annual production of oysters in Gatsby's day (3.3 million bushels, compared to below 28,000 today). Stone's historical account is also enlivened by descriptions of important figures of the Island's environmental past, including the naturalist, Robert Cushman Murphy, the conservation-minded shoe magnate/developer Ward Melville, and the master planner, Robert Moses.

In his concluding chapter, Stone moves from narration and description to prescription. These turn out to be more difficult waters. He insists that destructive development can be stopped only by

> an alternative view of the island's future...shaped around the idea of creating new economic opportunities by accentuating the island's environmental positives: safeguarding the biological diversity, the open space and the coastal viewsheds that remain, and using zoning, fees and tax incentives to make it happen (147).

Stone puts forward a bevy of specific recommendations for what he calls "stability-based economic progress," ranging from incentives for revitalizing existing downtowns; expansion of programs to buy farmland development rights; rejection of moves to widen highways other than for safety or addressing severe congestion; and environmental education.

Stone admits that most of his recommendations are not new, nor does he address the question of how, given years of being stalled on many of these issues, the ship of public action can get moving again. He sees glimmers of hope in, for example, the local waterfront revitalization program for Stony Brook Harbor, and the Pine Barrens agreement, but it remains to be seen how the underlying conflicts, for example between developers and those who would preserve open land can be resolved. At one point in the sailing narrative Stone rails against the "atrociously noisy" powerboats as they "whip the water into an uncomfortable, multidirectional slop that frequently spills the light breeze from our sails." He suspects the power boaters take a "perverse delight" in this (59).

Stone can not be faulted for not identifying magic solutions in this, one of the most difficult areas of public policy. The importance of his book lies not the novelty of his recommendations, but rather in its balance and its intrinsic thesis. The author's centrism is not surprising for someone who at various time in his career was a vice president at Chase Manhattan Bank and at the World Wildlife Fund. (Stone now serves as President of the Sustainable Development Institute in Washington, D.C.) Stone may recognize the contribution of the environmental firebrands, and he may share their deep concerns, but he recognizes the need for accommodation. He is not antidevelopment, but rather an advocate of more intelligent, sustainable development, and argues that the Island's comparative advantage economically is its environmental quality.

Stone's intrinsic thesis is the importance of enlightened public participation in determining the island's future. *Fair Tide* itself is a genial goad and an instructive guide to intelligent public participation. We will all be better off if we accept Roger Stone's invitation to join him on the voyage of the *Piper.* If he could only, somehow, bring the developers and the powerboaters along.

PHILIP F. PALMEDO
Long Island Research Institute

Joan Druett and Mary Anne Wallace. *The Sailing Circle: 19th Century Seafaring Women from New York.* Long Island: Three Village Historical Society and Cold Spring Harbor Whaling Museum, 1995. Illustrations, bibliography, index. Pp. 46. $9.95 (paper).

Long Island women went to sea, on merchant vessels and even on whaling

ships. This statement amazes most people and may be denied by many, but it is true, as demonstrated by the catalog of the major exhibition mounted jointly in 1995 by the Three Village Historical Society and the Cold Spring Harbor Whaling Museum.

Publication of the catalog is welcome for two reasons. It provides those who visited the exhibition a tangible tool to aid their recall of an excellent, visually enjoyable, rich display of memorabilia of these seafaring women. In addition, this well-written, handsomely illustrated catalog is a valuable introduction to and overview of this long-overlooked topic.

This reviewer, who has been fascinated during the last few years with the subject of women going to sea alongside their husbands, admits to having read, several years ago, a historical narrative of such an adventure based on a woman's diaries, but confesses to having passed it off as an anomaly. As one who works for a Long Island historical society and is the book buyer for its museum gift shop, she reconsidered that off-hand, unfair judgment with the recent publication of a couple of women's journals and letters from their days at sea, and with the conference on the topic held by the Long Island Studies Institute of Hofstra University. Just why do we not take seriously the role of women at sea until we are forced to do so?

First of all, we have the age-old problem of the universal acceptance of certain roles for men and others for women, the problem of stereotyping. In addition, the women who did go to sea went alongside their husbands or fathers who almost exclusively were captains of their ships. Thus, in the seafaring world they were of the elite, and small in number. Also, as pointed out in the introduction, even the federal government seemingly ignored them; there is no mention of sailor in the first comprehensive listing of women's occupations, in the 1870 census.

The preliminary list of sister sailors of Long Island (40-41) contains more than fifty names. The earliest identified is Polly Hubbard Gardiner, wife of Captain Henry Gardiner, of Quogue, who set sail from New York for the Pacific Ocean on the whaleship Dawn, on Christmas day, 1826. The most recent date is ca 1915, for a couple of women who sailed on coasting schooners. The women sailed on three types of vessels: whaleships, blue-water merchant ships, and ships in the coasting fleet. The coasters are often overlooked but played a vital role in our country's history. Their name comes from their routes. These smaller sloops and schooners plied their trade along the coast, carrying mundane cargoes such as lumber, coal, stone, clay, bricks, and cotton.

Captain William Lester Hawkins, whose wife Mary Ann and children sailed with him, delivered most of the granite and freestone used in constructing the Washington Monument and the east wing of the Capitol, until the Civil War interfered with the work. In fact, the entire family was on board and watched the battle between the Monitor and the Merrimac in 1862. Another woman, Carrie Hubbard Davis, led a rather atypical life as a crew member on board her father's coastal schooner in the 1870s. Her father was captain; her

husband was mate; she was cook and steward. They carried farm produce from one port to another along Long Island Sound and back and forth between Long Island and Connecticut.

Larger schooners, brigs, and barks were not limited to coastal waters. These blue-water merchant ships plied their trade between the continents, across the Atlantic Ocean, and even around the capes into the Pacific or Indian Oceans. Although these ships were larger, and the captain's accommodations roomier, the women still found their domain to be rather cramped. The larger ships carried larger crews which included a cook, so the sister sailor's duties were those of wife and mother—providing companionship for her husband and caring for the children.

The lives of women who went to sea on whaleships were similar to those of blue-water merchant wives. The main difference was the length of the voyage. Whalers stayed at sea until the barrels in their holds were filled with oil. Voyages typically lasted three years, some as long as six, and were usually to the Pacific. Because such lengthy voyages meant that whalemens' wives saw little of their husbands, it is understandable that some chose to go to sea with their men. There were many perils, not least of which was the lack of aid available in times of illness. Childbirth was a particular hazard; many husbands chose to put their wives ashore to await the event. Thus, some women found themselves in a strange country for months at a time awaiting the birth of their infant and their husband's return.

Of course, women experienced such other hazards of shipboard life as storms, pirates and even mutiny. But, aside from the tension of such threats or illness, there were many long hours of little to do aside from needlework or keeping a journal. It was a treat when another ship was sighted, particularly if it hailed from a port close to home. Merchant vessels had schedules to meet, but whalers could take some leisure time. Thus, there developed the practice of gamming, involving the lowering of whaleboats so that crews could visit each other, a form of socializing especially treasured by the women. Information on the location of whales and success of the work to date was shared, along with other gossip relative to their trade. Of particular interest was news of home, families, neighbors, and community. The gam was not restricted to random meetings with ships met rat sea. Gamming also took place on land, when a ship put in for repairs or other reasons and sighted another whaleship in the port. Gams were clearly important to the whalers, for they figure at length in logs, journals, and letters.

The Sailing Circle: 19th Century Seafaring Women from New York further illuminates the fascinating story of seafaring women. Richly enhanced with photographs of people, places, ships, and artifacts, the story is often told in a sister sailor's own words through quotations from letters and journals. This is a book to be cherished by social and maritime historians.

DIANE F. PERRY
Suffolk County Historical Society

Andrea Wyatt Sexton, and Alice Leccese Powers, eds. ***The Brooklyn Reader: 30 Writers Celebrate America's Favorite Borough.*** Introd. Pete Hamill. New York: Crown Trade Paperbacks, 1994. $13.00. Pp. vii, 287.

This quirky anthology is made up of writings and writers as eclectic as Brooklyn itself, ranging from production notes by Spike Lee to a poem by Vladimir Mayakovsky, contributions by Walt Whitman (b. 1819) and Cristina Garcia (b. 1958), from Woody Allen's half-page surreal vision of the place of his birth to a chapter-long excerpt from Betty Smith's *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn.* And perhaps only an anthology of this kind can do Brooklyn justice. Included in the selection are several attempts to capture the borough's essence singlehandedly, mostly by means of epic catalogues of the features that distinguish Brooklyn from all other communities, and mostly ending with the writer helplessly throwing up his or her hands, as in Carson McCuller's description of Fulton Street: "These shops have a musty, poky atmosphere, and the people who own them are an incredible crew" (146); or the borough's First Celebrant's exclamation: "Crowds of men and women attired in the usual costumes, how curious you are to me!" (267) Faced with Brooklyn's variegated splendors, the writer may reach greater heights of eloquence by simply admitting defeat, as Mayakovsky does: "Brooklyn Bridge—/Yes ...../That's quite a thing!" (141)

As a whole, though, the anthology casts a wide net, thereby increasing the chances of trapping an essential detail or a telling point. To boost the odds, the editors have taken care to include the voices of native Brooklynites as well as the late-comers, of men and women who have abandoned Brooklyn for Manhattan or Los Angeles as well as those who are marooned in the Fourteenth Ward, all of whom see the borough from very different perspectives. The non-native contributor may extol the beauties of the tonier districts in order to justify moving to Brooklyn rather than Manhattan; Truman Capote, for example, begins his story with the defiant lines, "I live in Brooklyn. By choice" (27), then proceeds to describe the view of Manhattan from Brooklyn Heights. Such writers convey a sense of living serenely on the edge of a great city, safe from its depredations yet still within its dynamic penumbra. Others remind the reader that Brooklyn is also a retirement colony without Florida's eternal sunshine, the habitat of maiden aunts and aging parents who, as in Anatole Broyard's tale, anxiously monitor their ever-extending family's struggle in the world across the water; or who are eulogized by Pete Hamill as the men and women who made his move to Manhattan possible.

But the strength of the anthology lies in the nostalgic recollections of Brooklyn childhoods. Those raised in Brooklyn focus on the *texture* of a life that is half suburban innocence, half big-city psychosis. This spirit finds its highest expression in Coney Island, that attainable Xanadu where small dreams come true and redeem the cheerless, seedy streets along which many of these writers roamed as children. Much of the nostalgia, here as elsewhere,

derives from a youth that is past, innocence that is lost, and the diminishment of the world that comes with adulthood. But a Brooklyn child's innocent bliss is another child's nightmare, a point that gives this anthology its peculiar charm. It is hard to imagine writers from any other part of the world waxing lyrical, as Henry Miller does, over Navy Yard sea gulls "wheeling and diving, making a dirty noise with their dirty beaks, a hoarse, preying sound of inhuman feasting, of mouths fastened down on refuse, of scabby legs skimming the green-churned water" (166); but it is the harshness of Brooklyn's beauty that throws the remembered experience into such stark relief, and which causes writers to refer to the past with unexpected tenderness. Life, according to these writers, was more vivid then and nothing since has been able to match it, even though they searched the world over; to quote Miller again: "And then comes a time when suddenly all seems to be reversed. We live in the mind, in ideas, in fragments. We no longer drink in the wild outer music of the streets—we *remember* only. Like a monomaniac we relive the drama of youth." (167)

Perhaps that explains Neil Simon's obsessive paraphrasing of his Brooklyn boyhood, that source of the "Unbelievable, Fantastic and Completely Private Thoughts of I, Eugene Morris Jerome, in this, the fifteenth year of his life, in the year nineteen hundred and thirty-seven, in the community of Brighton Beach, Borough of Brooklyn, Kings County, City of New York, Empire State of the American Nation—" (210).

The overall effect of the anthology is to recreate the wanderer's experience of Brooklyn even as it provides a glimpse of the lives behind the barred windows of Brownsville and the bay windows of the Heights; and at the end the reader may well be moved to revisit parts of the borough again, and to sigh after Mayakovsky: "Brooklyn. Yes ..... That's quite a thing!"

PETER STEPHAN
SUNY at Stony Brook

Book Notes

The Free-Holder 1 (Summer 1996), a new history magazine published quarterly by the Oyster Bay Historical Society, P. O. Box 297, Oyster Bay. NY 11772-0297. The first issue offers a twenty-page assortment of articles, features, and letters concerning the history of Oyster Bay. Non-members of the society are requested to send $1 or more to cover postage and handling.

For review in Spring 1997:
John A. Strong. *The Algonquian Peoples of Long Island from Earliest Times to 1700*, and *"We Are Still Here!" The Algonquian Peoples of Long Island Today*, both published in fall 1996 by Heart of the Lakes Publishing, under the auspices of the Long Island Studies Institute of Hofstra University (for information call 516 463-6411).

The expanded and enlarged edition of the *Town of Hempstead Archives Repository Guide*. Hempstead: Town Clerk's Office, 1996. For information, call Thomas A. Saltzman, (516) 489-5000, ext. 3493.

Steve Wick. *Heaven and Earth: The Last Farmers of Long Island.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

COMMUNICATIONS

Dear Editor,

The casual traveler passing through Stony Brook will see a pseudo-colonial shopping center, remark "How attractive," and continue on his or her way, but some inquisitive person may say, "This is an old village—how did this come about?" The answer, of course, is the so-called restoration. This letter attempts to give some idea of pre-restoration Stony Brook.

To verify my qualifications as a pre-university, pre-restoration Stony Brook old-timer, let me recount a little of my background. In the early 1900s, my grandmother rented a summer cottage near the far end of the Hollow Road for herself, her two unmarried daughters, my parents, and me. I remember walking with someone who had a lantern to the top of the hill above the station, where we sat on a bench around a tree in front of Hopkins Hall to meet someone arriving by train. In 1916 (when I was three), the cottage was to become unavailable and my grandmother looked into renting at some other location. Howard Dickerson (who ran the local general store) informed her that he had a house on the hill that might be adequate. She countered that, with some modifications, it might be. He replied that the modifications she had m mind would not be practical, but that he might build another house near the existing one and together they might do.

Accordingly, the "new house" was built next to the "old house," with only a driveway between them. We spent summers in both for many years. Later, my grandmother and then my parents lived full time in the new house, in which my grandmother and my father died (some years apart) in the same room. All told, my family occupied the new house for almost forty years.

During the restoration I was busy with my job and a family, and was an infrequent visitor to Stony Brook. However, I remember what it was before the restoration (I was a teenager in the early 1900s and most of my exploring was done on foot). In the heart of the village there was virtually nothing on the land side of the main road except a barn-like structure on an almost deserted hillside now occupied by the Post Office and a line of shops. The main road followed approximately the route of the present highway. However, between the present bank and the Hercules figurehead (a much later addition), a dock road left a slim triangle between it and the main road. The Liberty Pole was at the western tip of the triangle. Next to it, on the creek side of the main road, stood a large brick building which, I believe, once contained a drug store. Next to that were some shops and a general store, later replaced by Zimmerlein's Pharmacy. Brush's barbershop was also in the vicinity. On the creek side of the triangle were a few small houses. All these structures disappeared during the restoration.

West of the triangle, on the creek side of the main road, was Howard

Dickerson's general store that later became an ice cream parlor. Behind and east of this was the house (some of it old but well kept), the barn, the "mill house," and a play house for the oldest Dickerson girl where Hercules is now. All this was destroyed in the restoration.

Further west of the Dickerson place was the bank, Henry Peterman's grocery store, the Presbyterian Chapel, Reboli's fruit and vegetable store, and the remains of an early fire house. Except for the bank, all of these disappeared. Still further west, beyond the Mill Pond, was a row of stores including Bayles's hardware store (a good one), a bicycle repair shop, and the lumber yard. All of these also vanished, except the lumber yard, which became the site of the Museums. The entire center of the village was gutted and replaced with new construction.

On a more personal level, I had friends who summered with their parents on Shipman's Point, accessible only by boat long before the road from West Meadow was built. Houses at the tip of the Point had running water but no sanitary facilities; a four-holer, known as the House of Parliament, stood about where the turnaround is now. To reach my friends, I walked through the woods to the top of the bluff, then down and along the beach to where I could attract their attention. They would come across the creek in a boat and pick me up for a day of swimming or fishing. Later, I had the use of a canoe that I chained to a tree at the foot of the bluff. Sometimes we played baseball (as the "Starfish Giants") about where the turnaround is.

Speaking of fishing, there was always hope they might dredge the harbor. During one off-season, a large barge containing some dredging equipment—and a lot of junk—ran aground on the point just west of the mouth of West Meadow creek. It was there for more than a year and made an excellent place to fish for snappers. Sometime after the barge's arrival and the removal of the hardware from its deck, an exceptionally high tide floated it off the point. Unfortunately, it ran aground again in front of the dock, a few yards west of the pavilion, where it remained for some time until removed by blasting, also during an off-season.

My roots in Stony Brook are deep and long-standing. I have a great fondness for the village, especially as it was during my youth. My brother, his wife, and I still have an interest in a lot in the Oak Hill Cemetery, on the Hollow Road. My sister, my parents, and my wife are already there. My brother's, my sister-in-law's, and my name are on the stone. All we need are three closing dates and we, too, will be there for eternity.

Edwards H. Cleaveland
Littleton, Colorado

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